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Preface

“We need a new kind of book, which tries to connect the past with the present and future, to unite old material with modern theory. New principles and theses have to be worked out. I hope this new book will set an example as to how new opening books should be written. It makes no sense for the reader to learn the openings from bad books. New standards have been set in order to appreciate these creative problems. With his new book Lev Gutman succeeds in an explanatory manner.”


“In my opinion Lev Gutman is really an excellent theorist, even maybe one of the best in the world.”


“Many chess books were written within a few weeks and even more have quickly disappeared into oblivion, still, Gutman’s book remains.”


“More and more we can observe writers publishing their own productions of the pen. A striking example of this phenomenon is Lev Gutman’s Gewinnen mit Schottisch. A really outstanding opening book, which is bound to replace the classical textbook on this ancient opening by Harding and Botterill (Batsford 1977). Gutman has not only collected, but also evaluated almost everything available on the Scotch. Ever since Kasparov used it to surprise Karpov in the 1990 World Championship match, interest in 3 d4 has increased dramatically, and it must have been quite hard for Gutman (who never plays 1 e4 or 1 e4 e5, either as White or as Black) to write such an extensive treatise in the turmoil. Contrary to present-day authors of opening books, Gutman is prepared to stick his neck out. Throughout the book he takes a fresh look at both traditional knowledge and new developments.”


“Nigel Short was evidently surprised to face the Scotch Game in round 11; afterwards his part-time second Jon Speelman came to the BCM Chess Shop in Kensington to ask our help in finding a German book: Gewinnen mit Schottisch by Lev Gutman. We were happy to oblige, although we no longer had any copies left. Bernard Cafferty collected that our long time BCM subscriber and book collector, Ray English, had bought one. Unfortunately (wait for this) Ray lives in Manchester and to cap it all, was one of the leading supporters of the scuppered Manchester bid! Fortunately our BCM readers are a magnanimous bunch and a courier was employed by the Short camp (at some considerable expense) to bike the book to London. In addition to the £200 bill, Nigel may have had another surprise, just below the book title was the heading ‘foreword by Garry Kasparov’.”

1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4

“The Scotch Game or Gambit received its modern title from having been adopted with success, both in attack and defence, by the Scotch players in the celebrated match by correspondence between Edinburgh and London in 1824-1826.

A remarkable feature in this opening is the number of ways of attack and defence that have been advocated by experts at various times. As soon as one method has been satisfactorily met, another equally eligible has sprung up to take its place, showing that the resources of the opening are practically inexhaustible.” Freeborough/Ranken, Chess Openings, Ancient and Modern, London 1893.

“This opening, which is one of the strongest in practical play as well as in theory, is already mentioned by old Italian writers, but derived its name and its introduction into public favour chiefly from the match between Edinburgh and London, played in 1826-28.” Wilhelm Steinitz, Modern Chess Instructor, 1889.

“The idea of this opening is to open the centre to the pieces as soon as possible.” Emanuel Lasker, Manual of Chess.

“Noted briefly by Del Rio in 1750, this opening was taken up by Cochrane who recommended its use by the London Chess Club, in a correspondence match against the Edinburgh Chess Club, 1824-1828. Seeing the effectiveness of this opening, the Edinburgh players used it too; they won the match and gave the opening its name. The Scotch Game, usually in its gambit form, remained popular for more than twenty years, and Jaenisch could write in 1843 that it was the strongest of all openings.” David Hooper and Kenneth Whyld, The Oxford Companion to Chess, 1984.

“In common with many other commentators I had believed that the Scotch derived its name from a correspondence game between Edinburgh, White, against London, Black, played between 1826 and 1828. That game began 1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 ∆xd4 4 ∆xd4 exd4 5 ∆xd4 ∆e7 6 ∆c4 ∆c6 7 ∆d5 and was won brilliantly by White in 60 moves. What I had not appreciated was that there had been an earlier game London, White, against Edinburgh, Black, played by correspondence between 1824 and 1825,
in which the Scotch concept of 3 d4 was introduced for the first time. What the canny Scots realised was that White need not make a gambit of the opening after Black captures on d4. White can simply recapture, maintaining material parity and a slightly freer position.” Raymond Keene, The Complete Book of Gambits, 1992.

3...exd4 4 Qxd4

“The line of play initiated by this move is, in our opinion, at least as strong as the usual 4 c4, and White thereby obtains a more enduring attack than in other variations of the Scotch Gambit, which have all been demonstrated to be in favour of the second player.” Wilhelm Steinitz/William Potter, The Field, 1874.

“According to my ideas, the move 3 d4 is dangerous. It would, of course, be delightfully simple if thus one could get the better game so early. For Black has nothing better than 3...exd4, losing a tempo for development and giving up the centre, while White, after 4 Qxd4, obtains all that I have laid down as the main object of any opening — the capture of the centre. It is by no means as simple as that.” Siegbert Tarrasch, The Game of Chess, 1931.

“The Scotch Game is the more important; and, though the whole opening was condemned by Tarrasch as incorrect, a certain number of examples are still found, if in diminishing quantity, in modern master tournaments. White obtains a free and open development of his pieces, but cannot prevent Black from equalising the game.” Reuben Fine, Modern Chess Openings, London 1939.

4...Wh4!?

The Steinitz System is the boldest and most dangerous of Black’s defences to 4 Qxd4. Owing to the risks involved, 4...Wh4!? has only been employed spasmodically, but, as we shall see, it nevertheless remains unrefuted.

In the last century many masters, to name only the foremost: Howard Staunton, Wilhelm Steinitz, Louis Paulsen, Johann Zukertort, Mikhail Chigorin, most diligently analysed these variations.
"The move 4 $\triangle x d 4$, I believe to have been censured without good cause, and that it may be made with perfect security. The chief objection advanced against it, is the counter move 4...\textsc{wh}4, a manoeuvre which is certainly highly ingenious, and has been approved by every writer of eminence from the time of its introduction. But, which I have the temerITY to think has been somewhat underestimated." \textit{Howard Staunton, The Chess-Player's Handbook}, London 1847.

"Black's intentions are not lofty, noble or idealistic — they are rapacious. He aims to grab White's e4-pawn and hang on to his gains if possible. What an unseemly move this 4...\textsc{wh}4 is! ... The variation is certainly a very bold and challenging counter to the Scotch Game, and for this reason alone, we are inclined to prefer it." \textit{George Botterill/Tim Harding, The Scotch Opening} 1977.

"Steinitz's 4...\textsc{wh}4 is a brazen attempt at pawn grabbing. White maintains pressure, but this century-old line will appeal to materialists." \textit{Nick de Firmlan/Walter Korn, Modern Chess Openings}, 1990.

"This attempt at pawn-grabbing has been around for over a century, and even though Black's position often looks dubious, no really clear refutation is known." \textit{Nick De Firmlan, Batsford's Modern Chess Openings}, 2000.

"There is another approach to the position after White's fourth move, however, and one that strikes at the very foundation of White's opening idea. The Steinitz variation with 4...\textsc{wh}4 is undoubtedly Black's most challenging counter to the Scotch Game. After only four moves White suddenly must fight on Black's prepared territory, and is virtually forced to sacrifice his e-pawn and burn his safe, positional bridges behind him. Black provokes an immediate crisis, and brazenly grabs an important centre pawn while keeping a compact position without weaknesses. White then has no choice but to look for compensation in the ephemeral world of tempi and development, ever mindful that Black will win almost any endgame. Maximum tension prevails in the razor-sharp struggle that follows, as the two sides play out the age-old chess conflict between time and material." \textit{Sid Pickard, Scotch 4...\textsc{wh}4, The Steinitz Variation}, 1995.

"The defence 4...\textsc{wh}4 — at one time frequently played, particularly by Steinitz — is, in my opinion, not even worthy of consideration, for it cannot possibly be the right strategy to bring the queen out this early in the game, without the necessity or clear advantage of the move. White offers his e-pawn by 5 $\triangle d 5$ or 5 $\triangle f 3$ and obtains a violent attack." \textit{Siegbert Tarrasch}.

"By far the most aggressive Black defence against the Scotch is Steinitz's 4...\textsc{wh}4. Black immediately counterattacks against the white e4-pawn but in doing so, goes against a basic principle of opening play: do not bring your queen out too early. Despite this, Black's move is surprisingly difficult to refute." \textit{Gary Lane, Winning with the Scotch}, 1993.
"There are no convenient ways to defend e4, and all such attempts give Black good play. However, the move does have two drawbacks. First, c7 is weakened. Second, by breaking one of the most basic rules of opening play, not just developing the queen before other pieces, but exposing her to attack, Black creates the justification for White’s best course — to sacrifice the pawn on e4 for rapid development.” Peter Wells, *The Scotch Game*, 1998.

"At all times where an opponent launches an impudent attack with an insufficient number of pieces, one must not retreat but counterattack, even at the price of sacrifice.” Emanuel Lasker.

"Morphy’s great principles: the most rapid development of the pieces (even at the cost of material) and the opening up of the lines of attack.” Savielly Tartakower.

A man of honour

"The development of this anti-Scotch variation took a surprising turn, however, with its adoption by Wilhelm Steinitz (since 1867). Steinitz, who was introducing his Modern School of Chess, saw 4...\texttt{Wh}4 as the perfect vehicle for his ideas. The London-Vienna correspondence match 1872/74 gave Steinitz the opportunity to test his favourite variation against the Scotch Game. Steinitz considered this game and its accompanying notes to be the turning point from the old to the new, that it marked the division between the old romantic era and the modern method of play.” Sld Pickard Scotch 4...\texttt{Wh}4, *The Steinitz Variation*, 1995.

"What is more, it is definitely the case that White has no satisfactory alternative to the sacrifice of the threatened e4-pawn. Does he get enough compensation for the pawn? Well, Wilhelm Steinitz, who knew a good pawn when he saw one and who worked out a good deal of the early analysis on this line, was fond of this smash and grab raid for Black.” George Botterill and Tim Harding *The Scotch Opening* 1977.

"For the practical needs of chess, the concept of compensation suffices. If the advantages held by my opponent are compensated for by my advantages, the position is balanced. Only after the balance of the positions has been disturbed, so that one player holds an uncompensated advantage, may this player attack with intent to win. Here Steinitz elevates himself to the level of a genuine philosopher, in demanding that the player must attack with intent to win or else be punished by being deprived of his advantage.” Emanuel Lasker.

"A lead in development, more active pieces, the concentration of forces in a certain section of the board (dynamic features of a position) — all these may have an important influence for a short period only. On such occasions every tempo is very important. Time was considered to be a decisive factor in determining whether such features would bring an advantage or simply be dissipated.” Mihai Suba, *Dynamic Chess Strategy.*
Which cause could Steinitz have to advertise 4...Wh4!? Was it simply a provocation?

"He provoked his antagonists into playing to win, by giving them an excuse or at least a pretext for doing so. To this end, he made the most extraordinary and most unusual moves: Look I make ridiculous moves and yet you cannot beat me". Or was there another reason?

"I heard in London, that the London master, Mr. Potter, who loved unusual moves, had influenced Steinitz greatly." Emanuel Lasker.

Who knows the truth?

"Alas, truth appears seldom in fine garb." Emanuel Lasker.

"The merits of this move have been much discussed, since its introduction into practice in 1846. It has had a checkered career, during which it has experienced alternate phases of success and failure. Of late it appears to have been considered that the first player, by meeting it with a sacrifice of his e-pawn, obtains a more than compensating position. The result of the present game, however, seems to throw some doubts upon the correctness of that opinion." Wilhelm Steinitz/William Potter, *The Field*, 1874.

Ten years later:

"4...Wh4 is our favourite. We consider this defence sound, though no doubt Black is subjected to a vehement attack for the pawn he gains." Wilhelm Steinitz, *International Chess Magazine*, 1885.

It is an irony of fate that Steinitz himself contributed to the fact that interest in his System went rapidly down.

"First in order, however, we have placed an entirely new line of development for White in an answer to a move, which we have ourselves favoured in practice almost invariably, namely: 4...Wh4." Wilhelm Steinitz, *Modern Chess Instructor*, 1889.

"For the aesthetic effect, the language of the move and nothing else is of any account whatsoever. What the move says, expresses, discloses and announces, is that it excites and stirs the spectator. The spectator enjoys not a game of chess but history and drama; that a chess-board is its stage, and chess pieces its actors, matters not." Emanuel Lasker.

150 years in search of the best move!


"4...Wh4, which was introduced by a brilliant amateur of the London Chess Club ("This variation was originated in the 1830 by Wellington Pulling, a strong English player with a flair for blindfold displays, and first published in Walker's Treatise on Chess, 1841", The Oxford Companion to Chess) a few years ago. It has been approved by the best writers, Bilguer, Lewis, Jaenisch, et cetera, since, as the most effectual way of wresting the
attack from the opening player. An examination of the highly ingenious rejoinder, devised by Mr. Horwitz, will have the effect, if we mistake not, of considerably weakening the reliance of players upon this favourite variation in future." Howard Staunton.

At first 5 \( \texttt{Wd3} \) was analysed: "The game after this move can be played in various ways, we believe that the prospects for winning or losing are equal for both sides." Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1846.

"The usual modes of opposing this move of the queen have been by playing 5 \( \texttt{Wd3} \) (or 5 \( \texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Ab4} 6 \texttt{Wd3} \)) and the result in each case is favourable for Black. These were the accepted methods of replying to Black's 4th move, until a few months ago Mr. Horwitz originated another mode, which is, I think, deserving more attention than it has received; this is 5 \( \texttt{Qb5}. \) " Howard Staunton.

5 \( \texttt{Qb5} \)? almost began a new era of investigation and examination after 4... \( \texttt{Wh4}. \)

"This is the counter move intended by Mr. Horwitz. He had long felt assured, he tells us, that the fourth move of Black was unsound, and after much pondering and analysis, it occurred to him that 5 \( \texttt{Qb5} \) might be satisfactorily opposed to it." Howard Staunton.

In the 1870s two entirely new and very individual systems came into fashion.

5 \( \texttt{Qf3} \)? was one of these attempts.

"This move is the invention of Mr. George Fraser, and leads to many interesting and difficult positions. A good analysis of its principal variations, by Mr. Fraser, can be found in the January and February issues of The Chess Player's Chronicle, 1877." Cook's Synopsis of the Chess Openings, London 1882.

"We think the Fraser attack receives a fair answer, showing that the second player ought to maintain the pawn without being subjected to much disadvantage in position." Wilhelm Steinitz, Modern Chess Instructor, 1889.

5 \( \texttt{Qe3} \)? was also a new mode. "This move was played by Max Braune at the beginning of 1870s, and later by Joseph Blackburne. According to Braune, 5 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) is as strong as 5 \( \texttt{Qb5}. \)" Paul Rudolph Bilguer.

5 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) is at least as good as 5 \( \texttt{Qb5}. \) Freeborough/Ranken.

Now to 5 \( \texttt{Qc3} \)?, a new "wonder weapon" of Steinitz.

"The propositions which we make with 5 \( \texttt{Qc3} \) for the purpose of counteracting this sally, initiate a new line of attack, resting chiefly on the strength of White's combined two bishops and Black's inability to castle in time. It seems as the form of attack which we suggest has the advantage of reducing Black's resources, practically to one main line of play on the fifth move, and again, later on. The defence has no better option than to exchange ... \( \texttt{Ax} \texttt{c3} \) and to leave White with the powerful
combination of two bishops. White’s knight is also then better posted for the attack against the weak c7-pawn by being placed at c3, whereas in other variations the d2-square forms the basis of operations for White’s knight and the recovery of the pawn is made more difficult.” Wilhelm Steinitz Modern Chess Instructor.

The Steinitz System in the course of time

“4...Wh4 leads to a line of play which has an uninviting character.” Isidor Gunsberg, The Chess Openings, London 1891.

“Modern analysis has shown that 4...Wh4 yields Black a very difficult game.” Chess Openings, Ancient and Modern, London 1893. Revised and corrected up to the present time from the best authorities (with numerous original variations and suggestions by Geo.B.Fraser, Dundee, the Rev.W.Wayte, London and other eminent players and analysts) by Edward Freeborough, Hull, and the Rev.Charles Edward Ranken — one of the best opening books of all! (“In 1880 John Watkinson of Huddersfield decided to launch a new chess magazine, or rather an enhanced version of the Huddersfield College Magazine, on whose pages chess had occupied an honoured place over the years 1872-1880. So came into being the British Chess Magazine, the only chess publication to have enjoyed an uninterrupted run, come world wars, come printers’ strikes, since that era of Victorian rectitude. Watkinson had gathered together a faithful team of contributors, an apt word perhaps, in view of the great support provided by those two Church of England clerics, the Reverend Ranken and Rev.Wayte. Ranken, in particular, had considerable pedigree, since he had been editor of the Chess Player’s Chronicle 1877-1880 and proved to be a formidable annotator of games over the years.” Bernard Cafferty, British Chess Magazine, 2000).

“4...Wh4 risks too much for the sake of a pawn and is now hardly ever played.” James Mason, Chess Openings, London 1897.

“Most lively games in the Scotch have arisen after 4...Wh4, when White has chosen 5 Qf3 or 5 Qb5. The first, suggested by Fraser, was for some time considered as being the refutation of the whole variation. Recently Black plays 4...Wh4 again, mostly answered by 5 Qb5.” Oskar Cordel, Theorie und Praxis des Schachspiels, Potsdam 1912/13.

“4...Wh4, indicated by Pulling, has been during the last years practically played only in correspondence games. It was avoided in serious tournaments since White sacrifices the e4-pawn for permanent pressure.” Paul Rudolph Bilguer, Handbuch des Schachspiels, Berlin/Leipzig 1922-30.

“4...Wh4, Steinitz’s inspiration, is bad as 5 Qf3!! Whxe4+ 6 Qe2 d5 7 0-0 gives White a dangerous initiative.” Savielly Tartakower, Die Hypermoderne Schachpartie, 1925.

“4...Wh4, an inferior line yielding White considerable advantage: 5
δb5 (5 antino 3 4h5 reduces Black’s disadvantage to a minimum)
5...4xe4+ 6 δe3! δd8 7 δd2.”

Reuben Fine, Modern Chess Openings, London 1939.

“4...4h4 was often played by Steinitz before he showed himself that 5 4c3 can be very unpleasant for Black. 5 4β3 is less promising because of 5...4h5.” Paul Keres, Theorie der Schacheröffnungen, Estonia 1949.

Bruno Parma, in Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings, Belgrade 1974, takes another view of 5 4c3; he suggests 5 4f3!? with some edge for White. In any case the following edition, Belgrade 1981, goes again for 5 4b5.

“The same games, mostly with the same conclusions, have been hiding from one another.” Viktor Korchnoi.

“Was it in some book, can I find it? — What am I looking for?” Friedrich Nietzsche.

A good book is not only compilation of new games, it is (or, must be) one part of chess development. To analyse old games and to give the classical theories a modern view, this is a point.

“To write a useful, intelligible and reasonably authoritative book requires three things: a good working knowledge of the opening, an extensive chess library for reference and a lot of encouragement.” Michael Stean, Sicilian: Najdorf.

Only two publications in English in the last thirty years on the Steinitz System of the Scotch are worth considering when drawing conclusions on this old variation.


Secondly: Scotch 4...4h4, The Steinitz Variation, by John Hall, Dallas 1995, edited by Sid Pickard, where author and editor firmly take Black’s side.

“The limit of our ambition, at the moment, is to show the general way in which this exciting line should be handled, and reduce the prejudice that is bound to exist against a variation that reached its zenith in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The charge that we are particularly concerned to combat is that this whole line is just a piece of romantic extravagance. In so far as it involves the lasting concession of material in return for other advantages (development and king-position), it may fairly be described as romantic. Yet on the other hand, a pawn is a pawn: Black’s game is far from hopeless and he can sometimes whip up a speedy counterattack. On the whole, our reference is for White’s chances, but we will not attempt a dogmatic imposition of this view ... That is a view commonly held, but it is myth and misconception. The problems were not solved but merely shelved. The loose ends were not unravelled and sorted out, they were just swept under the carpet.” Botterill/Harding.

“Indeed, 4...4h4 reached its zenith in the period between 1870-1895 with Steinitz’s
patronage, when his variation was regularly seen at the international level and even World Championship play. The Steinitz variation faded from view, not because of any defect of reputation — far from it.” Sid Pickard.

Garry Kasparov and a spectacular comeback

"Once a theoretical backwater, the Scotch has been revitalized by Kasparov’s success with it. At the moment Black is holding his own, but it seems likely that the last word has not been said on many of the critical lines." Nunn’s Chess Openings.

“Learn more about one of Kasparov’s favourite weapons ... It was the World Champion, Garry Kasparov’s advocacy of the Scotch, which led, via the trickle-down effect of fashion, to its current great popularity at all levels. Indeed he has stated his belief that it is the only serious alternative to the Spanish after 1 e4 e5.” Peter Wells, The Scotch Game, Batsford 1998.

“The venerable Scotch Game has enjoyed a great revival in recent years, with many top Grandmasters adding it to their repertoires. World Champion Kasparov’s adoption of the opening aroused much interest, and the Scotch Game is regularly seen by his opponents. But Kasparov has so far gotten a free ride, because his opponents have failed to task him with the dangerous and uncompromising 4...\text{Wh}4?!?, the Steinitz variation!” Sid Pickard.

“It seems increasingly inevitable that introductions to opening books will discuss the information explosion in chess, both in terms of the mind-boggling growth in available material, and the much improved quality of analytical aides used by top players. One of the more positive consequences of these changes, especially in the Open Games, had been a greater willingness among the leading players to experiment, not just with new ideas, but with those old ideas which that fickle creature opening fashion had ditched prematurely.” Peter Wells.

But his treatment of the old Steinitz System was very superficial.

"4...\text{Wh}4?! seems to be rushing full steam ahead towards the status of unplayable. This crisis is two pronged: Both 5 \text{Qb}5 \text{c}5 6 \text{Wh}f3 and the new gambit approach, 5 \text{Qc}3 \text{b}4 6 \text{e}2 cause very severe problems.” Peter Wells.

"Wells does not take into account the history of the variation, the ideas of Staunton, Steinitz, Zukertort and Chigorin. New material on 4...\text{Wh}4 is far from complete and it is out of the question to think that 4...\text{Wh}4 can be refuted on such a narrow basis.” Stefan Bücker, Kaisiber, 1998.

Many interesting games published in old magazines and old opening books are forgotten; the author of each new book takes something away in order to exchange it in his own interpretation, but that doesn’t mean it is necessarily the best.

Only in polemics can we follow a struggle of old and new ideas ... and see a really good picture of one opening.
“Further, the Steinitz variation has been tested in the fire of top level international chess, and even World Championship match play. The move 4...\textit{\texttt{Wh4}} is sound, aggressive and suitable for players of any level, from Grandmaster to postal player to average club member. All will find a powerful weapon in this cold-blooded, anti-Scotch counter-attack.” \textit{Sid Pickard}.

The Steinitz System, with more than 1500 games in the database is presently enjoying a renaissance.

It would be a pity if this variation, which for many years has aroused controversy, grief or pleasure, were simply stigmatised and forgotten. I would like to quote Lasker again (referring to the Ruy Lopez):

“This opening is dearest and nearest to the spirit of the old game — that spirit, which dislikes rigid dogmas but, on the contrary, loves motion and struggle.” \textit{Emanuel Lasker}, \textit{Manual of Chess}.

\textit{The material included is topical up to October 2000.}
Part One

(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxd4 w4h4)
5 wd3

nevertheless, the resulting positions are quite interesting, and that is the reason why 5 wd3 is still popular.

The material is divided into three chapters:
Chapter 1: 5...de5
(5...b4+, 5...dxd4, 5...b4)
Chapter 2: 5...e5
Chapter 3: 5...f6!?

Chapter 1
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxd4 w4h4 5 wd3)
5...de5
"He may also play as advised by
Carl Jaenisch, and obtain a fine
game", Staunton.

There are three alternatives:
I) 5...b4+ 6 c3 (6 d2 c5 7 e3
will transpose into variation 5...c5 2 0 7
6 e3 — Part 1, Chapter 2, Section
2) 6...a5 7 f5!? (Sanli-Contoret,
Erevan Olympiad 1996, went 7 d3
we7 8 d3 d5 7 f5!? (Sanli-Contoret,
Erevan Olympiad 1996, went 7 d3
we7 8 d3 d5 9 dbd2 d6 10 e2
d6 11 0-0 0-0 12 g5 h6 13 d4
dd8 14 dd4 de5 when 15 wg3
could be quite annoying for Black)
7...wg4 (or 7...wf6 8 wg3) 8 dd2
with an edge for White, Gutman;
II) 5...dxd4 6 wd4 de7 seems
more testing due to the threat of...d6.

White has two options:
A) 7 g3 d6!? (an improvement on
7...wg4 8 g2 d6 9 we3, indi-
cated by Bilguer) 8 we3 wf6 9
g2 b4+ (this is more precise
than 9...d4?! 10 wd3 c5 11 0-0
0-0 12 c3) 10 c3 d6 11 0-0 0-0
appears equal, Gutman;
B) 7 c4!? might be better; 7...d6
8 wd5 we7 9 0-0 d6 10 g5
secures White some initiative,
Gutman.

“The oldest defence which is the
most direct one. Surely a sound and
substantial one, though it may not
appeal to the high-flown fancy. To
me it seems better not to lose time
with such slow, defensive moves so
early in the game”, Lasker.

“Nor is this stolid defence of the
e4-pawn quite in the spirit of the
position”, Botterill/Harding.

“Happily for Black, White can (by
strenuous effort!) in fact keep his
e-pawn. We will examine the con-
sequences of 5 wd3, a frequent choice
of the uninitiated. This venerable
move should not give Black cause
for alarm, though accurate play is
required. The first player often bogs
down in defence, while Black’s
active piece play can spark violent
attacks against the uncoordinated
White position”, Hall.

“Defence of the e-pawn by 5
wd3?! , for example, is none too
impressive”, Wells.

We don’t pretend that 5 wd3 is
one of the best ways to play;
III) 5...\text{\textcopyright}b4 6 \text{\textcopyright}e2?! (after 6 \text{\textcopyright}f3?! d5! 7 \text{\textcopyright}f4 \text{\textcopyright}f6 8 exd5 \text{\textcopyright}fxd5 9 \text{\textcopyright}e4+ \text{\textcopyright}e7 10 \text{\textcopyright}xe7+ \text{\textcopyright}xe7 11 \text{\textcopyright}g3, Novković-Lorbeck, Slovakia 1991, 11...\text{\textcopyright}f6! would give Black the advantage) 6...\text{\textcopyright}c5 is more forceful.

Then:
A) 7 c3 \text{\textcopyright}f6 (after 7...\text{\textcopyright}xd4?! 8 cxd4 \text{\textcopyright}e7 9 g3 \text{\textcopyright}f6 10 \text{\textcopyright}e3 0-0, S.Lopez-J.Lopez, Alcabete 1994, 11 \text{\textcopyright}g2?! d5 12 a3 \text{\textcopyright}bc6 13 e5 \text{\textcopyright}g6 14 \text{\textcopyright}c3 would have been excellent for White) 8 \text{\textcopyright}e3 \text{\textcopyright}a6?! 9 \text{\textcopyright}f5 \text{\textcopyright}xe4 10 \text{\textcopyright}xc5 \text{\textcopyright}xc5 11 \text{\textcopyright}xe4+ \text{\textcopyright}dxe4 12 \text{\textcopyright}xg7+ \text{\textcopyright}d8 led to equality in A.Rodriguez-Diano, Uruguay 1984;
B) 7 \text{\textcopyright}e3! is much more to the point, 7...\text{\textcopyright}xe4 (or 7...\text{\textcopyright}f6?! 8 c3 b6? 9 e5! \text{\textcopyright}h4 10 \text{\textcopyright}f3 1-0, Nielsen-Simonsen, Torshavn 1997) 8 \text{\textcopyright}c3 \text{\textcopyright}g6 9 a3 \text{\textcopyright}a6 10 0-0-0 \text{\textcopyright}e7 11 \text{\textcopyright}db5 \text{\textcopyright}xe3+ 12 \text{\textcopyright}xe3 \text{\textcopyright}we6 13 \text{\textcopyright}f4 and White has pressure, Gutman.

6 \text{\textcopyright}e2 \text{\textcopyright}f6 7 \text{\textcopyright}d2 \text{\textcopyright}c5 Neumann-Schweiger, Germany 1995, went 7...\text{\textcopyright}h5 8 \text{\textcopyright}xh5 \text{\textcopyright}xh5 9 \text{\textcopyright}b5 \text{\textcopyright}d8 10 \text{\textcopyright}c4 \text{\textcopyright}g6 11 \text{\textcopyright}e3 a6 12 \text{\textcopyright}c3 b5 13 \text{\textcopyright}d2 \text{\textcopyright}b7 14 0-0-0 \text{\textcopyright}f6 15 \text{\textcopyright}f3 \text{\textcopyright}b4, and now 16 \text{\textcopyright}d2?! yields a slight edge for White.

8 \text{\textcopyright}f5
8 g3 \text{\textcopyright}g4 (8...\text{\textcopyright}h5?! 9 \text{\textcopyright}xh5 \text{\textcopyright}xh5 10 c3 favours White, Bilguer) 9 \text{\textcopyright}f3 \text{\textcopyright}g6 10 \text{\textcopyright}db3 \text{\textcopyright}b6 causes no problems for Black, Gutman.
8...\text{\textcopyright}g4 9 \text{\textcopyright}f3 \text{\textcopyright}g6

"According to Jaenisch, this position is better for Black; this seems an exaggeration", Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1846.
10 \text{\textcopyright}b3 \text{\textcopyright}b6 11 h4!?
11 g4 h6 12 \text{\textcopyright}e3 (12 h4 d6 13 h5 \text{\textcopyright}h7 14 \text{\textcopyright}d2 \text{\textcopyright}xf5 15 gxf5 0-0-0 16 0-0-0 \text{\textcopyright}he8 17 \text{\textcopyright}a5 was played in Krolikowski-Graf, corr. 1987, when 17...d5?! should lead to equality) 12...\text{\textcopyright}xe3 13 \text{\textcopyright}xe3 also looks promising for White, Gutman.

11...h5
11...h6 12 h5 \text{\textcopyright}h7 is met by 13 \text{\textcopyright}f4 d6 14 \text{\textcopyright}xe5 dxe5 15 \text{\textcopyright}b5+, Gutman.

12 \text{\textcopyright}h3 \text{\textcopyright}h7 13 \text{\textcopyright}g3 \text{\textcopyright}g6 14 a4 d6 15 a5 \text{\textcopyright}g1 16 \text{\textcopyright}g5 \text{\textcopyright}h2 17 \text{\textcopyright}h3 \text{\textcopyright}f4 18 g3 \text{\textcopyright}xg5 19 \text{\textcopyright}xg5
Black lacks a respectable defence, Vratan-Sekac, Czech Republic 1993.

"While these variations are not satisfactory for Black, he may try to obtain more by assuming an aggressive role at once", Lasker.
Chapter 2
(1 e4 e5 2 \textit{d}f3 \textit{d}c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \textit{d}xd4 \textit{w}h4 5 \textit{w}d3)
5...\textit{e}c5
dxe4 9 \textit{d}xc6 bxc6 10 \textit{g}g2 f5, Hon
Kah Seng - Defize, Lucerne 1982)
7...\textit{d}xd4 8 \textit{c}xd4 \textit{d}xd4 9 \textit{e}e3!
\textit{d}xe3 10 \textit{w}xe3+ \textit{d}e7 11 \textit{b}b5+,
\textit{Gutman}.
7 \textit{d}d2 \textit{d}5!

Other possibilities are:
I) 7...0-0 8 g3 \textit{w}h5, when White has
nothing better than the draw
achieved after 9 \textit{e}e2!? (9 \textit{g}g2 \textit{d}5
10 0-0 \textit{w}g6!? 11 \textit{e}e2 \textit{d}d6 is
clearly awkward for White) 9...\textit{w}h3
(9...\textit{g}g6 10 \textit{f}4) 10 \textit{f}1, \textit{Gutman};
II) 7...\textit{d}g4 8 g3 \textit{w}f6 was suggested
by \textit{Neue Berliner Zeitung}, 1867.

This bishop move was preferred by
Joseph Blackburne and Mikhail
Chigorin.

We consider two lines here:
Section 1: 6 c3 (6 g3)
Section 2: 6 \textit{e}e3!?

Section 1
6 c3
6 g3 is of dubious value, 6...\textit{w}f6 7
\textit{d}f5 (Basualto-Cortes. Moyano,
Santiago 1994, went 7 \textit{d}f3 \textit{b}4 8
\textit{w}e2 \textit{d}xc2+ 9 \textit{w}xc2 \textit{w}xf3 10 \textit{g}g1
d6 11 \textit{h}g5 h6 12 \textit{f}f4 \textit{f}f6 13 \textit{g}g2
\textit{w}h5 14 \textit{d}d2 \textit{g}4 15 0-0-0 \textit{d}xf2
16 b4 \textit{d}xb4 17 \textit{w}a4+ \textit{d}d7 0-1)
7...d6!? (7...\textit{g}6 8 \textit{g}e3 \textit{d}e5 9 \textit{w}c3
\textit{d}f3+ 10 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}d4 is also possible,
Loczy-Hideg, Hungary 1997) 8
\textit{d}e3 (or 8 \textit{d}c3 \textit{d}x f5 9 \textit{exf5} \textit{d}g e7)
8...\textit{d}e5 9 \textit{w}c3 \textit{d}f3+ 10 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}g5
11 \textit{w}xf6 \textit{d}xf6 12 \textit{d}d2 \textit{d}fxe4 with
a decisive advantage for Black,
Klaus-Baer, e-mail game 1999.
6...\textit{d}f6
The immediate 6...\textit{d}5 can be met by
7 \textit{exd5}! (not 7 g3? \textit{w}xe4+ 8 \textit{w}xe4+

White has a choice:
A) 9 \textit{d}f3? \textit{d}ce5 10 \textit{w}e2 (10
\textit{d}xe5 \textit{w}xf2+ 11 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}xe5 12 \textit{w}d2
\textit{d}xd4 13 \textit{w}xd4 \textit{w}f3+ 14 \textit{c}c2 0-0
15 \textit{w}xe5 \textit{w}xh1 16 \textit{f}f4 \textit{w}xh2+ 17
\textit{b}3 \textit{d}6 resulted in a quick win for
Black in the game Ivanco-Hofmann,
Bratislava 1956) 10...\textit{d}xf3+,
Freeborough/Ranken;
B) 9 \textit{w}f3?! \textit{xd}4 10 \textit{c}xd4 \textit{d}xd4 11
\textit{w}xg4 \textit{d}c2+ 12 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}xa1 13 \textit{d}d3
0-0 14 \textit{w}e2 \textit{d}6 15 \textit{d}c4 \textit{b}5 16 \textit{d}e3
\textit{e}e6 17 \textit{b}4 \textit{a}5 18 \textit{d}b2 \textit{w}e7 19
\textit{d}xa1 axb4 gave Black considerable
pressure in Wheeler-Collias, USA
1990;
C) 9 \textit{f}3!? is the most precise course
at this juncture, when:
C1) 9...\(\text{xd}4\) 10 cxd4 (not 10 fxg4? \(\text{f}2+\) 11 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}5\)) 10...\(\text{b}4\) 11 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 12 \(\text{d}3!\)? (instead of 12 \(\text{f}2?? \text{d}1+\) 0-1, Nunez-Ferron, Abierto 1994) 12...\(\text{xd}4\) 13 \(\text{e}2\) c5 14 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{xd}3+\) 15 \(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{xd}3\) 16 \(\text{xd}3\) c4+ 17 \(\text{xe}3\) cxb3 18 axb3 d6 19 \(\text{d}2\) is slightly better for White, Gutman;
C2) 9...\(\text{d}5!??\) 10 \(\text{e}3\) 0-0 11 \(\text{e}2\) d6 (or 11...\(\text{e}8\) 12 \(\text{b}2\) b3 \(\text{b}6\), Bilguer, 13 \(\text{f}4!\)) 12 \(\text{b}2\) b3 \(\text{b}6\) 13 \(\text{f}4!\)? (after 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{xd}4\) 14 \(\text{xd}4\), Cid-Castell, Tortosa 1992, Black should play 14...\(\text{gx}5?!\) 15 \(\text{x}5\) \(\text{h}3\)) 13...\(\text{wd}8\) 14 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 15 \(\text{g}5\) with equality, Gutman.

C43) \(8\text{g}3\)
\(8\text{ex}d5\) \(\text{xd}4\) 9 cxd4 \(\text{xd}4\) 10 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xd}4\) 11 \(\text{c}4\) 0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{f}5\) leads to some edge for Black, according to Bilguer.

C5) \(8\text{wh}5\)
\(8\text{dxe}4?!\) 9 \(\text{c}4!\) (after 9 \(\text{b}5?!\) \(\text{wh}5\) 10 \(\text{x}6\) a6 11 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 12 \(\text{e}2\), NN-Blackburne, simultaneous game, London 1870, 12...\(\text{wd}5!\) would be excellent for Black) 9...\(\text{wh}5\) 10 \(\text{x}6\) \(\text{e}6\) 11 \(\text{b}5\) gives White the upper hand, Gutman.
\(9\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 10 exd5
“White should have played 10 f3 0-0 11 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 12 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{h}3\)

(12...\(\text{g}6?!\) 13 0-0 \(\text{e}8\) is probably better, Gutman) 13 0-0 with equal chances”, Hall. In my opinion 13...\(\text{fe}8\) might still ensure Black some initiative, Gutman.

10...0-0! 11 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 12 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{xe}4\)
13 \(\text{x}5\) \(\text{xf}2+\) 14 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xd}3\) 15 \(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{f}5+\) 16 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{f}8\) 17 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{cx}d5+\) 18 \(\text{xd}5\) c6 19 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{ed}8\)
Black’s advantage is obvious, Schiffany-Chigorin, third match game, St.Petersburg 1897.

Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3 \(\text{d}4\) exd4 4 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{wh}4\) 5 \(\text{wd}3\) \(\text{c}5\))
6 \(\text{e}3!\)
This is the only move that Black needs to fear.

We consider two lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 6...\(\text{xd}4\)
(6...\(\text{e}5\), 6...\(\text{b}4\))
Sequel 2: 6...\(\text{f}6\)
(6...\(\text{f}6\), 6...\(\text{d}6\))

Sequel 1
6...\(\text{xd}4\)
Hoping to ease the tension by exchanges.
There are two more opportunities:
I) 6...\(\text{Qe}5\) 7 \(\text{Wc}3\)?? (7 \(\text{Wc}2\) d6 8 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 9 0-0-0 \(\text{Qxe}4\) 10 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{Wxe}4\) 11 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{Wh}4\) 12 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{We}7\) 13 \(\text{Qxc}5\) dxc5 14 f4 a6 15 \(\text{Qe}1\) axb5 16 \(\text{Wxe}5\) \(\text{Wxe}5\) 17 \(\text{Qxe}5^+\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 18 \(\text{Qxb}5\) is also a bit better for White, Gutman) 7...d6 8 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qf}6\) (after 8...\(\text{Qg}4\) 9 \(\text{Qb}3\) \(\text{Qb}6\) 10 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{Qxe}3\) 11 \(\text{Wxe}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\), Conde-Galdeano, e-mail game 1998, 12 h3 \(\text{Qe}6\) 13 0-0-0 \(\text{Qf}6\) 14 f4 \(\text{Qc}6\) 15 g4 would retain a distinct plus for White) 9 g3?! (an improvement on 9 \(\text{Qd}3\) 0-0, analysed by Jaenisch) 9...\(\text{Wh}5\) 10 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Wg}6\) 11 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{Qd}7\) (White can meet 11...\(\text{Qe}6\) by 12 \(\text{Qxe}6\) \(\text{fxe}6\) 13 \(\text{Qxc}5\) dxc5 14 \(\text{Wb}3\), Oscar Cordel) 12 0-0-0 0-0-0 13 f4?! (13 \(\text{Qd}4\) isn't bad either, according to Cordel) 13...\(\text{Qxd}4\) (13...\(\text{Qc}6\) is worse because of 14 \(\text{Qxc}6\) \(\text{Qxc}6\) 15 f5) 14 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 15 f5 \(\text{Qxd}4\) 16 \(\text{Wxd}4\) \(\text{Wh}6\) 17 \(\text{Wxa}7\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 18 \(\text{Qb}1\)! \(\text{Qxe}4\) 19 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) 20 \(\text{Qhe}1\), and White quickly develops a crushing attack, Gutman;
II) 6...\(\text{Qb}4\) was the invention of Freeborough/Ranke, "and now Carl Schlechter gave 7 \(\text{Wc}4\) \(\text{Qxd}4\) as winning for Black. Presumably he thought that on 8 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Wxe}4^+\) was strong, overlooking that after 9 \(\text{Qd}1\)! (instead of 9 \(\text{Qd}2^?!\) \(\text{Wf}4^+\) 10 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qe}7^?!\), when 11 \(\text{Qxg}7\) \(\text{Qbd}5^+\) 12 \(\text{Qb}3\) \(\text{Wxc}4^+\) 13 \(\text{Qxc}4\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 14 \(\text{Qe}5\) d6 15 \(\text{Qg}3\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 16 \(\text{Qd}2\) 0-0-0 17 \(\text{Qae}1\) \(\text{Qc}6\) favours Black, Schumacher-Zicklein, German Women’s Bundesliga 1994/95, and 11 \(\text{Qxb}4^?\) is ruled out by 11...d5 12 \(\text{Wd}3\) c5!! 13 \(\text{Qxc}5\) a5) it is Black, faced with threats of \(\text{Wxb}4\) and \(\text{Qxg}7\), who is the only one in any danger of losing a miniature", Botterill/Harding.

A satisfactory continuation has not yet been found for Black:
B1) 9...\(\text{Qxc}2\) 10 \(\text{Qxg}7\) \(\text{Wxc}4\) (or 10...\(\text{Wg}6\) 11 \(\text{Qxh}8\) \(\text{Qxa}1\) 12 \(\text{Qd}3\) 11 \(\text{Qxc}4\) \(\text{Qxa}1\) 12 \(\text{Qe}1^+\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 13 \(\text{Qxh}8\) d5 14 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 15 b3 d4 16 \(\text{Qc}1\), picking up the knight, Grigory Levenfish;
B2) 9...\(\text{Qe}7^?!\) 10 f3 was indicated by Cordel, 10...\(\text{Wf}4\) 11 g3 (11 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qh}5\) 12 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 13 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qxd}4\) 14 \(\text{Qe}1^+\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 15 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Wxh}2\) 16 \(\text{Wd}5\) c6 17 \(\text{We}4\) g6 18 \(\text{Qxa}6\) \(\text{bxa}6\) 19 \(\text{Qe}7^+\) \(\text{Qg}7\) 20 \(\text{Qf}5^+\) \(\text{gxh}5\) 21 \(\text{Wg}5^+\) leads to a draw by repetition) 11...\(\text{Wh}5\) 12 g4 \(\text{Wd}5\) 13 \(\text{Wxd}5\) \(\text{Qbd}5\) 14 \(\text{Qxg}7\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 15 \(\text{Qh}6\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 16 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 17 \(\text{Qc}3\) gives White an edge, Gutman.

7 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Qxd}4\) 8 \(\text{Wxd}4\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 9 \(\text{Qc}3\) 0-0 9...d6 10 g3 \(\text{Wg}4\) (10...\(\text{Wh}5\) 11 \(\text{Qd}5^!\) 11 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{We}6\) 12 0-0-0 0-0 13 \(\text{f4}\) appears good for White, Gutman.
10 g3 \(\text{Wh}5\) 11 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Wh}6\) 12 e5! \(\text{Qe}8\) 13 f4 d6 14 0-0-0 \(\text{Qe}6\) 15 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(\text{dxe}5\) 16 \(\text{fxe}5\) 16 \(\text{Wxe}5^?!\) \(\text{Qd}6\) 17 \(\text{Wc}5\) \(\text{Qfc}8\) 18 \(\text{Qd}3\) is also quite reasonable, Gutman.
16...c6 17 h4 \(\text{Qc}7\) 18 g4 \(\text{Qd}5\) 19 g5 \(\text{We}6\) 20 \(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{We}7\) 21 \(\text{Qxd}5^?!\) Schiffer-Chigorin, fifth match game, St. Petersburg 1897,
continued 21 \(\text{He}1\) \(\text{Fd}8\) 22 \(\text{Ff}4\) \(\text{Ec}6\) 23 \(\text{We}3\) \(\text{Bb}4\) 24 \(\text{Exe}6\) \(\text{Xe}6\) with approximate equality.

21...\(\text{Dx}d5\) 22 \(\text{He}1\)
White is better, Gutman.

**Sequel 2**

(1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{Df}3\) \(\text{Dc}6\) 3 d4 exd4 4 \(\text{Dxd}4\) \(\text{Wh}4\) 5 \(\text{Dd}3\) \(\text{Cc}5\) 6 \(\text{Dxe}3\))

6...\(\text{Df}6\)

We mention here:

I) 6...\(\text{Df}6\) 7 c3 (not 7 \(\text{Dxc}6?\) \(\text{Dxe}3\) 8 \(\text{We}3\) \(\text{Xb}2\) 9 \(\text{Dd}4\) \(\text{Cc}1+\) 10 \(\text{De}2\) \(\text{Xc}2+\) 11 \(\text{Dd}2\) \(\text{Xc}6\) 12 \(\text{Xg}7\) \(\text{Df}6\) 19...\(\text{Dd}6\) 8 \(\text{De}2\) (8 \(\text{Dxb}5\) \(\text{Dxe}3\) 9 \(\text{We}3\) \(\text{Df}7\) is level) 8...\(\text{Dd}7\) 9 0-0 \(\text{De}5\) 10 \(\text{Dd}2\) \(\text{g}6\), Rakulji-Ryzhkov, Szombathely 1993, and now 11 f4 would be fine for White, Gutman;

II) 6...\(\text{Dd}6\) is worth consideration.

![Chess Diagram](image)

7 \(\text{Dc}3!\)

Other moves:

I) 7 \(\text{Df}5\) \(\text{Xe}4\) 8 \(\text{Dxg}7+\) \(\text{Df}8\) 9 \(\text{Dd}2\) \(\text{Xd}3\) 10 \(\text{Dxc}5+\) \(\text{Dd}6\) 11 \(\text{Dxd}3\) \(\text{Dxc}5\) 12 \(\text{Df}5\) \(\text{Dxf}5\) 13 \(\text{Dxe}8\) \(\text{Df}7\) simplifies the game too much, Gutman;

II) 7 \(\text{Dd}2\) \(\text{Dxd}4\) (7...\(\text{Dg}4?\) loses to 8 \(\text{Df}5\) \(\text{Dxf}2\) 9 \(\text{Dc}3!\)) 8 \(\text{Dxd}4\) \(\text{Xxd}4\) 9 \(\text{Dxd}4\) 0-0 (9...\(\text{Dd}6?!\) is premature due to 10 \(\text{Dxb}5+!\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 11 \(\text{Dd}3\)) 10 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{Dg}4\) 11 \(\text{Df}2\) (or 11 \(\text{Dg}2\) \(\text{d}6\)) 11...\(\text{Df}6\) with a balanced position, Gutman.

7...\(\text{Db}4\)

7...\(\text{Dg}4?\) 8 \(\text{Df}5\) \(\text{Dxf}2\) 9 \(\text{Df}2\).

8 \(\text{Df}2\) \(\text{d}6\)

8...\(\text{Dx}e4?\) 9 \(\text{Df}5\).

9 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{Dg}4\) 10 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{Dd}7\) 11 0-0-0
White has a slight edge, Gutman.
Chapter 3

(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxd4 Wh4 5 Wd3)

5...d6?!

This move is the reason why the whole variation with 5 Wd3 used to have a poor reputation — Black’s strategy is to focus his attention on the e4-pawn.

“White has a difficult life”, Hall.

We divide the material into four sections:

Section 1: 6 d2
Section 2: 6 d5
Section 3: 6 c3
Section 4: 6 xc6?!

Section 1
6 d2 g4!

Other possibilities are:

I) 6...d4 7 Wd2 c5 (7...c5?! 8 d5 Wf4 9 c4 Wg4 10 f3 Wg6 11 d5 was a disaster for Black in Pozzi-Hresc, Busto Arzisio 1985) 8 g3 Wg4 9 f3 Wh5 10 d2 b3 gives White some advantage, Gutman;

II) 6...c5 7 g3 (7 c3, Staunton’s suggestion, reaches a position after 5...c5 6 c3 d6 7 d2, covered in

Chapter 2, Section 1) 7...Wh5 8 d5 (concerning 8 xc6 see Part 1, Chapter 3, Section 4, Sequels 1 and 2) 8...0-0 9 d2 Wh3 10 d1 (Fabian-Nagy, Hungary 1997, went 10 d3? d5 11 exd5 xxf5 12 c4 Wg2 13 e1 b4 14 xc5 xc2+ 15 d1 xxa1 16 e3 xad8 and Black won quickly) 10...Wh5 11 d2 could be a draw by repetition; III) 6...d4 7 Wxd4 d5?! also appears quite promising.

Here are three examples:

A) 8 x5+ e8 9 g3 (9 exd5 d6) 9...Wg4 10 d2 Wg6 11 exd5 d6 12 c3 xe8 with dual threats against White’s king, Bilguer;

B) 8 g3 Wg4 9 d2 We6? (Bilguer gives 9...d7?!) 10 e5 10 exd5 xxd5 11 xxd5 dxd5 12 d4 d4 and White is in trouble, Gutman;

C) 8 d3! d6 9 g3 Wg4 10 d2 We6 11 exd5 xxd5 12 xxd5 dxd5 13 d4 d7 14 d2 h3 15 c3 0-0-0 16 0-0-0 c5 17 xxd5 xxd5 18 d2 xdd1+ 19 xdd1 d8 20 d4 f6 should be about equal, Gutman.

7 g3

7 d2? Wxf2+ 8 d1 Wxd4 was easily winning for Black, Century-Harding, Islington Open 1971.

7...Wf6
"White is lost", state Botterill/Harding.

8 f3

Two other moves are no better:
I) 8 ə2f3 əxd4 9 əxd4 əxf2+ 10 əxe3 əxh1 and Black won, Haack-Stocker, Germany 1996;
II) 8 ə4f3 əce5 (8...əc5 9 əg2 əxf2+ 10 əe2 d6 11 əc4 əe6 12 əf1 əd4+ 13 əxd4 əxd4 14 əa3 əe5 15 əxd4 əxd4 also gave Black a winning position in Pedersen-Fuhrhof, Copenhagen 1995; nevertheless 8...əb4! 9 əb3 əb6 seems to me even stronger) 9 əc3 (or 9 əb3 əc5) 9...əb4! 10 əxb4 əxf3+ 11 əxf3 əxf3 0-1, Prugel-Dyckhoff, corr. 1930.

8...əb4!

"Black's steeds run roughshod over White's position", Hall.

8...əge5 9 əe3 əxd4 10 əxd4 əxf3+ 11 əxf3 əxf3 12 əe5+ əe7 13 əg1 d6 (13...d5 14 əg2 əg4 15 exd5) 14 əxg7 əxe4+ 15 əe2 əe5 is less effective, Gutman.

9 əe3 əxd4 10 əxd4 əxc2+ 11 əd1 əxd4 12 fxg4 d5 13 h3 əe6 14 əg2 0-0-0


Section 2

(1 e4 e5 2 əf3 əc6 3 d4 exd4 4 əxd4 əh4 5 əd3 əf6)

6 əb5

"White can proceed sharply and thus contrive to give life and vigour to the game", Lasker.

6...əd8

6...əb4+!? is also a good answer, since 7 c3 (7 ə1c3 will transpose into the variation 5 əc3 əb4 6 əd3 əf6 7 əb5 — Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 3, Sequel 1) 7...əa5 8 əd2 d6 9 g3 əh5 10 əc4 a6 11 əxa5 (11 əd4 əe5) 11...axb5 12 əxc6 bxc6 13 əe2 əg6 14 əf3 əe6 is quite promising for Black, George Palm.

7 əd2

7 ə5c3 əb4 (7...əb4 8 əe2 əc5 9 g3 əg4 10 f3 əh5 11 əa3 d6 12 əe3 is fine for White) 8 əd2 əg4 9 əg3 (or 9 g3 əf6 10 f3 əge5 11 əe3 d6) 9...əxg3 10 hxg3 əc5 11 əd1 əb4 12 əd3 əe5 with good prospects for Black, Gutman.

7...əc5

7...əb4 8 əc4 c6 9 əa3 d5 10 exd5 əxc4 11 əxc4 əbd5 12 0-0 əf5 13 əb3 əc7 14 əac4 əc5 is slightly better for Black as well, Gutman.
8...\textit{\texttt{Wh}}5!
The ancient 8...\textit{\texttt{Wg}}4 9 \textit{\texttt{Ae}}2!? (Bergell/Knorr/Raaz versus Cordel/Neumann, consultation game, Berlin 1865, went 9 \textit{\texttt{Ag}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 10 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8 11 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}5 12 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}4 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}6 13 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}4 \textit{\texttt{Exd}}4 14 \textit{\texttt{Exd}}4 \textit{\texttt{Xxc}}4 15 \textit{\texttt{Wxc}}4 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}5 16 \textit{\texttt{Wc}}5 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}4 17 \textit{\texttt{Fxe}}4 \textit{\texttt{Wxc}}5 18 \textit{\texttt{Dxc}}5 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}4 19 0-0 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}6 with equality) 9...\textit{\texttt{We}}6 10 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 (10...\textit{\texttt{Dd}}4 11 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}3 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 12 \textit{\texttt{Db}}3 \textit{\texttt{We}}5 13 \textit{\texttt{Wxe}}5 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}5 14 \textit{\texttt{Da}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ab}}6 15 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}2 favours White) 11 \textit{\texttt{Db}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ab}}6 12 \textit{\texttt{Ae}}3 \textit{\texttt{Db}}4 (12...\textit{\texttt{We}}5 13 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}3) 13 \textit{\texttt{Wd}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}3 14 \textit{\texttt{Wxb}}4 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}6 (or 14...\textit{\texttt{We}}5 15 \textit{\texttt{Wc}}4) 15 \textit{\texttt{Dc}}4 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}3 16 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}1 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}6 leads to a tense struggle, with both kings becoming insecure, \textit{Gutman}.
\textbf{9 \textit{\texttt{Ae}}2}
\textbf{9 \textit{\texttt{Ag}}2}?! is suicide due to 9...\textit{\texttt{Dg}}4.
\textbf{9...\textit{\texttt{Wh}}3} 10 \textit{\texttt{Wc}}4 \textit{\texttt{Wg}}2 11 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 leads nowhere for Black.
\textbf{10 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}4}!?
This was indicated by \textit{Lothar Schuler}. \textit{Bilguer} gives 10 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 11 \textit{\texttt{Db}}3?! \textit{\texttt{Db}}4 12 \textit{\texttt{Wd}}1 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}4 with initiative to Black.
\textbf{10...\textit{\texttt{Db}}4}!
10...\textit{\texttt{Ag}}4? fails to 11 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}5 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}5 12 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}3.
\textbf{11 \textit{\texttt{Wc}}4} \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 12 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}5 \textit{\texttt{Ax}}f5 13 \textit{\texttt{Ex}}f5 \textit{\texttt{Wxf}}5 14 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}3
14 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}1 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8 15 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Wxc}}2+ 16 \textit{\texttt{Wxc}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dxc}}2 17 \textit{\texttt{Wxc}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}2 18 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}4 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}6 19 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}3 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}7 20 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}2 21 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8, and Black is clearly better, \textit{Gutman}.
\textbf{14...\textit{\texttt{Wf}}2}+ 15 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Dbd}}5!?
This keeps more control than 15...\textit{\texttt{Ee}}8 16 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}2 17 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3.
\textbf{16 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3} \textit{\texttt{Dxa}}3 17 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}3+ 18 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}3 \textit{\texttt{Wxe}}3 19 \textit{\texttt{Bxa}}3 \textit{\texttt{Df}}4 20 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8
Black has excellent compensation for his piece, \textit{Gutman}.

\textbf{Section 3}
(1 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}4 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}5 2 \textit{\texttt{Df}}3 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}6 3 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}4 \textit{\texttt{Exd}}4 4 \textit{\texttt{Dxd}}4 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}4 5 \textit{\texttt{Wd}}3 \textit{\texttt{Df}}6)
\textbf{6 \textit{\texttt{Dc}}3}
6...\textit{\texttt{Dg}}4?!
A new idea, suggested by \textit{Palm}.
\textbf{6...\textit{\texttt{Db}}4}! (probably best) will transpose into the variation 5 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}3 \textit{\texttt{Db}}4 6 \textit{\texttt{Wd}}3 \textit{\texttt{Df}}6, covered in Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 3. 1645
\textbf{7 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}3}
7 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}3?! \textit{\texttt{Db}}4 8 \textit{\texttt{Wc}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dxe}}3 9 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}3 (or 9 \textit{\texttt{Wxe}}3? \textit{\texttt{Cc}}5) 9...\textit{\texttt{Dexc}}2+ 10 \textit{\texttt{Uxc}}2 \textit{\texttt{Wf}}6 11 0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{Dxc}}2 12 \textit{\texttt{Uxc}}2 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}6 appears good for Black, \textit{Gutman}.
\textbf{7...\textit{\texttt{Wf}}6 8 \textit{\texttt{Df}}5}
Not $8 \text{d}e3? \text{d}ge5 9 \text{w}d1 \text{xd}4. 8...\text{b}4

Alternatively:
I) $8...\text{d}c5? 9 \text{d}d5 \text{w}d8 10 \text{c}3! \text{xf}2+ 11 \text{e}2 and Black is overwhelmed, Gutman;
II) $8...\text{b}4? 9 \text{w}e2 \text{c}5 10 \text{a}3 \text{xf}2+ 11 \text{d}1 \text{g}6 12 \text{xb}4 \text{xf}5 13 \text{xf}5+ \text{w}e5 14 \text{d}d5 with a decisive advantage for White, Gutman.
9 f4!?
9 $\text{e}2 \text{ge}5 10 \text{w}e3 \text{d}5 11 \text{exd}5 \text{xf}5 12 dxc6 0-0 13 \text{c}2 \text{c}5 14 \text{w}f4 \text{xc}6 seems equal, Gutman.
9...d5

10 ...\text{d}2 \text{xf}5 11 \text{exf}5 0-0 0-0 12 \text{e}2 \text{he}8 13 \text{h}3 \text{h}6 14 0-0-0 \text{d}4 15 \text{e}4 \text{w}e7
Black is fine, according to Palm.
16 ...\text{f}3 \text{xf}5 17 ...\text{g}4 \text{g}6 18 ...\text{g}5 \text{xd}2+ 19 ...\text{xd}2 \text{w}d7
19...\text{d}5 20 ...\text{e}2 \text{wd}7 21 ...\text{xe}8+ \text{we}8 22 ...\text{xe}7 \text{we}7 23 ...\text{g}5 ...\text{b}4
24 \text{wb}3 \text{xc}5 25 ...\text{b}1 ...\text{xc}2 26 ...\text{xf}5+ ...\text{xf}5 27 ...\text{xf}7 ...\text{xf}7 28 ...\text{xe}3 29 ...\text{e}5 ...\text{d}5 30 ...\text{c}1 ...\text{c}5+ 31 ...\text{d}2 ...\text{c}2+ 32 ...\text{d}3 c5 33 h4, and wins, Gutman.
20 ...\text{xf}5 ...\text{xf}5 21 ...\text{xe}7 ...\text{e}3 22 ...\text{xe}3 ...\text{xe}3 23 ...\text{xd}7 ...\text{xd}7 24 ...\text{e}1 ...\text{e}7 25 c3
The ending is clearly in White’s favour, Gutman.

Section 4

(1 e4 e5 2 ...f3 ...c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ...xd4 ...w4 5 ...d3 ...f6)
6 ...xe6!?

The exchange variation, which seeks to solve the puzzle of the opening by simplification.

6...dxc6
A more artificial continuation is
6...bxc6 7 ...d2!? (7 ...c3!? ...b4 will transpose into the variation after 5 ...c3 ...b4 6 ...d3 ...f6 7 ...xc6 bxc6 — Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 3, Sequel 3) 7...c5 8 g3 ...w5 9 ...e2 ...w3 (9... ...e5 can be answered by 10 f4 ...e7 11 e5 12 ...d4 ...e4 ...b6 (11... ...xe5? fails to 12 ...c3 ...d6 13 f4 ...g2 14 ...f2) 12 ...f4 with an edge for White, Gutman.
In the endgame, can White turn his extra pawn on the king's side to account? Black for now sees compensation for his doubled pawns in the open c-file and the mobility of his light-squared bishop.

"Although strategic considerations often recommend capturing toward the centre, in open games like this the capture away from the centre is often best because it allows the rapid deployment of the lightsquared bishop", Hall.

"With a lead in development and freedom for all his pieces Black must be on top", Botterill/Harding.

We consider four lines in this section:

Sequel 1: 7 Qd2
Sequel 2: 7 Qd2 Qc5 8 g3 Wh5 9 Qe2 (9 Qg2, 9 f3)
Sequel 3: 7 Qc3 (7 e5) 7...Qb4 8 e5
Sequel 4: 7 Qc3 Qb4 8 Qd2

Sequel 1
7 Qd2 Qc5
7...Qg4 8 g3 Qf6 deserves attention, however, 9 f3 Qe5 (after 9...Qc5?! 10 fxg4 Qf2+ 11 Qd1 Qxg4+ 12 Qe2 Qd8, Kemeny-Schumacher, Germany 1993, 13 Qxg4! Qxd3 14 cxd3 would have given White obvious compensation for his queen) 10 Wc3!? (10 We2 Qc5 11 Qg2 Qe6 12 f4 Qg4 13 f5 Qe3 14 fxe6 Qxe6+ 15 Qd1 Qe3+ 16 Qe1 0-0-0 17 Qb1 Wxe6 18 b4 Qb6 19 Qb3 Qc2+ 20 Qf1 Qd4 21 Wc4 Qg4 22 Qf3 Qxf3 23 Qxf3 Qhe8 24 Qf4 Wh3+ 25 Qe1 Qg2 26 Qf1 Wxa2 27 e5 was Radakov-Perović, Cetinje 1990, and now 27...Qa5! might ensure Black a clear plus) 10...g5 (10...Qe6 11 f4 Qg4
12 Wxf6 Qxf6 13 Qd3 0-0-0 14 Qf3 is at least no worse for White)
11 f4 (11 Qg2 Qe6 12 0-0 Qg7 13 f4 Qxf4 14 Qxf4 Qg4 15 Wxf6 Qxf6 16 Qf3 Qe7 17 c3 Qc5+ 18 Qd4 0-0-0 gave Black some edge in Boonen-Prein, Germany 1991)
11...Qxf4 12 Qc4 Qg4 13 Qxf6 Qxf6 14 Qxe4 Qxe4 15 Qd3 Qc5 16 0-0-0 Qxd3+ 17 Qxd3 Qe6 18 Qa5 should be level, Gutman.

8 g3
8 Wg3 Qxg3 9 hxg3 Qe6 (9...Qg4 is doubtful due to 10 f3 Qe3 11 Qd3 Qxg2+? 12 Qe2, Hall) 10 f3 (10 Qe2 0-0-0 11 f3 Qd6 12 Qf1 h6 13 Qf4 with equality, Hall) 10...Qd6! (10...Qd6?! 10...Qe5 11 Qb3 Qd6 12 Qf4 Qxf4 13 gxf4 Qhe8 "and we prefer Black in a roughly equal position", Hall; in my opinion after 14 Qd3 h6 15 Qf2 only White can be slightly better) 11 f4 Qc5, when Black still dominates the board in spite of the absence of queens, Gutman.

8...Qh5 9 Qb3

White tries to gain an important tempo by attacking the bishop.

9...Qg4!

"The most dynamic continuation: the threat is 10...Qd8, winning on the spot", Hall.
9...b6 10 f4!? (not 10 f3 e6 11 g2 d8 12 we2 g4 10...g4 (10...g4 11 0-0-0 0-0 12 e2) 11 g2 d8 12 wc3 0-0 13 h3 e6 14 d2 fe8 15 g4 wg6 16 0-0-0 might provide White with an easier defence, Gutman.

10 e3

Other tries in this position are:

I) 10 xc5 d8! 11 xd8+ xd8 12 xb7+ c8 13 a6 b8 14 b4 e8 15 c5 xe4 16 c3 f3 and Black won easily in Jornoud-De Rivière, Paris 1859;

II) 10 e2 d8 11 xg4 xg4 12 xc5 xd3 13 xd3 xh2 14 c3 c3 + 15 e2 g1+ 0-1, Manschke-Schinke, Germany 1998;

III) 10 f4 d8 11 c4 xe6 12 de2 xe4 13 xf4 wh6 14 c5 (Dille-Auzinsch, corr. 1978/79, went 14 f3 xd2 15 wxd2 xf4+ 16 c3 f3 17 xh1 xh1 18 xh1 0-0 19 e1 wh2 20 e5 xe8 21 wd4 yf4 22 c4 c5 0-1) 14...d5 15 g1 e6 16 g5 f6 17 xf6 wf6 with a clear advantage for Black, Gutman.

10...d8 11 wc4 xe3 12 xe3 0-0 12...f3?! 13 c2 xe4 14 0-0 g5 15 xe3 xe3+ 16 xg2 e5 is also very good, Ludwig Bachmann.

13 c2 xe8 14 d2 wh6 15 wb3 xe4

15...xd2!? 16 xd2 (16 xg4 xh2) 16...xe4+ 17 c1 xg3 and wins, according to Bachmann.

16 c4 xe4 17 0-0 e6 18 wb7 xe3 19 xc7

This position was reached in the game Kolisch-Steinitz, Paris 1867. Black could have played now 19...c8! 20 ad1 wg5 with decisive threats, Gutman.

Sequel 2

(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 wh4 5 wd3 c6 6 xc6 dxc6 7 ad2 ac5 8 g3 wh5)

"Experience shows that the more threats there are in a position, the greater are the possibilities of resistance", Tartakower.

9 e2!?

A critical response; other moves fail to equalize:

I) 9 g2 g4! (9...h3, Sigurjonsson-Gunnarson, Reykjavik 1996, is less effective due to 10 xh3! xh3 11 f3 d8 12 f1 wd7 13 we2 0-0 14 b3 with equality) 10 f3 xf2+ 11 e2 wc5 12 b3 wb6 13 f1 e5 (or 13...e6!? 14 f4 d8 and Black wins, Gutman) 14 f4 e4 15 h3 d2 16 e3 c5 17 wc3 xf1 18 xg7 e6 0-1, Sharkar-Swapan, Calcutta 1993;

II) "In fact 9 wc3 0-0 might be the least evil for White", Harding, Starling Correspondence Chess Miniatures, Dublin 2000. In my opinion, 10 f3 e8 (10...b6 11 c4) 11 g2 a5 isn’t terribly inspiring for White, Gutman;

III) 9 f3 e6 10 g2 (10 b3 d8 11 e2 can be met by 11...c4! 12
9...\textit{g}4!?  
9...\textit{g}4 10 \textit{h}3! (10 \textit{g}xg4 \textit{g}xg4 11 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}6 12 \textit{c}3 0-0-0 gave Black a decisive advantage in Leher-Feyerfeld, Vienna 1867) 10...\textit{xf}2+ 11 \textit{f}1 \textit{b}6 12 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}3+ (12...\textit{wc}5 13 \textit{hxg}4 \textit{g}xg4 14 \textit{g}2 \textit{xe}2+ 15 \textit{w}xe2 0-0-0, suggested by \textit{Bilguer}, appears wrong to me in view of 16 \textit{bb}3!) 13 \textit{w}xe3 \textit{wh}3+ 14 \textit{hxh}3 \textit{exh}3+ 15 \textit{f}2 \textit{xe}3+ 16 \textit{xe}3 0-0-0 17 \textit{b}3 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{bb}2 with an unusual ending which is slightly better for White, \textit{Gutman}.

10 \textit{h}3

10 \textit{f}3?! can be met by 10...\textit{h}3.

10...\textit{xe}2+!!

Less challenging are:

I) 10...\textit{d}8 11 \textit{g}xg4 \textit{g}xg4 12 \textit{w}f3 \textit{xf}2+ 13 \textit{e}2 \textit{b}5+ 14 \textit{c}4 \textit{xd}2+ 15 \textit{xd}2 \textit{wb}4+ 16 \textit{wc}3 \textit{xc}3+ 17 \textit{xc}3 \textit{df}6 18 \textit{g}4 does not give Black adequate compensation for the exchange, \textit{Gutman};

II) 10...0-0 11 \textit{g}xg4 \textit{g}xg4 12 \textit{f}3 (12 \textit{w}e2?! \textit{xf}2+ 13 \textit{f}1 \textit{f}5! 14 \textit{exf}5 \textit{d}3+ 15 \textit{xf}2 \textit{xf}5+ 16 \textit{f}3 \textit{xc}2 17 \textit{mb}1 \textit{d}4 18 \textit{wc}4+ \textit{h}8 19 \textit{f}4 \textit{xf}3 20 \textit{xf}3 \textit{g}5 21 \textit{wd}4+ \textit{f}6 22 \textit{mb}1 \textit{g}4 23 \textit{g}4 \textit{g}6 favours Black) 12...\textit{df}6 13 \textit{wh}5 \textit{wh}5 14 \textit{bb}3 \textit{bb}6 15 \textit{g}4 \textit{bb}6 16 \textit{f}3 yields White an edge, \textit{Gutman}.

11 \textit{wxe}2 \textit{xe}2+?!

11...\textit{we}5 12 \textit{f}4 \textit{we}6 13 \textit{e}5 is less impressive.

12 \textit{xe}2 0-0-0

Black is still slightly better, \textit{Gutman}.

Sequel 3
(1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2 \textit{df}3 \textit{d}6 3 \textit{d}4 \textit{ex}d4 4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{wh}4 5 \textit{wd}3 \textit{df}6 6 \textit{xc}6 \textit{dxc}6)
7 \textit{dc}3

7 \textit{e}5? is too provocative, 7...\textit{dc}5 (7...\textit{g}4?! 8 \textit{g}3 \textit{wh}5 9 \textit{f}4 \textit{dc}5 also looks good for Black, \textit{Lane}) 8 \textit{dc}3 \textit{xc}3 9 \textit{wxe}3 \textit{dc}3 10 \textit{wxe}2 \textit{wc}4 10 \textit{w}f4, “and Black has the better game”, \textit{Staunton}.

7...\textit{bb}4 8 \textit{e}5?!

“White has gained much room but has driven his pawns relentlessly forward leaving at their rear many spots that have to be defended by
the pieces only, should Black succeed in obtaining the attack. There is both profit and peril in such impetuous advances", Lasker.

8...Qg4!
"If Black desired to give momentum to the game, to play a sharp, biting game, he must find some new threat", Lasker.

Other moves are less pungent:
I) 8...Wxe4+ 9 Wxe4 Qxe4 10 A.d2 Qxd2 11 Qxd2 0-0 12 Qd3 Qd8 13 Qae1 c5, Pruijssers-Swinkels, Hengelo 1998, and now 14 a3 Qa5 15 Qc1 seems approximately equal;
II) 8...Qd5 9 A.d2 Qe6 10 Qxd5 (after 10 g3 Wxe7 11 Qg2 0-0 0-0 12 Wxe2, Koenings-Krueger, Germany 1996, 12...Qxc3!? 13 bxc3 Wc5 would have secured an advantage for Black) 10...Qxd2+ 11 Qxd2 Qxd5 12 0-0 0-0 0-0-0 13 Wc3 with an unclear position, Gutman.

9 g3 Wf7
9...Wf5 10 f4 Qf5 11 Wxe2 Qc5 12 Qg2 Wf6 13 Qf3! (this is a lot better than 13 Qe4 Qxe4 14 Qxe4 Qf2 15 f5 Wh3 16 Wc4 Qxe4 17 Wxe4 0-0-0 18 Qd2 Qd4 19 Wf3 Qe8 20 0-0-0 Qxe5 21 Qdf1 Qxd2 22 Qxd2 Wh6+ 23 Qd1 Qd5+ 0-1, Rebber-Surrey, Recklinghausen 1999) 13...Qf2 14 Qf1 Wh2 15 Qxf2 Qxg3 16 Qe4 Qxf2+ 17 Wxf2 Qxf2+ 18 Qxf2 0-0-0 19 Qc3, and White is at least no worse, Gutman.

10 f4
10 Qf4 0-0 11 Wc2 Qe8 12 0-0-0 Qxc3 13 bxc3 Wa3+ 14 Qb1 Qe6 15 c4 b5 16 Qd3 Wa4 resulted in a quick win for Black in Fernandes-Henriques, Lisbon 1998.

10...Wc5? Black has a range of possibilities:
I) 10...Qxc3+ 11 Wxc3 Qc6 12 Qg2 f6 was indicated by Bilguer, however, 13 h3 Qh6 14 Qd2 0-0-0 15 0-0-0 gives White the upper hand, Gutman;
II) 10...f6 11 h3 Qh6 12 Qd2!? (12 Qe3 fxe5 13 0-0-0 0-0 14 Qd2, Gross-Ebner, Friedrichshroda 1997, is best answered by 14...exf4!? 15 Qxf4 Qe6 16 Qe1 Wf7) 12...Qf5 (12...fxe5 13 0-0-0 0-0 0-0 14 fxe5 should be equal) 13 Wxe2 Qxc2 14 exf6 gxf6 15 Wxe7+ Qxe7 16 Qc1 Qg6 17 g4 promises White sufficient compensation for his pawn, Gutman;
III) 10...0-0 11 Qd2 Qe6 was preferred by Steinitz.
Then:

A) 12 \( \text{h3?!} \) \( \text{h}d8 \) (12...\( \text{xex5?!} \) 13 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{xh3} \) is clearly better for Black, Gutman) 13 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{xex2} \)! (13...\( \text{De3?!} \) 14 \( \text{wxex3} \) \( \text{xh3} \) with a fine position for Black, Gutman) 14 \( \text{xd2} \) (14 \( \text{xd2?} \) \( \text{d8} \) 15 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 16 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{xc3} \) + 17 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) + 18 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19 \( \text{wd1} \) \( \text{f2} \) led to a crushing defeat in Rose-Steinitz, Brooklyn 1886) 14...\( \text{d8+} \) 15 \( \text{c1} \) (15 \( \text{e1?} \) \( \text{c5} \) 15...\( \text{xc3} \) 16 \( \text{xc4} \)! (but not 16 \( \text{bxc3?} \) \( \text{wa3+} \) 17 \( \text{bl} \) \( \text{d5} \) 18 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e3} \), Steinitz) 16...\( \text{xb2} \) + 17 \( \text{xb2} \) \( \text{wb4+} \) 18 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{wa3+} \) 19 \( \text{b1} \) and Black has nothing better than a draw, Gutman; B) 12 a3?! is preferable, though 12...\( \text{xad8} \) 13 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) (13...\( \text{c5} \) 14 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 15 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 16 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f2} \) 17 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f4} \) 18 \( \text{we4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 19 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{fd8} \) 20 0-0-0 \( \text{we6} \) 21 \( \text{xc3} \) leaves White with no problems) 14 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{c5}?! \) (14...\( \text{d5} \) 15 \( \text{we4} ! \) \( \text{xh1} \) 16 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 17 0-0-0 with dual threats against Black’s king) 15 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 16 \( \text{c4} \) (16 \( \text{xf8?} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c3} \) + ) 16...\( \text{xc4} \) 17 \( \text{wg4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 18 \( \text{xf8} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 19 0-0-0 \( \text{xh1} \) is still in Black’s favour, Gutman.

IV) 10...\( \text{c5}?! \) might ensure Black good attacking chances.

After 11 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 13 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h6} \), indicated by Bilguer, 14 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 15 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 16 \( \text{we2} \) 0-0-0 17 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{he8} \) 18 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{g6} \) would have given Black decisive pressure on the d- and e-files, Gutman.

11 \( \text{w3} \)

Ettlinger-Vasquez, Havana 1882, continued 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{d3} \) 0-0-0 13 a3 \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xh2} \) 15 \( \text{wh2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) + 0-1.

11...\( \text{xc3} \) + 12 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{e6} \)

White is helpless, Gutman.

Sequel 4
(1 e4 \( \text{e5} \) 2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{wh4} \) 5 \( \text{wd3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 6 \( \text{xc6} \) dxc6 7 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \)?

“...The problem is this, though: since we suppose that Black has the advantage (after 5 \( \text{wd3} ? \) it ought to be possible to indicate an improvement upon his play that leads to a position in which he stands better. But how can Black improve?”, Botterill/Harding.

8...\( \text{xc3} ! ? \)

“...How is Black to continue?... Although there are other reasonable possibilities for Black, we confess we can find nothing very impressive for him: nothing that actually justifies Ludek Pachman’s verdict — Black is slightly better... Of course, these considerations do not suffice to make this line a commendable one for White”, Botterill/Harding.

Alternatives are:
I) 8...\( \text{g4} ! ? \) is dubious because of 9 \( \text{d4} ! \), Gutman;
II) 8...\( \text{g4} \) 9 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 10 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 11 \( \text{d1} \) 0-0-0 12 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 13 \( \text{f3} ? ! \) \( \text{e5} \) 14 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{b7} \) 17 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{wd4} \) 18 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{a5} \) 19 e5 \( \text{b4} \) 20 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 21 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 22
\[ \text{\texttt{We6 11 \texttt{g2}) 10 \texttt{e2 appears more testing.}} \]

We survey Black’s defences:

A) 10...\texttt{we5} 11 \texttt{f4} \texttt{we7} 12 \texttt{f3} \texttt{g4} 13 \texttt{e5} \texttt{ad8} 14 \texttt{we2} \texttt{xf3} 15 \texttt{xf3} \texttt{ad5} 16 0-0-0 \texttt{e5} 17 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{xd2}+ 18 \texttt{exd2} \texttt{cd5}, Kwiatkowski-Sosnowska, Warsaw 1994, and now 19 \texttt{f5} \texttt{fe8} 20 \texttt{e1} would retain an edge for White, Gutman.

B) 10...\texttt{g4} is a loss of time in view of 11 \texttt{f3} (11 \texttt{fxg4} \texttt{xf4} 12 \texttt{f3} \texttt{g6} 13 a3 \texttt{ad8} with approximate equality, Hall) 11...\texttt{e6} (or 11...\texttt{h3} 12 0-0-0 \texttt{ad8} 13 \texttt{cd4} a5 14 \texttt{g4}) 12 0-0-0 \texttt{ad8} 13 \texttt{we3}, Gutman.

C) 10...\texttt{g6} 11 \texttt{f3} \texttt{e6} 12 \texttt{we3} \texttt{fe8} 13 \texttt{g4} \texttt{cd7} 14 \texttt{g5}?! \texttt{f5} 15 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} 16 a3?! (16 0-0-0 a5 17 a3 \texttt{c5} 18 \texttt{xf4} \texttt{e7} 19 \texttt{eb1} \texttt{d6} was level in Hofmann-Junker, Germany 1999) 16...\texttt{c5} 17 \texttt{g5} \texttt{f8} 18 \texttt{f4} \texttt{xf6} 19 \texttt{e5} \texttt{ed5} 20 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{cxd5} 21 \texttt{f1} still looks fine for White, Gutman.

9 \texttt{xc3} \texttt{xe4}!

Less challenging are:

I) 9...\texttt{xe4+?!} 10 \texttt{xe4+} \texttt{xe4} 11 \texttt{exg7} \texttt{g8} 12 \texttt{d4}, “when White’s bishop pair gives him an edge”, Botterill/Harding;

II) 9...0-0 10 \texttt{e5} (10 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} 11 \texttt{c3} was mentioned by Efim
Bogoljubow, however 11...\text{g}6 12 f3 f5 13 e5 \text{xe}6 14 \text{f}6+ \text{d}6 15 \text{g}4 \text{xd}4 16 \text{xe}5 \text{xd}1+ 17 \text{d}1 \text{xe}6 18 \text{g}4 \text{g}4 19 f3 \text{xe}6 20 \text{xc}7 should be a draw) 11 \text{e}2 (or 11 g3 \text{wa}4?? 12 b3 \text{g}4 13 \text{e}2 \text{f}5 14 \text{xf}5 15 \text{d}2 \text{d}8 16 \text{d}3 \text{xd}3 17 \text{xd}3 \text{g}c3 18 \text{xc}3 \text{d}5 19 \text{h}e1 \text{fd}8 \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}, Apitzsch-Leisebein, corr. 1996) 11...\text{xc}3 12 \text{xc}3 \text{xe}8 13 0-0 \text{f}4 14 \text{fe}1 \text{f}5 (14...\text{xe}5 15 \text{a}6??) 15 \text{c}4 \text{d}8 16 \text{d}1 leads to a balanced position, Gutman.

A) 11...\text{g}5+?! ("Overlooking White's next move, but there is little to like in Black's game", Hall) 12 \text{f}4 \text{xf}4+ 13 \text{d}2 \text{h}4 ("Well, at least we know what we shouldn't do, because it actually was done in Maszuski-Kolisch, Paris 1864: 13...\text{g}4? 14 \text{d}8+ \text{xd}8 15 \text{g}5+ \text{e}8 16 \text{d}8 mate. A celebrated miniature", Botterill/Harding) 14 g3 \text{e}7 15 \text{w}g7?? (15 \text{e}1 f5 16 \text{g}2 "leaves White with a strong initiative, but it was obligatory", Botterill/Harding; in my opinion 16...0-0 is quite satisfactory for Black) 15...\text{f}6 (or 15...\text{f}8 16 \text{e}1 \text{f}5 17 \text{d}3) 16 \text{w}x\text{f}6 \text{xf}6 17 \text{c}3 \text{e}7 18 \text{c}4, and White is clearly better, Gutman;

B) 11...\text{xc}3?? might be a correct choice. 12 \text{w}x\text{g}7 (12 \text{xc}3 0-0 13 \text{f}4 \text{g}4 14 \text{e}1 \text{d}6 15 g3 \text{d}8 16 \text{d}3 \text{fe}8 17 \text{h}3 \text{e}6 18 a3 \text{d}5 19 \text{h}2, Gas-Hall, corr. 1993, is best answered by 19...\text{f}6!) 12...\text{xc}2+! (the endgame resulting from 12...\text{xd}1 13 \text{w}x\text{h}8+ \text{f}8 14 \text{xf}8+ \text{xf}8 15 \text{xd}1 \text{f}5 is good for White) 13 \text{b}1 \text{f}8 14 \text{xa}2 ("with an unclear position", Lane) 14...\text{f}7?? 15 \text{c}4 (15 \text{w}x\text{h}7 0-0-0 16 \text{b}1 \text{f}6 17 \text{e}2 \text{e}6 18 \text{w}4 \text{xf}2 19 \text{g}4 \text{xd}1+ 20 \text{xd}1 \text{e}8 21 \text{xe}6+ \text{xe}6 22 \text{w}7 b6 was fine for Black in Junghaenel-Zajkowski, corr. 1993) 15...0-0-0 16 \text{w}x\text{h}7 \text{e}5 17 \text{w}h4 \text{h}8 18 \text{d}4 (or 18 \text{w}f4 \text{h}8!!) 18...\text{xd}4 19 \text{xd}4 b5 20 \text{xf}7 \text{h}8 yields Black some pressure, Gutman.

10...\text{f}5?!

A new idea of Peter Leisebein.

There are two more possibilities:

I) 10...\text{w}e7 11 \text{xe}7 \text{g}8 was recommended by Oscar Cordes.
B) 13...f6!? was suggested by Steinitz in his Modern Chess Instructor, when 14 c4+ h8 15 f4 fxe5 16 fxe5 h3 17 g6 g6 18 f4! (18 0-0-0 g5+ 19 b1 xe5) 18...e7 19 0-0-0 xe5 20 Wh4 f5 21 xe1 Wh7 22 xf5 gxf5 is double-edged according to Leisebein.

11 c4 c5
12 d4 0-0-0 13 0-0-0 (13 xa7 dad2) 13...c5! 14 xec5 xd1 15 xed1 xed5 16 xec5 d8 17 xec1
Wh6+ 18 xe3 xed6 19 w(c3 g4 favours Black, Leisebein.

12...xg7
12...xf2 13 d4 xe3+ 14 xe3 d6 15 g3 a6 16 g4 0-0-0 17 xec2 is no worse for White, Gutman.

13 f3 w(g5

13...f8 14 xe4 xec5 15 wb3 xec8 16 b3 w(f4+ 17 b1 xed3 18 xed3 xc3 19 xf1 we4 20 g3 does not offer Black any advantage, Gutman.

14 xe1 xec3+ 15 xec3 w(f8 16 xec8 xed8 17 xed3 xoc3 18 g3 xec4 19 xed xec5 allows Black to keep the pawn, Grott-Leisebein, corr. 1999.

17...xe4 18 xa7 c5 19 xg1

Now:
A) 13...xd5 14 xd5 cxd5 15 f4 f6 16 0-0-0 fxe5 17 xdx5 exf4 18 xg4 x(a8 18...e6 19 xe5 19 c4 xe6 20 xe5 xc4 21 xec4 should be a draw;

White is close to equalising, Gutman.
Part Two: Less Popular Variations

(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4)
The material is divided into four chapters:
Chapter 1: 5 Qf5, Paulsen Variation
Chapter 2: 5 Qxc6
Chapter 3: 5 Qe2
Chapter 4: 5 Qe3, Braune Variation

"We now return to lesser systems in which White gambits his e-pawn. None of these can be considered entirely correct, but again the first player does receive some measure of compensation — and so Black must be both careful and prepared", Hall.

(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4)
5 Qf5

"Louis Paulsen was one of the great chess theoreticians and a player ranking among the world’s best half-dozen in the 1860s and 1870s. In his games Paulsen’s defensive notions often encouraged premature attacks. He would sometimes move pieces backwards; surely, his contemporaries thought, this must be wrong", Hooper/Whyld, The Oxford Companion to Chess.

"An innovation, which deserves more attention", Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1879

"The starting position for White’s most unexpected response to the Steinitz System. White spends a tempo to compel the capture of his e-pawn, but after 5...Wxe4+ 6 Qe3 the wandering knight at least protects the g2 square...Black has little trouble countering, however, and 5 Qf5 must be judged insufficient. Nevertheless, players who offer such gambits should be treated with respect", Hall.

5...Wxe4+ 6 Qe3 Qf6

"The black queen is rather embarrassed now; maybe 6...Qb4+ would have been better", Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1879.

After 7 c3 (7 Qc3 will transpose into variation 5 Qc3 Qb4 6 Qf5 — Part 4, Chapter 1) 7...Qc5 8 Qd3 We7 9 0-0 Qxe3 10 Qxe3 d6 11 Re1 Qe6, an untried suggestion of Anatoly Karpov, 12 Qd2 0-0-0 13 Qe4 would give White increasing pressure, Gutman.

7 Qd3 We5
7...Wh4!? is another possibility.
White has two main replies:

A) 8...\(\text{c}3\), fighting for the strategic d5 square, 8...\(\text{ac}5\) (8...\(\text{b}4\)? fails to 9 \(\text{d}5\) 9 0-0 d6 10 \(\text{ed}5\) \(\text{axd}5\) 11 \(\text{axd}5\) \(\text{b}6!\) (11...0-0 12 \(\text{ac}7\) \(\text{g}4\) 13 \(\text{wd}2\) \(\text{ac}8\) 14 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{e}6\) 15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}5\) is also slightly better for Black) 12 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{g}4\) 13 \(\text{wd}2\) \(\text{xe}3\) 14 \(\text{wx}e3+\) \(\text{d}7\) 15 \(\text{wf}4\) \(\text{h}5\) 16 \(\text{fe}1\) \(\text{ae}8\) favours Black, Gutman;

B) 8 0-0!? d5 (8...d6 is too passive as 9 \(\text{dc}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 10 \(\text{ed}5\) shows) 9 \(\text{e}1\) (Delmar-Steinitz, New York 1894, went 9 \(\text{af}5?!\) \(\text{e}6\) 10 \(\text{e}1\) 0-0 11 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{wh}5\) 12 \(\text{wxh}5\) \(\text{axh}5\) 13 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{df}6\) 14 a4 \(\text{e}8\) 15 \(\text{e}e6+\) \(\text{xe}6\) 16 \(\text{dd}1\) \(\text{e}5\) 17 b4 c6 18 \(\text{dd}2\) h5 19 \(\text{f}5\) g6 20 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}8\) with advantage to Black) 9...\(\text{e}7\) 10 g3?! \(\text{wh}3\) 11 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{wd}7\) 12 \(\text{g}2\) d4 (retaining more tension, 12...0-0 13 \(\text{axd}5\) \(\text{axd}5\) 14 \(\text{wx}d5\) is equal) 13 \(\text{c}4\) 0-0 14 \(\text{dd}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 15 \(\text{b}3\), when White has some compensation for the pawn, Gutman.

\(8\) 0-0

Black's position is strong enough to justify this advance in the centre.

Less effective are:

I) 8...d6 9 \(\text{c}4!\) (representing an important step in the quest to secure the d5-square for the white knight; 9 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}6\) 10 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{a}5\) 11 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xd}3\) 13 \(\text{wx}d3\) 0-0-0 14 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 15 b4 \(\text{wh}5\) 16 a4 d5 17 \(\text{dd}2\) \(\text{d}6\) gave an edge for Black in Alonso-Lopez Senra, Ponferrada 1991) 9...\(\text{e}6\) (or 9...\(\text{e}7\) 10 \(\text{c}3\) 0-0 11 \(\text{ed}5\) \(\text{axd}5\) 12 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 13 \(\text{e}1\) 10 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 11 \(\text{ed}5!?!\) \(\text{xd}5\) (11...\(\text{xd}5\) can be met by 12 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 13 \(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{ax}d5\) 14 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 15 \(\text{b}5\) 12 \(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{ax}d5\) 13 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 14 \(\text{ax}d5\) \(\text{wx}d5\) 15 \(\text{wc}2\) 0-0 16 \(\text{fc}1\) secures White a strong initiative, Gutman;

II) 8...\(\text{e}7\) was indicated by Bilguer, 9 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{d}5\) (9...0-0? 10 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}5\) 11 b4) 10 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{f}3\) (after 11 \(\text{dd}2\) \(\text{f}8\) 12 \(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{xe}7\) 13 \(\text{e}4\) “White has full compensation for his pawn investment, but not more”, Hall) 11...\(\text{dd}4\) 12 \(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{xe}7\) 13 \(\text{g}3\) with a promising position for White, Gutman;

III) 8...\(\text{d}6\) deserves more attention, 9 \(\text{g}3\) (instead of 9 \(\text{gg}4\) \(\text{xxg}4\) 10 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}5\) 11 \(\text{xe}5+\) \(\text{xe}5\) 12 \(\text{we}2\) \(\text{xf}2+\), “and we believe that Black has a healthy advantage”, Hall) 9...0-0 10 \(\text{f}5?!\) (10 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{we}6\) 11 \(\text{dd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{wb}4\) 13 \(\text{bc}3\) d6 14 \(\text{bb}5\) \(\text{g}4\) maintains an edge for Black) 10...\(\text{e}8\) (10...\(\text{dd}4\) loses too much time as 11 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}5\) 12 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{ce}6\) 13 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{wd}5\) 14 \(\text{cc}3\) shows) 11 \(\text{bc}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 12 \(\text{bb}5\) d6 13 \(\text{fc}4\) \(\text{cc}5\) 14 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{we}5\) 15 \(\text{fc}4\) \(\text{cc}5\) 16 \(\text{ee}3\) would lead to a draw by repetition, Gutman.

“Black stands slightly better, observes Paul Keres. White, however, can still make three or four natural rapid deployment moves. Black is better, but must be careful”, Hall.

8...d5!?
9 \textit{\texttt{\textsc{a}1 \texttt{\textsc{e}6} 10 \texttt{\textsc{c}3}}} \\

This is a crucial moment: White is ready to carry out a serious destruction of Black's centre.

10...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}6}?!} \\

"Surrendering his extra pawn, and reaching a position of dynamic equality", \textbf{Hall}.

There are two moves worth mentioning:

\textbf{I)} "Black could have secured his king and queen with a clear advantage by 10...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}d}6}", according to \textbf{Hall}; however, after 11 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}5 \texttt{\textsc{w}d}7}} (11...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}b}4}?! is ruled out by 12 a3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}b}6} 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}b}2} 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}4}! 12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}5} 0-0-0 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}d}4 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}c}5} 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{x}c}6 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}x}c}6} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}d}3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}7} 16 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}3} Black's king looks rather insecure, \textbf{Gutman};

\textbf{II)} 10...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}d}4} 11 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}b}6} 12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}b}2} 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}4}?! (more impressive than 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}d}7} 14 c3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}c}5} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}2 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}a}1} 16 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}a1} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}3}) 13...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}b}4} 14 c3 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}a}5} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}1 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}5} 16 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}a}6} 17 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}c}5} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}5} 18 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}c}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}x}d}3} 19 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}xg}7+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}d}7} 20 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}d}3 c6 21 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}x}e}6 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}x}b}5 22 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}4} would still leave Black with difficult defensive problems to solve, \textbf{Gutman}.

11 g3 \\

"The natural tendency of White is to develop a field of action", \textbf{Lasker}.

11...0-0-0!?

Other possibilities are:

\textbf{I)} 11...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}h}5} 12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}d}1 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}f}6+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{g}x}f}6 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}1 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}7} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}5+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}8} 16 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}c}4} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}f}5} 17 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}6 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}d}6 18 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{h}h}6+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}7} 19 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}1} gave White a slightly superior ending, Paulsen-Minkwitz, Leipzig 1879;

\textbf{II)} 11...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}d}4} 12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{b}b}5} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}b}5 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}a}5+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}8} 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{c}c}4} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{g}g}4} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}e}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}1 16 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}f}7} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}7} 17 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}1 c6 is roughly equal, \textbf{Hall}.

12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}5 \\

12 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{f}f}5} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}4} 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}6+ \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}x}d}6 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}e}4 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{d}x}e}4 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}e}4, \textbf{Hall}, is wrong due to 15...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{w}d}5}!, \textbf{Gutman}.

12...\texttt{\texttt{\textsc{g}g}4} 13 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}e}5} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}1 14 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{e}e}1} \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}5 15 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}x}d}5 \texttt{\texttt{\textsc{a}f}3} \\

Black's position is preferable, \textbf{Gutman}.
Chapter 2
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxe4 f6 5 dxe6)

"5 dxe6 put in a solitary appearance in Radulov-Zuckerman, Vrsac 1973, but should not be seen again. Evidently it is not vigorous enough", Botterill/Harding.

"This attempt yields White very little, and can be safely classified as non-threatening. Yet the move is seen rather frequently, perhaps due to its plausibility. But play is wide open, and Black will have to move his queen more than once; again, over-confidence is ill-advised", Hall.

5...dxe6

"Completely without prospect is 6 wxe2", Hall.

After 6...wexe2+ 7 dxexe dxe6 (another method is 7...bxc6 8 f4 d6 9 f3 d7 10 d2 e7 11 0-0-0 g5, Raddatz-Schwarzkopf, Baden-Baden 1991) 8 d3 (or 8 0-0 f5 9 c3 0-0-0 10 d3 a5 11 d3 d3 d3 d3 12 d2 d6 13 f3 d4 14 d2 d6 15 d1 d8 0-1, Huebert-Ziersch, corr. 1990) 8...d6 9 d3 0-0 10 a3 d7 11 d3 d6 12 h3 d5 Black was comfortably placed in Motlova-Martinkova, Chrudim 1993.

6...dxe6?"

"The text move keeps a safer advantage", Hall. Alternatively:

1) "There has been no experience with the positionally desirable 6...bxc6.

Black will then fall behind in development, yet the move is worth examining. We analyse 7 0-0 d5 8 d3 (8 d1 d7 9 d3 d4 forces off the queens) 8...d4 9 d3 d7 10 d3 d5 11 d1 d6 12 d4?! can be answered by 13 xh7+! xh7 14 d5+ d8 15 d3, Gutman) 13 d4 d5 with an unclear position", Hall; in my opinion 14 dxc5 dxc5 15 d3..."
\( \text{Wd6} 16 \text{Wh5} \) is quite promising for White, Gutman;

II) 6...\text{Wxc6} 7 0-0 deserves attention.

A) 7...\text{Ac5} 8 \text{Cf3} \text{De7} 9 \text{Af3}!? (Adontaki-Mastrakoukos, Hania 1995, went 9 \text{Af4} 0-0 10 \text{Fe1}?! d5! 11 \text{Af3} \text{De6} 12 \text{Wd2} \text{Ed6} 13 \text{Ad1} \text{Exf4} 14 \text{Wxf4} \text{Ad8} with an edge for Black) 9...\text{Wg6} 10 \text{Af4} (10 \text{Cxd5} \text{Cxd5} 11 \text{Wxd5} d6 12 \text{Fe1}+ \text{Fe6} 13 \text{Wxb7} 0-0) 10...d6 11 \text{Cde4} \text{Cb6} 12 \text{Fe1} puts Black under pressure, Gutman;

B) 7...\text{Cc7} 8 \text{Fe1} \text{Cf6} 9 \text{Cc3}?! (9 \text{Af3}?! gave Black a clear advantage after 9...d5! 10 \text{Cxe3} \text{Cxe6} 11 \text{Cde2} 0-0-0 12 \text{Cd4} \text{Wb6} 13 \text{Cge3} \text{Cc5} 14 \text{Cxe6} \text{Cxe6} 15 \text{Cxe6} \text{fxe6} 16 \text{Cb3} \text{Wc5} 17 \text{We2} \text{Cxe8}, Tokaji-Balint, Hungary 1997) 9...0-0 10 \text{Cf3} \text{Wc5} (or 10...\text{Wd6} 11 \text{Wxd6} \text{Cxd6} 12 \text{Db5}) 11 \text{Cfa4}!? (11 \text{Cxe3} \text{Wf5} 12 \text{Cd4} \text{Cxd8} 13 \text{Cxe5} \text{Wg6} is less effective) 11...\text{Wd6} 12 \text{Cg5}?! h6 (12...c6 13 \text{c4}?!?) 13 \text{Cah4} \text{Wb4} 14 \text{Cg3} \text{Wxa4} (14...\text{Cbd8} 15 \text{Cc} \text{Cxc4} 16 \text{Cxe5} leaves the black queen rather misplaced) 15 \text{Cxe7} \text{Wb4} 16 \text{We1}, and White obtains fair compensation for his pawn, Gutman.

7 0-0

Although it is difficult to believe that such play is intrinsically sound, it certainly presents Black with some defensive problems.

7...\text{Cxe6}!?

“A good move, but the queen’s bishop may prove useful elsewhere”, Hall.

However, two other possibilities appear to me less trustworthy:

I) 7...\text{Wd5} 8 \text{We1}!? \text{Cf6} 9 \text{Cxc3} \text{Wd7} 10 \text{Cg5} \text{Ce7} 11 \text{Cxd1} \text{Wc8} 12 \text{Cxe4} \text{h6} 13 \text{Wc3} \text{Cf8}, Schlemmer-Reiter, Germany 1997, and now 14 \text{Cxe7}+!? \text{Cxe7} 15 \text{Cxc5} would give White a clear plus, Gutman;

II) “We like 7...\text{Cc6}”, Hall, when White has a choice of:

A) 8 \text{Cd2} \text{Wd4} (more precise than 8...\text{Wf5} 9 \text{Cxc4} \text{Cc5} 10 \text{Cxd3} \text{Wg4} 11 \text{We1}+! \text{Cf6} 12 \text{Wc5} \text{b6} 13 \text{Cxe3}) 9 \text{Cf3} \text{Wh5} leads nowhere for White, Gutman;

B) 8 \text{Cxc3} \text{Cc5} (8...\text{Wc7} 9 \text{Cxc3} \text{Cc6} 10 \text{Cxe3} \text{Cf6} 11 \text{Cf1} \text{Cg4} 12 \text{Cxe3} \text{Cxe3} 13 \text{Cxe3} 0-0-0 is also good, Plukkert-Montembart, Leiden 1998) 9 \text{g3} \text{Cf6} 10 \text{Cf1} 0-0 11 \text{Af4} \text{Cxc4} 12 \text{Cxe3} \text{Wf5} 13 \text{Cxd4} \text{Cc6} 14 \text{Cxd3} \text{Wg4} 15 \text{Cc2} \text{Wg6} 16 \text{Cc6} \text{Wxf6} 17 \text{Cxe4} \text{Wxb2} 18 \text{Cxd6} \text{Cxd6} 19 \text{Cbc1} \text{Wxa2} 20 \text{Cxb7} \text{Wd5} 21 \text{Cxd5} \text{Cxd5} with a winning position for Black,
Mailath-Turner, Tatranska Lomnica
1997;
C) 8 $\text{He}1!!$ is preferable:

Black has a choice:
A) 8...$\text{Gg6}$ 9 $\text{Ae}5$ $\text{Ff5}$ 10 $\text{Ae}1$ $\text{Af6}$, Wortel-Kuyvenhoven, Hengelo
1994, loses in view of 11 $\text{g4}$!
B) 8...$\text{Ad4}$ 9 g3 (9 $\text{He}1$ $\text{Cc5}$ 10 g3
$\text{Dd4}$ was given by Lane) 9...$\text{Dd8}$!?
(this is sounder than 9...$\text{Wd3}$ 10 $\text{Af4}$
$\text{Dd8}$ 11 $\text{Cc1}$ $\text{Dd6}$ 12 $\text{Bxd6}$
$\text{Dxd6}$ 13 $\text{Bxg5}$ $\text{Dh6}$ 14 $\text{Aa5}$, Zuckerman)
10 $\text{Af4}$ (Vaganian-Horvath, German
Women's Bundesliga, 1994, went 10
$\text{Dd3}$ $\text{Df6}$ 11 $\text{Be2}$ $\text{Df7}$ 12 $\text{Aa5}$ 0-0
13 $\text{Bd1}$ $\text{Cc5}$ 14 $\text{Dxe7}$ $\text{Dxe7}$ 15
$\text{Bxd5}$ $\text{Dxd5}$ 16 $\text{Db5}$ $\text{Df6}$ 17 $\text{Bxe6}$
$\text{Dxe6}$ 18 $\text{Wb5}$ $\text{Ab8}$ 19 $\text{Cc5}$ c6 with
advantage for Black) 10...$\text{Dxe4}$ 11
$\text{Wd2}$ $\text{Df6}$ 12 $\text{Bd1}$ $\text{Cc4}$? (after
12...$\text{Cc5}$, Mossong-Klicnar, Budapest
1999, 13 $\text{Bxd5}$? $\text{Dxd5}$ 14 $\text{Ab3}$
c6 15 $\text{Cc4}$ $\text{Cc4}$ 16 $\text{Wf4}$ 0-0 17 $\text{Bxd5}$
$\text{Cc5}$ 18 $\text{Bxd5}$ $\text{Cc5}$ $\text{Wc5}$ would
be equal) 13 $\text{Wxd4}$ $\text{Cc5}$ (13...$\text{Dd5}$?!) 14
$\text{Bxd5}$ $\text{Cc5}$ is best answered by
15 $\text{Wb4}$! $\text{Cc8}$ 16 $\text{Ab3}$ c6 17 $\text{Cc1}$
14 $\text{Cc1}$ 0-0 15 $\text{Cc4}$ $\text{Cc8}$, and
Black has reasonable prospects,
Gutman;

C) Sharper, but also quite good, is
8...$\text{Wc5}$ (“the queen is exposed to
harassment here”, Hall) 9 $\text{f4}$

9...$\text{Wc5}$? (after 9...$\text{Cc5}$+ 10 $\text{Ae}1$
$\text{Dd4}$, suggested by Zuckerman as
being good for Black, 11 $\text{Cc3}$ 0-0-0
12 $\text{f5}$ $\text{Dd7}$ 13 $\text{Cc4}$ $\text{Df6}$ 14 $\text{Cxc5}$

There are two more options:
I) 8 $\text{Df3}$ $\text{Dh4}$ 9 g3 $\text{Wd8}$ 10 $\text{Cc3}$
$\text{Dxd1}$ 11 $\text{Dxd1}$ $\text{Cc6}$ 12 $\text{Cc3}$ $\text{Cc7}$
13 $\text{Dxe4}$ $\text{Af5}$ 14 $\text{Cc1}$ 0-0 15 $\text{Cc3}$
$\text{Cc8}$ 16 $\text{Dxc6}$ $\text{Dxc6}$ leaves Black a
pawn ahead, Brown-Neumann, Hilversum
1903;
II) 8 $\text{Cc3}$ appears to be less
challenging.
\[ \text{xc5 15 \text{g}5 should promise White good counterplay, Gutman) 10 \text{h}1 \text{f}6 11 \text{f5}!? \text{d}7?? ("A dismal retreat. White’s 11th move bid for more open lines looks too expensive after the calm 11...\text{x}f5", according to Hall. To me 12 \text{f}3!? may hold some chances for White, as 12...\text{d}6 13 \text{e}3 \text{e}5 14 \text{f}4 \text{e}6 15 \text{f}1 \text{x}f4 16 \text{x}d4 \text{g}6 17 \text{c}4 \text{d}6 18 \text{d}1 \text{c}5 19 \text{e}4 \text{e}4 20 \text{e}4+ shows, Gutman) 12 \text{d}3 0-0-0 13 \text{e}3 \text{a}5 ("Black’s position is still preferable, having an extra pawn, but White now hurries ahead in development", Hall) 14 \text{c}4 (or 14 \text{f}4 c5 15 \text{c}4 \text{d}6) 14...\text{xf}5 15 \text{xf}7, Radulov-Zuckerman, Vrsac 1973, and now 15...\text{xc}2?! would be fine for Black, Zuckerman.}

9...\text{d}5
8...\text{d}8 9 \text{d}2!? (after 9 \text{d}3 \text{h}4 10 \text{d}2 \text{c}5 11 \text{e}2 \text{f}6 12 \text{f}3, Frogman-Zippy, e-mail game 1994, 12...\text{h}5 should be consequent) 9...\text{h}4 10 \text{g}3 \text{f}6 11 \text{c}4 with some pressure since 11...\text{c}5? loses to 12 \text{x}e6+ \text{xe}6 13 \text{h}5+, Gutman.

9 \text{d}2

The ending is slightly better for Black, Gutman.
5...\(\text{c}5\)!
An interesting counter-idea exerting strong pressure on d4.
5...\(\text{w}x\text{e}4?\) 6 \(\text{d}b5\) will transpose into the variation after 5 \(\text{d}b5\) \(\text{w}x\text{e}4+\) 6 \(\text{c}2\) — Part 3, Chapter 1, a line regarded as good for White. 6 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{x}d4\)!
Recommended by Azmaiparashvili and Georgadze.
6...\(\text{w}x\text{e}4\) 7 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{w}x\text{g}2\) (or 7...\(\text{w}e\text{e}5\) 8 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{w}d6\) 9 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{w}e3\) 10 \(\text{w}x\text{e}3+\) \(\text{w}e7\) 11 \(\text{f}f4\) \(\text{w}b4\), Travenec-Brestak, Slovakia 1998, when the simple 12 \(\text{w}x\text{b}4\) \(\text{x}b4\) 13 0-0-0 \(\text{f}6\) 14 \(\text{h}1\) 0-0 15 a3 would have given White a promising ending) 8 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}6\) is less impressive.
White has two possibilities:
A) 9 \(\text{d}d5\) \(\text{e}3\) 10 \(\text{f}x\text{e}3\) (10 \(\text{c}7+\) \(\text{d}8\) 11 \(\text{d}a8\) \(\text{f}4\)) 10...\(\text{d}8\) 11 \(\text{d}5\) was suggested by the young Russian player Dimitri Basanin, however, 11...\(\text{f}6\) 12 \(\text{bxc}7\) \(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{d}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{e}5\) is good for Black, Gutman;
B) 9 \(\text{h}5?!\) \(\text{g}2\) (Black can play on by 9...\(\text{w}f6\) 10 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 11 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) but 12 \(\text{c}x\text{c}6\) \(\text{x}c6\) 13 \(\text{g}1\)

8 \(\text{e}3\)
Alternatives are:
I) 8 \(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{h}xg7\) 9 \(\text{h}xh8\) \(\text{h}xh1+\) 10 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}6\) 11 \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{e}4+\) 12 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}5\) with advantage for Black, Gutman;
II) 8 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{v}xg2\) (8...\(\text{e}7\) 9 0-0 0-0 10 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{g}6\) 11 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 12 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{g}6\) 14 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{g}4\) also isn't bad, O.Garcia-Gomez, Cuba 2000) 9 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 10 \(\text{e}2+\) \(\text{e}7\) 11 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 12 \(\text{x}d5\) \(\text{g}4\) 13 \(\text{f}3\) 0-0-0 14 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{f}5\) 15 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{d}5\) 17 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{x}c3\) 18 \(\text{bxc}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 19 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}7\) 20 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{g}6\) also favours Black, Heinrich-Daub, Germany 1992.
8...\(\text{w}xg2\) 9 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}3\)
9...\(\text{g}6?!\) 10 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 11 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{d}8\) might well be playable, Gutman.
10 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}7\)
10...\(\text{e}5?\) is only a loss of time, 11 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 12 \(\text{d}4!\) \(\text{f}3+\) 13 \(\text{x}f3\) \(\text{x}f3\) 14 \(\text{g}1\) 0-0 15 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{x}h1+\) 16 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{w}xh2\) 17 \(\text{h}1\) 18 \(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{d}6\) 19 \(\text{x}d6\) \(\text{cxd6}\) 20 \(\text{d}4\) 0-0, De Greef-Check Check, Aegon 1995.
11 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{d}8\)
White's position can easily become overextended, Gutman.
Chapter 4
The Braune Variation
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d5 3 d4 exd4 4 dxe4 c6)
5 e3

A little tested way of sacrificing the e4-pawn, but maybe a promising one, Karpov.
Here once again White ignores the threat to his centre pawn, and develops his queen's bishop to a promising square. It is not very dangerous for Black — though there are ways to go wrong if Black is not careful, Hall.

The material is divided into four sections:
Section 1: 5...c5
Section 2: 5...b4+
Section 3: 5...f6
Section 4: 5...xe4!?

Section 1

5...c5 6 c3!?
"Ordinary mortals prefer to keep the tension in the centre", Tartakower.

Two other moves have been tried:
I) 5...d3 reaches a position after 5 d3 c5 6 e3, covered in Part 1, Chapter 2, Section 2;

II) 6 f5 xe4 7 xg7+ d8 8 c3! (Blackburne-McLennan, blindfold game, London 1879, went 8 d2 w5 9 d3 b4+ 10 c3 xc3+ 11 bxc3 wc3+ 12 e2 w7 13 e2 ge7 14 0-0 d6 15 h1 e6 16 c1 g8 with advantage to Black) 8...w5 9 h5 xe3 10 fxe3 wxe3+ 11 e2 d6 12 w2 xd2+ 13 edx2 d4 14 d3 g4 15 f4 e7 16 h1, when White has enough compensation for his pawn, but not more, Gutman.

6...d6
Black has little choice:
I) 6...g7 7 f3 w5 8 g4 and Black loses a piece, Gutman;
II) 6...xd4 7 xd4 is fine for White due to his greater central control.

Black has tried:
A) 7...f6 8 g3 g5 9 f4 (9 e3 w6 10 g2 a6 11 f4 d6 12 w2 w5 13 h3 h6 14 g4 wa5 15 0-0 gave White an edge in Meulders-Jacobsen, Groningen 1967) 9...w6 (or 9 wa5 10 xf6 gxf6 11 d5 wb6 12 0-0-0 d6 13 w5 fe7 14 c4 0-0 15 d3 e6 16 e5 d6 17 xf6 h8 18 de4 xa2 19 d5 1-0, Lampe-Ristić, Hamburg 1999) 10 xf6 xf6 11 e5 secures a clear plus for White, Gutman;
B) 7...\=xd4 8 \=xd4 \=f6 (Gobet-Preismann, Lenk 1987, continued
8...\=f6 9 g3 \=g4 10 \=e2 \=e6 11 e5 \=g8 12 \=d5 \=d8 13 \=c5 1-0) 9 e5 \=b6 10 0-0-0 \=xd4 11 \=xd4 \=e7 12 \=b5 yields White considerable pressure, Gutman.

7 \=f3

7 g3 is also good, 7...\=e7 (after
7...\=g4?! 8 \=db5 \=xe3 9 \=xc7+ \=d8 10 \=xd6+ \=d7 11 \=xd7+ \=xd7 12 \=xa8 \=d4, Pokorna-Hudoba, Slovakia 1997, 13 0-0-0!? should be decisive) 8 \=xc6 bxc6 9 \=xc5 dxc5 10 \=e2 appears promising for White, Gutman.

7...\=wd8

7...\=wh5 8 \=b5 \=xe3 9 \=xc7+ (instead Gadailov-Christov, Teteven 1991, went 9 fxe3? \=d8 10 \=xd6 \=a5+ 11 \=f2 cxd6 12 \=xd6+ \=e8 13 \=d1 \=f6 and Black won easily) 9...\=d7 10 \=xa8 \=c5 11 c3 is definitely in White’s favour as Black has no time to pick up the knight on a8, Gutman.

8 \=xc5 dxc5 9 \=wd8+ \=xd8 10 \=d5 \=e6 11 \=g5!

White is clearly better, Gutman.

Section 2

(1 e4 e5 2 \=f3 \=c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \=xd4 \=h4 5 \=e3)

5...\=b4+

The check is quite popular in similar positions. Instead of taking the e-pawn straight away, Black forces c3.

A drawback to this idea is the loss of time inevitably associated with such a manoeuvre.

6 c3!

6 \=c3 \=f6 (6...\=xe4 7 \=db5 reaches a position after 5...\=xe4 6 \=b5 \=b4+ 7 \=c3, covered in Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequel 6) 7 \=db5 \=a5 8 \=d3 will transpose into a variation after 5 \=c3 \=b4 6 \=b5 \=f6 7 \=d3 \=a5 8 \=e3 — Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 4, a line regarded as good for Black. \=f6.

6...\=a5

6...\=c5 7 \=f5 \=xe4 8 \=xg7+ \=f8

9 \=d2 \=d5 10 \=xc5+ \=xc5 11 \=h5 gives White a good game, Gutman.

7 \=d2

7 \=f5 is innocuous due to 7...\=f6.

7...\=e7

Other possibilities are:

1) 7...d6? 8 \=xc6 bxc6 9 \=a4 \=e7 10 \=xa5 and White won easily, Fuchs-Kucik, Brno 1997;
II) 7...b6 8 e2 d6 9 0-0 d7 10 a4!? (10 b5 w8d8 11 xb6 axb6 12 c4 f6 13 cxd6+ cxd6 14 w6d6 can be met by 14...wb8! 15 e5 xex5) 10...w6f6 11 c4 xd4 12 cxd4 w7e7 13 f3 f6 14 xe1 w7f7 15 c1 with a clear plus for White, Ofstad-Peters, Bad Liebenzell 1996.

8 d3?!

8 e2 is the solid alternative, 8...0-0 9 0-0 xd4 (the endgame resulting from 9...d5 10 exd5 xd5 11 c3 xe3 12 c4h4 c4d1 13 cxc6 bxc6 14 fxd1 e6 15 f3 is better for White) 10 cxd4 c6 11 e3 d6 12 f4 b6 13 f2 xfx2+ 14 fx2 d7 15 g3 w3h5 16 f3 yields White a slight spatial advantage, Gutman.

8...e5

8...e5 9 f3 h5 10 0-0, Gutman.

9 f3 xd3+ 10 w xd3 w h5 11 g4?!

11 0-0-0 b6?! 12 g4 a5 13 b1 d6 14 e5? xg4 15 exd6 xd4 16 xd4 xf3 17 dxe7 w f5+ 18 c1 f6 19 w d8+ f7 20 wc7 he8 21 h1 ac8 22 wd7 a5 23 d4 xax2 24 d4 b3 was unclear in Sickenberger-Hofstetter, Germany 1987.

11...w g6 12 0-0-0

Section 3

(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 w h4 5 e3)

5...f6

"Intriguing is 5...f6", Botterill/Harding.

"A good counter to White’s fifth. Although Black can certainly grab the e-pawn with full confidence, in this section we examine attempts to exploit White’s lack of an immediate threat”, Hall.

We consider three lines in this Section:

Sequel 1: 6 b5 d8 (6...g4)
Sequel 2: 6 b5 b4+!?
Sequel 3: 6 d3 (6 e2)

Sequel 1

6 b5 d8

"Seems to be promising, and surely simpler”, Hall.

6...g4 7 xc7+ d8 was indicated by Botterill/Harding.

White has a choice of:

A) 8 xa8?! xe3 9 w2d2 d4 10 d3 (not 10 wa5+ b6 11 xb6 b4+, Hall) 10...xg2+ 11 d1 b6, and Black has the initiative, Gutman;
B) 8 g3  dxe3 9 g×h4  xd1 10
xa8  xb2 11 a4!? (instead of 11
d2  d6, Hall) 11...b4 (or 11...e5 12 a2 b4+ 13 c3
bd3+ 14 xd3 xd3+ 15 e2
ef4+ 16 ef3 ed6 17 a3) 12 d2
d6 13 b5 e5 (13...b6 14 c3)
14 c3 a6 15 ef1 ef4+ 16 e2
d4d3 17 eb6 and it is not easy for
Black to keep things under control,
Gutman;
C) 8 d5!? is probably best, then
8...xe3 9 xe3 xe4 (or 9 c5
10 ef3 e5 11 ed2 xe4 12 e3
b4 13 d2 ec6 14 ed5) 10
c3 eb4 11 ed2 ed5 12 0-0-0
will secure White good prospects
thanks to the grip on d5, Gutman.

7 d2!?
Another way to treat this position is
7 e2 e4!? (7...xe4 8 0-0 a6 9
d1c3 ef5 10 d4 xd4 11 xd4
d6 12 e1 should promise White
enough play for his pawn) with a
further split:
A) 8 ef5!? eb4 9 ec4 c6 10
xa7 ("He must continue sharply, or
Black will simply consolidate", Hall)
10...d5 11 b6+ e8 12 xb3
c5 13 e3+ e6 14 a3 bd3+
(14...d4 15 d2 d5 16 b7b5
cxb5 17 xxb5 d7 18 xd7+
xd7 19 c4 we4+ 20 ef1 d3 was
winning for Black in Weiner-
Brauening, Germany 1989) 15 e1
(or 15 xd3 wb4+ 16 ef2 xb6
17 ef7b5 xb5 18 xb5+ ed8) 15...d4 16 fg3 
xb3 17 hxg3
xb2 yields Black a decisive
advantage, Harding.
B) 8 0-0 is better, then
B1) 8...a6 9 g3! (instead of 9 a5c3
d6! 10 g3 ec3 11 hxg3 ec3
f5 12 ecxg3 ecxg3+ 13 eh1 eb3+ 14
g1 xe3+, Harding) 9...wc7 10
5c3 xc3 11 ec3 and White has a
dominating position, Gutman;
B2) 8...c5!? 9 ecxg5 ecxg5 is to be
preferred, as after the exchange of
dark-squared bishops Black can
defend himself, Gutman.
7...xe4
Rechmann-Scheulte, Germany
1991, went 7...g4 8 wc2 xe3 9
xe3 d4 9...f5 10 f3 10 c3
a5 11 c4 ec8 12 d3 eb6
(12...f5 can be answered by 13
xa5 xxa5 14 0-0) 13 xb6 axb6
14 0-0 ec5 15 ec2 d6 16 ed1
d7 17 xd6! ec8 (17...xd6 18
xb6+ ef7 19 xd6+ ed8 20
wc7+ ef7 21 xxe5+ ef8 22 wc5+
we7 23 d6 is clearly in White’s
favour, Gutman) 18 d2 ec6 19 f3
f5 20 d4 xe4 (or 20...xa2 21
ed1 xxa2 22 ed1 ef4 23 ef5)
21 ecx6 ecx6 22 d3 ea5 23
xe4 with a plus for White.
8 g3 wc7 9 a2 dxd2 10 wb2 a6
10...wb4 11 ec3!? wb2 is a risky
venture as 12 ab1 wa3 13 0-0 ab4
14 ab3 wa5 15 ecx6 ecx6 16 wb4
f8 (16...xc3 17 ecx3 f6 18
eh6!) 17 ed5! wa3 (17...xb5 18
g5+ f6 19 ecx6+ 18 ef5 shows,
Gutman.
11 ec3
White retains pressure, Gutman.
Sequel 2

(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 
 d4 Wh4 5 xe3 df6 6 b5) 
6...b4+

0-0-0 dxe4 19 xe4, Kortelainen-
Kivimaki, corr. 1992, when 19...e8!? should secure Black a 
plus. 
8...d4!?

8...xe4 9 da4 (not 9 df3!! e7 
10 d3 0-0 11 0-0 0 a6 12 db4 
d5 13 g4 xc3! and Black won eas-
ily in Weteschnik-Ploder, Giessen 
1991) also seems quite playable.

This move causes more problems 
for White.

7 c3
7 dc3 a5 8 d3 will transpose 
into a variation after 5 dc3 b4 6 
b5 df6 7 d3 a5 8 e3 — Part 
4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 4.

7...a5 8 d2

Other moves leave the initiative in 
Black’s hands:

I) After 8 b4 a6! 9 da3 
(Ravagnani-Cuijffoletti, St Vincent 
1998, went 9 d2 dg4 10 bxa5 
axb5 11 df3 xe3 12 xh4 xd1 
13 xd1 xa5 14 f5 0-0 15 e3 
e7 16 d6 d6 with a winning pos-
tion for Black) 9...d4 10 g3 
xe3 11 w f3 Wh6 12 fxe3 ab6 13 
c4 a7 14 w f4, Pokorna-
Zhikov, Bratislava 1995, 
14... wxf4! 15 exf4 (or 15 gxf4 b5) 
15...xb4! would have given Black 
a clear advantage, Gutman;

II) 8 d3 dg4 9 we2 xe3 10 
xe3 a6 11 xd4 xd4 12 xd4 
0-0 13 g3 Wh6 14 f4 lb6 15 wd5 
e3 16 dd2 c6 17 wb3 d5 18

Black has two possibilities:

A) 9...d5 and now:

A1) 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 f3 a6 (more 
precise than 11...d4 12 xh4 dxc2 
13 xxe2 d7, Hall, since 14 
b5!? b6 15 xxc6 wxc6 16 
xa4 xc6 17 xc6 xc6 18 xc4 
 promises White a better ending) 12 
fxe4 axb5 13 xb5 g4 favours 
Black, Gutman;

A2) 10 dx e4 wxe4 11 wxe4+ dxe4 
12 f4 0-0 13 xc7 g4 14 xxa5 
xa5 15 h3 h5 16 e2 (instead of 
16 g4? g6 17 0-0-0 f5 18 g5 
f7 19 b3 ac8 20 b2 h5, 
Reuvekamp-Lambers, corr. 1991) 
16...xe2 17 xe2, and I like 
White, Gutman;

B) 9...f5!? 10 x e4 (10 0-0-0 a6 11 
f3 axb5 12 xb5 0-0 13 fxe4 fxe4 
was indicated by Harding) 
10...fxe4 11 g3 w e7 12 g2 d5 13
11...\textbb{f}6!

"Simpler than 11...\textdx c5 12 \textbb{x}g4 f5, when Black is slightly better", Hall; to me after 13 \textbb{h}5+ g6 14 \textbb{f}3 \textfx e4 15 \textbx e4 \textbb{h}3 (15...a6 16 \textbb{a}3 \textbb{h}3 17 \textbb{w}e2 0-0-0 18 \textbx c6 \textbb{w}xe2+ 19 \textbx e2 \textbx c6 20 \textbb{f}3 \textbb{h}e8+ 21 \textbb{e}4) 16 \textbb{w}e2 0-0-0 17 0-0-0 \textbb{h}e8 18 \textbb{h}e1 \textbb{b}8 19 \textbb{a}3 White is at least no worse, Gutman.

12 \textbb{e}3 \textdx e4 13 \textdx e4 \textbb{w}xe4 14 \textbb{f}3 \textbb{w}e7 15 0-0-0 0-0 16 \textbb{e}1 \textbb{w}d7?! Raaste-Pyhala, Helsinki 1989, went 16...\textbb{e}6 17 b4?! ("White could have regained his pawn, remaining with only a slight disadvantage, after 17 \textbb{xc}6?! bxc6 18 \textbb{d}4 \textbb{w}d7 19 \textbb{w}a4 \textbb{b}6 20 \textbb{w}xc6 \textbb{f}e8 21 \textbx d7 \textdx d7", Hall) 17...\textbb{b}6 18 \textbb{xb}6 axb6 19 \textbb{d}4 \textbx d4 20 \textbx d4, and now 20...d5?! 21 \textbx d5 \textbb{xb}4 would retain an edge for Black, Gutman.

17 \textbb{g}2 \textbb{b}6 18 \textbb{xb}6 axb6 19 a4 \textbb{w}d8?!

19...\textbb{a}7 20 \textbb{d}4 \textbb{e}8 21 \textbx e8+ \textbb{w}xe8 with the better game, Hall, is less impressive in view of 22 \textbb{w}f3. White will be hard pressed to justify his material deficit, Gutman.
All in all, this seems obvious.
6...\( \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{d}4! \)?

Radu-Duminica, Bucharest 1991, went 6...\( \text{\textit{Q}}g4 7 \text{\textit{Q}}f5 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}3 8 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}3 \text{\textit{Q}}c5 9 \text{\textit{W}}d2 0-0 10 \text{\textit{Q}}c3 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}3 11 \text{\textit{W}}x\text{e}3 \text{\textit{d}}6 12 \text{\textit{Q}}d5 \text{\textit{W}}d8 13 0-0-0 \text{\textit{Q}}e6 14 \text{\textit{f}}4 \text{\textit{f}}5 15 \text{\textit{R}}h\text{e}1 \text{\textit{W}}d7 16 \text{\textit{Q}}c4 with advantage for White.
7 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{d}4 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}4 8 \text{\textit{W}}e2 \text{\textit{d}}5

White cannot take the position by direct assault because he is not sufficiently developed.
9 g3!?
9 0-0 \text{\textit{Q}}e6 10 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}4 0-0-0! (not 10...\( \text{\textit{W}}x\text{e}4?! ) 11 \text{\textit{W}}b5+ \text{\textit{c}}6 12 \text{\textit{W}}x\text{b}7 \text{\textit{Q}}c8 13 \text{\textit{Q}}c3) 11 \text{\textit{f}}4 (11 \text{\textit{Q}}d2 \text{\textit{d}}xe4 12 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{a}7 is bad due to 12...\text{\textit{f}}5 13 \text{\textit{Q}}b3 \text{\textit{d}}6 14 \text{\textit{g}}3 \text{\textit{W}}h3 15 \text{\textit{f}}4 \text{\textit{h}}5) 11...\text{\textit{d}}xe4 12 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{a}7 \text{\textit{W}}g4! (stronger than 12...\text{\textit{f}}5 13 \text{\textit{Q}}e3 \text{\textit{c}}7 14 \text{\textit{Q}}d2 \text{\textit{f}}6 15 \text{\textit{Q}}b3 \text{\textit{W}}g4 16 \text{\textit{W}}b5) 13 \text{\textit{W}}xg4 \text{\textit{Q}}xg4 14 \text{\textit{Q}}e3 \text{\textit{f}}5 was fine for Black, Gutman-Listebein, corr. 1999.
9...\text{\textit{W}}e7 10 0-0 \text{\textit{c}}5 11 \text{\textit{Q}}e3 \text{\textit{d}}7 12 \text{\textit{c}}4 \text{\textit{Q}}f6 13 c\text{\textit{x}}d5 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{d}5 14 \text{\textit{W}}f3 \text{\textit{c}}6 15 \text{\textit{Q}}e4 0-0-0 16 \text{\textit{Q}}c3!?
16 \text{\textit{Q}}e1 \text{\textit{W}}f6 17 \text{\textit{W}}xf6 (17 \text{\textit{W}}g4+ \text{\textit{Q}}d7) 17...gxf6 leads nowhere for White.
16...\text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}3 17 f\text{\textit{xe}}3 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}4 18 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{e}4 \text{\textit{g}}6!? 19 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{c}5 \text{\textit{Q}}h6 20 \text{\textit{Q}}h1 f5 21 \text{\textit{R}}c1 \text{\textit{W}}b8 22 b4 \text{\textit{Q}}h8 23 \text{\textit{Q}}c4 The chances are balanced, Gutman.

Section 4

(1 e4 e5 2 \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \text{\textit{Q}}c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{d}4 \text{\textit{W}}h4 5 \text{\textit{Q}}e3)
5...\text{\textit{W}}xe4!?

The most popular continuation, though the complexities of this variation have never been fully resolved.

We consider eight lines in this Section:

Sequel 1: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}d2 (6 \text{\textit{W}}e2, 6 \text{\textit{Q}}c3)
Sequel 2: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}d8 7 \text{\textit{Q}}d2
Sequel 3: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}d8 7 \text{\textit{Q}}c3
Sequel 4: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}d8 7 \text{\textit{Q}}c1\text{\textit{c}}3 \text{\textit{W}}e5 (7...\text{\textit{W}}g6)
Sequel 5: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}b4+ 7 \text{\textit{Q}}c3
Sequel 6: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}b4+ 7 \text{\textit{Q}}d2
Sequel 7: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{Q}}b4+ 7 \text{\textit{Q}}d2
Sequel 8: 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{W}}e5?!

Sequel 1
6 \text{\textit{Q}}d2

Alternatively:

I) 6 \text{\textit{W}}e2 \text{\textit{W}}e5! 7 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 reaches the position after 6 \text{\textit{Q}}b5 \text{\textit{W}}e5 7 \text{\textit{W}}e2, covered in Sequel 8;

II) 6 \text{\textit{Q}}c3 \text{\textit{Q}}b4 with a further split:
A) 7 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{c}6 bxc6 (after 7...\text{\textit{W}}xc6 8 \text{\textit{W}}d4 \text{\textit{Q}}x\text{c}3+ 9 bxc3 \text{\textit{f}}6 10 \text{\textit{Q}}c4 \text{\textit{W}}xg2 11 \text{\textit{Q}}d5 \text{\textit{W}}h3 12 0-0-0 \text{\textit{Q}}e7, Terpening-Wall, internet game 1996, 13 \text{\textit{Q}}b3!?) would secure good
attacking chances for White) $8 \text{Wd}2 \text{We}6$ $9 \text{a}3 \text{Sxa}5$ $10 \text{Wd}4 \text{Sf}6$ $11 0-0-0 0-0$ gave White no compensation for his pawn minus, Schneider-Krugel, Friedrichroda 1997;

B) $7 \text{Wd}2 \text{Sxd}4 8 \text{Wxd}4 \text{Sf}6$ $9 0-0-0 \text{Wxd}4$ $10 \text{Sxd}4 \text{Sc}3$ $11 \text{Sxc}3$ $0-0 12 \text{Se}2$, Vahtera-Jorvinen, corr. 1997, when $12...\text{d}6!!$ $13 \text{Sxf}6$ (or $13 \text{Sf}3 \text{Sb}8$ $14 \text{Sh}1 \text{Se}6$) $13...\text{gx}f6$ would lead to a slightly better ending for Black, Gutman;

C) $7 \text{Sdb}5$ will transpose into the variation after $6 \text{Sdb}5 \text{Sb}4+7 \text{Sbc}3—$ Sequel 5.

$5 \text{Sx}e3$ $6...\text{We}7!!$

Having fulfilled the task of capturing the e4-pawn, the black queen returns home.

Other possibilities are:

I) $6...\text{Wh}4$ $7 \text{Sb}5$ (7 $\text{Sf}3$ $\text{Wg}5$ $8 \text{Se}7$ $9 \text{We}2$ $d6$ $10 0-0-0 \text{Sg}4$ $11 \text{We}4$ $\text{Sxd}4$ $12 \text{Sxd}4 \text{Sxf}3$ $13 \text{gx}f3$ $c6$ $14 \text{Sh}3$ $d5$ $15 \text{We}2 \text{Sf}8$ with advantage for Black, Escholz-Seeck, Germany 1993) $7...\text{Wxd}8$ transposing back into the main line;

II) $6...\text{Wd}5$ $7 \text{Sb}5 \text{Sd}8$ $8 \text{Sc}3 \text{We}6$ $9 \text{Sc}4 \text{Wg}6$ $10 0-0 \text{f}5$ $11 \text{Sd}5 \text{h}6$ $12 \text{Sf}3 \text{Wh}7$ $13 \text{Sh}4!!$ (Rogobete-Reiter, Germany 1999, went 13 $\text{Se}1$ $\text{Sd}6$ $14 \text{We}2 \text{Sge}7$ $15 \text{Sf}4 \text{Sxf}4$ $16 \text{Sxe}7$ $g5$ $17 \text{Sd}5 \text{Sd}6$ $18 \text{Sf}1$

$\text{Se}7$ $19 \text{Sf}5 \text{Sf}8$ $20 \text{Sxe}7$ $\text{Wxe}7$ $21 \text{Sxd}6$ $\text{We}8$ $22 \text{Sdd}1 1-0$ $13...\text{d}6$

B) $7 \text{Sf}3 \text{Sxd}4$ $8 \text{Wxd}4$ (or 8 $\text{Wxd}4 \text{Sf}6$) $8...\text{Wf}6$ $9 \text{We}4+ \text{We}7!!$ (safer than 9...$\text{Se}7$ $10 0-0-0 \text{We}6$ $11 \text{Wa}4$ $c6$, Papp-Balint, corr. 1997, when $12 \text{Sd}3 \text{d}5$ $13 \text{Sh}1 \text{Wg}4$ $14 \text{Sd}4 \text{Wxg}2$ $15 \text{Se}3 \text{Se}6$ $16 \text{Wa}5$ yieds White a devastating attack, Gutman) $10 \text{Wxe}7+$ ($10 \text{Wd}3 \text{Wb}4+$ $11 \text{c}3 \text{Wxb}2$ $12 \text{Sb}1 \text{Wxa}2$ $13 \text{Se}2$)}
7 \( \Box b5 \)

There are five other moves, which we arrange in descending order of importance:

I) 7 \( \Box x6 \) dxc6 8 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box f6 \) 9 0-0 \( \Box d8 \) 10 \( \Box e1 \) \( \Box e7 \) looks quite promising for Black, Gutman;

II) 7 \( \Box e2 \) \( \Box x4d \) 8 \( \Box x4d \) \( \Box x2+ \) 9 \( \Box e2 \) c5 10 \( \Box c3 \) d5 11 \( \Box b5+ \) \( \Box d7 \) 12 \( \Box x7d+ \) \( \Box x7d \) 13 0-0-0 d4 14 \( \Box f3 \) \( \Box d6 \) 15 \( \Box x4d \) cxd4 16 \( \Box x4d \) \( \Box c6 \) 17 \( \Box h1d \) \( \Box c5 \) 18 \( \Box e4 \) b5 19 \( \Box x5c+ \) \( \Box x5c \) 20 \( \Box x7 \) \( \Box e7 \) 21 \( \Box x7h \) \( \Box x7h \) 22 \( \Box d7 \) \( \Box e8 \) 23 \( \Box x7a \) h5 was excellent for Black in Salminen-Joutsi, corr. 1999;

III) 7 \( \Box f3 \) \( \Box x4d \) 8 \( \Box x4d \) \( \Box b4+ \) 9 \( \Box x4b4 \) \( \Box x4b4+ \) 10 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box e7 \) 11 \( \Box c4 \) \( \Box f6 \) 12 0-0-0 d6 13 \( \Box d4 \) a6 14 \( \Box e1 \) 0-0 15 \( \Box g5 \) \( \Box d8 \) and Black is fine, Zehner-Holst, Hamburg 1997;

IV) 7 \( \Box 2b3 \) \( \Box x4d \)! (after 7...d6!) 8 \( \Box b5 \) \( \Box d7 \) 9 0-0 0-0 0-0 10 \( \Box e1 \) a6, Bilek-Atfoldi, Hungary 1951, 11 \( \Box x6c6 \) ! \( \Box x6c6 \) 12 \( \Box x6c6 \) bxc6 13 \( \Box g4+ \) \( \Box w6 \) 14 \( \Box w4 \) should be winning for White) 8 \( \Box x4d \) \( \Box f6 \) appears good for Black, Gutman;

V) 7 \( \Box e2 \) is an important option.

Then:

A) 7...d5 is premature because of the simple 8 0-0 \( \Box d7 \) 9 \( \Box e1 \), Gutman;

B) 7...\( \Box x4d \) 8 \( \Box x4d \) with three examples:

B1) 8...d6 9 0-0 \( \Box e6 \) 10 \( \Box e1 \) \( \Box d7 \) 11 \( \Box e4 \) \( \Box e7 \) 12 \( \Box f3 \) h6 (or
12...\(\Delta f5\) \(13 \Delta g5 \Delta xd4\) \(14 \Box xd4 h5\) \(15 \Delta xb7\) and White won in Blackburne-Hughes, simultaneous game, London 1879) \(13 c4!\? \Delta xc4\) \(14 \Box e2 \Box e6\) \(15 \Box ad1\) when 15...\(\Delta c6\) fails due to 16 \(\Delta f6+!\) \(gx\Box f6\) \(17 \Delta xf6, Gutman;\)

B2) \(8...\Delta f6\) 0-0 \(\Box d8\) 10 \(\Box e1 \Delta e7\) 11 \(\Delta d3\) 0-0 12 \(\Box e2\) “and the bishops are a potent attacking force, Krtukhin-Ishimbajev, USSR 1957”, Lane;

B3) \(8...c5\) 9 \(\Box e3\) \(d5\) 10 0-0 \(\Delta d7\) 11 \(\Box e1\) 0-0-0 12 \(c3\)!? (after 12 \(\Box b3\) 13 \(\Delta f4\) \(\Delta f6\) 14 \(\Delta f3\) \(\Box e6\) 15 \(\Box d2\) b6, Ros-San Marco, corr. 1991, 16 a4 \(\Box d7\) 17 a5 b5 would be unclear) 12...\(\Delta f6\) 13 \(\Box b3\) offers White good prospects, Gutman.

C) \(7...\Delta f6\) 8 0-0 \(\Delta d5\)!? 9 \(\Box xc6\) (9 \(\Delta f5\) \(\Box xe3\) 10 \(\Box xe3\) \(\Box c5\) 11 \(\Delta e4\) \(\Box e5\) 12 \(\Delta c3\) \(g6\) 13 \(\Delta g3\) \(\Delta g7\) 14 \(\Delta c4\) 0-0-0 15 \(\Delta d5\) \(\Delta a5\) 16 \(\Delta e2\) \(c6\) 17 \(\Delta c3\) \(\Box xe3+\) 18 \(\Box h1\) d5 left White lost in Tsekhimba-Post, Philadelphia 1992) 9...\(\Box x c6\) (9...\(\Box xe3\) 10 \(\Box xe7\) \(\Delta xd1\) is bad because of 11 \(\Delta d5\) 10 \(\Delta d4\) (Marinova-Rodriguez, Antwerp 1992, continued 10 \(\Box c4\) \(\Delta xe3\) 11 \(\Box fxe3\) \(\Delta e6\) 12 \(\Box f3\) 0-0-0 13 \(\Delta d3\) \(\Box c5\) 14 a4 h5 15 \(\Delta e4\) \(\Box e5\) with advantage for Black) 10...c5 11 \(\Box e1\) \(\Delta e6\) 12 \(\Box c4\) 0-0-0 13 \(\Delta e5\) \(\Box g5\) and Black stands very well, Gutman.

The possibilities are numerous and it would be hard to strike what may be regarded as a perfect line of defence.

7...\(d6\)!

Less common, but certainly playable.

Here are two more options with Black employing different strategies:

I) 7...\(\Box d8\) is the old continuation, which appears insufficient. Now:

A) \(8 \Box g4?!\) \(g6\) (8...\(d6\), Botterill/Harding, is no better due to 9 \(\Box g3\) \(\Delta f6\) 10 0-0-0 \(a6\) 11 \(\Delta c3\) \(\Delta e6\) 12 \(\Delta d4\) 9 0-0-0 (Griffith/White, Chess Openings 1913, analyses 9 \(\Box e4+\) \(\Delta g7\) 10 \(\Box d6+\) \(cxd6\) 11 \(\Delta c4\) \(\Box c7\) 12 \(\Delta f4\) as favourable for White, yet 12...\(\Delta g7\) 13 \(\Box xd6+\) \(\Box f8\) 14 \(\Box xf7\) \(\Box b6\) 15 \(\Box xh8\) \(\Box xb2\) 16 \(\Box d1\) \(\Delta xh8\) looks fine for Black) 9...\(\Delta g7\) 10 \(\Delta e4\) \(d6\) (10...\(a6\) loses to 11 \(\Box xc7+\) \(\Box xc7\) 12 \(\Box d6+\) \(\Box f8\) 13 \(\Delta c4\) 11 \(\Box g3\) \(\Delta f6\) (11...\(\Delta g7\) 12 \(\Delta g5\) 12 \(\Box xd6+\) \(cxd6\) 13 \(\Box xd6+\) \(\Box f8\) 14 \(\Box xf7\) \(\Box f7\) (or 14...\(\Box e7\) 15 \(\Box xh8\) \(\Delta xh8\) 16 \(\Delta c4\) \(\Delta f5\) 17 \(\Delta he1\) 15 \(\Delta c4+\) \(\Delta e6\) 16 \(\Box xe6+\) \(\Box xe6\) 17 \(\Box xd8\) \(\Box x d8\) 18 \(\Delta g5\) \(\Delta d5\) 19 \(\Box b3\) when the white queen dominates the board, Gutman;

B) \(8 \Box c4?!\) \(\Delta f6\) 9 \(\Box e2\) (9 \(\Box f3\)?! \(d6\) 10 0-0 \(\Delta e7\) 11 \(\Delta g5\) 0-0 12 \(c3\) \(\Delta e5\) was fine for Black in Will-Lyons, Glasgow 1995) 9...\(\Delta e7\) 10 0-0-0 \(a6\) 11 \(\Delta c3\) 0-0 12 \(g4\) \(b5\) 13 \(\Delta b3\) \(\Delta b4\) (or \(13...b4\) 14 \(\Delta d5\) \(\Box xd5\) 15 \(\Box xd5\) \(\Delta b7\) 16 \(\Delta c4\) 14 \(\Box d5\) \(\Box xd5\) 15 \(\Box xd5\) \(\Box xd2+\) 16 \(\Box xd2\) \(\Delta b7\), Eising-Surrey, Germany 1998, and now 17 \(g5\) \(\Box e7\) 18 \(\Box h5\) would have been powerful, Gutman.

II) “But of course this is all very silly. In the first place Black should play 7...\(d5\)!”

Botterill/Harding.
Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4
Qxd4 WH4 5 8e3 8xe4)
6 Qb5!? 
"And the pawn won by Black will bring him no happiness on account of his backward development", Tartakower, 500 Master Games of Chess, 1952.

6...Qd8
"Played by Steinitz in a match game with Martinez, Philadelphia 1883. This move with the king appears to be the best way of meeting the attack on his weak c7-pawn", Freeborough/Ranken.
"At any rate, all the authorities give only the miserly 6...Qd8 after which Black ekes out a precarious existence", Botterill/Harding.
7 Qd2!? Qg6
Black has also tried:
I) 7...Qe6 8 Qc4 d5 9 Qf3 Qf6 10 0-0 Qe4. Amann-Ligeti, e-mail game 1999, when 11 Qd3 Qg4 12 h3 Qh5 13 Qf4 should be excellent for White, Gutman;
II) 7...Qe8 8 Qe2 (8 Qc4 Qc5! 9 0-0 Qxe3 10 fxe3, Romcovici-Lusacek, Eforie Nord 1998, is less precise due to 10...Qf6 11 e4 d6) 8...a6 9 Qd4 Qxd4 10 Qxd4 Qe7 11 c4 Qc6 12 Qe3 f6 13 0-0 Qe5

After 8 Qb3 (8 8e2 a6 9 Qd4
Qxd4 10 8xd4 8f5 11 0-0 0-0-0
favors Black) 8...a6! (8...Qf6 9
8e2 a6 10 Q5d4 Qxd4 11 8xd4
Qf5 12 0-0 0-0-0 can be met by 13
f3! 8e8 14 8e1 Qd8 15 8f2 8d6
16 Qd4) 9 Qc3 Qf6 10 Qxd5
Qxd5 11 Qxd5 Qe6! (11...Qb4?!
12 Qd2 8f5 is weaker due to 13
0-0-0 Qe4 14 Qc5! Qxc2+ 15
Qxc2 8xc2 16 Qd3 8xd3 17
Qxd3) 12 Qd2 Qd8 13 Qd3 Qe5 14
0-0 8xd3 15 cxd3 Qd7 16 Qc3 the
position is balanced, Gutman.
8 8e2 a6

9 Qd4 Qf6 10 0-0 Qd8!?
Safer than 10...Qd7 11 Qc4 0-0-0
12 Qxc6 Qxc6 13 Qa5.
11 8e1 8e7
I prefer Black, Gutman.
14 Bd1 Qd4 15 Qd3 Qe6 16 b4 Qd6 17 g3 Qg5 18 Me1 Me8 19 f4 Qh3+ 20 Kg2 We6 21 f5 We7 22 Qxh3 and White won easily, Bergstrom-Hoglund, Stockholm 1994; III) 7...We5!? is the more testing line.

White has three possibilities:
A) 8 Ne2 Qc5!? (safer than 8...Wxb2 9 Qb1 Wxa2 10 0-0) 9 Qf3 We7 10 Qxc5 Wxc5 11 0-0 d6 12 a3 Qf6 13 b4 Qf5 14 c4 a6 15 Qbd4 Qxd4 16 Qxd4 Qe5 17 c5 d5 18 b5 Qe4 19 Qc1 axb5 20 Qxb5 Qxa3 gave Black a plus in Welz-Trenner, Germany 1998;
B) 8 Qf3 Wxb2 is too adventurous.
B1) 9 c3 a6 with three examples:
B1a) 10 Qc1 Wxa1 11 Qg5+ f6 12 Wxa1 axb5 promises Black more than enough for his queen;
B1b) 10 Qg5 axb5 (10...Qh6 11 Qb1 Wxa2 12 Qa1 Qb2 forces a draw by repetition) 11 Qxf7+ Qe8 12 Qxh8 Qxc3+ 13 Qd2 Qe5+ 14 Qe2 g6 appears clearly better for Black;

B1c) 10 Qb1 Wxa2 11 Qa1 Qe6 12 Qg5 Qf6 13 Qb3 Qh6 and Black can still defend himself, Gutman.

B2) 9 Qd3!? seems more enterprising, 9...a6 (9...b4+ 10 Qf1 a6 11 Qb1 Wxa2 12 Qa1 Qd5 13 Qg5 Qh6 14 Qf4 d6 15 c4 Qc5 16 Qe4 yields White a dangerous initiative, Rasanen-Aivinen, Kalakukko 1992) 10 Qb1 Wxa2 11 Qa1 Qd5 12 0-0 (12 Qg5 fails to 12...f6 13 c4 Wxg2 14 Qe4 Qb4+) 12...Qb8 (or 12...f6 13 c4 Qf7 14 Qf4 d6 15 c5) 13 Qc3 (13 c4 can be answered by 13...Wf5 14 Qc3 f6 15 Qd5 Qg7) 13...Wf5 14 Qe2 leads the game into random and bizarre complications. Black has already three pawns more, but his position is not easy to defend, as 14...f6 15 Qxa6!? Qd6 (15...bxa6 16 Qd4) 16 Qa4 shows, Gutman.

C) 8 c3 Qc5!? ("normal" moves don’t help: 8...Qf6?! 9 Qf3 Qd5, Hari-Orel Karmen, Slovakia 1998, fails to 10 Qg5!, while after 8...a6 9 Qf3 Qe8 10 Qbd4 Qxd4 11 Wxd4 d6 12 0-0-0 Qd7, Salin-Pitkänen, Finland 1998, 13 Qc4!? would be clearly in White’s favour) 9 Qc4 We7 is a more reliable approach.
White has a choice:
C1) 10 ʁe2 ʁxe3 (10...a6 11 ʁd4 ʁxd4 12 ʁxd4 ʁxd4 13 ʁxd4 ʁf6 14 ʁe3 ʁe8 15 0-0 d6 16 ʁf1 ʁe5 is also possible) 11 ʁxe3 ʁf6 12 0-0 d6 13 c4 a6 14 ʁc3 ʁe5 15 ʁe1 ʁe8 16 ʁe1 ʁd4 17 b4 a5 18 b5 c5 19 bxc6?! bxc6 was good for Black in Paulsen-Steinitz, Vienna 1882;
C2) 10 ʁg4! is more forceful, 10...ʁf6 11 ʁg3 (11 ʁxg7?? ʁg8 12 ʁh6 a6 gives Black plenty of counterplay, as after 13 ʁd4 ʁxd4 14 cxd4 ʁg6 15 ʁh4 ʁg4 16 ʁh6 d5 17 ʁe5 ʁxd4! the white king is rather insecure) 11...d6 12 0-0-0 ʁxe3+ 13 ʁxe3 a6 14 ʁd4 ʁxd4 15 ʁxd4 with some pressure for the sacrificed pawn, Gutman.
8 ʁf3!

An improvement, suggested by Freeborough/Ranken, and not by Reuben Fine as Botterill/Harding claim.
8 ʁd3 ʁxg2 9 ʁxe4 ʁh3 10 ʁf3 d6 11 ʁg5 ʁd7 is less promising for White.

A) 12 ʁxh7 deserves attention, however, 12...ʁe8!? (12...ʁe7 is less convincing due to 13 ʁg1 f5 14 ʁg5 ʁxg5 15 ʁxg5+ ʁe7 16 ʁd5 ʁb4 17 ʁc3) 13 ʁe2 ʁe7 (but not 13...f5? 14 ʁd5 ʁg7 15 ʁxf8 ʁxd5 16 ʁg5+ ʁd7 17 ʁe6+ ʁxe6 18 ʁxe6 a6 19 ʁxd6 cxd6 20 0-0-0 ʁh5 21 ʁhg1 ʁe8 22 ʁxe7 ʁxe7 23 ʁxg7, and Black is helpless) 14 ʁg5 ʁxg5 15 ʁxg5+ f6 16 ʁd2 ʁh4 17 f3 ʁh5 does not promise White enough for the pawn, Gutman;
B) 12 ʁd5 ʁe5 has been tested.

Now can follow:
B1) 13 f4 ʁf6 14 ʁb3 ʁxe4 15 fxg5 16 ʁxg5+ ʁe7 17 ʁe7+ ʁxg7 18 0-0-0 ʁwe5 19 ʁhe1 ʁf4+! (19...ʁg5+?!, Chess Monthly 1883, can be met by 20 ʁb1 ʁe6 21 ʁxd6! ʁxb3 22 ʁxf7+ ʁc8 23 ʁxg5 ʁc4 24 ʁe7) 20 ʁb1 ʁe6 21 ʁc3 ʁc4 gives Black a decisive advantage, Gutman;
B2) 13 0-0-0 ʁf6 14 ʁb3 (after 14 ʁwe5 dxe5 15 ʁxf7+ ʁe8 16 ʁxd7 ʁxd7 17 ʁxh8 ʁxb5 18 ʁxb7 ʁb8 19 ʁf3 ʁd6 20 ʁg1 ʁf8 White’s knight is trapped, Martinez-Steinitz, Philadelphia 1883) 14...h6 15 ʁf3 (or 15 f4? hxg5 16 fxe5
\( \text{\textcopyright{1883}, Chess Monthly,}\) 15...\( \text{\textcopyright{eg4}}! \) (is more exact than 15...\( \text{\textcopyright{xf3}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{xf3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{a6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textcopyright{d4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c5}} \) 18 \( \text{\textcopyright{e2}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c7}} \) 19 \( \text{\textcopyright{f4}} \) with increasing pressure for the sacrificed pawns) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{d3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xe3}} \) 17 \( \text{\textcopyright{fxe3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{a6}} \) 18 \( \text{\textcopyright{bd4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c5}} \) 19 \( \text{\textcopyright{e2}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{e7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textcopyright{c4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c7}} \) 21 \( \text{\textcopyright{xf7}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{g5}} \) leaves White uncomfortably placed, Gutman. (Chess Monthly, 1879-1896, was edited by Johann Zukertort until his death and also by Leopold Hoffer).

“White has a pawn less, but has ample compensation in the number and weight of the pieces that can be brought to bear upon Black’s king”, Freeborough/Ranken.

8...\( \text{\textcopyright{a6}} \)

Other moves:
I) 8...\( \text{\textcopyright{f6}} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright{d3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{w}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{g2}} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright{g1}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{h3}} \) 11 \( \text{\textcopyright{e2}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{d6}} \) 12 \( \text{\textcopyright{g5}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{d7}} \) 13 0-0-0, and Black suffers, Gutman;
II) 8...\( \text{\textcopyright{d6}} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright{d2}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{e6}} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright{bd4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4}} \) 11 \( \text{\textcopyright{dx4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{a6}} \) 12 0-0-0 \( \text{\textcopyright{e7}} \), Klimesova-Vecerkova, Moravia 1994, when 13 \( \text{\textcopyright{d3}}! \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xg2}} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{hg1}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xh2}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{xg7}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{f6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{f5}} \) gives White the initiative, Gutman.

9 \( \text{\textcopyright{bd4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{ge7}} \)
9...\( \text{\textcopyright{d6?}} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright{xc6}} + \) \( \text{\textcopyright{bxc6}} \) 11 \( \text{\textcopyright{e5}} \) and 9...\( \text{\textcopyright{xd4}} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4}} \), intending castling, Griffith/White, Chess Openings, 1913, are only illusions.

10 \( \text{\textcopyright{d3}}! \)

“With splendid attacking chances for White”, Botterill/Harding.

10...\( \text{\textcopyright{w}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{g2}} \)

It hardly makes sense not to take the pawn, 10...\( \text{\textcopyright{d6}} \) 11 0-0, Fine.

11 \( \text{\textcopyright{g1}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{h3}} \) 12 \( \text{\textcopyright{g5}}! \)

“Euwe endorses this analysis, providing the further continuation: 12 \( \text{\textcopyright{g3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{h5}} \) 13 \( \text{\textcopyright{g5}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{h6}} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{e2}} \) followed by 0-0-0”, Botterill/Harding; in my opinion after 14...\( \text{\textcopyright{xd4}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{f6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{g4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textcopyright{c3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{h5}} \) Black can survive, Gutman.

12...\( \text{\textcopyright{wh2}} \) 13 \( \text{\textcopyright{df3}}! \)

13 \( \text{\textcopyright{xf7+}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{e8}} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{f3}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xg1+}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{g1}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xf7}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{f3+}} \) is possible.

13...\( \text{\textcopyright{wh5}} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{c4}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{d5}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd5}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{xd5}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd5}} \) \( \text{\textcopyright{c6}} \) 17 0-0-0

Black’s position collapses, Gutman.
Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 WH4 5 ∆e3 WXe4 6 ∆b5 ∆d8)
7 ∆1c3!? 
White mostly reaches this position through the move order 5 ∆b5 WXe4+ 6 ∆e3 ∆d8 7 ∆1c3.

7...∆d4 8 a3!? 
The most direct approach.
Alternatives are:
I) 8 WHc2 ∆f6 9 0-0-0 WE6 10 WHf3 WG4 11 Wg1 Wxf3 12 gxf3 a6 (after 12...∆e8?!) 13 ∆d5 ∆a5?, J. Garcia-Jimenez, Cuba 1993, 14 WHg7! would be crushing) 13 ∆d4 ∆xc3 (13...∆f5 14 ∆e4 ∆xe4 15 fxe4 d6 16 f4 ∆xd4 17 ∆xd4 ∆g8 is also playable, with a tight but solid position) 14 bxc3 ∆xd4 15 ∆xd4 ∆e8 16 ∆c4 f6 17 ∆f7 g6 18 Wge1 d6, and White's bishops provide sufficient compensation, but not more, Gutman;
II) 8 Wd2!? gives Black a choice:
A) 8...∆xc3 9 ∆xc3 (9 WXc3 ∆f6 10 0-0-0 d6 11 ∆g5 WE5 12 Wxf6+ WXf6 13 Wxf6+ gxf6 14 f4 WE6 was at least no worse for Black in Stutz-Hagner, Germany 1998) 9...WB4 10 ∆b5 (10 a3!? WG4 11 WE2? WXg2 12 0-0-0 is another possibility) 10...∆ge7 11 0-0-0 d6 12 a3 (after 12 Wxe1 ∆e6 13 ∆g5 h6 14 Wg4 Wc5 15 ∆e3 WH5 16 ∆e2 Wg6 17 Wf4 WXg2 18 WXd6 cxd6 19 Wxd6+ WE8 20 ∆b5 a6 21 ∆xc6+ bxc6 22 f4 WC8 White has yet to prove that he has enough for the piece, Garcia Romero-Ferron Garcia, Barcelona 2000) 12...WG4 13 f3 is fine for White, Gutman;
B) 8...WG6 9 ∆d3 WH5 appears more challenging.

Then:
B1) 10 0-0-0 d6 (10...∆f6 looks premature in view of 11 ∆g5! h6 12 Wxf6+ gxf6 13 WHf4 WE5 14 WHh4 Wg5 15 WC4) 11 ∆e2 (11 a3 WXc3 12 WXc3 ∆f6 13 Wfe1 WE6) 11...WG6 12 a3 ∆xc3 13 WXc3 ∆g5 15 WXg4 and Black is still alive, Gutman;
B2) 10 ∆e2 BG6 11 0-0-0 was suggested by Oscar Cordes, however, 11...a6 12 ∆d4 ∆ge7 13 ∆f3 (13 ∆f3 f6) 13...d6 14 a3 WXc3 15 WXc3 ∆g4!? 16 WXg4 (16 WXc6+
bxc6 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{a}}}c6 \text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}c6\) 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}c6\) fails to 18...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d1!\) 16...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xg4\) 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}3\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d7\) 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xf7\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{h}}}f8\) is quite acceptable for Black, Gutman.

8...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}e3+\) 9 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}e3\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}g6\)

Black has tried:

I) 9...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}e5\) 10 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}d2\) d6 11 0-0-0 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}e7\) 12 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}f4\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}a5\) 13 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b5\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d7\) 14 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{h}}}he1\) a6 15 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}c4\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}8\) 16 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b3\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}c8\) 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b1\) b6 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}d6!\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}xd6\) 19 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xg6\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{h}}}a7\) 20 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}xe7\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}xe7\) 21 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d5\) and White won easily, Chesney-Cotten, USA 1987;

II) 9...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}e8\) 10 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}d2\) (instead of 10 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}c4?!\) d6 11 0-0 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e6\) 12 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}e6\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}xe6\) 13 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e1\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}6\), when Black was already better in Jahnz-Demir, Passau 1998) 10...d6 11 0-0-0 seems extremely good for White, Gutman.

10 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d3!\)

Other ways to continue his build-up are less convincing:

I) 10 g3 d6 11 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}2\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}e7\) 12 0-0 h5 13 h4 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d7\) 14 b4 a6 ½-½ Szurovsky-Toth, Hungary 1996;

II) 10 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}d2\) d6 11 f3 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}5\) 12 0-0-0 h5?! 13 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}c4\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d7?!\) 14 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d5\), Pokorna-Kiss, Szombathely 1993, and now 14...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}e7?!\) should be satisfactory.

10...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xg2\) 11 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e4\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{h}}}3\) 12 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d5\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}e6\) 13 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}5+\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}6\)

Gudat-Levin, Riga 1979, went 13...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}f6\) 14 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}3\) h6 15 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}4\) d6 16 0-0-0 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e6\) 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}d6\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}d6\) 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e6\) 19 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}c6\) bxc6 20 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b8\) 21 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b5+\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{c}}}c8\) 22 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d5\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d7\) 23 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{b}}}b6+\) 1-0.

14 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}1\)

"With a strong attack, according to Panov and Estrin", Botterill/Harding.

14...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e7\)

"As a sample of what may happen they give 14...h6 15 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xg7\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}8\) (15...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}e8\) 16 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}d6\) bxc6 17 0-0-0) 16 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}xg8+\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}g8\) 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}g8+\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{e}}}7\) 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d5+\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d6\) 19 0-0-0 and wins", Botterill/Harding.

15 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d3\) h6 16 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}h4\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}8\)

16...\(\text{\textsf{\textsc{g}}}6\) 17 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}g6\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{f}}}xg6\) 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{x}}}g6\) \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{w}}}e7\) 19 0-0-0 is no better.

17 0-0-0 d6 18 \(\text{\textsf{\textsc{d}}}d4\)

"A really sad situation for Black, when the whole queenside is dead", Tartakower.

"White has many pieces in play, Black none; at these odds everyone would like to play gambits", Lasker.

Black has no defence, Gutman.
Sequel 4
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wxh4 5 Qe3 Wxe4 6 Qb5 Qd8 7 Qc3)
7...Wf6
7...Wg6 is one interesting, though untried, alternative, indicated by
Samuel Rosenthal. ("A Polish-born player who settled in Paris in 1864
to become a journalist and chess teacher. He played in six important
matches, losing them all except one
(a defeat of Wisker in 1871). At
Vienna 1873 he took fourth place
after Steinitz, Blackburne, and
Anderssen ahead of L.Paulsen",
Hooper/Whyld, The Oxford
Companion to Chess.).

This position was reached (after the
move order 4...Wh4 5 Qb5 Wxe4+
6 Qc3 Qd8 7 Qc3 Wf5) in
Chigorin-Steinitz, 19th match game,
Havana 1892.

"These two geniuses had an unrivalled insight into the nature of
chess. Whereas the popularizers think of chess as being amenable to
order, logic, exactitude, calculation, foresight and other comparable
qualities, Steinitz and Chigorin agreed on one thing: that chess can be, and
often is, as irrational as life itself. It
is full of disorder, imperfection,
blunders, inexactitudes, fortuitous
happenings, unforeseen consequences. But whereas Steinitz strove
with all his might to impose order
on the irrational, Chigorin went to
the other extreme. Let us surrender
to the irrational, he said in effect.
Steinitz tried to banish the unforeseen.
Chigorin took delight in it.
Steinitz sought order, system, logic,
balance, broad basic postulates; Chigorin wanted surprise, change, novelty, glitter, the lightning stroke
from a clear sky", Fred Reinfeld,
Chess Review.

The idea of this move is to prevent
Qf1-d3 and to gain some counter-
play by the threat of...Qc6-b4.
However, after 8 Qd5 Qb4!? 9
Qxb4 Qxb4+ 10 c3 Qa5 11 Qd3!!
(11 Qxa7 Qb6 12 Qxb6 Qxb6 13
Qb5 Qxa2! 14 Qxa2 Qe6+ 15 Qe2
Qxa2 16 Qc1 Qf6 17 0-0 Qe8
would maintain an edge for Black)
11...Qxg2 12 Qd2! Qb6 13 Qd4 g6
(or 13...Qf6 14 Qg1 Qxh2 15 Qxg7
Qxd4 16 cxd4 Qf8 17 Qf3) 14 Qb3
White keeps the initiative, Gutman.
8 \( \text{d}5! \)

This is the move that puts the line out of business.

Less compelling are:

I) 8 \( \text{a}4 \text{c}4 \text{a}5? \) (8...\( \text{d}f6 \) 9 0-0 d6
10 \( \text{e}e1 \text{g}4 11 \text{g}3 \text{w}h5 12 \text{h}4 \text{w}f5
13 \text{c}d5 \text{c}e5 14 \text{d}d4 \text{x}e3 15 \text{x}e3 \text{w}d7 16 \text{e}2 \text{c}6 \) is also play-
able) 9 \text{d}5 \text{x}e3 10 \text{x}e3 a6 11 \text{b}xc7 \text{a}7 12 0-0 b5 13 \text{b}3 \text{x}c7
14 \text{x}c7 \text{x}c7, favouring Black, Gutman;
II) 8 \( \text{e}2 \)

8...\text{c}5 (8...a6 9 \text{d}4 \text{d}6 brings Black no success due to 10 \text{f}3
\text{w}a5 11 0-0) 9 \text{x}c5 (9 \text{x}c7 \text{x}e3 10 \text{x}a8 can be met by 10...
\text{c}5 11 0-0 \text{f}6 12 \text{b}5 \text{a}6) 9...\text{w}x5 gives
White two possibilities:

A) 10 0-0 \text{f}6 11 \text{f}3 \text{d}6 12 \text{c}6 \text{x}c6
\text{c}6 (12...\text{x}c6!? 13 \text{d}4 \text{d}7 is worth consideration) 13 \text{d}2 \text{c}5
14 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 15 \text{a}d1 \text{d}7 16 \text{b}3
\text{e}8 (but not 16...h5? 17 \text{a}4 \text{w}d5, Pokorna-Harastova, Slovakia 1995,
when 18 \text{c}4! \text{w}e4 19 \text{x}e6 should be decisive) 17 \text{a}4 \text{w}h5 18 \text{c}4
\text{c}8 looks acceptable for Black, Gutman;
B) 10 \text{d}5!? \text{b}4! (10...\text{f}6 is worse because of 11 \text{b}xc7 \text{x}d5
12 \text{x}d5 \text{e}8 13 \text{c}3 \text{d}4 14 0-0
\text{x}e2+ 15 \text{x}e2) 11 \text{x}b4 (after 11
\text{d}xc7?? \text{x}c2+ 12 \text{f}1 \text{a}1 13
\text{a}8 \text{a}6 14 \text{d}6 \text{h}6 15 \text{c}4,
Hari-Rovtar, Slovakia 1996, 15...\text{c}2! would have been superior for Black) 11...
\text{w}x4+ 12 \text{c}3 \text{w}f4 13
\text{w}b3!? \text{e}7 (13...\text{w}5!? 14 0-0!
\text{w}x2 fails to 15 \text{f}1 \text{w}h5 16 \text{w}b4
d6 17 \text{d}6) 14 0-0 \text{a}6 15 \text{d}4 \text{c}5
16 \text{f}3 \text{c}7 with good prospects
for Black, Gutman.

"The variations with \text{c}1-e3, given by Steinitz in his Modern Chess
Instructor, are very dangerous as White seriously hampers
Black's counterplay", Mikhail Chigorin, Rigaer Tagesblatt, 1893.
8...\text{f}6
8...\text{w}x2?! is powerfully met by 9
\text{c}3, Efim Bogoljubow, Mikhail Chigorin, Selected Games.
9 \text{b}xc7 \text{d}6
"Better would have been 9...\text{x}d5
10 \text{x}d5 \text{x}b2 (Steinitz) unclear!",
Botterill/Harding.
Bogoljubow now gives 11 \text{b}1!
\text{x}a2 12 \text{e}2 with advantage to
White.
10 \text{f}4! \text{w}e4
10...\text{x}b2 11 \text{b}1 was quite play-
able according to Bogoljubow.
Black has a choice:
A) 11...\text{a}3 12 \text{b}5!? (recom-
}
\[ \text{B1) 12 } \text{a1 } \text{b2 and White should repeat moves since 13 } \text{xf6?! (13 } \text{c4, suggested by Steinitz, is no better because of 13... } \text{xc7 14 } \text{a2 } \text{xd5 15 } \text{xb2 } \text{xe3, Bogoljubow) 13... } \text{xc7 14 } \text{d5, Steinitz, fails to 14... } \text{b4!, Bogoljubow;}
\]

\[ \text{B2) 12 } \text{xf6?! } \text{xc7 13 } \text{d5 represents a new try, after 13... } \text{e8 14 } \text{f2 } \text{d6 15 } \text{e2 } \text{a4 16 } \text{f3 } \text{e4 17 } \text{e1 } \text{a5 18 } \text{e2 } \text{w6 19 } \text{c4 } \text{e6 20 } \text{xd3 White's pressure is not to be underestimated, Gutman.}
\]

\[ \text{11 } \text{d3 } \text{wg2 12 } \text{g1 } \text{xh2}
\]

"Such an appetite! Can it really be healthy?", Botterill/Harding.

According to Bogoljubow, this move was a mistake; he gives 12... \text{wh3 13 } \text{f1 (13 } \text{g3? } \text{xh2 14 } \text{f3 } \text{wh5) 13... } \text{xh2 14 } \text{g2 (14 } \text{xa8? } \text{e8) 14... } \text{wh3 as practically forced.}

\[ \text{White has two possibilities:}
\]

\[ \text{A) 15 } \text{g1 } \text{f5 (or simply 15... } \text{h2, Bogoljubow) 16 } \text{d3?!}
\]

\[ \text{(16 } \text{g5 } \text{xd5?! 17 } \text{xd5 } \text{e6 18 } \text{f2 } \text{e7) 16... } \text{wh3 with repetition, Gutman;}
\]

\[ \text{B) 15 } \text{d3?! is more ambitious, 15... } \text{xd5 16 } \text{xd5 } \text{wh4+ 17 } \text{f2!}
\]

\[ \text{(17 } \text{f2 } \text{e8+ 18 } \text{e2 } \text{w6 19 0-0-0 } \text{e7 leads nowhere) 17... } \text{e8 (or 17... } \text{b4 18 } \text{xb4 } \text{xb4+ 19 } \text{c3 } \text{e7 20 0-0-0) 18 0-0-0 } \text{e7 19 }
\]

\[ \text{g2 } \text{xd5 20 } \text{xd5 } \text{f6 21 } \text{f4 secure White an overwhelming position as may be seen from 21... } \text{xf4+? 22 } \text{b1 } \text{w6 23 }
\]

\[ \text{xh7!, Gutman.}
\]

\[ \text{13 } \text{f3 } \text{xd5 14 } \text{xd5 14 } \text{h1? would be a terrible blunder in view of 14... } \text{b4+! (Steinitz gives 14... } \text{wh1+ 15 } \text{wh1 } \text{e3 16 } \text{xa8 } \text{xf4 as advantageous for Black) 15 c3 } \text{xb2, Gutman.}
\]

\[ \text{14... } \text{wh6 15 0-0-0 } \text{f5 15... } \text{g6 16 } \text{f5 } \text{f8 17 } \text{g5+ } \text{e7 18 }
\]

\[ \text{xe7 } \text{xe7 19 fxg6 fxg6 20 } \text{xf8+ } \text{xf8 21 } \text{e1 and White wins, Chigorin.}
\]

\[ \text{16 } \text{xf5 g6 17 } \text{f6}
\]

Besides the text move White has 17 \text{e4!} followed by 18 \text{f4-f5}, recommended by Steinitz, and 17
\[ \text{\textdollar}xg6!? \text{hxg6 18 f5 \textdollar}f8 19 \text{\textdollar}g5+ \text{\textdollar}e7 20 \text{\textdollar}ge1 \text{\textdollar}xf5 21 \text{\textdollar}e3 with a winning attack, according to Alexander Khalifman.} \]

17...\text{\textdollar}f8
17...gxf5 18 \text{\textdollar}xd6 \text{\textdollar}f8 can be met by 19 \text{\textdollar}e8! (more effective than 19 \text{\textdollar}h5, given by Steinitz) 19...\text{\textdollar}h4 20 \text{\textdollar}f2 \text{\textdollar}e7 21 \text{\textdollar}e1, Gutman.

18 \text{\textdollar}xd7
18 \text{\textdollar}e4!? was suggested by Grekov.

18...\text{\textdollar}xf6 19 \text{\textdollar}xc6 \text{\textdollar}c7 20 \text{\textdollar}e4 \text{\textdollar}f8 21 \text{\textdollar}xd6!?

Chigorin-Steinitz, 19th match game, Havana 1892, went 21 \text{\textdollar}gf1 \text{\textdollar}d7 22 \text{\textdollar}d3 \text{\textdollar}c6 23 \text{\textdollar}xc6 bxc6 24 \text{\textdollar}d2 \text{\textdollar}c5 (24...\text{\textdollar}ac8 25 \text{\textdollar}e3) 25 \text{\textdollar}c3 \text{\textdollar}f7 26 \text{\textdollar}e5+ \text{\textdollar}b7 27 \text{\textdollar}fd1 \text{\textdollar}c4 28 \text{\textdollar}c3 \text{\textdollar}b5 29 \text{\textdollar}b3 \text{\textdollar}b4 30 \text{\textdollar}d7+ \text{\textdollar}b6 31 \text{\textdollar}c7+ \text{\textdollar}a6 32 \text{\textdollar}xb4 1-0.

21...\text{\textdollar}xd6 22 \text{\textdollar}d1 \text{\textdollar}b4 23 f5!

Breaking down the hostile bastions and leaving Black defenceless against White’s raging bishops and the threat 24 \text{\textdollar}f4+, Gutman.

"The more space you dominate, the less space for the opponent in which to move his pieces about, the more restricted the number of moves with which he may threaten you or guard himself against your threats", Lasker.

Sequel 5
(1 e4 e5 2 \text{\textdollar}f3 \text{\textdollar}c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \text{\textdollar}xd4 \text{\textdollar}h4 5 \text{\textdollar}e3 \text{\textdollar}xe4 6 \text{\textdollar}b5) 6...\text{\textdollar}b4+ 7 \text{\textdollar}c3

Incidentally, this common position can, and often is, reached via a different move order — 5 \text{\textdollar}c3 \text{\textdollar}b4 6 \text{\textdollar}b5 \text{\textdollar}xe4+ 7 \text{\textdollar}e3, and therefore is of major importance for all variations with ...\text{\textdollar}h4xe4.

7...\text{\textdollar}xc3+!?

It seems better to give up the bishop at once. Other moves are:

I) 7...\text{\textdollar}a5? 8 \text{\textdollar}xc7+ \text{\textdollar}d8 9 \text{\textdollar}xa8 b6 10 \text{\textdollar}e2 \text{\textdollar}b4 11 0-0-0 \text{\textdollar}e7 12 \text{\textdollar}d5 and White soon won, Wortel-Arcilla, Arnhem 1996;

II) 7...\text{\textdollar}d8 reaches a position after 5 \text{\textdollar}e3 \text{\textdollar}xe4 6 \text{\textdollar}b5 \text{\textdollar}d8 7 \text{\textdollar}c1c3 \text{\textdollar}b4, covered in Section 4, Sequel 3;

III) 7...\text{\textdollar}e5 is more often seen. White has three options:

A) 8 \text{\textdollar}e2 is too harmless, 8...a6 9 \text{\textdollar}d4 \text{\textdollar}f6 10 0-0 \text{\textdollar}xc3 11 bxc3 0-0 12 \text{\textdollar}e1 \text{\textdollar}a5 13 c4 \text{\textdollar}e5 14 \text{\textdollar}b3 \text{\textdollar}a4 15 \text{\textdollar}c5 \text{\textdollar}a3 16 \text{\textdollar}d4 d6 17 \text{\textdollar}b3 \text{\textdollar}e6 18 \text{\textdollar}c1 \text{\textdollar}a4 19 \text{\textdollar}c5? \text{\textdollar}a5 20 \text{\textdollar}e3 \text{\textdollar}xc5 0-1, Winter-Holst, Balaton 1996;

B) 8 \text{\textdollar}d5!? represents a more original treatment, after 8...\text{\textdollar}a5 (8...\text{\textdollar}xc3+ 9 bxc3! \text{\textdollar}d8 10 \text{\textdollar}xf7 \text{\textdollar}ge7 11 \text{\textdollar}e2 d6 12 \text{\textdollar}d4 \text{\textdollar}e8 13
\[ \text{C3: } \text{Qxd4 14 cxd4 Wxa5+ 15 Qd1 Wc3 16 Qb1 Qf5 17 Qb3 maintains an edge for White) 9 Wxe5+ Qxe5 10 b4! Qxb4 11 Qd4 f6 (11...Qd6 12 f4 f6 13 Qxe5 Qxe5, Wetschnik-Kersten, Kassel 1991, is refuted by 14 Qe3) 12 Qxc7+ Qd8 13 Qxa8 Qc6, Wetschnik-Oparaugo, Wiesbaden 1992, 14 a3!? Qa5 15 0-0-0 Qxd4 16 Qe4 Qc6 17 Qd6 Qh8 18 Qb2 would give White the advantage, Gutman; } \]

C) 8 Qd2!?, however, appears to be the most popular continuation.

Black has a choice:

C1) 8...Qxc3? 9 bxc3 Qd8 (or 9...a6 10 f4 Wf7 11 Qxc7+, Zesch-Montavon, Leipzig 1998) 10
0-0-0 d6 11 Qf4 is devastating;

C2) 8...Qd8 is also of dubious value, with a further split:

C2a) 9 Qc4 a6 10 f4 Wh5!? (10...Wf7?! 11 Qd4 Qxd4 12 Wxd4 Qf6 13 0-0-0 He8 14 He1 gave White strong pressure in Wagner-Hlaikova, Zinnowitz 1981) 11 Qd4 Qge7 12 0-0 He8 offers Black enough counterplay, Gutman;

C2b) 9 0-0-0! d6 10 He1 makes it much more difficult, Gutman.

C3) 8...Qf6 9 0-0-0 (9 f4?! Wf7 10 Qxc7+ Qd8 11 Qxa8 Qc5 12 Qd1 Qg4 13 c3 Qxe3 14 Qxe3 Qxe3 favours Black) 9...Qxc3 (more accurate than 9...Qe4 10 Wd5 Qxc3 11 bxc3 Wxd5 12 Qxc7+ Qd8 13 Qxd5) 10 Qxc3 0-0 (10...d6 11 Qg5 0-0 12 He1 Wa5 can be met by 13 Qxf6! gxf6 14 Qd5 Qxa2 15 Qxf6+ Qh8 16 Qc3) 11 Qf4 Wa5 12 Qb1 a6 13 Qg5 Qg4 14 Qd5 and White will regain his pawn with an edge, Gutman.

8 Qxc3

8 bxc3 Qd8 (8...Qe5 9 Wd5) 9 Wd2 a6 10 Qd4 Qge7 (it is a pity to undouble the c-pawns: 10...Qxd4 11 Qxd4 Qd5 12 f3 Wf7 13 Qd3 Qh6 14 0-0 Qf5 15 Qe1 Qxe3 16 Qxe3 Qe6 17 He1 g6 18 c4 turned out quite well for White, Owens-Thompson, Detroit 1990) 11 0-0-0 h6 12 Qc4 Wg6 13 He1 d6 causes no problems for Black, Gutman.

8...Wf5!?

Less challenging are:

I) 8...Wf7 9 Qc4 (9 Qd3 is similar, 9...d6 10 0-0 Qe6 11 Qe1 0-0-0 12 Qb5 Wd7 13 Qxa7 with advantage for White, Martin-Berrang, Friedrichrod 1997) 9...Qf6 10 0-0
d6 11 He1 Qe6 12 Qb5 0-0 13 Qg5 Wd7 14 Qxf6 gxf6 15 Qe4, and again Black's king position was
destroyed, in Maggiolo-Ferragud, Zarate 1992;

II) 8...\textit{wg6}, when White can try:

A) 9 \textit{cd5} \textit{cd8} 10 \textit{cf4} (10 \textit{wd2} d6 11 0-0-0, Plescko-Kiss, Hungary 1993, allows Black to consolidate with 11...\textit{ge7} 12 \textit{d3} \textit{f5} 10...\textit{xf6} 11 c3 d6!? (instead of 11...\textit{ge7} 12 \textit{d3} g6?! 13 \textit{wd2} b6?! 14 0-0-0 h6 15 \textit{e4} \textit{b8} 16 g4 g5 17 \textit{d5} \textit{xd5} 18 \textit{xd5} \textit{e8} 19 \textit{xc6} 1-0, Kahra-Hervir, corr. 1980) 12 \textit{d5} (12 \textit{d3} \textit{f5} 13 \textit{b3} \textit{ge7} 14 0-0 \textit{xd3} 15 \textit{xd3} \textit{c8} seems satisfactory for Black, \textit{Gutman}) 12...\textit{g6} 13 \textit{f4} \textit{f6} should be equal, \textit{Gutman};

B) However, 9 \textit{d3}! is hard to meet, 9...\textit{xf6} (or 9...\textit{xg2} 10 \textit{e4} \textit{h3} 11 \textit{d5} \textit{d8} 12 \textit{g5+} f6 13 \textit{f4}) 10 0-0 \textit{ge7} 11 \textit{e1} 0-0 12 \textit{b5} yields White a very dangerous initiative, \textit{Gutman}.

III) 8...\textit{wb4} is Black’s most provocative reaction.

\textbf{\textit{We examine:}}

A) 9 \textit{we2} \textit{ge7} 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 \textit{wh5} d6 12 \textit{d3} h6 13 h3 \textit{e6} 14 f4 \textit{wa5} 15 \textit{wh4} \textit{xa2} 16 f5 \textit{xf5}!? (but not 16...\textit{d5} 17 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 18 f6 \textit{wa1+} 19 \textit{d2} \textit{xb2} 20 \textit{fxg7}

\textit{xe7} 21 \textit{wh6} and White won easily, Zerbini-Bertucci, corr. 1987) 17 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 18 b3 (18 \textit{xa2} \textit{e6}) 18...\textit{we5} 19 \textit{e2} \textit{xb3} 20 cxb3 \textit{d4} looks very reliable for Black, \textit{Gutman};

B) 9 \textit{d2}! is the more dynamic way of playing this position, White must try his chances with a second pawn sacrifice.

Then:

B1) 9...\textit{xb2} 10 \textit{b1} \textit{a3} 11 \textit{c4} \textit{e7} (or 11...a6 12 \textit{d5} \textit{d8} 13 \textit{xc7}! \textit{xc7} 14 \textit{b6+} \textit{b8} 15 \textit{f4+} d6 16 \textit{xb3}) 12 \textit{d5} \textit{d8} 13 0-0 d6 14 \textit{e1} \textit{f8} 15 \textit{f4} gives White an overwhelming position, \textit{Gutman};

B2) 9...\textit{f6} is more prudent, 10 a3!? (Sander-Oparaugo, Hamburg 1995, went 10 0-0-0 d6?! 11 a3 \textit{wa5} 12 \textit{g5} \textit{e6} 13 \textit{f4} \textit{h5} 1/2-1/2) 10...\textit{e7} (10...\textit{g4} can be met by 11 \textit{e2}! \textit{xb2} 12 0-0-0) 11 0-0-0 d6 12 \textit{g5} \textit{e6} 13 \textit{e1} secures good attacking prospects for White, \textit{Gutman}.

\textit{9 wd2}

9 \textit{d5} \textit{ge7}!? 10 \textit{xe5} \textit{xe5} 11 \textit{db5} \textit{d8} 12 0-0-0 a6 with approximately equal chances in the
endgame: White has two bishops, Black has a pawn, Gutman.

9...Qf6?!
9...Qg7 already looks suspect to me, 10 0-0-0 Wa5 (10...0-0 is premature in view of 11 Qb5 a6 12 Qf4 We6 13 Qxc7 Wxa2 14 Qc3 Qb8 15 Qc4 Wa1+ 16 Qd2 Wa5 17 Wxa5 Qxa5 18 Qd3 Qac6 19 Qd6) 11 Qc4 (11 Qe2 a6 12 f4 d6 13 g4 Qd7 14 Qf3 0-0-0 would allow Black to complete his development successfully, Birnie-Jelfs, Paisley 1995) 11...a6 12 We2?! (12 Qhe1 0-0 13 Qg5 Qc5 14 Qb3 also isn’t bad) 12...0-0 13 Qd5 Qxd5 14 Qxd5 b5 15 Qg5! Qb4 (15...h6 loses immediately, 16 Qxg7+ Qxg7 17 Qg4+ Qh8 18 Qxh6 Qg8 19 Wh4 Qg6 20 Qxf7 Wb4 21 f4 1-0, Praguna-Schaeffer, corr. 1985) 16 Qd5 Qb7 17 Wh5, when Black lacks a respectable defence, Gutman.

10 0-0-0 0-0

12...De4 (12...Qe6?! is wrong due to 13 Qg5! Wa5 14 Qxf6 Qxc4 15 Re3 Wf5 16 Wf3) 13 Qxe4 Qxe4 14 Qd5 Wg6, and Black’s position is quite solid, Gutman.

11 Wxa5 12 Qc4
12 Qg5 looks like a reasonable alternative; after 12...Qg4 13 f3 (13 f4 d5! 14 a3 d4 15 Qb5 Qb6) 13...Qf2 14 Wxf2 Wxg5+ 15 f4 Wd8 16 g4 d6 17 Qg1 Qd7 White has adequate compensation for the pawn, though Black’s position is still fully viable, Gutman.

12...d6 13 Qg5 Qg4
13...Qe6?! is less convincing due to 14 Qxf6 Qxc4 15 Wf4! (15 Qxg7 Qxg7 16 Wf4 Qe6 17 Qd5 Qxd5 18 Wg5+ Qh8 19 Wf6+ Qg8 20 Wg5+ Qh8 21 Wf6+ is only a draw) 15...gxf6 16 Qxc4, Gutman.

14 Qhe1 Qf5
14...Qc5 can be answered by 15 Qd5 since 15...Qxf2? is shown to be careless by 16 Qxf2 Qxf2 17 Qh1, Gutman.

15 Qb3

11 Qf4?!

Other moves:
I) 11 Qb5? is a mistake because of 11...a6 12 Qf4 We6!, Gutman;
II) 11 Qc4 d6 (11...Wa5?! 12 Qg5!) 12 Qhe1?! (12 Qb5?! Qe6!)

The chances are balanced: White’s bishop-pair and pressure along the central files offset Black’s extra pawn, Gutman.
Sequel 6
(1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 A.e3 Wxe4 6 A.b5 A.b4+) 7 c3!? "Suggested by Mr. Fraser, and analysed in the Chess Player's Chronicle, 1880, by the editor Charles Edward Ranken", Freeborough and Ranken.

7...A.a5 8 A.d2 Wg6
Other possibilities are:
I) "Wilhelm Steinitz gives 8...Wd5, but 9 A.c4! (9 W.a4 a6 10 W.xa5 Wxb5 11 Wxb5 axb5 12 A.xb5 A.ge7 is level, Steinitz) 9...Wxd1+ 10 A.xd1 A.d8 (10...a6 11 A.d4 A.ge7 can be met by 12 A.xc6 A.xc6 13 b4, Gutman) 11 A.xa5?! (11 b4 A.b6 12 A.f4 d6 13 a4 also looks nice, Gutman) 11...A.xa5 12 A.f4 d6 13 A.xc7! A.xc7 14 A.xd6 A.xc6 15 A.d5+ and White mates neatly in four moves", Ranken;
II) 8...W.e7 9 A.c4! (9 A.e2 d5 10 0-0 a6 11 A.d4 W.d6 12 A.e1 A.ge7 13 b4 A.b6 14 A.b3 0-0 leads nowhere, Daniel-Kukumba, Elista Olympiad 1996) 9...d6 (9...a6 10 A.d4 A.b6 11 Axeb6 cxb6 12 A.f5 followed by 13 A.d6+ with a fine game, Steinitz) 10 W.a4! (not 10 A.e2?! A.b6 11 0-0 A.xe3 12 A.xe3 A.f6 13 A.e1 0-0, Horak-Serdamba, Hradec Kralove 1997) 10...A.b6 (or 10...a6 11 A.d4) 11 A.bxd6+ winning, Mackenzie-Meitner, Vienna 1882.

9 A.c4!
9 b4?! runs into the disruptive 9...a6
10 A.a3 A.b6 11 A.xb6 cxb6 12 A.dc4 b5 13 A.e3 A.ge7 14 c4 W.f6 15 A.ac2 A.xb4 16 W.d2 A.xc2+, Meitner-Steinitz, Vienna 1882.

9...a6
9...A.d8?! is hopeless due to 10 W.e2! A.b6 (10...a6 11 A.bd6 A.f6 12 0-0-0) 11 A.f4 d6 12 0-0-0, Gutman.

10 A.d4
The most lively continuation is 10 A.d3!? W.xg2 (10...W.e6 11 A.ba3 d5 can be met by 12 A.xa5 A.xa5 13 0-0 A.c6 14 A.e1 A.ge7 15 A.f4 A.d7 16 W.h5, Gutman) 11 A.e4!. "This bishop cannot be taken on account of A.d6+", Ranken.

After 11...W.h3 12 A.d4 d5 13 A.xd5 A.ce7 14 A.f3?! (14 W.a4+ b5 15 A.xb5 axb5 16 W.xb5+ A.d7 17 W.b7 A.xc3+ 18 bc3 A.e8 19 A.e5 A.xd5 20 W.xd5 W.e6 21 W.xd7+ Wxd7 22 A.xd7 W.xd7 23 A.g1 also gives..."
White a slight edge) 14...\(\text{b6}\) 15 \(\text{Qxb6}\) \(\text{cxb6}\) 16 \(\text{Ag1}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 17 \(\text{Wxa4}\) \(\text{Ad7}\) 18 \(\text{Wb3}\) \(\text{Wxh2}\) 19 \(\text{Ag3}\) White stands excellently, Gutman.

10...\(\text{Qge7}\)?

Paulsen-Meitner, Vienna 1882, continued 10...\(\text{Qb6}!\) 11 \(\text{Qxc6}!\) (another good option is Ranken's 11 \(\text{Qxb6}?!\) \(\text{cxb6}\) 12 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{b5}\) 13 \(\text{Qd3}\) 11...\(\text{Qxc6}\) 12 \(\text{Qxb6}\) \(\text{cxb6}\) 13 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) (13...\(\text{Qf6}\) can be met by 14 \(\text{Qd6+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 15 0-0-0) 14 \(\text{Qxb6}\) \(\text{Qxb6}\) 15 \(\text{Qxb6}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{Qf6}\) 17 \(\text{Qc4}\) with a clear plus for White.

18 0-0 d5 19 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Wd6}\) (instead of 19...\(\text{Wf5}\) 20 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 21 \(\text{Wb4}\) \(\text{Qab8}\) 22 \(\text{Qab1}\) \(\text{b5}\) 23 \(\text{Wd6}\) \(\text{Qbc8}\) 24 \(\text{Qbc1}\) \(\text{Qed8}\) 25 \(\text{Wf4}\) c5 26 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 27 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{Qc6}\) 28 \(\text{Qd7}\) and White won, Krepp-Gregory, e-mail game 1998) 20 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 21 \(\text{Qab1}\) \(\text{b5}\) is equal, Gutman.

11...\(\text{Qb6}\) 12 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxc6}\) 13 \(\text{Qxb6}\) \(\text{cxb6}\) 14 \(\text{Qd6+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 15 \(\text{Wd4}\) \(\text{Qd5}\) 15...\(\text{b5}\) 16 0-0-0! \(\text{f6}\) 17 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Wxg2}\) 18 \(\text{Qhg1}\) \(\text{Wxh2}\) 19 \(\text{Qg3}\) a5 20 \(\text{Qe3}\) leaves Black defenceless, Gutman.

16 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Wxd6}\) 17 0-0
Black has serious problems, Gutman.

Sequel 7

\[1 \text{e4} \text{e5} 2 \text{Qf3} \text{Qc6} 3 \text{d4} \text{exd4} 4 \text{Qxd4} \text{Wf4} 5 \text{Qe3} \text{Qxe4} 6 \text{Qb5} \text{Qb4+}
7 \text{Qd2}!??\]

"With the better game", Freeborough/Ranken.

This is the most effective continuation, which leaves Black with nothing to balance White's two bishops and superiority in development.

7...\(\text{Qxd2}+\)
“With the continuation 7...\( \text{a5} \) 8 c3 ("we see nothing better", Steinitz, however, he overlooks the crushing 8 \( \text{\alpha\times c7+!} \), Gutman) 8...\( \text{\alpha\times d5} \) we arrive at the same position as after 7 c3 \( \text{\alpha a5} \) 8 \( \text{\alpha d2} \) \( \text{\alpha d5} \) (Sequel 6"), Steinitz, Modern Chess Instructor.

8 \( \text{\alpha x d2} \) \( \text{\alpha d8} \) 9 0-0-0 a6

Black has also tried:

I) Grimshaw-Steinitz, informal game, London 1878, went 9...\( \text{\omega e6} \) 10 \( \text{\omega f4} \) d6 11 \( \text{\omega x d6 c x d6} \) 12 \( \text{\omega x d6} \) \( \text{\omega x a2} \) (12...\( \text{\omega e7} \) 13 \( \text{\omega c4} \)) 13 \( \text{\omega b5+} \) \( \text{\omega e8} \) 14 \( \text{\omega c7+} \) \( \text{\omega f8} \) 15 \( \text{\omega d6+} \) \( \text{\omega g e7} \) 16 \( \text{\omega d8+} \) \( \text{\omega x d8} \) 17 \( \text{\omega x d8} \) mate;

II) 9...\( \text{\omega f6} \) 10 \( \text{\omega f4} \) \( \text{\omega d5} \) 11 \( \text{\omega g3} \) (11 \( \text{\omega g5+} \) f6 12 \( \text{\omega x d5} \) \( \text{\omega x d5} \) 13 \( \text{\omega x d5} \) \( \text{\omega x g5} \) g6 15 \( \text{\omega c4} \) \( \text{\omega e8} \) 16 \( \text{\omega c3} \) d6 was equal in Zchess-Crafty, computer game 1998) 11...a6 (or 11...\( \text{\omega c e7} \) 12 \( \text{\omega c3} \) \( \text{\omega x c3} \) 13 \( \text{\omega x c3} \)) 12 \( \text{\omega x d5} \) \( \text{\omega x d5} \) 13 \( \text{\omega x c7+} \) \( \text{\omega e7} \) 14 \( \text{\omega x d5 a x b 5} \) 15 \( \text{\omega b 5} \) \( \text{\omega x a 2} \) 16 \( \text{\omega b 1} \) \( \text{\omega a 8} \) 17 \( \text{\omega e 1+} \) yields White a decisive advantage, Gutman.

10 \( \text{\omega x c7} \)

10 \( \text{\omega e 1} \) also appears very strong, 10...\( \text{\omega g6} \) (10...\( \text{\omega b 4?} \) fails due to 11 \( \text{\omega x b 4} \) \( \text{\omega x b 4} \) 12 \( \text{\omega d 6} ! \)) 11 \( \text{\omega d 6} ! \) \( \text{\omega x d 6} \) 12 \( \text{\omega x d 6 e 5} \) (12...\( \text{\omega h 6} ? \) 13 \( \text{\omega g 5+} \) f6 14 \( \text{\omega x h 6} \)) 13 f4 c x d 6 14 f x e 5 d x e 5 15 \( \text{\omega b 6+} \) \( \text{\omega e 8} \) 16 \( \text{\omega x e 5} + \)

\( \text{\omega e 7} \) 17 \( \text{\omega c 5 d 6} \) 18 \( \text{\omega x d 6 e 6} \) 19 \( \text{\omega c 4} \) \( \text{\omega c 6} \) 20 \( \text{\omega e 4} \), Gutman.

10...\( \text{\omega x c 7} \) 11 \( \text{\omega d 6+} \) \( \text{\omega d 8} \) 12 \( \text{\omega e 1} ! \) 12 \( \text{\omega b 6+} \) \( \text{\omega e 8} \) 13 \( \text{\omega d 3} \) \( \text{\omega h 4} \) 14 \( \text{\omega h e 1+} \) \( \text{\omega g e 7} \) 15 \( \text{\omega e 4} \) is less precise.

A) 15...\( \text{\omega h 6+?!} \) 16 \( \text{\omega x h 6 g x h 6} \) 17 \( \text{\omega x c 6 b x c 6} \) 18 \( \text{\omega c 5} \) (I prefer 18 \( \text{\omega d 4} ! ? \) \( \text{\omega g 8} \) 19 \( \text{\omega f 6} \) 18...\( \text{\omega d 6} \) 19 \( \text{\omega x d 6 e 6} \) 20 \( \text{\omega x e 6 f x e 6} \) 21 \( \text{\omega x e 6} \) gave White a clear plus in Bird-Roberts, Philadelphia 1876; B) 15...\( \text{\omega f 6} ! ? \) 16 \( \text{\omega f 6} \) g x f 6 17 \( \text{\omega x c 6} b x c 6 \) 18 \( \text{\omega d 4} \) (18 \( \text{\omega c 5 d 6} \) 19 \( \text{\omega x d 6 g 8} \) 18...\( \text{\omega f 8} \) 19 \( \text{\omega x f 6} \) \( \text{\omega g 6} \) 20 \( \text{\omega x h 8} \) \( \text{\omega h 8} \) 21 \( \text{\omega d 6} \) \( \text{\omega g 6} \) leads to an unusual ending, which is not easy for White to win, Gutman.

12...\( \text{\omega f 6} \) 13 \( \text{\omega b 6+} \) \( \text{\omega e 8} \) 14 \( \text{\omega d 3} \)

Black is helpless, Gutman.
Sequel 8
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
xd4 Wh4 5 e3 xe4 6 b5) 6...We5!

Wxb2 12 bc3 xd5 13 xd5 f5 14 b3 0-0-0 was better for Black in Heider-Bruder, corr. 1989;
III) 7 We2 d8 8 l c3 is a more important alternative.

“A strong and active defence which appears to be little known”,
Botterill/Harding.

“Black’s 6...We5 is a reliable choice”, Hall.
7 d2

Other possibilities are:
I) 7 Wd5?! is the crudest attempt to win the sacrificed pawn back:
A) 7...d8 8 l c3 (“It would not have been good for White to play 8 
x7 on account of 8...Wh6, and it is Black who has the attack”,
Botterill/Harding) 8...a6 9 We5 
xe5 10 f4 f6 11 d4 b4 12 0-0-0 d6 (12...xc3? 13 e6+) 13 
d5 l c5 14 g3 e7 leaves White with insufficient compensation for his pawn minus;
B) 7...xb2!? may well be even stronger, 8 xc7+ d8 9 x8a8 
xa1 10 b3 d4! (10...b4+ 11 
d1 b6? runs into 12 b5 ge7 13 
x6xb6 xe6 14 xe6 cxe6 16 xb4!) 11 xd4 Wh4 is clearly in Black’s favour,
Gutman.

II) 7 c4 a6 8 c5 d6 9 0-0 d5!? (9...d6!? 10 g3 Wh5 looks also playable) 10 xd5 l d6 11 f4

Black has three ideas at his disposal:
A) 8...c5 9 xc7! xe3 (not 9...xc7? 10 f4) 10 xa8 d4 11 Wh3 c1+ 12 e4! (12 d1 
b2 13 b1 xc3 14 xc3 b6 15 d3 c6 16 xe5 cxe5 17 e2 b6 18 f4 d6 19 f3 b7 20 
xb6 xb6 21 xb6 c7 would maintain an edge for Black) 12...xe4+ 13 e4 c2+ 14 
d1 xa1 15 c1 gives White the upper hand, Gutman;
B) 8...a6!? is the principal continuation, 9 xc7 x7 10 d5 
(10 0-0-0 c6 11 a4 We5 12 
b6+ e8 13 xe5+ xe5 14 
bd6 15 e6 g4 16 xa8 
xd1 17 xd1 c7) 10...xa5+ 11 
xc5 12 b4 x6b4 13 cxb4 
x6b4+ 14 xb4 x6b4+ 15 
ed2 
e2 17 0-0-0 xe2 17 a5+ e8 18 
e6, S.Arkell-Hague, Plymouth 1989, and now 18...e7 19 
hel d5 20 xd5 e6 would have secured a plus for Black;
C) 8...f6!? 9 0-0-0 is also good.

Black has a choice:
B1) 9...a6 10 d4 dxe4 11 dxe4 wxe2 12 xe2 e7 13 c4 f8 14 he1 d6 (after 14...b5?! 15 d5 dxe3+ 16 dc5+ b5 17 db1 h6 18 c5 d6 19 xc7 xc7 20 xxd6+ White won in Kopa-Neumann, Barmen 1905) 15 f4?! e4f4 g4 16 d3 h5 17 d5 e6 18 de3 b5 19 b3 c5 20 c3 b4 21 d2, and White retains some pressure, Gutman;

B2) 9...c5?! 10 xc5 wc5 11 w3 d6 (is more precise than 11...a6?! 12 wg3! e8 13 de4 we5 14 dg5 wf6 15 c3 h6 16 de4) 12 wg3 eg8 13 e2 f5 (13...a6? is bad because of 14 xxe6! cxd6 15 xxe6+ cd7 16 xd1) 14 w4 (14 w4 can be met by 14...wc5) 14...cd7! 15 f3 a6 16 xc6+ bxc6 17 d4 e6 yields Black good prospects, Gutman.

7...d5?!

"Thus Black returns the pawn in such a way as to attain full equality — a far better procedure than the miserly 7...dc8", Botterill/Harding, which will transpose into the variation after 5 e3 xe4 6 db5 cd8 7 dc2 we5 — Section 4, Sequel 2.

8 f3 we7 9 xd5 a6?!

Two other moves were tried:

I) 9...f6 10 d2 a6 11 db4 dxe4 12 dxe4 de4 13 wa5! (13 wd1?, Papp-Koszoruz, corr. 1982, is dubious in view of 13...wb4+ 14 c3 xb2) 13...wb4+ (not 13...d7? 14 0-0-0) 14 xb4 xb4+ 15 c3 e7 16 d3 c5 17 c2 d7 18 0-0-0, when I prefer White, Gutman;

II) 9...e6 with a further split:

A) 10 d2 ("No doubt it is a better retreat, but ...") 10...d8 11 d3 c4 ("...after 11...d4 Black has a fine game", Botterill/Harding, in my opinion 12 0-0 d3 xd3 13 cxd3 a6 14 db4 causes some problems for Black, Gutman) 12 c3 xd3 13 cxd3 a6 14 db4 cxd4 15 xd4 d6 16 0-0 d7 17 fe1 e7 18 ac1 d5 19wb3 c6 gives Black a comfortable position, Gutman;

B) 10 we4!? d6 11 a4 (a new idea, O'Hanlon-Mikenas, Buenos Aires 1939, went 11 wh4 a6 12 c3 db4 13 c1 0-0-0 and "Black enjoyed some advantage, which was further enhanced by 14 a3? db5 15 dxd5 dxd5 16 we7 xxe7", Botterill/Harding) 11...wb4+ (11...d4 12 0-0-0 cxe3 13 fx3 is fine for White) 12 xb4 xb4+ 13 c3 a5 14 db4 (or 14 b4 a6 15 dbd4 cxd4 16 cxd4 b6) 14...dxd4 15 cxd4 d7 with equality, Gutman.

10 dc3

10 dbd4 is best answered by 10...wb4+ 11 db2 df6, Gutman.

10...e6 11 d2 df6 12 d3 0-0-0

Black is at least no worse, Gutman.
Part Three
The Horwitz Variation

(1 e4 e5 2 əf3 əc6 3 d4 exd4 4 exd4 əh4)
5 əb5

“Bernhard Horwitz, a player and composer, was born in Germany, and lived in England from 1845. The greatest players of the time defeated him in match play, but he won against Bird in 1851 (+7=4-3). It was the year of the great London tournament in which Horwitz defeated Bird in the first round, and was then knocked out by Staunton”, Hooper/Whyld, The Oxford Companion to Chess.

“This very fine move is the invention of Horwitz, and was first played by him in a game which he won of Staunton. It has since been frequently adopted by strong players, and we may mention that it is especially favoured by Kolisch, one of the leading players on the Vienna side in the present contest (the Correspondence match Vienna-London of 1872-74). It is certainly much superior to 5 əd3, and at least so strong as the new move 5 əf3, which is recommended by Fraser”, Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

“Yet again with this (surely) sorehoofed horse! Much though it resembles kriegspiel, this is, perversely enough, the right move... There can be little doubt that White should reply with 5 əb5! if he is to get any advantage”, Botterill/Harding.

“For a long time this was the standard reply, though the pendulum is now swinging towards 5 əc3 in the popularity stakes. In my view, both are promising”, Peter Wells.

“Despite the recent popularity of 5 əc3 əb4, the immediate attack on c7 must still be considered the main line. White offers his e-pawn for rapid development and the possibility of dislocation of Black’s king; the play is finely balanced and dangerous for both sides”, Hall.

The material is divided into three chapters:
Chapter 1: 5...əxe4+
(5...əd8, 5...əf6)
Chapter 2: 5...əb4+
Chapter 3: 5...əc5

Chapter 1
(1 e4 e5 2 əf3 əc6 3 d4 exd4 4 exd4 əh4 5 əb5)
5...əxe4+
We mention two more alternatives here:

I) 5...əd8 is a strange choice, when White has three options:
A) 6 əd3 əf6 7 əd2 (7 əe3 is harmless, as 7...əg4 eliminates the bishop; after 8 əe2 əxe3 9 əf3 əg4 10 əf1 əg4 (10...d6 11 əg5) 11 əe2 a6 12 əc3 d6!? (12...əxh2 13 əxh2 əxh2 14 əe3 əd4 15 əxd4 əxd4 16 0-0-0 əh6+ 17 f4 əd6

B) 6 əd3 əf6 7 əd2 (7 əe3 is harmless, as 7...əg4 eliminates the bishop; after 8 əe2 əxe3 9 əf3 əg4 10 əf1 əg4 (10...d6 11 əg5) 11 əe2 a6 12 əc3 d6!? (12...əxh2 13 əxh2 əxh2 14 əe3 əd4 15 əxd4 əxd4 16 0-0-0 əh6+ 17 f4 əd6

C) 6 əd3 əf6 7 əd2 (7 əe3 is harmless, as 7...əg4 eliminates the bishop; after 8 əe2 əxe3 9 əf3 əg4 10 əf1 əg4 (10...d6 11 əg5) 11 əe2 a6 12 əc3 d6!? (12...əxh2 13 əxh2 əxh2 14 əe3 əd4 15 əxd4 əxd4 16 0-0-0 əh6+ 17 f4 əd6
was Szilagyi-Jakubowski, Szombathely 1993) 13  \( \text{Qd2} \)  \( \text{Qxh2} \) 14  \( \text{Qxh2} \)  \( \text{Wxh2} \) 15 0-0 0  \( \text{Qd4} \) 16  \( \text{We1} \)  \( \text{Qf3} \) 17  \( \text{We2} \)  \( \text{Qg4} \) with advantage for Black, Gutman; B) 6  \( \text{Qc1c3}\)!?  \( \text{Qb4} \) will transpose into variation 5  \( \text{Qc3} \)  \( \text{Qb4} \) 6  \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) — Part 4, Chapter 2, Section 1; C) 6  \( \text{Qxe3}\)!? (probably best) 6... \( \text{Qf6} \) 6... \( \text{Wxe4} \) reaches a position after 5  \( \text{Qxe3} \) \( \text{Wxe4} \) 6  \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \), covered in Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 4) 7  \( \text{Qd2}\)!? will transpose into variation 5  \( \text{Qe3} \)  \( \text{Qf6} \) 6  \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 7  \( \text{Qd2} \) — Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 3, Sequel 1; II) 5... \( \text{Qf6} \) 6  \( \text{Qc1c3} \) (6  \( \text{Qxc7+} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 7  \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) transposes to variations with 5... \( \text{Qc5} \) — Part 3, Chapter 3) 6... \( \text{Qb4} \) will transpose into the variation after 5  \( \text{Qc3} \)  \( \text{Qb4} \) 6  \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) — Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 2.

"The immediate acceptance of White’s gambit is rightly regarded with skepticism", Wells.
6  \( \text{Qe2} \)!

Less impressive are:
I) 6  \( \text{Wc2}?! \) \( \text{Wxe2+} \) 7  \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Qd8}?! \) (Knotkova-Buldrova, Pilsen 1995, went 7... \( \text{Qb4}+ \) 8  \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 9 0-0  \( \text{a6} \) 10  \( \text{Qa3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 11  \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 12  \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 13  \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 14  \( \text{Qxd5} \) when 14...0-0 would have given Black a plus) 8  \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 9  \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 10  \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 11  \( \text{Qa3} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 12  \( \text{g4?!} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 13  \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 14  \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 15 0-0-0  \( \text{Qe8} \) 16  \( \text{Qhe1} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) and Black was clearly better in Bohnstorff-Wegner, Hamburg 1993;
II) "The better move for the attack is 6  \( \text{Qe3} \), as adopted by Paulsen", wrote Steinitz in his International Chess Magazine, 1886; this reaches a position after 5  \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Wxe4} \) 6  \( \text{Qb5} \), covered in Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 4. 

6... \( \text{Qd8} \)

Black has a range of possibilities:
I) 6... \( \text{Qd6}?! \) fails to 7  \( \text{Wxd6} \), winning the exchange after 7... \( \text{Wxe2+} \) 8  \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{x xd6} \) 9  \( \text{Qxc7+}, \) Staunton;
II) 6... \( \text{Wxe5}?! \), "throwing away the game at once", Staunton.

The 14th match game Horwitz-Staunton, London 1846, went 7  \( \text{f4} \)
\( \text{c5} (7... \text{e4} 8 \text{dx}c7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xa}8 \text{wx}g2 10 \text{xf}3 \text{w}g6 11 \text{e}3 \text{w}e6 12 \text{w}e2 \text{xf}6 13 \text{a}3 \text{d}6 14 \text{xc}6 \text{e}8 15 \text{f}3 \text{xe}3 16 \text{xe}3+17 \text{f}2 \text{c}5 18 \text{g}2 \text{led to a decisive advantage for White in Gilmay-From, Paris 1867}) 8 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xa}8 \text{f}6 10 \text{c}3 \text{e}7 11 \text{wd}2 \text{e}8 12 \text{a}4 \text{f}5 13 0-0 \text{e}4 14 \text{d}3 \text{we}6 15 \text{f}5 \text{f}6 16 \text{f}4 \text{d}6 17 \text{dx}d6 \text{dx}d6 18 \text{mad}1 and White won easily;

III) 6... \text{wx}g2? 7 \text{f}3 \text{g}6 (or 7... \text{wh}3 8 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xa}8 \text{c}5 10 \text{g}1 \text{wx}h2 11 \text{g}2 \text{h}1+ 12 \text{e}2 \text{wh}4?? 13 \text{ag}5+ 1-0, Maia-Gunha, Rio de Janeiro 1999) 8 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xa}8 \text{d}6 10 \text{c}3 \text{gh}6 11 \text{e}3 \text{f}5 12 \text{e}4 \text{xe}3 13 \text{xc}g6 \text{dx}d1 14 \text{ex}d1 was easily winning in Rosa-Fernandez, Santiago 1997;

IV) 6... \text{c}5?! was suggested by Ilya Shumov, according to Bilguer.

White has now three reasonable ideas:

A) 7 \text{wd}5!? \text{we}7 (7... \text{wx}d5? 8 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xd}5) 8 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 9 \text{xa}8 \text{d}4 10 \text{wc}4! (more precise than 10 \text{e}3 \text{f}6 11 \text{wc}4 \text{d}5 12 \text{wa}4 \text{xe}2 13 \text{xc}5 \text{wc}5 14 \text{xe}2 \text{d}7) 10... \text{d}5 (10... \text{df}6 11 \text{g}5) 11 \text{wd}5+ \text{e}8 12 \text{e}3 \text{xc}2+ 13 \text{d}2 \text{exe}3 14 \text{fxe}3 \text{xe}3+ 15 \text{wc}2 \text{xe}2+ 16 \text{d}2 \text{e}7 17 \text{ae}1 \text{e}6 18 \text{exe}2 \text{dx}d5 19 \text{gc}7+ with a winning position for White in the game Rastrelli-Hellmann, Livorno 1926;

B) 7 0-0!? \text{d}8 (7... \text{b}6 8 \text{c}3 \text{wh}4 9 \text{e}3 \text{f}8 10 \text{d}5 \text{ge}7 11 \text{g}3 \text{we}4 12 \text{f}3 \text{wc}4 13 \text{bxc}7 \text{xc}7 14 \text{b}3 \text{dx}d5 15 \text{bxc}4 \text{xe}3 16 \text{fxe}3 cannot attract Black, Garber-Kiltti, Helsinki 1996) 8 \text{c}1c3 (8 \text{dc}3 \text{we}5 9 \text{dc}2 is also quite possible) 8... \text{we}5 (or 8... \text{we}6 9 \text{d}5 \text{d}6 10 \text{g}4 \text{f}5 11 \text{e}1 \text{e}5 12 \text{g}5+ \text{f}6 13 \text{dg}4 \text{we}7 14 \text{gx}f5 \text{h}6 15 \text{g}6 \text{we}8 16 \text{fx}f6+ \text{gx}f6 17 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 18 \text{wxd}6 1-0, Mazur-Lacina, Podebrady 1991) 9 \text{e}1e1 (9 \text{d}5 can by met by 9... \text{d}4) 9... \text{a}e6 10 \text{d}3 \text{xf}2+ (10... \text{f}6 11 \text{e}4) 11 \text{xf}2 \text{f}6+ 12 \text{g}1 \text{axb}3 13 \text{wh}5 \text{g}6 14 \text{wx}b5 \text{xa}5 15 \text{wc}4 \text{wd}4+ 16 \text{wxd}4 \text{xd}4 17 \text{d}2 and Black has a very difficult position, Gutman;

C) 7 \text{xc}7+!? \text{d}8 8 \text{xa}8 \text{d}4 9 \text{c}3 (9 \text{fx}f1!? \text{b}6 10 \text{d}3 \text{wa}8 11 \text{wg}4 also looks fine for White, Gutman) 9... \text{xc}2+ 10 \text{f}1 \text{f}5 11 \text{f}3 (11... \text{e}4!? \text{xa}1 12 \text{xc}5 \text{wc}5 13 \text{e}3 is devastating, Gutman) 11... \text{f}6 (11... \text{xa}1 can be met by 12 \text{b}4! \text{xb}4 13 \text{b}2 \text{c}2 14 \text{e}4 \text{e}1 15 \text{ax}g7 \text{fx}3 16 \text{gf}3, Gutman) 12 \text{eb}1 \text{e}8 13 \text{d}2 \text{ag}4 was given by Shumov, though after 14 \text{eb}1 \text{fx}2 15 \text{wc}2 \text{wc}2 16 \text{xc}2 \text{eh}1 17 \text{d}5 \text{d}6 18 \text{g}4 White is still winning, Gutman.

V) "He may, however, play another move, viz. 6... \text{b}4+!?, the
consequences of which it may be well to examine briefly", Staunton. “This is the best move in the circumstances”, Botterill/Harding.

This check reaches a position, covered in Part 3, Chapter 2. \( \text{7} 9 \text{c} \text{7} \text{0-0-0} ? \)

Other continuations are:

I) \( 7 \text{d}d2?! \text{wxg2} 8 \text{f}f3 \) gives White no compensation for the two pawn deficit; 8...\( \text{wxg5} \text{9} \text{c}c3 \text{wx}e5+ \text{10} \text{f}f1 \text{fxf6} \text{11} \text{de}4 \text{xe}4 \text{12} \text{xe}4 \text{d}5 \text{13} \text{g}g2 \text{exe}6 \text{14} \text{e}e1 \text{xd}6 \text{15} \text{xd}6 \text{wx}d6 \) was clearly better for Black in Speisser-Pukropski, corr. 1998;

II) \( 7 \text{c}c3 \text{wxg2} 8 \text{f}f3, \) examined by Palm, is more testing.

\( \text{8...wxg6} \text{9} \text{f}f4 \) (9 \( \text{d}d5 \) backfires due to \( \text{9...xb4} \)!) \( 9...d6 \text{10} \text{d}d5 \text{f}f5!? \) (10...\( \text{g}g4 \) 11 \( \text{d}xc7 \text{xf}3 \) 12 \( \text{wx}f3 \) \( \text{xc}8 \text{13} 0-0-0 \text{xc}7 \text{14} \text{xd}6 \text{xd}7 \text{15} \text{xf}8 \text{xf6} \text{16} \text{f}f4 \text{d}5 \text{17} \text{xd}5! \text{xd}5 \text{18} \text{wx}7+ \text{exe}8 \text{19} \text{a}3 \text{we}6 \text{20} \text{wb}7 \) and Black is helpless, Palm) 11 \( \text{d}xc7 \text{xc}8 \) leaves White with a distinct choice:

A) \( 12 \text{xd}6 \text{xc}7!? \) (improving on 12...\( \text{xd}6 \text{13} \text{b}5 \text{we}6+ \text{14} \text{e}e2 \text{xb}4 \text{15} \text{wx}d6+ \text{wx}d6 \text{16} \text{xd}6 \text{xc}2+ \text{17} \text{d}d2 \text{xa}1 \text{18} \text{xa}1 \text{xe}6 \text{19} \text{c}c8, \) Palm, when 19...\( \text{xc}8 \) 20 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 21 \( \text{e}5 \text{f}6 \text{22} \text{d}4 \text{b}6 \text{23} \text{c}4 \) is equal) \( 13 \text{xf}7+ \text{ec}8 \text{14} \text{hxh}7+ \text{e}3 \text{f}6 \text{16} 0-0 \text{g}6 \text{17} \text{xc}6 \text{wc}6 \text{appears very good for Black, Gutman; B) } 12 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 \text{13} \text{xc}6 \text{ec}7!? \) \( 14 \text{wx}d6+ \text{wx}d6 \text{15} \text{d}5+ \text{wx}d5 \text{16} \text{xd}5 \text{wc}5 \text{17} \text{c}c3 \text{wc}6 \text{18} 0-0-0 \text{bb}8 \text{19} \text{he}1+ \text{h}6 \) leads to a level ending, Gutman. 7...\( \text{a}6 \)

Alternatively:

I) \( 7...\text{c}5 \text{reaches the position after } 6...\text{c}5 \text{7} 0-0 \text{d}d8; \text{II) } 7...\text{ge}7 8 \text{c}c3 \text{g}6 9 \text{f}f4 \text{d}d6 10 \text{wb}2 \text{f}5 \text{(10...a6 is ruled out by } 11 \text{xc}7! \text{xc}7 \text{12} \text{h}5 \text{we}6 \text{13} \text{xf7! \text{wd}7} \text{14} \text{fe}1 \text{e}5 \text{15} \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 \text{16} \text{e}8+ \text{d}8 \text{17} \text{d}1 \text{xd}2 \text{18} \text{xd}2+ \text{d}7 \text{19} \text{e}6 \text{e}8 \text{20} \text{xd}7, \) Gutman) 11 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 12 \( \text{xe}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}xe7 \) \( \text{c}d4 \) 14 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 17 \( \text{xe}6+ \) \( \text{b}x \) \( \text{e}6 \) 18 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 19 \( \text{x}5 \) \( \text{exe}4 \) 20 \( \text{wa}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 21 \( \text{b}5+ \) and White won easily in Shneider-Khalid, Biel 1992; \text{III) } “\text{We prefer 7...f}6”, \) Steinitz.

White has two interesting ideas at his disposal:

A) \( 8 \text{c}4 \text{d}6!? \) (after \( 8...\text{a}6 \) \( 9 \text{c}5 \) \( \text{we}5 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 11 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{de}4 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 14 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{White is doing great) } 9 \text{d}1 \text{c}3 \text{wh}4
10 g3 \texttt{Wh3} 11 \texttt{\#e1 \#/e6} 12 \texttt{\#g5 \#e7} 13 \texttt{\#/f1 \#/g4!} 14 \texttt{\#/xf6}, Kradolfer-Sarailić, Mureck 1998, and now 14...\texttt{\#/xf6} 15 \texttt{\#/xd5 \#/xd1} 16 \texttt{\#/xd1} 17 \texttt{cxd5 \#/e5} would have secured an edge for Black, Gutman; B) 8 \texttt{\#/1c3}! is the principal response, when Black has difficulties in resolving the tension:

\textbf{B1)} 8...\texttt{\#/f5} 9 \texttt{\#/d3 \#/h5} 10 \texttt{\#/xh5} \texttt{\#/xh5} 11 \texttt{\#/d5} \texttt{\#/d6} 12 \texttt{\#/xd6 cxd6} 13 \texttt{\#/e2 \#/f6} 14 \texttt{\#/g5 \#/e8} 15 \texttt{\#/fe1} was decisive in Pridorozny-Henriksson, Litohoto 1999; 
\textbf{B2)} 8...\texttt{\#/e8} 9 \texttt{\#/e1!} (9 \texttt{\#/g5 \#/e7} 10 \texttt{\#/xf6} \texttt{\#/xf6} 11 \texttt{\#/d5} \texttt{\#/e5} 12 \texttt{f4 a6} was given by Steinitz as good for Black) 9...\texttt{\#/e7} 10 \texttt{\#/f3 a6} 11 \texttt{\#/d4 d6} 12 \texttt{\#/g5 \#/d7} 13 \texttt{\#/xc6 bxc6} 14 \texttt{\#/f3 d5 15 \#/ad1}, when White is certainly better with a lead in development and the opposing king in the middle of the board, Gutman; 
\textbf{B3)} 8...\texttt{\#/h4} 9 \texttt{\#/g3}! (or 9 \texttt{\#/e1 d6} 10 \texttt{g3 \#/h3} 11 \texttt{\#/f1 \#/f5} 12 \texttt{\#/f4 a6} 13 \texttt{\#/d4 \#/xd4} 14 \texttt{\#/xd4 \#/e7} 15 \texttt{\#/e5 \#/d7} 16 \texttt{\#/e2} with fine compensation for the pawn, Gutman) 9...\texttt{\#/b4} (9...\texttt{\#/h3} is powerfully met by 10 \texttt{\#/d5} since 10...\texttt{\#/xd5} loses to 11 \texttt{\#/g4}! 10 \texttt{\#/g5 \#/e7} (10...\texttt{\#/e7} 11 \texttt{\#/xc7!}) 11 \texttt{a3 \#/a5} 12 \texttt{\#/f4 \#/e8} 13

\texttt{\#/d5} \texttt{\#/xd5} 14 \texttt{\#/xd5 d6} 15 \texttt{b4 \#/a4} 16 \texttt{\#/fe1 \#/e7} 17 \texttt{\#/xd6 \#/xd6} 18 \texttt{\#/xd6 \#/xd6} 19 \texttt{\#/b5} 1-0; Hassim-Hrubant, e-mail game 1999; 
\textbf{B4)} 8...\texttt{\#/e5} 9 \texttt{\#/e1 a6} 10 \texttt{\#/f3 \#/c5} 11 \texttt{\#/e3 \#/f5} 12 \texttt{\#/xc6 axb5} 13 \texttt{\#/xb5 d6} 14 \texttt{\#/d3} (14 \texttt{\#/e2 \#/e6} 15 \texttt{\#/d4 \#/e7} 16 \texttt{\#/ad1 c6} 17 \texttt{\#/a4 \#/e8} 18 \texttt{\#/b3 \#/xb3} 19 axb3 \texttt{\#/c7} 20 \texttt{h3 \#/f8} 21 \texttt{\#/d2} d5 22 \texttt{\#/e2?}! \texttt{\#/d6} was comfortable for Black in Sullivan-Coffield, corr. 1997) 14...\texttt{\#/g4} 15 \texttt{\#/d2} with a clear advantage for White, Gutman.

The critical moment. Black's position looks pretty miserable: passive pieces, an uncastled king and no counterplay to speak of.

"In an interesting article on the Scotch, in the Deutsche Schachzeitung for October 1846, we find this move of Mr.Horwitz's, reviewed, and the writer, in answer to it, suggests that Black may take the e4-pawn, and afterwards establish a good defence...", Staunton.

"According to Staunton this position is better for White, while Deutsche Schachzeitung 1846, favours Black", Bilguer.

We now consider two lines:
\textbf{Section 1:} 8 \texttt{\#/1c3} (8 \texttt{\#/g5}, 8 \texttt{\#/f3} \
\textbf{Section 2:} 8 \texttt{\#/5c3}
Section 1
8  \( \mathcal{Q}xc3!?! \)

Two more possibilities are worth exploring:
I) 8  \( \mathcal{Q}g5+?! \) is hardly to be recommended as 8...f6 9  \( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) (9  \( \mathcal{Q}e1? \), Makovsky-Hahn, Prague 1870, loses due to 9...fxg5! 10  \( \mathcal{Q}h5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e1+ \) 11  \( \mathcal{Q}e1 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)) 9...\( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 10  \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) is quite solid for Black, Gutman;
II) 8  \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) causes more problems.

We see:
A) 8...\( \mathcal{W}f5 \) 9  \( \mathcal{Q}d4!? \)  \( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \) 10  \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 11  \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 12  \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 13  \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \)  \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) 14  \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \)  \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) 15  \( \mathcal{A}d1 \) d6, Raskazov-Kondrashov, Russia 1998, and now 16  \( \mathcal{Q}a4?! \)  \( \mathcal{Q}a7 \) 17  \( \mathcal{W}a5 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 18  \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) would be excellent for White as 18...\( \mathcal{W}xc2 \) 19  \( \mathcal{H}d2 \) \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) 20  \( \mathcal{C}c1 \) shows;
B) 8...\( \mathcal{W}e5 \) 9  \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d6 \) (9...\( \mathcal{W}d6 \) 10  \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 11  \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) f6 12  \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)  \( \mathcal{W}e6 \) 13  \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) d6 14  \( \mathcal{Q}c4 \) is no better, Cheron-Marin, Paris 1998) 10 g3  \( \mathcal{W}d4 \) 11  \( \mathcal{W}e2 \)  \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) (11...\( \mathcal{A}ge7 \) 12  \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \)  \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) 13  \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)  \( \mathcal{W}e6 \) 14  \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) f6 15  \( \mathcal{A}d1 \)  \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) 16  \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \)  \( \mathcal{W}f7 \) 17  \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) d6 18 c3 h5 19  \( \mathcal{Q}xe7 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}xe7 \) 20  \( \mathcal{Q}xb7+ \)  \( \mathcal{A}xb7 \) 21  \( \mathcal{A}xb7 \)  \( \mathcal{A}b8 \) 22  \( \mathcal{W}xa6 \) gave White a decisive advantage in Timmermann-Degembe, Huy 1993) 12  \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) 13  \( \mathcal{W}d1 \)

\( \mathcal{Q}xf3+ \) 14  \( \mathcal{W}xf3 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 15  \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) (15... \( \mathcal{B}b4 \) 16  \( \mathcal{F}f4 \) 16  \( \mathcal{Q}c4 \)  \( \mathcal{W}e6 \) 17  \( \mathcal{Q}g5! \)  \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 18  \( \mathcal{F}f1 \)  \( \mathcal{W}c6 \) (18...\( \mathcal{W}xc4 \) 19  \( \mathcal{Q}xe7 \)) 19  \( \mathcal{W}xc6 \)  \( \mathcal{B}xc6 \) 20  \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \)  \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 21  \( \mathcal{E}e2 \)  \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 22  \( \mathcal{A}ae1 \)  \( \mathcal{B}b4 \) (or 22  \( \mathcal{Q}d8 \) 23  \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) 23  \( \mathcal{Q}g4 \) and Black's position collapses, Gutman; C) 8...\( \mathcal{W}h4?! \) 9  \( \mathcal{Q}c5c3 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 10  \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) (10  \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \)) 10...d6 looks quite acceptable for Black, Gutman.
8...\( \mathcal{W}e8! ? \)

"This is the retreat proposed by the German critic", Staunton.

Alternatively:
I) 8...\( \mathcal{W}e6 \) 9  \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \) 10  \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 11  \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 12  \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) (12  \( \mathcal{F}f1 \)  \( \mathcal{F}e8 \) 13  \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \)  \( \mathcal{F}f5 \) 14  \( \mathcal{E}e3 \)  \( \mathcal{W}xc2 \) 15  \( \mathcal{A}d2 \)  \( \mathcal{F}f5 \) 16  \( \mathcal{C}c1 \) was less impressive in Morales-Avalos, Lima 1999) 12...d6 13  \( \mathcal{F}f1 \)  \( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 14  \( \mathcal{C}e4 \) with White having the initiative, Gutman; II) "If 8...\( \mathcal{W}e5 \) you may first play 9  \( \mathcal{Q}d5! \), and if then he takes 9...\( a\times b5 \) (after 9...\( \mathcal{F}f6 \) 10  \( \mathcal{B}xc7 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) 11  \( \mathcal{F}f3 \)  \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) 12  \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \)  \( \mathcal{D}e6 \) 13  \( \mathcal{E}e1 \)  \( \mathcal{W}d4 \) 14  \( \mathcal{W}e2 \)  \( \mathcal{D}d6 \) 15  \( \mathcal{A}e3 \)  \( \mathcal{W}b2 \) 16  \( \mathcal{F}ab1 \)  \( \mathcal{W}xa2 \) 17  \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \)  \( \mathcal{W}a3 \) 18  \( \mathcal{A}b3 \) White won easily in Hebert-Biyiasis, Toronto 1978) you reply with 10  \( \mathcal{F}f4 \) and have a better game", Staunton.

![Chess Diagram]

A) 10...\( \mathcal{W}xb2 \) 11  \( \mathcal{Q}c7+ \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 12  \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \)  \( \mathcal{W}a3 \) 13  \( \mathcal{Q}xb5 \) (Lane analyses
13 \( \text{Ke1} \text{Ke7} \) 14 \( \text{Qxb5} \text{Qf8} \) 15 \( \text{Qxa8} \text{Wxa8} \) 16 \( \text{Qd6} \text{Wa5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxc6} \text{bxc6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe7}+ \text{Qxe7} \) 19 \( \text{Wd6} \text{Wg5} \) 20 \( \text{Wc7} \) as winning for White 13...\text{Qc5} (or 13...\text{Qe7} 14 \( \text{Ke1} \text{Qf8} \) 15 \( \text{Qxc6} \text{Wc5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxa8} \text{Wxc6} \) 17 c4 b5 18 cxb5 \( \text{Wxa8} \) 19 \( \text{Qd6} \text{Qb7} \) 20 \( \text{Qxe7}+ \text{Qxe7} \) 21 \( \text{Wd6} \text{We8} \) 22 \( \text{Qc1} \text{f5} \) 23 \( \text{Qc7} \text{Qe4} \) 24 \( \text{Qxd7} 1-0 \), Latroncio-Bueno, e-mail game 1999) 14 \( \text{Qxa8} \text{Wxa8} \) 15 \( \text{Wh5} \) b6 16 \( \text{Qc4} \text{g6} \) 17 \( \text{Wd5} \text{Qh6} \) 18 \( \text{Qf4} \) leaves Black defenceless, David-Heinieke, Germany 1995;

B) 10...\text{Wd4} 11 \( \text{Qxc7}+ \text{Qe8} \) 12 \( \text{We1} \) ("The continuation is from a game De Visser-Blackmar in the Brooklyn Chronicle, vol.3", Freeborough/Ranken; Staunton gives 12 \( \text{Qb6} \) with a clear plus for White) 12...\text{Qc5} 13 \( \text{Qf3}+ \text{Qge7} \) 14 c3 \( \text{Wa4} \) 15 b4 d6 16 bxc5 dxc5 17 \( \text{Qb6} \text{Wa6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxc6}+ \) bxc6 19 \( \text{Qxa8} \text{Wxa8} \) 20 \( \text{Qd1} \text{Qd7} \) 21 \( \text{We3} \text{Wa4} \) 22 \( \text{Qf1} \text{Wh4} \) 23 g3 \( \text{Wf6} \) 24 \( \text{Qd6} 1-0 \), Winge-Bergman, Boras 1979.

9 \( \text{Qd4} \)

9 \( \text{Qxc7}?! \text{Qxc7} \) 10 \( \text{Qd5}+ \text{Qb8} \) (10...\text{Qd8}? 11 \( \text{Qe3} \) 11 \( \text{Qf4}+ \) (or 11 \( \text{Qb6} \text{Qc5} \)) 11...d6 12 \( \text{Qb6} \text{Qf6} \) 13 \( \text{Qxd6+} \text{Qa7} \) and Black has everything covered, Gutman.

"And again, I believe, with the strangely changed position of his king and queen, and the facility afforded you for bringing the pieces into immediate action, that the game is very much in your favour", Staunton.

"White has a tremendous initiative. One could not reasonably ask for greater compensation for the gambit of a pawn. Unfortunately, there are no examples from practical play", Botterill/Harding.

9...\text{Qc5}!?

Several other moves have been tried:

I) 9...\text{Qd6} 10 \( \text{Qxc6}+ \) bxc6 11 \( \text{Qe1} \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Qf3} \) d6 13 \( \text{Qf4} \text{Qe6} \) 14 \( \text{Qe4} \text{Qf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qc5} \text{Qc8} \) 16 c4 \( \text{Qb8} \) 17 \( \text{Qd3} \text{Qd7} \) 18 \( \text{Qa4} \) h6 19 c5 d5 20 \( \text{Qa5} \) and White was winning in Braune-Friedrich, Graz 1872;

II) 9...\text{Qxd4} 10 \( \text{Qxd4} \) d6 11 \( \text{Qe1} \text{Qf5} \) 12 \( \text{Qf4} \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qf3} \text{Qc8} \) 14 \( \text{Qe2} \text{Qg4} \) 15 \( \text{Qae1} \text{Qe7} \), Schrevens-Kuij hoven, Hengelo 1995, when 16 \( \text{Qxe7}! \text{Qxe7} \) 17 \( \text{Qxg7} \) should be decisive;

III) 9...d6 10 \( \text{Qe1} \text{Qge7} \) 11 \( \text{Qf3} \text{Qxd4} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd4} \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qg5} \text{Qf5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe7}+ \text{Qxe7} \) 15 \( \text{Qd5} \text{Qf6} \) 16 \( \text{Qc4} \text{Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qad1} \) h5 18 \( \text{Qxf6} \text{gx6} \) 19 \( \text{Qf4} \text{Qf5} \) 20 \( \text{Qxd6+} 1-0 \), Cairney-Reid, corr. 1990.

10 \( \text{Qxc6}+ \) bxc6 11 \( \text{Qe1} \text{Qf8} \) 12 \( \text{Qe4}! \)

An improvement on 12 \( \text{Qf4} \text{Qf6} \) 13 \( \text{Qf3} \text{Qb7} \) 14 \( \text{Qe2} \text{Qc8} \) 15 \( \text{c3}?! \text{Qd5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxd5} \text{cxd5} \) with an unclear position, Braune-Friedrich, Graz 1870.

12...\text{Qb6} 13 \( \text{Qc4} \)

White has strong pressure for the sacrificed pawn, Gutman.
Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 √f3 √c6 3 d4 exd4 4 √xd4 √h4 5 √b5 √xe4+ 6 √e2 √d8 7 0-0 a6)
8 √5c3!?
Preferred by Joseph Blackburne.

III) 8...√e8 9 √d2 seems more testing. We examine:
A) 9...f5 10 √e1 √e7 11 √c4 √f6 12 √f3 d6 13 √f4 √f8 14 √d2 √d7 15 √ad1 √e8 16 b4! h6
(16...√xb4 is bad in view of 17 √e3! √d8 18 √xd6+) 17 b5 axb5 18 √xb5 √e8 19 √xc7! √xc7 (or
19...√xc7 20 √b6+ √d8 21 √xc6 √xc6 22 √xd6) 20 √xd6 √xd6 21 √xe8 √xe8 22 √xd6+ √d8 23 √c7+
√e7 24 √e1+ √f6 25 √xe8 √hx8 26 h4 and White won easily, Lau-Elstner, Bad Wörishofen 1992;
B) 9...√ge7 allows 10 √de4.

8...√d4
There are many other possibilities:
I) 8...√f5 9 √g4 √g6 10 √d5 d6 11 √h5 √f5 12 √bc3 g6 13 √f3 √f6 14 √xf6 √xf6 15 √d5 √f5 16
g4 √d7 17 √g5+! (Vitzhum-Minckwitz, Leipzig 1870, went 17 √f6?! √e6 18 √g5 √e7 19 √e1
√c4 20 b3 √b5 21 √d5 √e6 22 c4 √a5 23 b4?! √xb4 24 √e2 h6 25
a3 √xd5 26 √d2 √f4 0-1) 17...√e7 18 √e7 √xe7 19 √d4 √e8 20
√fe1 √b5 21 √d5 √e6 22 c4 and Black is helpless, Gutman;
II) 8...√h4 9 g3 (9 √d2 √d4 10
√f3 √xf3+ 11 √xf3 √f6 12 g3
√b4 13 a3 √a5 14 √f4 √f5 15
√e1 is also good for White, Metcalfe-Hakuc, corr. 1999) 9...√f6 10 √f4 d6 11 √d2 g6 (or 11...h6 12
√de4 √d4 13 √c1 with 14 √d1 to follow) 12 √de4 (12 √f3 √e7 13
√c1 h5 14 √d5 √g7 15 c4 √e6 was less clear in Saraiva-Rebelo, Lisbon 1999) 12...√g7 13 √d2 √f5
14 √fd1 √c8 15 b4 promises White good attacking chances, Gutman;

Blackburne-Burn, London 1886, continued 10...f6 (10...d6 can be met by 11 √g5!? f6 12 √h5 √d7
13 √e1, Gutman) 11 √e1 √f7 12
√f4 g5 (“Faulty. The whole king’s side becomes weak in consequence.
12...f5 was the correct play”, wrote Steinitz in International
Chess Magazine, 1886; however, his suggestion fails to 13 √xf6!) 13
√h5 √c4 (13...√g7?? 14 √c5) 14
√xg5 (“Finely played”, Steinitz)
14...hxg5 15 √xg5 √g6 16 √d5
(“We learn that Mr. Blackburne afterward pointed out an easy win for
himself at this stage by playing 16
√xg6! hxg6 17 √d5”, Steinitz)
16...√ge5 17 √e4 √b5, when 18
\[ \text{Chapter 2} \\
(1 \text{ e4 e5 } 2 \text{ d3 c6 } 3 \text{ d4 exd4 } 4 \text{ cxd4 } \text{ Wh4 } 5 \text{ a5}) \\
5...\text{b4} + \\ 

“This move, first played by Paulsen against Wilson, in the Bristol tournament of 1861, is a great improvement upon the line of play previously adopted”, Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

“5...\text{b4}+ used to be played here for some time according to Paulsen’s precept, but we believe the pawn cannot be maintained in that case on account of 6 \text{ c3 } \text{ Wh4+ 7 } \text{ dxe4}”,” Steinitz, International Chess Magazine, 1885.

We consider three lines in this chapter:
Section 1: 6 \text{ d3}
Section 2: 6 \text{ c3}
Section 3: 6 \text{ d2}

6 \text{ c3} will transpose into the variation after 5 \text{ d3 } \text{ b4} 6 \text{ db5 } — 
Part 4, Chapter 3.

Section 1
6 \text{ d3}

“Was frequently adopted here, but has been discarded since the game Rosenthal-Steinitz, Baden-Baden 1870”, Steinitz/Potter.
"6 \(\text{Qd2}\) is inferior", Freeborough and Ranken.

"And 6 \(\text{Qd2}\) proves surprisingly fragile", Botterill/Harding.

6...\(\text{Wxe4+!?}\)
6...\(\text{a5}\) 7 \(\text{d3}\) \text{a6} is a more recent try.

\[\text{Wxe1} 15 \text{Wxe1 Qd7}, \text{when the endgame is at least equal for Black, Gutman.}\]

\textbf{B)} 8 \(\text{Qa3}?!\) is more solid, with a further split:

\textbf{B1)} 8...\(\text{Qf6}\) 9 0-0 0-0 10 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wh5}\)
11 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qb4}\) 12 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 13 \(\text{Qe2}\)
\(\text{Wg6}\) 14 \(\text{Qg5}\) d5 15 \(\text{Qh5}\) \(\text{Wf5}\) 16 \(\text{g4}\)
\(\text{Wxg5}\) 17 \(\text{Whx5}\) dxc4 18 c3 gave White a decisive advantage in Parligras-Tikhomirov, Techirghiol 2000;

\textbf{B2)} 8...b5 9 0-0 (the prosaic 9 c3 \(\text{Qf6}\) 10 0-0 is also playable)
9...\(\text{Qb5}?!\) 10 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wf6}\) 11 \(\text{e5}?!\)
\(\text{Qxe5}\) 12 \(\text{Wxe2}\) \(\text{Qxa3}\) 13 \(\text{bxa3}\) d6 14
\(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Wxe5}\) 15 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{b8}\) (not
15...\(\text{Qxa1}\) 16 \(\text{Qc6+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 17 \(\text{Wxa8}\), Zelčić-Peranić, Pula 1992) 16 \(\text{Qb1}\)
\(\text{Qa7}\) 17 \(\text{Wh3}\), and White obtains the
initiative;

\textbf{B3)} 8...\(\text{d6}?!\) 9 0-0 \(\text{Qb6}\) 10 \(\text{Qac4}\)
\(\text{Qa7}\) 11 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wh5}\) 12 h3 \(\text{Qge7}\)
appears to be approximately equal, Gutman.

7 \(\text{Qe2}\)

White has two possibilities:

A) 8 \(\text{Qc3}\) is the direct way, hoping that White’s two bishops and active
pieces compensate for his pawn weaknesses after the exchange on c3.

\textbf{A1)} 8...\(\text{Qe5}?!\) 9 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wf6}\) 10 \(\text{Qxe5}\)
\(\text{Qxc3+}\) 11 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{Wxe5}\) 12 0-0! \(\text{Qf6}\)
(12...\(\text{Qxc3}?!\) is taboo because of 13
\(\text{Qb1}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 14 \(\text{Qb2}\) \(\text{Wc6}\) 15 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{Qd5}\)
16 \(\text{Qg4}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{e6}\) \(\text{g6}\) 18 \(\text{c4}\), Gutman)
13 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 14 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Qc5+}\) 15
\(\text{Qh1}\) d6 16 h3 h5 17 \(\text{Qb1}\) b6 18 \(\text{Qb4}\)
b5 19 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) (19...\(\text{Qf6}\) 20 \(\text{e5}\) 20
hxg4 \(\text{hxg4}+\) 21 \(\text{Qg1}\) 0-0-0 22 \(\text{Qe2}\)
f5 23 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qde8}\) 24 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Wc6}\) 25 \(\text{c4}\)
\(\text{Qe6}\) 26 cxb5 axb5 27 c4 b4 28 \(\text{Qg3}\)
\(\text{We8}\) 29 \(\text{e5}\) was winning for White
in Zapata-Djurčić, San Martin 1992;

\textbf{A2)} 8...\(\text{Qxc3}?!\) 9 \(\text{bxc3}\) d6 10 0-0
\(\text{Qf6}\) looks like a better chance, 11
h3 0-0 12 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Qe8}?!\) (Steiner-
Shipman, Las Vegas 1997, con-
tinued 12...\(\text{Qxh3}\) 13 gxr3 \(\text{Qg3+}\) 14
\(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Qxh3}\) with a draw by perpet-
ual) 13 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qg3}\) (13...\(\text{Qh5}?!\) 14
\(\text{We1}\) \(\text{Wa5}\) is also possible) 14 \(\text{We1}\)

7...\(\text{Qxg2}!\)

7...\(\text{Qxd}2+?!\) is less impressive, 8
\(\text{Qxd2}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 9 0-0 \(\text{Qf6}\) (Bilguer
gives 9...a6 10 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wg6}\) 11 \(\text{Qc3}\)
with a clear advantage for White) 10
\(\text{We1}\) (10 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Wh4}\) 11 \(\text{Wc1}\) h6 12
\(\text{Qf4}\) d6 13 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 14 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Wg5}\)
leads nowhere for White, Frignani-
Hakuc, e-mail game (1999) 10...d6 (Gutierrez-Grouls, corr.1999, went 10...æe8 11 ëf3 ëc4 12 ëxe8+ ëxe8 13 ëxc6 ëxc6 14 ëd4 ëa6 15 ëg4 ëd5 16 ëe1 ëb8 17 ëh4+ ëf6 18 ëg3 ëc8 19 ëxg7 ëxd4 20 ëc3 ëa4 21 ëxf6 and White has the initiative) 11 ëg5! (an improvement on 11 ëc3 ëg6 12 ëd3 ëf5 13 ëxf5 ëxf5 14 ëe2 ëe8 15 ëxf6+ ëd7 16 ëd3 ëxg6, Metcalfe-Reuter, corr. 1999) 11...ëg6 12 ëxd6! ëxd6 13 ëxd6+ ëd7 14 h4 ëc8 15 ëd3 ëh5 16 ëf4 ëd5 17 ëh2 ëd8 18 c4 and Black is helpless, Gutman.

8 ëf3 ëh3

"Dr. Schmid from Dresden published in Deutsche Schachzeitung 1879, an article on the 6 ëd2 variation, where he justified Black's strategy: this was in reply to a critical statement by Johann Berger", Bilguer.

9 ëxc7+

After 9 ëg4 ëh4 10 ëxc7+ ëd8 11 ëxa8 ëf6 12 ëe2 ëe8 13 c3 ëe5 14 0-0 ëd6 15 f4 ëc5+ 16 ëg2 (or 16 ëh1 ëeg4 17 ëxg4 ëxg4 18 ëf3 ëf2+ 19 ëxf2 ëxf2 20 ëd2 ëe2 21 ëf1 b5 22 ëxf2 ëxf2 21 ëf2) 16...b6 17 fxe5 ëb7+ 18 ëf3 (18 ëf3 can be met by 18...ëxe5, threatening 19...ëh5, Gutman) 18...ëg4 White has no valid defences, Schmid.

9...ëd8 10 ëxa8 ëf6

The crucial moment. The open e-file presents obvious attacking prospects for Black, and White is struggling to get his king out of the middle.

We consider two lines in this section:

Sequel 1: 11 a3
Sequel 2: 11 c3

Sequel 1 11 a3

This interesting attempt to rehabilitate the whole variation was suggested by Berger.

11...ëe8+ 12 ëe2 ëc5 13 ëe4!?

Some examples of other moves:

I) 13 b4?! ëd4 14 ëb1 ëg4 15 ëf1 ëxf2 16 ëxf2 ëh4 17 ëd4 ëxe4 18 ëg5+ ëxg5 19 ëf3 ëe5 is crushing for Black, Schmid;

II) 13 ëb3 and then:

A) 13...ëxf2+?! 14 ëxf2 ëe4+ 15 ëg1 ëe6 16 ëh5! (instead of 16 ëg5+ ëxg5 17 ëd3 ëe3 18 ëd1 ëh4 and White is defenceless, Botterill/Harding) 16...ëf6 17 ëc5 ëf2 (or 17...ëf2 18 ëd5 h6 19 ëf4 ëxf4 20 ëd6) 18 ëg5+ ëf6 19 ëg4 yields a winning advantage for White, Gutman;

B) 13...ëe5! is more effective, after 14 ëe3 ëxe3 15 fxe3 ëxh3 16 ëf1 ëf3+ 17 ëxf3 ëxf3 18 c3 ëh1+ 19 ëd2 ëxh2 White's position collapses, Schmid.

13...ëh4!

Less effective are:

I) 13...ëxe2+, indicated by Hall, 14 ëxh2 ëd4 15 ëxh3 ëxd3 16 ëxh3 ëc2+ 17 ëe2 ëxa1 18 ëe3!? (18 ëf4 ëb3 19 ëc7+ ëe7 20 ëe1 ëd6 21 ëd2 ëxd2 22 ëxd2+ ëe6 23 ëf4 ëd7 is fine for Black) 18...ëb3 19
Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\_xd4 Wh4 5 b5 b4 6 \_d2
\_xe4 7 c3 \_e2 8 \_xg2 f6 3 \_h3 9
\_xe7 + \_d8 10 \_axa8 \_f6)
11 c3 \_e8 12 \_e2
A logical continuation since the d4-square is now under control; on
the other hand the d3-square needs protection.

\_xc5 7xc5 20 \_d6 b6 21 b4 \_e6
22 \_c1 \_a6 23 \_d2?! \_d5 24 b5
\_e7 25 \_f5 + \_f6 26 \_xg7 \_d4
27 \_e8 + \_e7 28 \_c7 \_xc7 29
\_xc7 \_b3 + 30 \_c3 \_xc1 31 bxa6
leads to a winning ending for White,
Gutman;
II) 13...\_xf2 + 14 \_xf2 \_e4 + 15
\_g1 \_e6 16 \_h5! (improving on
Schmidt’s analysis with 16 \_g5 + ?!)
\_xg5 17 \_g4 \_e1 + 18 \_xe1
\_xg4 + 19 \_g3 \_h3 + 20 \_f1
\_xc4 + 21 \_e1 \_d4 22 \_d3
\_xc2 +) 16...\_f6 17 \_e3! ? (“we
think 17 a4 \_d4 18 \_a3 \_f5 19
\_e1 “offers White excellent chances”, Hall; to me 19...\_xc2 20 \_e2
\_d4 21 \_g2 \_c5 22 \_e3 \_xc1 +
23 \_d1 \_g6 24 \_xg6 \_xd1 + 25
\_f1 \_g4 + should lead to a draw
by repetition) 17...\_e5 (17...b5 18
\_ab6 \_xb6 19 \_we2 \_b7 20 \_xb6 +
\_c8 21 \_d2 gives White a decisive
advantage) 18 \_we2 \_xc4 19 \_xa7
d5 20 \_xd1 \_f5 21 h3 \_xb2 22
\_g4 \_we5 23 \_d4 \_g3 + 24 \_g2
\_xd1 25 \_xf6+ \_xf6 26 \_xg3
\_xb3 27 \_xd1 \_hxh1 28 \_hxh1
\_xh3 29 \_f3 yields White a very
promising ending, Gutman.

14 0-0
14 \_wd3 \_xf2 + 15 \_d1 \_d4 16
\_e3 \_xe2 17 \_we2 \_xe3 18 \_xe3
\_d5 19 \_f5 (or 19 \_g2 \_d4 + 20
\_wd3 \_g4 + 21 \_c1 \_xg2 22 \_d1
\_e2 23 \_xh7 \_e3) 19...\_f6 20
\_wd3 \_xf5 21 \_xf5 \_e3 + 22 \_d2
\_xf5 23 \_h1 g6 24 a4 d5 25 a5
\_e6 26 a6 b5 27 \_e1 \_d7 28
\_b6 + \_c6 is without hope for
White, Gutman.

14...\_d4 15 \_d3 d5
Black has a ferocious attack,
Gutman.

12...\_e5!
Alternatives are:
I) 12...\_d5 13 \_e4 (not 13 \_xb4?
\_d4 “with a fine attack”, Steinitz)
13...\_xe4 14 \_xd5 f3 15 \_g5+ \_e7 16 \_xe7 +! (16 0-0-0, indicated
by Schmid, 16...\_xe2 17
\_xe7 + \_xe7 ?! 18 \_he1 \_xf2 19
\_f1 \_we3 + 20 \_b1 \_we6 21 \_we6
\_xe6 22 \_f8 + \_e8 23 \_xe8 \_xe8
24 \_c7 + \_e7 looks satisfactory
for Black) 16...\_xe7 17 0-0-0 \_xe2 18
\_xf7 \_c6 19 \_h1, and Black is
helpless, Gutman;
II) 12...\_g2 13 \_f1 is considered as
a quite promising line for Black.

There are two plans:
A) 13...\_e5 was suggested by Stei-
nitz, however, 14 \_wa4! (more
effective than 14 \_c2 \_f8 15 f4
\_eg4 16 \_f3 b6) 14...\_d3 + 15
\[ \text{\textdollar}d1 \text{\textdollar}xf2+ 16 \text{\textdollar}xf2 \text{\textdollar}xf2 17 \text{\textdollar}f3?! \text{\textdollar}e1+ 18 \text{\textc2} \text{\textd6} 19 \text{\textb3} \text{\texte3} 20 \text{\texta3} \text{\texta3} 21 \text{\textwxa3} \text{\textxf3} 22 \text{\textxf1} \text{gives White a decisive advantage;}
\]

B) 13...\text{\textd4}5?! might be better.

White has four possibilities:

B1) 14 \text{\textb3}? \text{\textxc3}+ 15 \text{\textd2} \text{\texte5} 16 \text{\textw2} \text{\textf3}+ 17 \text{\textd1} \text{\textxd2} 18 \text{\textw4} \text{\textxf1}+ 19 \text{\textxf1} \text{\texte1}+ 20 \text{\textc2} \text{\textb4}+ and Black wins, Steinitz;

B2) 14 \text{\textc4} \text{\textxc3}+ 15 \text{\textxc3} \text{\textxc3} 16 \text{\texte3} \text{\textxe3} 17 \text{\textxe3} \text{\textxd1} 18 \text{\textxd1} \text{\textwh2} ("and Black ought to win the game, as White's knight cannot escape", Steinitz/Potter, \textit{The Field}, 1874) 19 \text{\textf4}?! (19 \text{\textd3} \text{\textwe5} 20 \text{\textf4} \text{\textwb8} 21 \text{\textb6} \text{\textaxb6} 22 \text{\textxb6}+ \text{\textwe8} 23 \text{\textc5} \text{\textd6} 24 \text{\textxd6} \text{\textwa7} 25 \text{\textff3} \text{\textg6} 26 \text{\textfe3}+ \text{\texte6} 27 \text{\textf5} \text{\textwa5}+ 28 \text{\textmd2} \text{\textxf5} gave Black a winning position in Rosenthal-Steinitz, Baden-Baden 1870) 19...\text{\textb6} 20 \text{\textd2} \text{\textb7} 21 \text{\texth1} \text{\textw2} 22 \text{\textwh7} \text{\textaxa8} 23 \text{\texth8}+ \text{\texte7} 24 \text{\textaxa8} \text{\textd4} 25 \text{\textxd4} \text{\textwa8} favours Black, \textit{Gutman};

B3) 14 \text{\textwb3} \text{\textd4} (14...\text{\textd6}?! is worse due to 15 \text{\textd3} \text{\textxf3} 16 \text{\texte3}) 15 \text{\textd1} (15 \text{\textxb4} \text{\textxe2}+ 16 \text{\textd1} \text{\textxd2}+ 17 \text{\textxd2} \text{\textxf1} with a fine game, Steinitz, \textit{International Chess Magazine}, 1886) 15...\text{\textxe2} 16 \text{\textxf7} \text{\textd6} 17 \text{\texte1} \text{\textw4} 18 \text{\textxe2} \text{\textxe2}+

After 14...\text{\texte5} 15 \text{\textd2} \text{\textc5} 16 \text{\textc2} \text{\textxf2} 17 \text{\textb3} \text{\textb6} 18 \text{\textc4} \text{\textb7} (or 18...\text{\texte5} 19 \text{\textxe3} \text{\textxe3} 20 \text{\textf3} \text{\textxf3} 21 \text{\textxf3} 19 \text{\textxf2} (19 \text{\textcxd5} \text{\textxd5}+ 20 \text{\texta3} \text{\textxa8} 21 \text{\textc3} is possible) 19...\text{\textxf2} 20 \text{\textcxd5} \text{\textxa8} 21 \text{\textc3} \text{\textwh2} 22 \text{\textf1} \text{\textf6} 23 \text{\textf4} \text{\textwh4} 24 \text{\textd1} White stands clearly better, \textit{Gutman}.

13 \text{\textwa4}

Stassen-Graig, corr. 1997, went 13 \text{\textwb3}?! \text{\textd3}+ 14 \text{\textd1} \text{\textxf2}+ 15 \text{\texte1} (15 \text{\textc2} \text{\textf5}+) 15...\text{\textxe1} 16 \text{\textcxd4} \text{\textwh2} 17 \text{\textc4} \text{\textwg3}+ 0-1.

13...\text{\textd3}+ 14 \text{\textd1} \text{\textxf2}+ 15 \text{\textc2} \text{\textxe2}

16 \text{\textwb4}

Other moves are:
I) 16 $\text{Wxa7 Wf5}+ 17 \text{b3 c5!} 18 \text{Wb6+ Wxb6} 19 \text{Wxb6 Qxh1} 20 \text{Qxb4 Qxh2 and wins, Schmid.}
II) 16 Qg1 Qd3+ 17 Qb3 a5 18 Qb6 (18 Qg3 Qd5+ 19 c4 Qh1) 18...Qxd2 (or 18...Qd4e) 19 Qxd2 Q6e4 leaves White helpless, Bozidar Ivanović;
III) 16 Qb5 Wh5 17 Qxh5 Qxh5 18 Qg1 Qd6 19 Qg5 g6 20 Qb3 b6 21 Qc4 Qxh2 with the same outcome, Canellas-Walsh, corr. 1997.
16...Qd3+
16...Qf5+?! 17 Qb3 Qxh1 18 Qc4 Qd5 returns to the main variation.
17 Qb3 Qxh1
17...d6?! 18 Qg1 Qe4 19 Qxe4 Qxe4 20 Qa5+ b6 21 Qxb6 axb6 22 Qxb6+ Qe7 23 Qa3 (or 23 Qa5? Qd7 24 Qg5) 23...Qc2 24 b3 Qxc3 25 Qb2 (after 25 Qg5? Qd7 26 Qa6, Brajović-Perović, Yugoslavia 1978, 26...Qe5! wins) 25...Qd2 26 Qad1 yields an edge for White, Gutman.
18 Qc4
18 Qa5+ b6 19 Qxa7 is met by 19...Qb5+ 20 Qc2 Qd5.
18...Qd5 19 Qf4 Qe8 20 a4 b6 21 Qaxb6 axb6 22 Qxb6+ Qe7 23 Qxh1 Qxh1 24 Qc5+ d6 25 Qxe8 Qd5

Black should win, Gutman.

Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qb5 Qb4+)
6 c3

A natural continuation, gaining time thanks to the attack on the bishop.

We consider three lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 6...Qc5
Sequel 2: 6...Qxe4+
Sequel 3: 6...Qa5?!

Sequel 1
6...Qc5
This move was preferred by Szymon Winawer in his game against Paulsen, Vienna 1882.

("At Vienna 1882, the strongest tournament held up to that time, Winawer achieved his greatest success, first equal with Steinitz (a play-off was drawn +1-1). In his games he was often adventurous (a "kill or cure" style, wrote Steinitz), but he could also play positionally", Hooper/Whylde, The Oxford Companion to Chess.)

"It is definitely bad", Botterill/Harding.
7 \(\text{We}2 \text{\&b}6\)

Alternatively:

I) 7...\(\text{\&f}6?!\) 8 \(\text{\&xc}7+\) (Kral-
Vyhidal, Czech Republic 1997, went 8 \(\text{\&d}2 \text{\&d}8\) 9 g3 \(\text{\&g}4\) 10 f3
\(\text{\&g}6\) 11 \(\text{\&b}3 \text{\&b}6\) 12 \(\text{\&e}3 \text{\&e}8\) 13
\(\text{\&g}2 \text{\&xe}3\) 14 \(\text{\&xe}3\) with increasing
pressure) 8...\(\text{\&d}8\) 9 \(\text{\&xa}8 \text{\&xe}4\)
(9...\(\text{\&e}8\) 10 \(\text{\&d}2 \text{\&xe}4\) 11 \(\text{\&xe}4\)
\(\text{\&xe}4\) fails in view of 12 \(\text{\&g}5+)\) 10
\(\text{\&e}3\) gives Black insufficient
compensation for his rook, Gutman;

II) 7...\(\text{\&d}8\) 8 \(\text{\&f}4 \text{\&b}6\) (8...\(\text{\&d}6\) can
be met by 9 e5??) 9 \(\text{\&d}2\) a6 10 \(\text{\&a}3\)
d6 11 \(\text{\&ac}4!\) (after 11 0-0-0 \(\text{\&c}6\)
12 \(\text{\&ac}4\) \(\text{\&a}7\) 13 h4, Thomas-
Kauperman, corr. 1988/90,
13...\(\text{\&g}7?!\) 14 \(\text{\&e}3\) 0-0 would have
given Black good counterplay)
11...\(\text{\&a}7\) 12 \(\text{\&e}3 \text{\&xe}3\) 13 \(\text{\&xe}3\)
\(\text{\&f}6\) 14 g3 0-0 15 \(\text{\&g}2\), and White
maintains a spatial advantage,
Gutman.

8 \(\text{\&e}3 \text{\&d}8\) 9 \(\text{\&xb}6 \text{axb}6\)

Sequel 2

(1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{\&f}3 \text{\&c}6\) 3 d4 exd4 4
\(\text{\&xd}4 \text{\&h}4\) 5 \(\text{\&b}5 \text{\&b}4+\) 6 c3)

6...\(\text{\&xe}4\+)

“In answer to 6 c3 Black would play
6...\(\text{\&xe}4\+) followed by 7...\(\text{\&a}5\)”,
Stelinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.
“Black could also consider
6...\(\text{\&xe}4\+\), although it is evident
that he runs a great risk”, Botterill/
Harding.

7 \(\text{\&e}2\)

7 \(\text{\&e}3?!\) \(\text{\&a}5\) 8 \(\text{\&d}2\) is probably
best, reaching a position after 5 \(\text{\&e}3\)
\(\text{\&xe}4\) 6 \(\text{\&b}5 \text{\&b}4+\) 7 c3 \(\text{\&a}5\) 8
\(\text{\&d}2\), covered in Part 2, Chapter 4,
Section 4, Sequel 6. 6 \(\textf\text c\text f\text e\text s\text f\text a\text b\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text a\text b\text c\text d\text e\text f\text g\text h\text i\text j\text k\text l\text m\text n\text o\text p\text q\text r\text s\text t\text u\text v\text w\text x\text y\text z\text 10 \(\text{\&g}4?!\)

10 g3 d6 11 \(\text{\&g}2 \text{\&f}6\) 12 \(\text{\&d}2\) 0-0
was approximately equal in
Paulsen-Winawer, Vienna 1882.

10...\(\text{\&f}8\) 11 \(\text{\&g}3\) d6 12 \(\text{\&d}2\)
White keeps a slight plus, Gutman.
Savarese-Candura, Corsica 1994) 13
\[ \text{Wxd4?! f6 (13...0-0 14 \text{\underline{\text{d3}}}) 14} \]
\[ \text{\underline{\text{d}}xf6 \text{gx}f6 15 \text{Wxf6 \underline{\text{d}}g6 16 \text{Wg7}} \]
\[ \text{\underline{\text{w}}e7 17 \text{Wh6 \underline{\text{w}}f8 18 Wh5 \underline{\text{b}}6 19} \]
\[ \text{\underline{\text{c}}4 \text{\underline{\text{w}}f6 (19...\text{Wxf4 20 \underline{\text{a}}ae1+ \underline{\text{d}}8} \]
\[ 21 \text{g3 \underline{\text{w}}f6 22 \underline{\text{d}}g5) 20 \underline{\text{a}}ae1+ (20} \]
\[ \text{\underline{\text{e}}5 \underline{\text{f}}8 21 \underline{\text{a}}ae1 \underline{\text{d}}8 22 \underline{\text{f}}7+ \underline{\text{xf}}7 23 \underline{\text{x}}f7 \underline{\text{xf}}7 24 \text{\underline{\text{g}}5+ \underline{\text{e}}7} \]
\[ 25 \underline{\text{x}}e7 \text{\underline{\text{w}}xe7 26 \text{\underline{\text{g}}8+ \underline{\text{e}}8 27} \]
\[ \underline{\text{g}}5+ leads to a draw by repetition) 20...\underline{\text{d}}8 21 \underline{\text{d}}g5 \text{c6 22} \underline{\text{f}}7+ \underline{\text{c}}7 \]
\[ 23 \underline{\text{x}}h8 \underline{\text{xh8 24 \text{\underline{\text{w}}h1 d5 25 \underline{\text{d}}3 \text{\underline{\text{g}}7 26 f4 is in White's favour,}} \]
\[ \text{Gutman;} \]
\[ \text{BIII 8...a6!? 9 \underline{\text{d}}a3!? (9 \underline{\text{d}}d4 \underline{\text{d}}xd4 10 \text{cxd4 \underline{\text{a}}f6 11 \underline{\text{c}}c3 \underline{\text{xc}}3 12 \text{bxc3} \]
\[ 0-0 13 \underline{\text{d}}d3 \text{\underline{\text{w}}h4 14 \underline{\text{a}}a3 d6 15 \underline{\text{b}}1 b5 16 c4 \underline{\text{b}}7 is less convincing, Philipp-Goldberg, corr. 1987) looks like a sensible way to play.} \]

Black has two possibilities:
A) 9...\underline{\text{e}}7 10 \underline{\text{c}}4 0-0 and then:
A1) 11 \text{\underline{\text{e}}1 d5 (11...\text{\underline{\text{w}}d5}?! 12 \text{\underline{\text{b}}bd2 \underline{\text{g}}g6 13 \underline{\text{f}}3 \underline{\text{b}}5 14 a4 \text{\underline{\text{e}}5} \]
\[ 15 b4 was winning for White in Szczbak-Jasak, Polen 1997) 12} \]
\[ \underline{\text{b}}bd2 \underline{\text{w}}g6 13 \underline{\text{a}}xa5 \underline{\text{a}}xa5 14 \underline{\text{f}}3 \text{\underline{\text{w}}d6 leads nowhere for White, Gutman;} \]
\[ A2) 11 \text{\underline{\text{b}}bd2 \underline{\text{w}}e6 12 \underline{\text{b}}3! is more exact, 12...\underline{\text{b}}6 13 \underline{\text{xb}}6 cxb6 14} \]
\[ \text{\underline{\text{e}}1 \underline{\text{w}}f6 15 \underline{\text{c}}3 yields White a clear plus, Gutman.} \]

B) 9...\underline{\text{b}}6 is to be preferred, with two examples:
B1) 10 \underline{\text{c}}4 \underline{\text{a}}7 11 \underline{\text{e}}1 \underline{\text{e}}7 12 \text{\underline{\text{b}}bd2 \underline{\text{w}}g6 (12...\text{\underline{\text{w}}h4}?! is well met by 13 g3 \underline{\text{w}}f6 14 \underline{\text{c}}e4) 13 \underline{\text{h}}5 \text{(Masquelier-Lustyk, corr. 1997, went} \]
\[ 13 \underline{\text{f}}3 \text{d6 14 \underline{\text{f}}4 0-0 0 15 \underline{\text{d}}3 \underline{\text{w}}h5 16 \underline{\text{g}}5 \underline{\text{xd}}1 17 \underline{\text{a}}xd1 \text{h6 18} \]
\[ \underline{\text{f}}3 \underline{\text{g}}4 19 \underline{\text{e}}2 b5 20 \underline{\text{e}}3 \underline{\text{e}}6 \]
\[ 21 b3 g5 0-1) 13...\underline{\text{w}}f5 14 \underline{\text{c}}e4 0-0 appears fine for Black, Gutman; } \]
\[ B2) 10 \underline{\text{d}}2!? \underline{\text{w}}h4 (not 10...\underline{\text{w}}g6 11 \underline{\text{h}}5 \underline{\text{f}}5 12 \underline{\text{a}}c4 \underline{\text{a}}7 13\]
\[ \underline{\text{d}}e4)! 11 \underline{\text{a}}c4 \underline{\text{a}}7 12 \underline{\text{f}}3! \]
\[ (instead of 12 \text{\underline{\text{d}}3 \underline{\text{w}}d8 13 \underline{\text{d}}3 \underline{\text{e}}7 14 \underline{\text{f}}4 \underline{\text{d}}6 15 \text{\underline{\text{e}}1 0-0 16} \]
\[ \underline{\text{h}}7+?! \underline{\text{h}}xh7 17 \underline{\text{g}}5+ \underline{\text{g}}8 18\]
\[ \underline{\text{w}}5 \underline{\text{f}}5 19 g4 \underline{\text{g}}6 and Black won easily in Musil-Barle, Portoroz/\]
\[ Ljubljana 1975) 12...\underline{\text{f}}6 (12... \underline{\text{e}}7 would be a grave error in view of 13 \underline{\text{e}}4 d5 14 \underline{\text{g}}5) 13\]
\[ \underline{\text{e}}1+ \underline{\text{f}}8 14 \underline{\text{w}}2 d5?! (after 14...\underline{\text{h}}6 15 g3 \underline{\text{w}}h3 16 \underline{\text{e}}4 \underline{\text{e}}4 17\]
\[ \underline{\text{e}}4 \underline{\text{we}}6 18 \underline{\text{f}}4 d6 19 \underline{\text{d}}3 \underline{\text{d}}7\]
\[ 20 \underline{\text{ad}}1 Black's position might not inspire sympathy) 15 g3 \underline{\text{w}}h3 16\]
\[ \underline{\text{xd}}5 \underline{\text{g}}4 17 \underline{\text{g}}2 \underline{\text{w}}h5 18 \underline{\text{f}}1 \underline{\text{f}}5 19 \underline{\text{f}}3 secure White good prospects, Gutman.} \]

9 \underline{\text{d}}2!
Less challenging are:
I) 9 \underline{\text{f}}3 \underline{\text{w}}g6 10 \underline{\text{f}}4 (10 \underline{\text{e}}1 a6\]
\[ 11 \underline{\text{w}}2, Hager-Neldner, Germany]
1997, could have been well answered by 11...0-0) 10...d6 11 \(\text{e}1\) 0-0 12 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{w}h6\) 13 \(\text{d}2\) a6 14 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 15 \(\text{a}c4\) \(\text{a}7\) 16 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 17 \(\text{x}c6\) bxc6 18 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 19 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{x}g3\) 20 \(\text{w}xg3\) \(\text{b}6\) with advantage for Black, Dahms-Wagner, Kerkwitz 1996;

II) 9 a4 a6 10 \(\text{d}5\) a3 0-0 (or 10...\(\text{b}6\) 11 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{a}7\) 12 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{w}h4\) 13 \(\text{f}3\)) 11 \(\text{c}4\) d5 12 \(\text{x}a5\) \(\text{x}a5\) 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{w}f5\) 14 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}6\) 15 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 16 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{e}5\) 17 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{c}6\) 18 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{w}4\) 19 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{w}h4\)! (more precise than 19...\(\text{w}g6\) 20 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{a}d8\) 21 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}4\) 22 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{f}e8\) 23 b3 \(\text{d}6\) 24 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{w}f6\) 25 \(\text{w}c2\) g6 26 b4, Khamrakulova-Zakhareenko, Szeged 1994) 20 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{a}d8\), when White has nothing for the pawn, Gutman;

III) 9 b4 a6 (not 9...\(\text{b}6\)?) 10 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{w}h4\) 11 \(\text{c}4\) (c4) 10 \(\text{d}d6+\)!? (10 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{w}h4\) with 11...0-0 to follow, was already mentioned in the \textit{Deutsche Schachzeitung}, 1846) 10...\(\text{cxd6}\) 11 bxa5 seems more critical.

A) 9...\(\text{w}e5\) 10 \(\text{d}d2\)? (10 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{w}f6\) 11 \(\text{e}3\) a6 12 \(\text{d}4\) 0-0 13 \(\text{c}2\) d5 14 \(\text{w}d2\) \(\text{w}d6\) 15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{w}d8\) 16 \(\text{x}c6\) \(\text{x}c6\) 17 \(\text{d}3\) g6 was satisfactory for Black in Mzychuk-Batsiashvili, Tallin 1997) 10...a6 (10...0-0 is premature due to 11 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{w}f6\) 12 \(\text{e}4\)) 11 \(\text{d}4\) d5 (11...\(\text{d}xd4\) 12 \(\text{c}4\)) 12 \(\text{d}c6\) bxc6 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{w}d6\) 14 \(\text{w}a4\) \(\text{a}b6\) 15 \(\text{e}1\) yields White good attacking chances, Gutman;

B) 9...\(\text{w}h4\)!? 10 b4 a6 (10...\(\text{b}6\)! is bad because of 11 \(\text{e}3\) 0-0 12 \(\text{x}b6\) \(\text{x}b6\) 13 \(\text{d}d6\) 11 \(\text{d}d6+\) (11 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{a}b6\) 12 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{a}7\) 13 \(\text{b}d2\) d5) 11...\(\text{c}xd6\) 12 bxa5 0-0 13 \(\text{d}2\) d5 14 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{w}f6\) appears equal, Gutman.

9...\(\text{w}g6\)

De Vita-Smolin, San Giorgio 1998, went 9...\(\text{w}f5\) 10 \(\text{c}4\) 0-0 11 \(\text{x}a5\) \(\text{x}a5\) 12 \(\text{x}c7\) \(\text{b}8\) 13 \(\text{w}d6\) with a miserable position for Black.

10 \(\text{c}4\)

10 \(\text{h}4\)? d5 11 \(\text{f}3\) a6 12 h5 \(\text{w}xh5\) 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{w}g6\) 14 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{x}d4\) 15 \(\text{c}xd4\) 0-0 was excellent for Black, Bethe-Nogy, Germany 1990.

10...a6 11 \(\text{d}4\)

11 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{w}f6\) 12 \(\text{ba}3\) d5!? (12...b5 13 \(\text{x}a5\) \(\text{x}a5\) 14 \(\text{e}1\) 0-0 15 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 16 \(\text{c}2\) d6 17 a4 \(\text{b}4\) 18 \(\text{x}a4\) \(\text{f}5\) 19 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 20 \(\text{c}4\) gave White the advantage in Gibris-Haller, Germany 1995) 13 \(\text{x}a5\) \(\text{x}a5\) 14 \(\text{e}1\) 0-0 15 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 16 \(\text{w}h5\) h6 17 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{e}6\), and White’s initiative has fizzled out, Gutman.

11...0-0 12 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}5\) 13 \(\text{w}f3\) \(\text{x}d4\) 14 \(\text{c}xd4\) \(\text{b}6\) 15 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}e6\) 16 \(\text{w}d5\) \(\text{w}f7\) 17 \(\text{e}b6\) \(\text{x}b6\) 18 \(\text{w}d6\)!?

More precise than 18 \(\text{w}xh7+\) \(\text{c}xh7\) 19 \(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{f}6\) 20 \(\text{f}4\) d6 21 \(\text{b}x\) with a plus for White in Krulich-Hresc, Munich 1985.

18...\(\text{b}5\) 19 \(\text{f}4\)

White stands clearly better, Gutman.

Contrary to Bozidar Ivanović, after 11...0-0 12 \(\text{a}3\) d5 13 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{w}h4\) 14 \(\text{f}3\) d6 15 \(\text{x}d6\) \(\text{e}6\) 16 \(\text{w}b3\) \(\text{x}a5\) 17 \(\text{w}b6\) \(\text{c}4\) 18 \(\text{w}b4\) \(\text{f}e8\) 19 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 20 \(\text{w}xh7\) \(\text{f}5\) Black is no worse, Gutman;

IV) 9 \(\text{d}3\) leaves Black a choice:
Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\(a\)xd4 Wh4 5 \(b\)b5 \(b\)b4+ 6 c3)
6...\(a\)a5!!?

“Since part of the idea behind Paulsen’s 5...\(a\)b4+ is that after 6 c3 
Black gets the chance to defend his 
c7-pawn by dropping his bishop 
back to a5”, Botterill/ Harding.

“While 6 c3 \(a\)a5 fits in a little too 
comfortably with Black’s plans”, 
Wells.

7 \(d\)d2

There are other continuations:
I) 7 \(d\)d3 a6!? (“Boris Chaplinsky 
considers only 7...\(f\)f6 with better 
prospects for Black”, Botterill/ 
Harding, however, 8 g3 Wh3 9 
\(d\)d2 a6 10 \(a\)a3 0-0 11 \(f\)f1 We6 12 
\(g\)2 b5 13 0-0 \(b\)b8 14 \(c\)c2 \(b\)7 
was equal in Muenz-Bruder, corr. 
1987) 8 \(a\)a5a3 \(b\)b6 9 0-0 \(e\)e5!?
(9...d6 10 \(a\)c4 \(a\)a7 is too passive, 
11 \(b\)bd2 \(g\)4 12 \(f\)f3 We7 13 \(e\)e3 
\(x\)xf3 14 \(x\)xf3 \(e\)e5 15 \(e\)e2 \(x\)xd3 
16 \(x\)xd3 0-0-0 17 \(d\)d5 with an 
derg for White, Motlova- 
Vecerkova, Chrudim 1993) 10 h3 
d5! 11 exd5 \(x\)xh3 and Black won 
quickly, Brychta-Syrnak, Pilsen 
1997;
II) 7 \(e\)e2 a6!? (7...\(x\)xe4?! 8 0-0 re-
aches a position covered in Seque

2) 8 \(a\)a5a3 \(a\)b6 9 0-0 \(f\)f6 10 \(c\)c4 
\(a\)a7 11 \(b\)bd2 d6 (11...\(x\)xe4?!! 12 
\(x\)xe4 \(x\)xe4 is very risky as 13 \(d\)d3 
Wh4 14 \(e\)e1+ \(d\)d8 15 \(f\)f3 shows) 
12 \(f\)f3 \(x\)xe4 13 \(d\)d3 \(x\)e7 14 \(e\)e1
\(e\)6 seems to offer Black reason-
able prospects, Gutman;
III) 7 \(a\)e3 gives Black a choice:
A) 7...a6? (“However, Black can 
strengthen his play by interpolating 
7...a6 here”, Botterill/Harding) 8 
\(d\)d4 \(f\)f6 (8...\(x\)xe4 is well be met 
by 9 \(d\)d2 We7 10 \(c\)c4) 9 \(f\)f5 
\(x\)xe4 10 \(x\)xg7+ \(f\)f8 11 \(h\)h5 \(g\)4 
12 \(d\)d2 \(a\)xe3 13 \(a\)xe4 \(x\)xd1 14
\(x\)xd1 d6 15 \(e\)e6 \(e\)e6 16 \(d\)d3 \(a\)5 
17 0-0 \(b\)b6 (17...\(x\)xd3 18 \(x\)xd3 
\(c\)c4 19 \(e\)e3) 18 b3 \(g\)4 19 \(x\)xh7+ 
\(e\)7 20 h3 \(e\)e5 21 \(a\)5f6 gave 
White a clear advantage in Santo 
Roman-Bryson, Graz 1981;
B) 7...\(f\)f6! is probably best, reac-
ching a position after 5 \(a\)e3 \(f\)f6 6 
\(a\)b5 \(a\)b4+ 7 c3, covered in Part 2, 
Chapter 4, Section 3, Sequel 2.
IV) 7 \(f\)f3 seems more enterprising.
played in Sulashvili-Aleksyev, Rimavska Sobota 1996, when 12 \( \text{D}a4 \) would have secured an edge for White) 10 \( \text{D}a4 \) \( \text{a}7 \) with approximate equality, Gutman.

7...a6

"The annoying knight at b5 is immediately driven back", Hall.

8 \( \text{D}a3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 9 \( g3 \)

9 \( \text{W}e2 \) d6 10 \( g3 \) \( \text{W}g4! \) 11 \( f3 \) \( \text{W}e6 \)

12 \( \text{D}d4 \) \( \text{a}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 14 \( \text{Dxe}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 15 \( \text{g}2 \) is quite a common alternative.

\[ \text{C2} \ \text{b}8 \ 26 \ \text{g}1!? \) (after 26 \( \text{D}d3 \) \( \text{xe}4! \) 27 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 28 \( \text{D}e3 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 29 \( \text{W}e1 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 30 \( d2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 31 \( \text{W}f1 \)

\( \text{xe}4 \) 32 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{ff}1 \) 33 \( \text{W}e2 \), Radulov-G. Garcia, Torremolinos 1975, 33...\( \text{exd}5!? \) 34 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 35 \( \text{D}d1 \) \( \text{xa}2+ \) 36 \( \text{D}d2 \) \( \text{f}7 \) would have been winning for Black) 26...\( \text{W}g4 \) 27 \( \text{D}e3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 28 \( \text{xe}3 \), and the chances are level, Gutman.

9...\( \text{W}e7 \)

Glinz-Grube, corr. 1991, went 9...\( \text{W}c6 \) 10 \( \text{W}e2 \) d6 11 \( \text{D}d4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 12 \( f4 \) \( \text{D}c4 \) 13 \( \text{D}x4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 15 \( \text{D}xe3 \) \( \text{D}e7 \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{D}d7 \) 17 \( \text{D}d5 \) \( \text{D}xd5 \) 18 \( \text{exd}5+ \) \( \text{D}d8 \) 19 \( \text{W}f2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 21 \( \text{xe}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

22 \( \text{f}3 \) b6 23 g4 \( \text{D}d3 \) 24 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( \text{b}5 \)

25 \( \text{e}4 \) g6 26 g5 with advantage to White.

10 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{D}f6 \) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \( \text{D}d4 \)

\( \text{a}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}3 \)

"White appears to have the initiative here, but it may well be the wrong impression", Botterill/Harding.

Black has to try:

A) 15...0-0 16 \( f4! \) (16 \( \text{D}ac2?! \) \( f5 \)

17 \( \text{h}h3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 18 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 19 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 20 0-0-0 \( \text{ae}8 \) was better for Black in Ares-Bernardino, corr. 1979) 16...\( \text{D}d7 \) 17 0-0 with a slight plus for White, Gutman;

B) 15...h5!? 16 \( c4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17 \( \text{d}5 \)

0-0-0 18 0-0-0 \( h4 \) 19 \( f4 \) \( f5 \) 20 \( \text{xe}1 \) \( hxg3 \) 21 \( hxg3 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) (the immediate 21...\( \text{b}8?! \) 22 \( \text{W}f2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 23 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) is more promising) 22 \( \text{xe}4 \)

\( \text{f}5 \) 23 \( \text{W}f2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 24 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{de}8 \) 25
15 f3 $\square$e5 16 $\triangleleft$f2 $\square$e6 17 $\triangleleft$e3 $\$a$7 18 $\$c$e2 $\$e$8 19 $\$d$4 $\$d$7 causes no problems for Black, Gutman.

15...$\$d$7

15...$\$g$4 appears premature.

We examine:

A) 16 $\$f$4 $\$a$7 17 $\$e$2 $\$e$6 18 $\$a$e1 $\$c$e5 ("Black’s superior piece coordination and pressure along the a7-g1 diagonal give him the better play; also the knight at a3 doesn’t make a pretty picture", Hall) 19 $\$a$5?! (19 $\$e$3 was better)

19...$\$xf$2! 20 $\$xf$2 $\$g$4 21 $\$e$e2 $\$g$5 22 $\$c$1 $\$xf$2 23 $\$xf$2 $\$f$5 24 $\$d$5c4 $\$f$4 25 $\$g$xf4 $\$g$xf4 26 $\$h$1 $\$h$4!

27 $\$f$3 $\$h$8 28 $\$w$3d3 (28 $\$w$wd2 $\$b$5 29 $\$a$5 $\$e$3) 28...$\$f$6 29 $\$c$2 $\$g$8 30 $\$d$4 $\$f$6 31 $\$xf$4 $\$x$g$2 0-1, Radulov-Trapl, Decin 1976.

B) 16 $\$d$4!? $\$g$e5 (or 16...$\$c$e5 17 $\$f$4 $\$x$e4 18 $\$x$e4 $\$e$6 19 $\$e$3 $\$x$e3 20 $\$x$e3) 17 $\$f$4 $\$x$e4 18 $\$x$e4 $\$x$e4 19 $\$x$e4 $\$a$7 20 $\$w$3 $\$f$6 21 $\$f$1d1 $\$f$8 22 $\$e$3 $\$c$6 23 $\$f$5, and Black has some difficulties in activating his two bishops, which are currently doing very little, Gutman.

16 $\$d$1 $\$e$8

The position is balanced, Gutman.

---

Section 3

(1 e4 e5 2 $\$f$3 $\$c$6 3 d4 exd4 4 $\$x$d$4 $\$h$4 5 $\$b$5 $\$b$4+)

6 $\$d$2?!

"The only correct reply", Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

"It would seem to be the most logical choice. We favour this interposition: it appears to be stronger for White than 6 $\$c$1c3, and its availability is thus one of the reasons for preferring 5 $\$b$5 to 5 $\$c$3", Botterill/Harding.

"More logical, as it prevents 6...$\$a$5", Wells.

Now there is a division:

Sequel 1: 6...$\$c$5 (6...$\$x$2d2, 6...$\$f$6)

Sequel 2: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 (7 $\$w$e2) 7...$\$x$2d2+

Sequel 3: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$x$g$2

Sequel 4: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$e$5 8 $\$c$1c3 (8 f4)

Sequel 5: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$e$5 8 0-0

Sequel 6: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$d$8 8 0-0 $\$f$6 (8...a6)

Sequel 7: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$d$8 8 0-0 $\$g$e7

Sequel 8: 6...$\$w$xe4+ 7 $\$e$2 $\$d$8 8 0-0 $\$x$2d2+ 9 $\$x$2d2 $\$g$6 (9...$\$w$e8, 9...$\$e$5, 9...$\$h$4)
Sequel 9:  6...\texttt{#xe4}+ 7 \texttt{#e2} \texttt{#d8} 8 0-0 \texttt{#xd2}+ 9 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#f4} 10 c4, \textit{Vienna Variation}
Sequel 10:  6...\texttt{#xe4}+ 7 \texttt{#e2} \texttt{#d8} 8 0-0 \texttt{#xd2}+ 9 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#f4} 10 a4, \textit{MacDonnell Variation}
Sequel 11:  6...\texttt{#xe4}+ 7 \texttt{#e2} \texttt{#d8} 8 0-0 \texttt{#xd2}+ 9 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#f4} 10 g3 (10 \texttt{#b3})
Sequel 12:  6...\texttt{#xe4}+ 7 \texttt{#e2} \texttt{#d8} 8 0-0 \texttt{#xd2}+ 9 \texttt{#xd2}, \textit{Blackburne Variation}, 9...\texttt{#f6} (9...\texttt{#h4})
Sequel 13:  6...\texttt{#xe4}+ 7 \texttt{#e2} \texttt{#d8} 8 0-0 \texttt{#xd2}+ 9 \texttt{#xd2} a6

Sequel 1

6...\texttt{#c5}

"This counter-attacking withdrawal seems very satisfactory for Black", \textit{Hall}.
We consider here two other possibilities:
I) 6...\texttt{#f6} is an intriguing response.

And now:

A) 7 \texttt{#c1c3} will transpose into the variation 5 \texttt{#c3} \texttt{#b4} 6 \texttt{#b5} \texttt{#f6} 7 \texttt{#d2} — Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 1; 172
B) 7 \texttt{#d3}!? \texttt{#d8} 8 g3 (8 0-0 \texttt{#c5} 9 g3 \texttt{#h3} 10 \texttt{#g5} \texttt{#e5} 11 \texttt{#d2} h5 12 \texttt{#h4} \texttt{#g8} 13 \texttt{#f3} \texttt{#eg4} 14 \texttt{#d2} a6 15 \texttt{#c3} g5 16 \texttt{#xg5} \texttt{#xh2} 17 \texttt{#f4} \texttt{#xf3}+ 18 \texttt{#xf3} \texttt{#e8} 19 \texttt{#f4} h4 20 \texttt{#g2} d6 gave Black the advantage in Gerasimov-Ninov, corr. 1992.

C) 7 \texttt{#xc7}+!? is the sharpest method of meeting the new variation, after 7...\texttt{#d8} 8 \texttt{#xa8} \texttt{#xe4} (8...\texttt{#e8} 9 \texttt{#d3}) 9 g3 \texttt{#f6} 10 f3 \texttt{#xd2} 11 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#e8}+ 12 \texttt{#f2} \texttt{#d4}+ 13 \texttt{#g2} \texttt{#xd2}+ (or 13...\texttt{#xd2} 14 \texttt{#d3} \texttt{#e3} 15 \texttt{#f1}) 14 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#xd2} 15 \texttt{#d1} \texttt{#g5} 16 \texttt{#b5} White is clearly better as Black has no time to pick up the knight on a8, \textit{Gutman}.

II) 6...\texttt{#xd2}+ 7 \texttt{#xd2} \texttt{#d8} 8 \texttt{#g4}! g6 9 \texttt{#g3} d6 10 \texttt{#c3} \texttt{#f6} 11 0-0-0 a6 12 \texttt{#d4} \texttt{#xd4} 13 \texttt{#xd4} \texttt{#e6} 14 \texttt{#c4} \texttt{#xc4} 15 \texttt{#xc4} \texttt{#d7} (15...\texttt{#e7} 16 \texttt{#a5}) 16 e5 \texttt{#xe5} 17 \texttt{#xe5} \texttt{#g7} 18 \texttt{#h1} \texttt{#e7} 19 \texttt{#c6} 1-0, S.Lalic-Kovacs, Budapest 1992.

7 \texttt{#f3}!!

7 \texttt{#e2} is the traditional reply.

Black has tried:

A) 7...\texttt{#d4}?! 8 \texttt{#xd4} \texttt{#xd4} 9 \texttt{#c3} (9 \texttt{#c3} \texttt{#b6} 10 \texttt{#xg7} fails to 10...\texttt{#g5} 11 \texttt{#xh8} \texttt{#c1}+ 12 \texttt{#d1} \texttt{#xf2}+) 9...d6 10 g3 \texttt{#g4} 11 f3 \texttt{#c6} 12 \texttt{#c4} (12 \texttt{#d5}? \texttt{#b6} 13 \texttt{#e3} c6 14 \texttt{#xb6} cxd5 15 \texttt{#d4} also looks very good) 12...\texttt{#d6} 13 0-0-0 \texttt{#e7} 14 \texttt{#d5} \texttt{#c6} 15 \texttt{#c3} \texttt{#f6} 16 \texttt{#e3} \texttt{#f7} 17 \texttt{#c4} and White has pressure, Bargel-Martinkova, Klatovy 1996;

B) 7...d6!? seems more interesting.
leads to a rather amusing draw, Horvath-Wells, Budapest 1997”, Wells 9...\f6 (“the point of the check on move five; the queen is denied the square d2”, Wells) 10 g3 \h5.

“This was my own idea. Sadly it is time to put it gently to sleep”, Wells.

White has two main replies:
B1) 8 g3 is less ambitious, when Black has a choice:
B1a) 8...\e7 9 \c1c3 \f6 10 \g5! (after 10 \d5? \xd5 11 exd5 \e5 12 h3 a6 13 \xc7+ \xc7 14 f4 0-0 15 \xe5 \e8 16 \c3 \b4 17 \xb4 \xe5 18 0-0-0 \xe2 19 \xe2 \b6 20 \c3 \e3+ 21 \d2 \f5 22 g4 \xc2 23 \f1 \d6 Black won easily in Weide-Wells, London 1989) 10...\d4 11 0-0 \e6 12 \xf6 (not 12 f4? \g4 13 \xf6 \xe2 14 \xe7 \xd1 15 \h4 \f3, indicated by King) 12...\g6 13 \d5 \xd5 14 exd5 \e2 15 \xe2 \a6 16 \d4 with a pleasant position for White, Gutman;
B1b) 8...\d8!? might be more consequent, 9 \e3 \xe3 10 \xe3 \f6 11 \c1c3 0-0 12 0-0-0 \e8 13 \g2 (13 \f3 \e7 14 g4 a6 reaches a position after 5...\c5 6 \e2 \d8 7 \e3 d6 8 \d2 \xe3 9 \xe3 \f6, covered in Part 3, Chapter 3, Section 1, Sequel 6) 13...\d7 14 h3 a6 15 \d4 \xd4 16 \xd4 \c6 1/2-1/2, Barbero-Wells, Graz 1991.

B2) 8 \xc7+ \d8 9 \xa8 (“9 g3 \f6 10 \c3 \h6 11 \d2 \f6 “White should better refrain from this line”, Hall.

“It is difficult to get a handle on the positions that arise — they are so far away from anything that is normal, that reference to similar positions doesn’t come into it; it simply isn’t possible. In many variations Black gives up a whole rook for the attack, while White has a wobbly king”, Daniel King, English Defence.

We examine:
B2a) 11 \c4 \f6!? (11...\e5 was suggested by Russian Chess Report, nevertheless, after 12 \c3 \f3+ 13 \d1 \f6 14 \a5+ \e7 15 \c+ \d7 16 \c1 \xa8 17 \c3 \xd2 18 \xd2 \f2 19 \d5+ \f8 20 \xd6+ \g8 21 \d3 Black has insufficient compensation for the exchange) 12 \g2 (12 \d3 \e8) 12...\e8 13 h3 (13 0-0 \e2 14 \b3 \xf1 15 \f3!? \g4 16 \xg4 \xg4 17 \xb7 \xf2+ 18 \xf1 \h3+ 19 \xe2 \h5+ leads to a draw by perpetual) 13...\d4 14 \xe4 b5! (14...f5 15 \c3) 15 \d3 (or 15
\[ \text{\textit{Bf1 \textit{xe4+ 16 \textit{e3 \textit{f3 17 \textit{c3 \textit{e7 and Black has the initiative)}}}}}

15...\textit{f5 16 0-0 \textit{fxe4 17 \textit{hxg4 \textit{wh3 18 \textit{g5+ \textit{c8 19 \textit{c3 e3 20 \textit{xe3 \textit{exe3 21 \textit{fxe3 \textit{w}xg3+ 22 \textit{h1 \textit{wh}3+ forces a draw, Gutman;}}}}}}}

\textbf{B2b)} 11 \textit{w}d3 was recommended by Wells.
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Black now has two options:

\textbf{B2b1)} 11...\textit{d}d4 12 \textit{h}3 (12 \textit{g}2 \textit{xe2 13 \textit{a}5+ \textit{c}8 14 \textit{w}c3 \textit{f}3 15 \textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3+ 16 \textit{fl} \textit{f}6) 12...\textit{f}6!? (12...\textit{f}3+ “looks dangerous enough, but after 13 \textit{d}1 \textit{e}5+ 14 \textit{hxg4 \textit{wh1 15 \textit{we2 \textit{exg4 16 \textit{e}1 Black has no real follow-up, and White’s material advantage is too serious”, Wells) 13 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}2 14 \textit{w}c3 \textit{exe4 15 \textit{exe4 \textit{e}8 16 \textit{e}3 (16 \textit{g}5+ \textit{w}xg5 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{we7!)}}}

16...\textit{exe4 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7!? (17...\textit{b}5 18 \textit{g}4 \textit{w}d5 19 \textit{g}1 \textit{f}3+ 20 \textit{xf}3 \textit{b}4 21 \textit{wd2 \textit{xd2+ 22 \textit{xd}2 is less convincing) 18 \textit{c}1 \textit{b}5 19 \textit{g}4 \textit{wh4 20 \textit{d}1 \textit{exe3 (20...\textit{e}2+ 21 \textit{xe1 \textit{b}5 would have drawn) 21 \textit{exe3 \textit{exe2+ 22 \textit{e}1 \textit{exe2+ 23 \textit{xe}2 \textit{exe3 24 \textit{fxe3 \textit{w}g3 25 \textit{d}3 \textit{w}x}3+ 26 \textit{c}2 \textit{b}4 27 \textit{c}4 \textit{w}e4+ 28 \textit{b}3 b5 29 \textit{xb}4 bx4 bx4 30 \textit{md}1 \textit{d}7 31 \textit{c}7 c3+ 32 \textit{xc}3 \textit{xc}7 gives Black a fine endgame, Gutman;}}}}}

\textbf{B2b2)} 11...\textit{f}6!? is even better.
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12 \textit{e}3 (or 12 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}5 13 \textit{w}c3 \textit{f}3 14 0-0 \textit{exe4 15 \textit{a}5+ \textit{d}7 16 \textit{c}7+ \textit{e}6) 12...\textit{e}5 13 \textit{c}3 \textit{f}3+ 14 \textit{d}1 \textit{exe4 15 \textit{w}a5+ (15 \textit{w}xg7 \textit{e}8 16 \textit{h}3 \textit{exe3 17 \textit{fxe3 \textit{c}5) 15...\textit{e}7 16 \textit{c}7+ \textit{e}6 17 \textit{d}3 \textit{w}d5 18 \textit{h}3 \textit{exe3 19 \textit{fxe3 \textit{f}2+ 20 \textit{c}1 \textit{xd}3+ 21 \textit{cx}d3 \textit{c}8 22 \textit{hxg4 \textit{xc}7+ 23 \textit{xc}7 \textit{xd}3, and White looks rather helpless, Gutman.}

“I do not present this as an answer to all Black’s problems, but it is evidence that there is far more to the rook sacrifice than meets the eye”, King.
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7...\textit{b}6 8 \textit{d}4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 could be answered by 9 \textit{c}3! \textit{xc}3+ (9...\textit{f}6 10 \textit{e}5 \textit{e}7 11 \textit{d}3 \textit{h}6 12 0-0 0-0 13 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}6 14 \textit{h}3) 10 \textit{xc}3 \textit{f}6 11 \textit{d}3 0-0 12 \textit{w}g3 \textit{w}xg3 13
hgx3 c6 (13...a6 14 Qd5) 14 0-0-0 Qg4 15 Qd2 h6 16 Qe2 with an edge for White, Gutman.
8 Qe3!
8 Qc3 Qf6 9 Qd2 a6 10 Qa3 d6!? (after 10...Qg4 11 g3 Qg5 12 h3! Qxf2+ 13 Qe2 d5 14 hxg4 Qxg4 15 Qxf2 Qxf3 16 Qxf3 White has fair compensation for his queen) 11 Qd3 Qg4! (11...Qe5, Berenyi-Schenkerik, Balaton 1996, is inaccurate due to 12 Qg3!? Qxg3 13 hxg3) 12 g3 Qh6 favours Black, Gutman.
8...Qa5+
We have reached, by a different move order, a position after 5...Qc5
6 Qf3 Qb6 7 Qe3 Qa5+, which is covered in Part 3, Chapter 3, Section 2, Sequel 2. 140

Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Qh4 5 Qb5 Qb4+ 6 Qd2)
6...Qxe4+

This move ("suitable for the more adventurous players", Hall) represents the main continuation.
7 Qe2
7 Qe2 Qxe2+ 8 Qxe2 is somehow a strange decision; after 8...Qd8
(8...Qxd2+ 9 Qxd2 Qd8 10 0-0 Qf6 11 Qf3?! Qe5 12 Qe1 d6 13 Qad1 Qe8 14 Qe3 Qxf3+ 15 Qxf3
Qxe3 16 fxe3 Qg4 gave Black the advantage in Ewert-Chomicki, corr. 1992) 9 a3 Qxd2+ 10 Qxd2 a6 11 Qc3 Qf6 12 0-0-0 d6 13 h3 Qe8?! 14 Qhe1 Qe5 15 Qf3 Qd7 16 Qde4
Qxe4 17 Qxe4 Qxe4 18 Qxe4 Qe7 19 Qc5+ Qe8 20 Qxe7+ Qxe7 21 Qd3 Qe8 Black was clearly better in Dittrich-Harju, corr. 1978.
7...Qxd2+ 8 Qxd2!
8 Qxd2 was indicated by David Bronstein.

With this daring move White provokes more complications.

Black has two possibilities:
A) 8...Qe5 and then:
A1) 9 f4 Qxb2 10 0-0 achieves nothing due to 10...Qd8! (instead of
10...Qxa1? 11 Qc3 Qxf1+ 12 Qxf1 Qd8 13 Qd5, Bronstein) 11
Qc3 Qc4 12 Qh1 Qf6, Gutman;
A2) 9 Qc3! looks like a better chance, 9...Qce7 10 0-0-0 a6 11 f4
Qc5 12 Qe4 Qc6 13 Qbc3 Qf6 14
Qf3 0-0 15 Qhe1 yields White considerable pressure, Gutman.
B) 8...Qxg2! is the critical response, 9 Qxc7+(or 9 Qf1 Qxh2 10 Qg5
\( \text{Qe7} 11 \text{Qd2} \text{Qd} 8 12 \text{Wxg7} \text{We5} \)

9...\( \text{Qd} 8 \) 10 \( \text{Wd} 5 \text{Wxd} 5 11 \text{Qxd} 5 \text{Qe7} 12 \text{Qxe7} \text{Qxe7} 13 \text{Qc3} \text{Qd} 8 \\
14 0-0-0 \text{Qf} 8 \text{gives Black a plus, Gutman.} \\
8...\text{Wxg2} \\
There is only a choice of evils:
I) “If 8...\text{Wf} 4 the answer is 9 g3”, Steinitz, International Chess Magazine, 1885;
II) “8...\text{We} 5 9 \text{Qc} 4 and wins, for if 9...\text{Wxb5} his queen will be lost by 10 \text{Qd} 6+”, Steinitz.
9 \text{Qf3} \text{Wh} 3 \\
Jahnz-Ries, Germany 1998, went 9...\text{Wg5} 10 \text{Qxc7+} \text{Qd8} 11 \text{Qxa8} \\
\text{Qf6} 12 \text{Qc} 4 \text{Qe8}+ 13 \text{Qe3} \text{Wf4} 14 \\
\text{Qxc6 bxc6} 15 \text{Wd2} \text{Wf3} 16 \text{Qg1} \\
with a winning position for White.

10 \text{Qxc7+!}?

White has two alternatives, which are worth exploring:
I) 10 \text{Qxc6 bxc6} 11 \text{Qxc7+} \text{Qd8} 12 \\
\text{Qxa8} \text{Qf6} 13 \text{Wf3} (“well known to be unsound for Black”, Wells) \\
13...\text{Qe8}+ 14 \text{Qd1} \text{Qe4}?! (improving on 14...\text{We6}?! 15 c3 d5 16 \text{Cc2} \\
\text{Wf5}+ 17 \text{Qb3} \text{Wxf3} 18 \text{Qxf3} \text{Qb7} \\
19 \text{Qae1} \text{Qe4} 20 \text{Qhg1} \text{Qxa8}?! 21 \\
\text{Qxg7} \text{Qf8} 22 \text{Qe5} \text{Qe7} 23 \text{Qxh7} \\
\text{Qd6} 24 \text{Qxf7+} \text{Qd7} 25 \text{Qg5+} 1-0, \\
Gallagher-Costa, Bern 1991) 15 \\
\text{Wf4} \text{Qg4}+ 16 \text{Qxg4} \text{Qxf2+} 17 \text{Qc1} \\
\text{Qxg4} 18 \text{Qb3} (or 18 \text{Qc} 4 \text{d5} 19 \\
\text{Qd6} \text{Qe2} 20 \text{Qxf7+} \text{Qe7} 21 \text{Qg5} \\
\text{Qe3}) 18...\text{g6}?! 19 \text{h3} \text{Qe3} 20 \text{Qe1} \\
f5 21 \text{Qa5} \text{f4} 22 \text{b4} \text{Qa6} 23 \text{a4} \text{Qc8}, \\
and Black’s position is quite acceptable, Gutman;
II) 10 \text{We2+}!? \text{Qd8} 11 0-0-0 \text{We6} \\
12 \text{Wd3}! is a lively continuation; \\
White prefers to play for the attack.

Sziebert-Kirjak, Budapest 1995, 
continued 12...a6 (12...\text{Qf6} 13 \text{Qhe1} \\
\text{Wxa2} fails due to 14 \text{Qxc6 bxc6} 15 \\
\text{Wg3}! \text{Qe8} 16 \text{Qxe8}+) 13 \text{Qhe1} \\
\text{Wxa2} 14 \text{Qxc7} \text{Qa1}+ (14...\text{Qxc7} is \\
bad because of 15 \text{Qxc6 bxc6} 16 \\
\text{Qb3} \text{Qf6} 17 \text{Qg3}) 15 \text{Qb1} \text{Qxc7} \\
16 \text{Wd6+} \text{Qb6} 17 \text{Qxc6 bxc6} (or \\
17...\text{dxc6} 18 \text{Qd8+} \text{Qa7} 19 \text{Qd4}+) \\
18 \text{Qe3} \text{Qa5} 19 \text{Qb3}+ \text{Qa7} 20 \\
\text{Wxd7+}! 1-0.

10...\text{Qd8} 11 \text{Qxa8} \text{Qf6} \\
11...\text{Qe5} is well met by 12 \text{Qe2} \\
\text{Qf6} 13 0-0-0 .

12 \text{Qc4} \text{Qe8}+ 13 \text{Qe3} \text{Qd4} 14 \\
\text{Wxd4} \text{Wxf3} 15 \text{Qf1} \text{b6} 16 \text{Qxb6} \\
Black is helpless, Gutman.
Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 c3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 h4 5 a5 b4+ 6 a2 xe4+ 7 e2)
7...xg2 8 f3 h3
"Taking the g-pawn, which involved the sacrifice of a rook, was also examined here, but was rejected as not sufficiently warranted in the present position if properly defended", Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

9 xc7+!
9 xc6 bxc6 (but not 9...xd2+?)
10 wxd2) 10 xc7+ d8 11 xa8 wg2 12 xb4 we4+ (12...wxf4+? is bad because of 13 d2 xd1+ 14
d1 wb7 15 a5+) 13 d2
d4+ 14 c1 h6? 15 g1 f5
16 f3 d5 17 c3 e6 leads to an double-edged position, Gutman.
9...d8 10 xb4!?
10 xa8 is also very good, 10...c6 (10...exd2+ 11 cxd2 f6 will transpose into Sequel 2) 11 xb4
e8+ 12 d2 wh6+ (after 12...xb4 13 c1 White is out of danger) 13 c3 e4+ 14 xe4
f6+ (or 14...xe4 15 d6! wh3+ 16 wg3) 15 b3 d4+ 16 xd4
cxd4 17 c3 and White wins, Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.
10...xb4

10...xc7? fails to 11 wd6+ d8
12 wg8+ c7 13 d6+ b6 14 a2.
11 xa8 f6 12 d2 wh6+
12...c8 can be answered by 13
c1.
13 c3 w4 14 e1 d5 15 a3 c4+ 15...a2+ 16 xxa2 c4+ 17 d2
xa2 18 c1 is also without hope for Black.
16 d2 f4+ 17 e3 d4 18 axb4
dxe3+ 19 fxe3 wb8 20 c1+ e7
21 wd4
White has a decisive advantage, Gutman.

Sequel 4
(1 e4 e5 2 c3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 h4 5 a5 b4+ 6 a2 xe4+ 7 e2)
7...w5

"The text move was carefully examined, but it was ascertained that this line of play would have given Black a disadvantageous position", Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.
8 d3
8...c3 is bad on account of 8...xf4
9 c3 wh4+ 10 g3 we4", Steinitz, International Chess Magazine, 1885.
8...\(\text{d8}!\)?

The dangerous looking 8...\(\text{f6}\) is worth consideration.

White has two main replies:

A) 9 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{wc5}\) 10 \(\text{xc7+}\) \(\text{d8}\) 11 \(\text{xa8}\), when "Black allows White to capture on a8, but in the ensuing tactical struggle the chances will remain about even", Hall.

We see:

A1) 11...\(\text{xc3?!}\) gives White a choice:

A1a) 12 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{e4}\) 13 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e8}\) 14 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{b6}\) 15 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{e7}\) (Gnirk-Roth, corr. 1986/87, went 15...\(\text{xb5}\) 16 \(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{c3+}\) 17 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{xd1}\) 18 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{b7}\) 19 \(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{axb6}\) ½-½), however, White could have carried on with 20 \(\text{c4}\) 16 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 17 a4 \(\text{wh4+}\) 18 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{wh2}\) 19 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{g3+}\) 20 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{xe2+}\) 21 \(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{wh3}\) 22 \(\text{gxh3}\) \(\text{xe2}\) 23 \(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{c8}\) 24 \(\text{d3!}\) (an improvement on 24 c4 \(\text{d4+}\) 25 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{dxb5}\) 26 \(\text{dxb6}\) \(\text{axb6}\) 27 \(\text{cxb5}\) \(\text{b7}\) 28 a5, suggested by Hall) 24...\(\text{xb5}\) 25 \(\text{axb5}\) \(\text{e7}\) 26 c4 \(\text{b7}\) 27 \(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{axb6}\) 28 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 29 \(\text{c5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 30 \(\text{xc5}\) secures White a promising ending, Gutman;

A1b) 12 \(\text{xc3!}\) is more effective, 12...\(\text{e4}\) (or 12...\(\text{e8}\) 13 \(\text{xf6+}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 14 c3 \(\text{d5}\) 15 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e4}\) 16 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{xf4}\) 17 \(\text{d2}\), Gutman) 13 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{f2+}\) 14 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{hxg2}\) 15 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{f2+}\) 16 \(\text{d2}\) and Black is lost, Lelsebein.

A2) 11...\(\text{e8?!}\) looks like a better try, 12 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 13 \(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{g2}\) 14 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{xb4}\) 15 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{d5}\) (15...\(\text{xe2}\) 16 \(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{xc2}\) 17 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{e3}\) 18 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f1}\) 19 \(\text{xf1}\) \(\text{d5+}\) 20 \(\text{c1}\) favours White) 16 c3 \(\text{wh2}\) 17 \(\text{cxb4}\) \(\text{wh4}\) 18 \(\text{f2}\) 18...\(\text{wh1}+\) with a draw by perpetual, Gutman.

B) 9 0-0! might be preferred, 9...\(\text{a6}\)

(9...0-0 10 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{a5}\) 11 \(\text{d3}\) 10 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{d8}\) 11 \(\text{g4!}\) (11 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{f5}\) 11...\(\text{c5}\) 12 a3! \(\text{xc3}\) 13 \(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{e8}\) 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{c4}\) (or 14...\(\text{a5}\) 15 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 16 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 17 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{e6}\) 18 \(\text{c4}\) 15 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{e5}\) 16 \(\text{g5}\) yields White massive pressure, Gutman.

9 0-0

9...\(\text{a6}!\)?

It is necessary to attack White’s knight at once.

Alternatives are:

I) 9...\(\text{f6}\) 10 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 11 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{f5}\) 12 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{bxc6}\) 13 \(\text{d4}\) proves that Black’s position isn’t that easy to defend, Gutman;

II) 9...\(\text{g7}\) gives White three good possibilities:

A) 10 a3 \(\text{xc3}\) 11 \(\text{xc3}\) (11 \(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{g5}\) 11...\(\text{d6}\) 12 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{h6}\) 13 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 14 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{h4}\) 15 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{d5}\) 16 \(\text{c4}\) and Black has difficulties, Lelsebein;

B) 10 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{d6}\) 11 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{a6}\) 12 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{f6}\) 13 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{g6}\) 14 \(\text{xe7+}\) \(\text{xe7}\) 15 \(\text{xc7}\) \(\text{xc7}\) 16 \(\text{xe7+}\) \(\text{h8}\) 17 \(\text{xc8}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 18 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 19 \(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 20 \(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{xe7}\) 21 \(\text{xc7+}\) \(\text{f6}\) 22 \(\text{xd6+}\) \(\text{g5}\) 23 \(\text{d2+}\) \(\text{h5}\) 24 \(\text{d5+}\) \(\text{h6}\) 25 \(\text{xb7}\) with a clear
advantage for White in Hiarcs 4-Hiarcs 6, computer game 1997; C) 10 \textit{\textsc{Re}}1 a6, when White has two ideas at his disposal:
C1) 11 \textit{\textsc{Qd}}3 \textit{\textsc{Wf}}6 12 \textit{\textsc{Qe}}4 \textit{\textsc{Wxb}2} 13 \textit{\textsc{Qb}1} \textit{\textsc{Wxa}2} 14 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}4 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}4} was mostly analysed.}

Here:
C1a) 15 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}4 axb}5 16 \textit{\textsc{Qg}5} \textit{\textsc{Wd}5} (not 16...c6? 17 \textit{\textsc{Qc}4, Evgeny Sveshnikov}) 17 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}5 c5} 18 h4 \textit{\textsc{Qf}8}!!? (Van Bommel-Van der Klaar, corr.1987, went 18...\textit{\textsc{He}}8 19 \textit{\textsc{He}5} \textit{\textsc{Wa}2} 20 c4 \textit{\textsc{d}6} 21 \textit{\textsc{Hb}6} \textit{\textsc{Qc}7} 22 \textit{\textsc{Qb}1} \textit{\textsc{Wxb}1} 23 \textit{\textsc{Qxe}7+ 1-0}) 19 c4 \textit{\textsc{Wd}4} 20 \textit{\textsc{Qf}3} \textit{\textsc{Wd}6} 21 \textit{\textsc{Qxd}1} \textit{\textsc{Qxd}1} 22 \textit{\textsc{Qxd}1} \textit{\textsc{Ha}6} 23 \textit{\textsc{Qxc}5} \textit{\textsc{Mc}6} is equal, \textit{\textsc{Gutman};}
C1b) 15 \textit{\textsc{Qxc}7} \textit{\textsc{Qxc}7} (15...\textit{\textsc{Qxd}3}? 16 \textit{\textsc{Wxd}3} \textit{\textsc{Qxc}7} 17 \textit{\textsc{Wd}6+ \textit{\textsc{Qd}8}} 18 \textit{\textsc{Qg}5, Sveshnikov}) 16 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}4} \textit{\textsc{Qa}5} 17 \textit{\textsc{Qc}4+ is more ambitious. Black has to make an important choice:
C1b1) 17...\textit{\textsc{Qc}6} 18 \textit{\textsc{Mc}5 with a further split:
C1b11) 18...\textit{\textsc{Wb}6} 19 \textit{\textsc{Qf}5}!? (after 19 \textit{\textsc{Qxa}6 \textit{\textsc{bxa}6} 20 \textit{\textsc{Wd}6+ \textit{\textsc{Qb}7} 21 \textit{\textsc{Mc}6} dxc6 22 \textit{\textsc{Qc}5+ \textit{\textsc{Qa}7} 23 \textit{\textsc{Mc}7+ \textit{\textsc{Qb}7} 24 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}7+ \textit{\textsc{Wxb}7} 25 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}7 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}7 the game is even, Hall}) 19...\textit{\textsc{f}6} 20 \textit{\textsc{Wg}4} \textit{\textsc{Wb}4} 21 \textit{\textsc{Qg}3+ \textit{\textsc{De}5} 22 \textit{\textsc{c3 \textit{\textsc{Wf}8} 23 \textit{\textsc{Qxf}6 gxf6} 24 \textit{\textsc{Mc}5+ \textit{\textsc{Qb}6} 26 \textit{\textsc{Mc}4} \textit{\textsc{Qxf}5} 27 \textit{\textsc{Wc}3+ \textit{\textsc{Qa}5} 28 \textit{\textsc{Mc}4}, and Black is helpless, \textit{\textsc{Gutman; \textit{\textsc{C1b}12}) 18...b5 19 \textit{\textsc{Qf}1} (19 c4? d6 20 \textit{\textsc{Mc}5 was recommended by Sveshnikov) 19...\textit{\textsc{Qa}7} 20 c4 \textit{\textsc{Qd}8} 21 exd5? (21 \textit{\textsc{Dxc}6+! dxc6 22 \textit{\textsc{Wd}6+ \textit{\textsc{Qb}7} 23 \textit{\textsc{Qc}5+ wins at once, \textit{\textsc{Gutman}) 21...axb5 22 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}5} \textit{\textsc{Wb}4} 23 \textit{\textsc{Dxc}6 \textit{\textsc{Qxe}4} 24 \textit{\textsc{Dxe}4+ \textit{\textsc{Wxc}5} 25 \textit{\textsc{Qd}2 \textit{\textsc{Mc}4} 26 \textit{\textsc{h}3 d5? 27 \textit{\textsc{Wxd}5} (27 \textit{\textsc{Qd}3! keeps some advantage for White, Sveshnikov) 27...\textit{\textsc{Qxd}5} 28 \textit{\textsc{Qxd}5} \textit{\textsc{Mc}4} 29 \textit{\textsc{Qe}7+ \textit{\textsc{Mc}6} 30 \textit{\textsc{Qxf}7 \textit{\textsc{Qxf}7} 31 \textit{\textsc{Qxf}7 1/2-1/2, Sveshnikov-Barle, Bucharest 1976;
\textit{\textsc{C1b}2) 17...\textit{\textsc{Qb}5}!? “with an unclear position, according to Sveshnikov. After 18 \textit{\textsc{Mc}6, for example, we offer 18...\textit{\textsc{Qc}6} 19 \textit{\textsc{Qxf}7 \textit{\textsc{Qf}8} 20 \textit{\textsc{Mc}6} \textit{\textsc{Mc}6} 21 c3 \textit{\textsc{Qe}5} 22 \textit{\textsc{Qe}4 \textit{\textsc{Wb}6} 23 \textit{\textsc{Qxe}5 \textit{\textsc{Wxd}6}, and believe Black is at least equal”, Hall.
C2) 11 \textit{\textsc{Qg}4}! seems to me like the most aggressive reaction.

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

11...\textit{\textsc{Wf}6} 12 \textit{\textsc{Qe}4 \textit{\textsc{Wxb}2} 13 \textit{\textsc{Mc}1 \textit{\textsc{Wxa}2} 14 \textit{\textsc{Qxb}4 axb}5 (or 14...\textit{\textsc{Qxb}4} 15 \textit{\textsc{Qxc}7} 15 \textit{\textsc{Qc}3 \textit{\textsc{Wc}4} 16 \textit{\textsc{Qg}7 \textit{\textsc{Qg}8} 17 \textit{\textsc{Qxd}7 \textit{\textsc{Qxd}7} 18 \textit{\textsc{Qf}6 \textit{\textsc{Qb}8} 19 \textit{\textsc{Qxe}7 \textit{\textsc{Qxe}7} 20 \textit{\textsc{Qg}8+ \textit{\textsc{Qd}8} 21 \textit{\textsc{Qf}5+ gives White a crushing attack, \textit{\textsc{Gutman.}
\textit{\textsc{Qc}7} \end{center}

\begin{center}

10 \textit{\textsc{Qc}7}}
After 10 Qa3 Qd6 11 g3 Qxa3 12 bxa3 Qf6 13 He1 Wc5 14 f3, Madsen-Alberny, e-mail game, 1999, 14...d6 would have kept matters unclear, Gutman.

10...Qxc7

10...Qd6 11 Qf4! Wxf4 12 g3 We5 13 Qxa8 Qc5 14 Qd5 Qd4 15 f3 b5 16 Qab6 Qb7 17 Qg2 Qf6 18 Qxf6! (Lewis-Perry, corr. 1985, went 18 c4 Qe2+ 19 Qh1 Qg4 20 Qe3 Qxg2+ 21 Qxg2 We4+ 0-1) 18...Wxf6 19 Qxd7 Qxd7 20 Qxb7 with a winning position for White, Gutman.

11 Qd5+

11 Qf4 is well met by 11...Qxc3 12 Qxe5+ Qxe5.

11...Wxd5 12 Qf4+ Wd6 13 Qxd6+ Qxd6 14 Qd5 Qe5 15 c3 f5 16 f4 Qge7 17 Wf7 Qf6

Black’s prospects are not bad, Gutman.

Sequel 5

(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qb5 Qb4+ 6 Qd2 Wxe4+ 7 Qe2 Wf5) 8 0-0!?  

This is the most common response.

9...Qxd2?

Alternatively:

I) 8...a6 9 Qe1 Qd8 10 Qxb4 Qxb4 11 Qf6 and White has the initiative, Gutman;

II) 8...Qf6 9 Qe1! (9 f4?! Wc5+ 10 Qh1 Wb6 11 Qe3, suggested by Hall, fails to 11...Wxe3 12 Qxc7+ Qd8 13 Qxa8 Qe4) 9...0-0 10 Qd3 (10 Qf4 reaches a position, covered in Sequel 4) “and Black cannot save the c-pawn”, Steinitz/Potter, The Field 1874.

In any case 10...Wxb2 11 Qc3 a6 12 Qxc7! (after 12 Qb1 Wxb1 13 Wxb1 axb5 14 Qxb5 Qc5 Black obtains sufficient compensation for his queen) 12...Qxc3 13 Qb1 Qa3 14 Qxc3 Wxc3 15 Qxa8 is clearly in White’s favour, Gutman.

9 Qxd2

9 Qxd2 leaves White with some problems concerning the cooperation of his knights, 9...Qf6 (9...a6 10 Qe1 Qd8 11 Qc3 Wd4 12 Qd3 Qf6 is also good, Gutman) 10 Qe1 Qd8 11 Qc3 Wc5 12 Qad1 Qe8 “and Black at least has a small advantage”, Hall.

9...Qd8
10 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \)!

There are many other possibilities:

I) 10 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}c4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f4 \)??
(11...\( \mathcal{W}c5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \) \( \mathcal{d}6 \)

can be met by 14 a3 \( \mathcal{A}e6 \) 15 b4 \( \mathcal{W}f5 \)
16 \( f4 \) \( \mathcal{A}e4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xd6 \)
(\( cxd6 \) 19 \( b5 \)) 12 \( g3 \) \( \mathcal{W}g5 \) 13 a3 \( h5 \)??
(Minshin-Coker, London 1875, went 13...\( a5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}d3 \) \( h5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \) \( h4 \)
16 \( \mathcal{A}e4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) \( hxg3 \) 18
\( fxg3 \) \( \mathcal{W}c5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{H}h1 \) \( f6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{A}fe1 \) \( \mathcal{W}g5 \)
21 \( \mathcal{M}d5 \) \( \mathcal{W}xg3 \) 22 \( \mathcal{H}h5 \) 1-0)
14 \( h4 \)
(14...\( \mathcal{W}d3 \) \( h4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \) \( hxg3 \) 16 \( fxg3 \)
\( \mathcal{W}c5 \)) 14...\( \mathcal{W}c5 \) appears fine for
Black, \textit{Gutman};

II) 10 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) \( \mathcal{W}xb5 \) (10...\( \mathcal{W}c5 \) 11 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)
\( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}c3 \) will
transpose into the variation after 10
\( \mathcal{A}c3 \) — I) 11 \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) \( \mathcal{W}xb2 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}xf7+ \)
\( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}xh8 \) (or 13 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) \( g6 \) 14
\( \mathcal{B}b1 \) \( \mathcal{W}g7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}xh8 \) \( \mathcal{W}xh8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{E}e1+ \)
\( \mathcal{D}ge7 \)) 13...\( g6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) \( hxg6 \) 15
\( \mathcal{B}b1 \) (15 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{D}ge7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) \( \mathcal{W}f7 \))
15...\( \mathcal{W}g7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \) \( \mathcal{D}ge7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) \( d6 \)
18 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) \( a6 \) is no worse for Black,
\textit{Gutman};

III) 10 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) is more testing. Black has to try:

A) 10...\( \mathcal{d}6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}d3 \)
\( \mathcal{D}ge7 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \) a6 14 \( \mathcal{D}b6 \) (14
\( \mathcal{D}xd6 \)?) \( cxd6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}e3 \) \( \mathcal{C}c7 \) 16
\( \mathcal{X}d6 \) \( \mathcal{E}e6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{f}3 \) \( \mathcal{D}c8 \) 18 \( \mathcal{W}c5 \)
also looks very good for White,
\textit{Gutman}) 14...\( \mathcal{X}b8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{D}xc8 \) \( \mathcal{X}c8 \)
16 \( \mathcal{W}h3+ \) \( \mathcal{D}d8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( h5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \)
\( \mathcal{D}e5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}b3 \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 20 \( \mathcal{D}e4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f4 \) 21
\( \mathcal{W}c3 \) \( \mathcal{A}7c6 \) 22 g3 \( \mathcal{W}f3 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g4 \)
24 \( f4 \) \( \mathcal{D}xd3 \) 25 \( \mathcal{D}f6+ \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 26 \( \mathcal{D}xg4 \)
(\( \mathcal{D}xe1 \) 27 \( \mathcal{W}c4 \) with a clear advantage for White in Strand-Brusila,
e-mail game 1999;

B) 10...\( \mathcal{G}e7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \)?? (11 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \)
\( \mathcal{W}f4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{E}e4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( d6 \))
11...\( \mathcal{W}f6 \) (11...\( \mathcal{X}xb2 \) 12 c3 \( a6 \) is shown to be careless by 13 \( \mathcal{D}g5 \) \( \mathcal{A}f8 \)
14 \( \mathcal{D}d4 \)) 12 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) \( a6 \) (12...\( d6 \)
allows 13 \( c4 \)??) 13 \( \mathcal{A}c3 \) \( d6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}e4 \) \( \mathcal{G}g6 \) 15
\( \mathcal{A}c4 \) and White’s pressure on the d-
and e-files is very unpleasant,
\textit{Gutman};

C) 10...\( \mathcal{F}f6 \)?? \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f5 \)
(11...\( \mathcal{W}c5 \) 12 c3 \( a6 \) 13 \( b4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f5 \) 14
\( \mathcal{A}a3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}ad1 \)
gives Black little counterplay) 12
\( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{C}c5 \) is the principal alternative,
when Black keeps more control in the centre.

White has a choice :

C1) 13 \( \mathcal{W}d3 \) \( d6 \) (not 13...\( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 14 \( c3 \)
\( d5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}b3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{D}e5 \) \( \mathcal{D}xe5 \) 17
\( \mathcal{X}x e5 \) \( c 6 \) 18 \( \mathcal{D}d4 \) as 18...\( \mathcal{D}c7 \) is bad
in view of 19 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}bd4 \) (14
\( \mathcal{A}xf7 \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}c4 \) \( \mathcal{X}x c4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{X}x c4 \)
\( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{D}bd4 \) \( \mathcal{X}xd4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{X}xd4 \) \( d5 \)
19 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( c5 \) 20 \( \mathcal{D}c6+ \) \( \mathcal{X}xe6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{X}x e 6 \)
\( \text{c8 22 } \text{c6e1 } \text{f7 is drawish, Gutman) 14... } \text{cxd4 15 } \text{cxd4 } \text{c8f8 16 } \text{cadd1 } \text{c6g4 17 } \text{f3 } \text{c6d7 18 } \text{cwb3 } \text{c6b6 19 } \text{c6xf7 c6!} \text{? (19... } \text{c6xb3 20 } \text{c6xb3}\)

\text{gives White a superior endgame, Sveshnikov) 20 } \text{c6e6 } \text{c6e8 21 } \text{c6xd7 } \text{c6xe1+ 22 } \text{c6xe1 } \text{c6xb3 22... } \text{c6xd4+? is wrong due to 23 } \text{c6f1 } \text{c6xd7 24 } \text{c6g8+ } \text{c6c7 25 } \text{c6xa8, Sveshnikov) 23 } \text{c6xb3 } \text{c6xd7 24 } \text{c6g4 24 } \text{c6f5 } \text{c6e8! 25 } \text{c6d1 } \text{c6e2 26 } \text{c6xd6 } \text{c6xc2 secure Black counterplay, Sveshnikov) 24... } \text{c6g6 25 } \text{c6f2 a6 was equal in the game Sveshnikov-Sermek, Bled 1994; C2) 13 } \text{c6e2} \text{ is recommended by Sveshnikov.}

After 14... \text{c6b4 (or 14... } \text{c6a6 15 } \text{c6xe8+ } \text{c6xe8 16 } \text{c6c3) 15 } \text{c6xe8+ } \text{c6xe8 16 } \text{c6e2 d5 17 } \text{c6b3 } \text{c6d7 18 } \text{c6c3 Black's position is not strong enough to justify the pawn on d5, Gutman; C2b) 13...d6! is a much better try since 14 } \text{c6xf7 (14 h3 } \text{c6e8 15 } \text{c6d3 would have been of dubious value in account of 15... } \text{c6xe1+ 16 } \text{c6xe1 } \text{c6f5) 14... } \text{c6g4 leaves Black with no problems, Gutman.}

\[ \text{10... } \text{c6f6} \]

Acceptance of the second pawn is hazardous and hardly advisable; Black will be unable to bring his plus to bear upon the struggle. 10... \text{c6xb2?}! 11 c3 a6 12 \text{c6bd4 } \text{c6xc3 (12... } \text{c6xd4 13 } \text{c6xd4 f6 14 } \text{c6g5!) 13 } \text{c6cl } \text{c6a3 14 } \text{c6xc6+ bxc6 15 } \text{c6e5 } \text{c6e7 16 } \text{c6c4 } \text{c6h6 17 } \text{c6e1 with no valid defences, Gutman.}

11 \text{c6d2 a6}

11... \text{c6ge7 12 c4!} \text{? would enable White to strengthen his control over the critical d5-square. 12 } \text{c6c3 } \text{c6ge7 13 } \text{c6e4!} \text{? 13 } \text{c6g5 h6 14 } \text{c6ge4 can be answered by 14... } \text{c6d4.}

13... \text{c6g6 14 } \text{c6f4}

Black’s position is not easy to defend, Gutman.
Sequel 6
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 W h4 5 b5 b4+ 6 d2 Wxe4+ 7 e2)
7...d8 8 0-0

"In this situation I think, in opposition to the able writer mentioned, that Black's game is vastly inferior to yours, and that with his king so circumstances, the loss of your pawn is actually an advantage, since it affords so much scope for the attack of the rooks", Staunton.

"This position is the subject of significant controversies.
Does White have enough play for his pawn?
Or can Black consolidate and contrive somehow to develop his pieces?
Should Black develop his knight at this point or should he swap bishops himself? Where should Black place his queen when White attacks her? — These issues provided material for both practical and theoretical disputes in the second part of the nineteenth century (as is apparent, for example, from the very fine notes by Potter and Steinitz to the London-Vienna Correspondence Match of 1872-1874).

Nor are these questions devoid of interest today", Botterill/Harding.

8...f6
"This was the move originally played by Louis Paulsen in 1861. For a long time (a hundred years!) it was considered — if the matter was considered at all — that the move had been refuted by an analysis by Potter and Steinitz", Botterill/Harding.
8...a6 is worth consideration.

White has a choice of:
A) 9 f1c3 W e5 reaches a position, covered in Sequel 4;
B) 9 f3 with a further split:
B1) 9...g6 10 xc6 bxc6 11 xc7 xc7 (11 b8 12 xb4 xb4 13 d2) 12 xb4 a5 13 c3 was clearly better for White in Van Foreest-Prange, Utrecht 1886;
B2) 9...c4 10 d5c3 dge7 (10...f6 can be met by 11 g5 e7 12 e1) 11 e1 f6 12 e4 f7 seems to be pretty acceptable for Black, Gutman;
B3) 9...h4!? 10 xc6 (10 d5c3 d6) 10...bxc6 11 g3 f6 (more precise than 11...c4 12 a3 xa3 13 xa3) 12 xb4 axb5 13 e1 d6 and Black is fine, Gutman.
C) The immediate 9 d5c3 keeps more tension in the position, 9...d4 10 c1? (Miller-Augustat, Germany 1996, went 10 f3 f6 11 a3 a5 12 xc6 bxc6 13 h3
9 ²c1c3!
Less challenging are:
I) 9 ²e3 ²h4 10 g3 ²h3 11 ²xb4 ²xb4 12 ²c1c3 a6 (12...h5 leads nowhere due to 13 ²g2 ²g4 14 ²d2 h4 15 h3 ²f5 16 ²d4 ²c5 17 g4) 13 ²d4 d6 14 a3 ²c6 15 ²g2 ²g4 16 ²xc6+ bxc6 17 ²xc6 (not 17 ²e2 ²d7 18 h3 ²c4, Zelic̆-Leventić, Pula 1992) 17...²xd1 18 ²axd1 ²b8 is level, Gutman;
II) 9 ²e1 with two examples:
A) 9...²xd2 10 ²xd2 ²b4 11 ²c1c3 (11 c3?! ²c5 12 b4 ²d5 13 ²c2 a6 14 ²d1 ²e4 15 ²d3 ²e5 16 ²a3 ²g4 17 g3 ²h5 18 h4 g5 was fine for Black, L.Horváth-Balint, Hungary 1997) 11...a6 12 ²g5 ²g8 13 ²d5 h6 14 ²xf6+ gxf6 15 ²xb4 ²xb4 16 ²d4, when in spite of being a pawn down, White has a better endgame, Gutman;
B) 9...²c5!? is a more purposeful move, 10 ²f3 ²f5 11 ²c3 d6 12 ²xf6+ gxf6 13 ²c1c3 ²e5 14 ²e4

10 ²xf3+ 15 ²xf3 ²xf3 16 gxf3 a6 17 ²bc3 ²d4 gave Black a clear plus in Hodak-Zelic̆, Zagreb 1993. 9...²h4
Alternatively:
I) 9...²e5 will transpose into Sequel 4;
II) 9...²e7 10 ²e1 d6 11 ²f3 ²e6 12 ²g5 ²d7 13 ²d4 (13 ²xc6?! bxc6 14 ²d4 ²c5 15 ²h4 ²c8 16 ²xf6 gxf6 17 ²xf6 ²g8 18 ²a3 ²g6 brought Black some edge in Klueners-Trabert, St Ingebert 1991) 13...²xc6 14 bxc6 ²c8 15 ²xf6 gxf6 16 ²xc6 bxc6 17 ²d4 leaves Black with weak pawns and a suspicious-looking king, Gutman. 10 g3 ²h3

11 ²f4!? There are a number of interesting ideas:
I) 11 ²xc7?! ²xc7 (11...²xc3 12 bxc3 ²xc7 13 ²f4+ ²d8 14 ²d6 ²e6 15 ²c7+ ²e8 16 ²f3 ²e7 17 ²fe1 ²b6 18 ²e5 ²fg8 19 ²xg7 ²f6 20 ²xe7+ and wins, Steinitz/Potter) 12 ²d5+ ²xd5 13 ²g4 ²xg4 (has been mostly analysed, nevertheless 13...²xf1+?! is also strong: 14 ²xf1 ²xd2 15 ²xd2 ²f6 with a clear advantage for Black, Gutman) 14 ²xg4 ²xd2 15 ²fd1 (or 15 ²xg7 ²e8 16 ²ad1
\(\text{Qe5}\), when, "as Alexander Tolush pointed out, Black gets a winning game with 15...\text{Qh}6! (instead of 15...d6 16 \text{Wxg7} \text{Qe6} 17 \text{Qxd2} with the superior game, as Black has only three minor pieces for the queen and pawn, Steinitz/Potter) 16 \text{Qxd5} d6. The minor pieces will undoubtedly prove too strong for the queen. So the analysis is refuted", Botterill/Harding;

II) 11 \text{Qd5} \text{Qxd2} (11...\text{Qxd5?} 12 \text{Qg4}) 12 \text{Qxf6} was suggested by Botterill/Harding.

"Yet we still think that the assessment of the variation as favourable for White is correct", Botterill/Harding.

And here:
A) 12...\text{Qxf6} 13 \text{Qxd2} d6 (Black has nothing better, 13...h5? 14 \text{Qf4} 1-0, Zhuravlov-Lebedev, corr. 1995, or 13...\text{Qg8?} 14 \text{Qf4} \text{Qg6} 15 \text{Wxc7+ Qe8} 16 \text{Qe1} \text{Qf8} 17 \text{Qd6+ Qg7} 18 \text{Qf1} \text{Qh5} 19 \text{Qe8}, and White won easily, Griffiths-Armstrong, corr. 1993) 14 \text{Qad1} indeed isn't terribly inspiring for Black: "not only does White have a lead in development and an attack against the king in the centre: he has also inflicted chronic weaknesses on Black's pawn formation", Botterill/Harding;

B) 12...\text{Wf5}?! looks like a more feasible try, after 13 \text{Wxd2} \text{Wxf6} 14 \text{Qad1}!? Black has three options:

B1) 14...\text{Qxb2} 15 \text{Qc3} (15 \text{Qf4 \text{Wxe5} 16 \text{Qxf7}} doesn't contribute too much due to 16...\text{Qe7}) 15...f6 16 \text{Qe1} d6 17 \text{Qd5 \text{Wa3} 18 \text{Qxf6} gxf6} 19 \text{Qh6} \text{Qc3} 20 \text{Qh5} with a decisive attack for White, Gutman;

B2) 14...d6 15 c4 and Black has difficulties to find a defence against the annoying threat of c4-c5, 15...\text{Qh3} (15...b6 can be met by 16 \text{f4} \text{Qe8} 17 \text{Qf3}) 16 \text{Qe1} \text{Qc8} 17 \text{f4} h5 18 \text{Qf3} h4 (or 18...\text{Qg4} 19 \text{Qxg4+ hgx4} 20 \text{Qe2}) 19 g4 a6 20 \text{Qc3} \text{Wg6} 21 f5 \text{Wh6} 22 \text{Qd5} \text{Qb8} 23 c5 dxc5 24 \text{Qxc5} \text{Wf4} 25 \text{Qe3} \text{Wxe3+} 26 \text{Qxe3} \text{Qa7} 27 \text{Qe2} 1-0, Hamilton-Gash, corr. 1995;

B3) 14...h5! is an improvement, 15 h4 (15 c4 h4 16 \text{Qc3} \text{Wh6}) 15...\text{Qh6} 16 \text{Qd5} \text{We6} 17 \text{Qg5+ \text{Wf6}} seems to hold, Gutman;

III) 11 \text{Qf3} a6 12 \text{Qg5} (Benes-Goc, corr.1996, went 12 \text{Qxc7}!! \text{Qxc7} 13 \text{Qd5+ Qxd5} 14 \text{Qg4 Wxf1+!} 15 \text{Qxf1} \text{Qxd2} 16 \text{Wxd2} \text{Qf6} 17 \text{Qf3} \text{d6} 18 \text{Qd1 Qh3+} 19 \text{Qg1 Qad8 with a decisive advantage to Black}) 12...\text{Wf5} 13 \text{Qxf6+ gxf6} 14 \text{Qd4} \text{Qxd4} 15 \text{Wxd4} \text{Qxf3} 16 \text{Qxb4} d6 17 \text{Qe1 Qh3} 18 \text{Wf4} \text{Qxe4} 19 \text{Qxe4} \text{Qf5} leads to equality, Gutman;

IV) 11...\text{Qg5}?! causes Black a few problems.

For instance:
A) 11...\text{Qxc3} 12 \text{Qg4} (12 \text{Qxc3 Wf5} 13 \text{Qd5} d6 14 \text{Qd3} is also slightly better for White) 12...\text{Wxf1}+ 13 \text{Qxf1} \text{Qxb2} 14 \text{Qb1} h6 15 \text{Qh4} g5 16 \text{Qxb2} gxd4 17 \text{Qf3 Qxg4} 18 \text{Wxg4} and White wins, Gutman;

B) 11...\text{Qf5} is preferable.
Then:

B1) 12 h4 Qe7 (12...Qe7 13 Qd3 Wh3 14 Qxf6 gxf6 15 Qxc7 Qg8! 16 Qxa8 Qxg3+ 17 Qxg3 Qxg3+ leads to a draw) 13 Qd4 Wa5 14 Qcb5 Wb6 15 a3 Qc5 16 b4 Qxd4 17 Qxd4 Qe4 18 Qxc7+ Qxe7 19 Qel d5 20 c4 (20 Qf3 Qf5) 20...Qd8 21 Qf3 Qf8 22 Qxe4 Qxe4 23 Qxe4 c5 24 bxc5 Wxc5 25 Wg4, Bridges-Watson, corr. 1990, and now 25...Qb6!? should give Black an edge;

B2) 12 Wd5 We6 13 Rad1 Qe7 (13...a6 14 Qd4) 14 Wd2! (14 Qg2?! d6 15 Qf3 Qd7 16 Qh1?! Wh3 17 Qg1? Qf5 accelerates White’s promising position into a lost one, 18 Qf4 g5 19 Qxc7 Qxc7 20 Qd5+ Qxd5 21 Qxd5 Qe5 22 Wg2 gxf4 0-1, Wilson-Paulsen, Bristol 1861) 14...a6 15 Qd4 Qxd4 16 Wxd4 d6 17 Qf1 with good prospects for White, Gutman;

B3) 12 Qxf6+!? gxf6 13 Qd5 is the most logical approach, 13...a5 14 Qg4 Qg5 (or 14...We5 15 Qf4 Qxb2 16 Qb1 Qxa2 17 Qxf6) 15 Qf4 Qg7 16 Qf2 d6 17 Qxe8 Qxe8 18 Qd3 Qg6 19 Qc4 Qe8 20 Q5 Qg7 21 Qf4 a6 22 Qa3 Qd2 23 Qg4 Qh8 24 Qd1 Qg5 25 h4 Qh6 26 b4 Qb8 27

b5 axb5 28 Qxb5 Qa5 (28...Qc8 29 Qc3 Qe5 30 Qb4 Qd8 31 Qdb1) 29 Qb1 Qd2 30 Qd4 Qe1+ 31 Qxe1 Qxe1 32 Qxc6+ bxc6 33 Qe7 h5 34 Qg8+ 1-0, Welz-Hesselbarth, corr. 1984.

11...d6 12 Qxc7 Qxc7

Black’s king is already in danger, but the position is still difficult in as much as Black has good mobility.

13 a3!

Haupold-Kahn, corr. 1984, went 13 Qb5+? Qd8 14 c3 Qc5 15 Qxd6 Qxd6 16 Qxd6+ Qd7 17 Wc3 Qe7 18 Qxe7+ Qxe7 19 Qe3 Qd5 and Black won easily.

13...Qg4 14 Qxg4 Qxg4 15 f3 Qc5+ 16 Qh1 Qe6

16...Qf5 is no better, 17 b4 Qb6 18 Qxd6+ Qc8 19 Qd5 Qd8 20 b5 1-0, Torre-Ballesteros, corr. 1990.

17 b4 Qb6 18 Qxd6+ Qc8 19 Qa4 Qd8 20 b5 Qe7 21 Rad1!

21 Qfd1 is wrong due to 21...Wh5!

22 Qd3 Qa5 23 b6 Qd5 24 Qg2 Qc6 25 Qc7 Qd5 0-1, Amann-Pljusnin, e-mail game, 1999.

21...b6 22 c4

White has a winning attack, Gutman.
Sequel 7
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 ∆h4 5 ∆b5 ∆b4+ 6 ∆d2 ∆xe4+ 7 ∆e2 ∆d8 8 0-0)
8...∆ge7

A less confrontational approach.
9 ∆1c3

The most logical continuation, though here are two other ideas:
I) 9 ∆d3 ∆h4 and then:
A) 10 ∆e3 d6 11 ∆c1 h6 12 ∆1c3 a6 13 ∆a3 ∆f5 14 ∆xf5 ∆xf5 15 ∆d5 ∆e8 16 c3 ∆xa3 17 bxa3 ∆e4
gave Black the advantage in Heindrich-Schliesinger, Wiesbaden 1989;
B) 10 g3 ∆h3 (more precise than 10...∆f6?! 11 ∆1c3 ∆xc3 12 ∆xc3 ∆h6 13 ∆f3 f6 14 ∆ad1 d6 15 ∆fe1
∆d7 16 ∆c4 ∆c8 17 ∆e6 ∆g6 18 ∆xd7 ∆xd7 19 ∆e2 ∆e8 20 ∆f4 ∆ae8? 21 ∆xd6+ 1-0, Jovanić-
Medak, Tucepi 1996) 11 ∆1c3 a6 12 a3 ∆a5! (12...∆xc3 13 ∆xc3 ∆e5 14 ∆e2 d6 15 f3 ∆d7 16 ∆e4
f6 17 ∆f2 leave White with adequate play for the pawn in Lazar-Laszlo, Hungary 1997) 13 b4 ∆b6
14 ∆e4 f6 15 ∆bc3 ∆e5 16 ∆e2 h5 and White’s position collapses, Gutman;
C) 10 ∆e1 is relatively best, 10...∆xd2 (Hunerkopf-Gibbons, Copenhagen 1985, went 10...a6?!)

11 ∆e4! ∆f6 12 ∆xb4 ∆xb4 13 ∆xb4 axb5 14 ∆xb5 b6 15 ∆e4 ∆a7 16 ∆c3 ∆e8 17 ∆d2 ∆b7 18 ∆b3
∆c8 19 ∆xb7 ∆xb7 20 ∆d5 with a plus for White) 11 ∆xd2 a6 12 ∆5c3 d6 13 ∆e4 h6 looks very re-
liable for Black, Gutman.
II) 9 c3!? ∆a5 10 b4 is a more interesting possibility as after 10...∆b6 (10...a6? fails to 11 ∆d6!
∆xd6 12 bxa5 ∆xa5 13 ∆e3 ∆c7 14 ∆d2 ∆c6 15 ∆f3 d5 16 c4) 11 c4 ∆d4 12 ∆xd4 ∆xd4 13 ∆c3 White
obtains good attacking chances, Sveshnikov.

“White has an excellent develop-
ment and many targets for attack; besides White has brought his pieces more rapidly to the scene of action”, Lasker.

9...∆h4

There are three more possibilities:
I) 9...∆g6 10 ∆d3 f5 11 ∆e2 was indicated by Sveshnikov, 11...∆xd2 12 ∆xd2 a6 13 ∆f4 ∆f7 14 ∆a3 b5
(or 14...∆e5 15 ∆fe1 ∆xd3 16
∆xd3 d6 17 ∆c4 ∆d7 18 ∆ad1
∆g6 19 ∆d5 ∆b5 20 ∆xd6 cxd6
21 ∆a3 ∆c6 22 ∆xd6+ ∆wd7 23
∆c5) 15 ∆fe1 d6 16 c4 b4 17 ∆c2
a5 18 c5 g5 19 cxd6 cxd6 20 ∆b5
with a crushing attack for White, Gutman;
II) 9...♖xc3 10 ♖xc3 a6 (10...♗g6 is well met by 11 ♖d3 ♕h6 12 ♖f3 f6 13 ♖ad1) 11 ♖f3 ♖h4 (11...♗g6 "produced a miniature" — 12 ♖d4 ♖xd4 13 ♖xd4 ♖f5 14 ♖f4 ♖d6 15 ♖ad1 a5 16 ♖d5 f6 17 ♖h5 1-0, Botterill-Yeo, Manchester 1972) 12 ♖d4 ♖xd4 13 ♖xd4 f6 14 ♕e1, and White's powerful bishops clearly provide more than sufficient compensation for the pawn, Gutman;

III) 9...♗e5 reaches a position covered in Sequel 4. ♖f5

10 g3!?

The ancient alternative is 10 a3!?.

Now:

A) 10...♘c5 11 g3 ♖f6 12 ♕e4 ♖f5 13 ♖d3! (after 13 ♖xc5 ♖xc5 14 ♖f4 d6 15 c4 a5, Kouts-Djegg, corr. 1879, 16 b4! would have been very strong) 13...♗b6 14 ♕ed6 ♖f6 15 ♖g5 and Black is lost, Gutman;

B) 10...♖xc3 11 ♖xc3 a6 is safer, nevertheless, 12 ♖d4 ♖xd4 13 ♖xd4 f6 14 ♕e1 ♖c6 15 ♖c3 ♖e8 16 ♖d5! d6 17 ♕h5 still clearly favours White, Gutman.

10...♖f6 11 ♕e4 ♖g6 12 ♖f4 ♖a5 13 ♕g5! ♖f8 14 ♕e1

14 ♕h5?! ♖f5 15 ♖d4 ♖xd4 16 ♖xd4 looks like a good idea, Gutman.

14...♖h6 15 ♖d3 ♖f5 16 ♖f3 ♖f6 17 ♖d2 d6 18 c3 a6 19 ♖a3 ♖b6 20 ♕e4!

20 ♖ad1 ♖e6 21 ♕g5 ♖e8 22 ♕e4 ♖e7 23 ♖c4 ♖xc4 24 ♖xd6! ♖xe1+ 25 ♖xe1 ♖xe1+ 26 ♖xe1 ♖xd6 27 ♖xd6 ♖xd3 28 ♕f8 ♖g6

20...♖a7 21 ♖xf5 ♖xf5 22 ♖xd6

Black has no valid defence, Gutman.

Sequel 8

(1 e4 e5 2 ♖f3 ♕c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♖xd4 ♕h4 5 ♖b5 ♖b4+ 6 ♖d2 ♖xe4+ 7 ♕e2 ♕e8 8 0-0)

8...♖xd2 9 ♖xd2

"The play is delicately balanced, but in return for his pawn White appears to get adequate dynamic chances. The prospect of a tense struggle here should not discourage the enterprising player", Botterill/Harding.

9...♗g6

"Hitherto 9...♖e7, 9...♖g6 or 9...♖e8 had been the usual modes of defence, but had hardly been found satisfactory", Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

We consider here three more possibilities:

I) 9...♖e8 10 ♕c4 ♖f6 (after 10...♖f8 11 ♖e1 a6 12 ♕c3 ♖g7 13 ♕f3 f6 14 ♖d2 ♕f7 15 ♖d5 ♖b8 16 ♖ad1 ♖xd5 17 ♖xd5 ♖f8 18 ♖e3 White's pressure was decisive in Baer-Beisser, corr. 1980) 11 ♕f3 ♖f8 12 ♖xc6 bxc6 13 ♖a5 ♕c5 (Yeo-McCallion, corr.1985, went 13...♖a6 14 ♖xc6+ ♕c8 15 ♕d4 c6 16 ♖f3 ♖c5 17 c4 ♖b7 18 ♕ac1 a6 19 ♕b3 ♖f8 20 ♕c3 d6 21 c5 d5 22 ♕a4 and White won
quickly) 14 ∆d4 ♜e8 15 ♜e1+ ♚f8 16 ∆x6c6 ♜a6 17 b4 ♞d5 (or 17...♗b6 18 ♚e5 d6 19 ♞xf3 ♜e8 20 ∆ec6) 18 ♚e5 ♞xd1 19 ♞xd1 leads to a clear advantage for White, Gutman;

II) 9...♗h4 10 ♜e1 ♙ge7, giving White a choice:

A) 11 d4 ♜f5?! (11...♗f4?! is much better, transposing to Sequel 5) 12 ♞b3 a6 13 ♞f3 ♞f6 14 ♜e6 (14 ♞c3?! looks good enough) 14...♗xb2 (Schmidtien-Montavon, Geneva 1997, went 14...♗f8? 15 ♞g5 ♞a5 16 ♜e2 axb5 17 ♞e6+ 1-0) 15 ♞b1 ♞xb2 16 ♞xb1 dxe6 17 ♞d1+ ♞d5 18 ♞xd5 exd5 19 ♞xd5+ ♞d7 20 ♞bd4 ♙e8 21 ♞xc6 ♞xc6 22 ♞xf5+ ♞d7 23 ♞f7 yields White a plus, Gutman;

B) 11 ♞f3?! ♞f6 reaches a position covered in Sequel 5.

III) 9...♗e5 will transpose into Sequel 5.

This square for his queen was preferred by Samuel Rosenthal.

"It is debatable whether this or 9...♗f4 is the better move. However, White's play in the following examples is no test of Black's defensive resources", Botterill/Harding.

10 ♞c4!?
Sequel 9
The Vienna Variation
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\textit{exd4} \textit{Wh4} 5 \textit{Kb5} \textit{Kb4}+ 6 \textit{Kd2} 
\textit{Whx}e4+ 7 \textit{Ke}2 \textit{Kd}8 0-0 \textit{ax}e2 9 
\textit{ax}d2) 
9...\textit{Wf}4!?

“...to the best of our knowledge the text move, which was adopted by the London players at the recommendation of Steinitz, was played in the present game for the first time. This move has the merit of preventing the immediate development of White’s attack and compels him, sooner or later, to play g3, thereby weakening his kingside pawns”, Steinitz/Potter, \textit{The Field}, 1874.

“The text-move would appear to have been introduced in the correspondence match between London and Vienna which we have already had occasion to mention. (The players were:- \textit{London}: Blackburne, Horwitz, Lowenthal, Potter, Steinitz and Wisker; \textit{Vienna}: Berger, Czank, Fleisig, Gelbfuhs, Kolisch and Meitner.)

We cannot resist quoting the annotation by Steinitz and Potter at this point as it vividly illustrates the vigorous state of the nineteenth century theoretical study of this variation”, Botterill/Harding.
10 c4!?

“This very good move kept Black’s position confined for a long time, as it effectually checked the advance...d7-d6 by threatening c4-c5”, Steinitz/Potter.

10...h6

Black has two more ideas at his disposal:

I) 10...a6 11 d3 d4 12 g3 h6 “may, we believe, also be played with safety”, Steinitz, Modern Chess Instructor. However, 13 f3 (13 f4! d4 14 de4 dxe2+ 15 wxe2 seems good) 13...e8 (or 13...d6 14 h4 f6 15 c5) 14 h4 f6 15 c5 d4 16 xd3 d6 17 e4 b4 18 c4 d5 19 e1 a5 20 xd5+ xd5 21 wxd5+ e7 22 c4 favours White, Gutman; II) “10...f6 opened the door to various complications which otherwise could not arise”, Steinitz/Potter.

And now:

A) 11 g3 f5 (“if 11...h5?! then 12 f3 xe8 13 h4 “would have been an effective mode of continuing the attack”, Steinitz/Potter) 12 f3 e8 13 fd4 h3 14 f3 xd4 15 xd4 (15 xd4 d6) 15...a6 16 c3 f5 17 d5 e5 (17...h3? is bad in view of 18...xe1 g4 19 xe8 h2 20 g2 xh2+ 21 f1 22 xe5 e5 19 xf7 d6 20 fe1 e7 with equality, Gutman; B) 11 f3!? (“This move enabled us to safely bring about the retreat...h6, and therefore, in our opinion, was inferior...”, Steinitz/Potter) 11...g4 is a more original treatment.

(“The effect of this move had probably escaped the notice of the Vienna analysts. It enabled Black to rectify 10...f6, and to provide a retreat for the queen at f6”, Steinitz/Potter) 12 g3 f6 13 d3 (“Our abstention from making the tempting move...a7-a6 at previous stages of the game is now fully justified, as this knight was comparatively inactive at b5, and its ultimate retreat therefore was certain”, Steinitz/Potter) 13...e8 (“With an obscure position and probably equal chances”, Botterill/Harding) 14 d2!? (14 d2, though apparently stronger, could have been advantageously met with 14...h6?!, Steinitz/Potter) 14...h6 leads to the main line.

This was the original move order in the Vienna-London, corr. 1872-74: “The position now arrived
at would probably have arisen from our playing 10...\(\mathcal{Q}h6\)^\textsuperscript{15}, Steinitz/Potter.

11 \(\mathcal{Q}c3 \mathcal{Q}e8\) 12 g3 \(\mathcal{W}f6\)

13 \(\mathcal{Q}d4\)!

13 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) d6! (13...b6, "which would have confined White to a line of play that we considered the least dangerous for London", Steinitz/Potter, seems to me less convincing on account of 14 \(\mathcal{W}d2 \mathcal{Q}b7\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}d1\) d6 16 \(\mathcal{Q}d5 \mathcal{W}f5\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}h4 \mathcal{W}d7\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}d3\) with pressure for White) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}e1 \mathcal{Q}g4\) is fine for Black as 15 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) fails to 15...\(\mathcal{W}xb2\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}b1\) \(\mathcal{W}xa2\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xb7\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe2\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xe2 \mathcal{Q}xf3\) 19 \(\mathcal{Q}xa2 \mathcal{Q}xd1\) 20 \(\mathcal{Q}xc7\) \(\mathcal{Q}c8\), Gutman.

13...\(\mathcal{W}g6\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}h5\)!!

"With the object of driving the hostile queen away from the support of Black's g-pawn. Instead, 14 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4 \mathcal{W}xe4\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}g5\) would have given us the option of drawing the game at once", Steinitz/Potter.

We follow: 16...\(\mathcal{Q}e8\)! (the only move to draw, after 16...\(\mathcal{Q}c7\)?! 17 \(\mathcal{W}xg7 \mathcal{Q}f5\) 18 \(\mathcal{W}h8+ \mathcal{Q}e8\) 19 \(\mathcal{W}f6+\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 20 \(\mathcal{Q}h5\) d6 21 \(\mathcal{Q}fe1 \mathcal{Q}d7\) 22 c5 d5 23 \(\mathcal{Q}ad1\) White has a crushing attack) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xg7\) (17 \(\mathcal{Q}fe1 \mathcal{Q}f8\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}h5\) \(\mathcal{W}f5\) 19 \(\mathcal{Q}e3 \mathcal{Q}e6\) 20 \(\mathcal{W}a3+\) \(\mathcal{W}d6\) 21 \(\mathcal{W}e3 \mathcal{Q}e7\) 22 \(\mathcal{Q}ad1 \mathcal{Q}hf5\), when Black is safe) 17...\(\mathcal{W}g6\) 18 \(\mathcal{W}h8+\) \(\mathcal{Q}g8\) (best, if 18...\(\mathcal{Q}g7\)? White answers 19 \(\mathcal{Q}h5\) winning, in view of 19...\(\mathcal{W}g5\) 20 h4) 19 \(\mathcal{W}f6\) \(\mathcal{W}g6\) forcing a draw, Steinitz/Potter.

14...\(\mathcal{W}f5\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) b6?!

"15...\(\mathcal{Q}e5\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}g2 \mathcal{Q}xc4\) would not have been so good.

17 \(\mathcal{W}d4\) \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\)? (18 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}eg4\)! 19 \(\mathcal{W}xg7\) \(\mathcal{W}g6\) 20 \(\mathcal{W}xg6\) hxg6 21 \(\mathcal{Q}fe1\) f5 22 \(\mathcal{Q}g5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe1+\) 23 \(\mathcal{Q}xe1\) c6 is equal, Gutman), and Black can only avoid losing a pawn by 18...c6, in which case White plays 19 \(\mathcal{Q}ec4\) with a far better game", Steinitz/Potter.

The logical continuation could have been 19...\(\mathcal{W}g6\) 20 \(\mathcal{Q}ad1\)! (20 \(\mathcal{Q}d6\) is tactically suspect due to 20...\(\mathcal{Q}f5\) 21 \(\mathcal{Q}xf5\) \(\mathcal{W}xf5\) 22 \(\mathcal{Q}e4\) d5 23 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}c4\) 20...\(\mathcal{Q}f5\) 21 \(\mathcal{W}b4\) d5 22 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) \(\mathcal{Q}d6\) 23 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 24 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) 25 \(\mathcal{Q}a6+\) bx\(\mathcal{Q}a6\) 26 \(\mathcal{Q}c1+\) and White wins, Gutman.

16 \(\mathcal{Q}g2\) \(\mathcal{Q}b7\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}d2\)

17...\(\mathcal{Q}f6\)

"This may appear tardy, but the position required the utmost
patience on our part. Our chief object in playing the text was to make room for the king's knight, as we had determined to manoeuvr with our minor pieces before making any efforts to liberate our queen's rook. Of the many plausible lines of play which were here at our disposal, and which we discarded after careful examination, we give two interesting variations:

I) 17...\(\text{\&e5}\) 18 \(\text{\&d1}\) \(\text{\&xc4}\) 19 \(\text{\&d4}\) \(\text{\&e5}\) 20 \(\text{\&f4}\) \(\text{\&c6}\) 21 \(\text{\&xg7}\) \(\text{\&g6}\) 22 \(\text{\&xd7+}\) \(\text{\&xd7}\) 23 \(\text{\&xf6+}\) \(\text{\&d6}\) 24 \(\text{\&d1+}\) \(\text{\&c5}\) 25 \(\text{\&d7+}\) \(\text{\&b4}\) 26 \(\text{\&d4+}\), and mates in two moves;

II) 17...\(\text{\&e7}\) 18 \(\text{\&d5+}\) \(\text{\&f8}\) 19 \(\text{\&xc7}\) \(\text{\&xe4}\) 20 \(\text{\&d6+}\) \(\text{\&e7}\) 21 \(\text{\&xa8}\) \(\text{\&xa8}\) 22 \(\text{\&b4}\) \(\text{\&b7}\) 23 \(\text{\&b5}\) \(\text{\&d8}\) 24 \(\text{\&xb7}\) \(\text{\&xb7}\) 25 \(\text{\&b8+}\), and wins", Steinitz/Potter.

18 \(\text{\&d1}\) \(\text{\&f7}\) 19 \(\text{\&f1}\) \(\text{\&b8}\)

"The key move of defence. Had we played otherwise the following continuations would probably have ensued:

I) 19...\(\text{\&a5}\) 20 \(\text{\&c5}\) \(\text{\&c4}\) 21 \(\text{\&c2}\) (21 \(\text{\&xf6}\)? \(\text{\&xe1+}\) 22 \(\text{\&xe1}\) \(\text{\&xf6}\) 23 \(\text{\&xb7}\) \(\text{\&b8}\) 24 \(\text{\&d5}\) \(\text{\&xb2}\) 25 \(\text{\&d2}\) \(\text{\&e5}\) 26 \(\text{\&xb2}\) \(\text{\&d3}\) 27 \(\text{\&d2}\) \(\text{\&xb2}\) 28 \(\text{\&xb2}\) also favours White, Gutman) 21...\(\text{\&xc5}\) 22 \(\text{\&a4}\) \(\text{\&cd6}\) 23 \(\text{\&xd6}\) \(\text{\&xe1+}\) 24 \(\text{\&xe1}\) \(\text{\&xd6}\) 25 \(\text{\&xf5}\), winning the bishop;

II) 19...\(\text{\&ce5}\) 20 \(\text{\&b3}\) \(\text{\&e7}\) 21 \(\text{\&f4}\) \(\text{\&c6}\) (or 21...\(\text{\&g6}\) 22 \(\text{\&xf6}\) ) 22 \(\text{\&d5}\) with a fine game", Steinitz/Potter.

20 \(\text{\&f4}\) \(\text{\&a5}\)

"This marks another step towards freeing our game, as it brought our bishop into active operation, and ultimately forced the exchange of pieces so long desired on our part", Steinitz/Potter.

21 \(\text{\&c5}\)!

21 \(\text{\&d3}\) \(\text{\&d6}\) 22 \(\text{\&b3}\) (22 \(\text{\&xd6}\)!?) \(\text{\&e5+}\) 23 \(\text{\&h1}\) \(\text{\&xe1+}\) 24 \(\text{\&xe1}\) \(\text{\&xg2}\) 25 \(\text{\&xg2}\) \(\text{\&xd6}\) 26 \(\text{\&xh7}\) \(\text{\&f8}\) 27 \(\text{\&b3}\) \(\text{\&c6}\) was indicated by Steinitz/Potter as slightly better for Black, in my opinion the position after 28 \(\text{\&d3}\) \(\text{\&c7}\) 29 \(\text{\&d1}\) \(\text{\&d8}\) is equal, Gutman) 22...\(\text{\&xe4}\) 23 \(\text{\&xe4}\) \(\text{\&e7}\) 24 \(\text{\&h1}\) \(\text{\&ab7}\) 25 \(\text{\&b4}\) \(\text{\&a5}\) 26 \(\text{\&a3}\) \(\text{\&xb4}\) 27 \(\text{\&xb4}\) \(\text{\&e6}\) 28 \(\text{\&c5}\) \(\text{\&xc5}\) 29 \(\text{\&b1}\) \(\text{\&c4}\) 30 \(\text{\&xc5}\) \(\text{\&xe4}\) 31 \(\text{\&xe4}\) (31 \(\text{\&xe4}\) \(\text{\&xc5}\) 32 \(\text{\&xb7}\) \(\text{\&xe1+}\) 33 \(\text{\&xe1}\) \(\text{\&a7}\) 34 \(\text{\&xh7}\) \(\text{\&xb7}\) 35 \(\text{\&g1}\) \(\text{\&wb6+}\) 36 \(\text{\&e2}\) \(\text{\&c5}\) 37 \(\text{\&xg7}\) \(\text{\&c6}\) with some edge to Black, Gutman) 31...\(\text{\&xe4}\) 32 \(\text{\&xe4}\) \(\text{\&c8}\) ("After a severe examination we considered this a much more prudent and safe mode of play than 32...\(\text{\&xc5}\) in which case Vienna would have obtained a fine attack by 33 \(\text{\&f5}\)", Steinitz/Potter) 33 \(\text{\&d5}\) \(\text{\&xc5}\) 34 \(\text{\&xh7}\) \(\text{\&f8}\) 35 \(\text{\&d3}\) \(\text{\&e8}\) 36 \(\text{\&c3}\) \(\text{\&d6}\) 37 \(\text{\&f3}\) ("37 \(\text{\&e1}\) appears more plausible, but would have been successfully met by 37...\(\text{\&h5}\) 38 \(\text{\&f3}\) \(\text{\&f7}\)", Steinitz/Potter) 37...\(\text{\&e6}\) 38 \(\text{\&c1}\) \(\text{\&b5}\) 39 \(\text{\&d2}\) \(\text{\&c6}\) gave Black an advantage in Vienna-London, corr. 1872-74 (by a different move order).
21...bxc5 22 \( \text{b}5 \text{c}6 \\

“Our forces were sufficient to meet any hostile attack”, Steinitz/Potter.

23 \( \text{w}xd7+! \\

“We were also prepared for other replies, which if not properly met would have given our opponents the satisfaction of winning in a most brilliant style. The line which we intended to adopt will be found interesting”, Steinitz/Potter.

23 g4 \( \text{w}xg4 \) 24 \( \text{d}xc5 \text{e}xel+ \) 25 \( \text{e}xel \) was more forceful, and now:

A) 25...\( \text{a}8 \) 26 h3! (“26 \( \text{d}e6+ \text{c}8 \) 27 \( \text{d}exc7 \) \( a6 \) and wins, for if 28 \( \text{d}xa8 \) \( axb5 \) and the other knight cannot escape”, Steinitz/Potter)

26...\( \text{w}f5 \) 27 \( \text{d}e6+ \text{c}8 \), when White wins “brilliantly” by 28 \( \text{w}a5!! \) \( \text{d}xa5 \) (or 28...\( \text{b}6 \) 29 \( \text{d}xa7+ \) \( \text{d}xa7 \) 30 \( \text{w}xf5 \) 29 \( \text{d}xa7 \) mate, Gutman;)

B) 25...\( \text{d}ce5?! \) 26 \( \text{d}xb7+ \text{xb7} \) 27 \( \text{d}d4 \) c5 28 h3 \( \text{w}g6 \) 29 f5 \( \text{w}g3 \) 30 \( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{w}xe3+ \) 31 \( \text{w}xe3 \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 32 \( \text{w}xd4 \) \( \text{b}6\) is level, Gutman.

23...\( \text{w}xd7 \) 24 \( \text{d}xd7+ \text{xd7} \) 25 \( \text{d}xc5+ \text{d}8 \) 26 \( \text{d}xb7+ \text{xb7} \) 27 \( \text{e}xe8+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 28 \( \text{f}8 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 29 \( \text{d}xd6 \) \( \text{d}xd6 \) 30 b3

The endgame is better for White thanks to his active rook, Gutman.

Sequel 10
The MacDonnell Variation
(1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{d}xd4 \) \( \text{w}h4 \) 5 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{b}4+ \) 6 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{w}e4+ \) 7 \( \text{e}2 \) \( d8 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{d}xd2 \) 9 \( \text{d}xd2 \) \( \text{w}f4 \))

10 a4!?

This move was introduced by MacDonnell in his matches against John Wisker: London 1873 (+3=1) and London 1875 (+4=4-7).

“George Alcock MacDonnell, was an Irish-born player and author. A genial man, fond of company, full of anecdotes and imitations of Staunton and other leading players, MacDonnell — the king’s jester of chess — was popular among London’s players”, Hooper/Whylde, The Oxford Companion to Chess.

“The queen’s rook is poised to switch via a3 across to the kingside. An interesting idea, which gives White good practical chances”, Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1874.

10...\( \text{h}6 \)

10...\( a6 \) is designed to force back the white knight and to prevent the activity of the White’s rook.

White has two possibilities:

A) 11 \( \text{d}3 \) with a further split:

A1) 11...\( \text{h}6 \) leaves the black knight badly placed on h6, and
would allow White to exert pressure in the centre by 12 \( \text{Qd}3 \) d6 13 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Wd}4 \) 14 \( \text{Qd}3 \)! since after 14...\( \text{Wxa}4 \) (14...\( \text{Wxb}2 \) 15 \( \text{Qc}4 \)) 15 b3 \( \text{Wxa}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) 17 c3 \( \text{Qe}6 \) (17...\( \text{Qf}5 \) 18 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 19 \( \text{Qcb}6 \)!) 18 \( \text{Qcb}6 \) \( \text{cx}b6 \) 19 b4 \( \text{Wb}5 \) 20 \( \text{Qd}2 \) Black loses the queen, Gutman;

A2) 11...\( \text{Qf}6 \)? keeps more control, 12 a5 (12 \( \text{Qc}4 \) d6 13 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{We}8 \) 14 a5 \( \text{Qe}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qa}4 \) is too slow as 15...\( \text{We}5 \) 16 \( \text{Wd}2 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \)? shows) 12...\( \text{Qe}8 \) (more precise than 12...d6 13 \( \text{Qa}4 \) \( \text{We}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qc}4 \)) 13 \( \text{Qa}4 \) \( \text{We}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qc}4 \) (or 14 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) 15 \( \text{Wd}2 \) d6 16 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) 14...\( \text{Qe}7 \) 15 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) d6 favours Black, Gutman.

B) 11 g3 \( \text{Wf}6 \) (11...\( \text{Wf}5 \) 12 \( \text{Qg}4 \)) 12 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) is the critical line.

White has a choice:

B1) 13 \( \text{Qde}4 \) \( \text{Wf}5 \) 14 \( \text{Hb}1 \) \( \text{He}8 \) 15 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qxd}3 \) 17 \( \text{Wxd}3 \) d6 18 b4 b6 19 \( \text{Hbd}1 \) \( \text{He}6 \) 20 g4 \( \text{Wg}6 \) 21 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qxg}4 \) 22 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 23 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Wh}6 \)? (MacDonnell-Wisker, first match game, London 1873, went 23...\( \text{Wxe}4 \) 24 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{Qxe}4+ \) 25 \( \text{Qg}1 \) \( \text{Qxd}3 \) 26 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{fxe}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qxe}8+ \) \( \text{Qe}7 \) 28 \( \text{Hxa}8 \) \text{Qxc}2 29 \( \text{Hc}1 \) \( \text{Qxa}4 \) 30 \( \text{Hxe}7+ \) and White won easily) 24 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{Wxe}6 \) 25 \( \text{Qde}1 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) (25...\( \text{Qf}5 \) 26 \( \text{Qc}5 \) \( \text{Qf}2 \) 27 \( \text{Qxf}2 \) \( \text{Wxe}1+ \) 28 \( \text{Qf}1 \) 26 \( \text{We}3 \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) appears fine for Black, Gutman;

B2) 13 \( \text{Qd}5 \)! looks like a promising alternative, 13...\( \text{Wxb}2 \) 14 c3 \( \text{He}8 \) (or 14...\( \text{Qa}5 \) 15 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{Qxc}4 \) 16 \( \text{Qxc}4 \) with the decisive 17 \( \text{Qa}2 \) to follow) 15 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qa}2 \) and White wins, Gutman.

11 \( \text{Qa}3 \) \( \text{He}8 \)

11...a6 12 \( \text{Qc}3 \) will transpose into a variation after 10...a6 11 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) 110 12 \( \text{Qc}4 \)!

12 g3 is less convincing due to 12...\( \text{Wb}4 \)! (after 12...\( \text{Wf}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qc}4 \) a6 14 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Wg}5 \) 15 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 18 \( \text{Wd}2 \) \( \text{Qf}7 \) 19 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qd}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qce}5 \) 21 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 22 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 23 \( \text{Wd}4 \) g6 24 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \), MacDonnell-Wisker, second match game, London 1875, 25 \( \text{Qd}5 \) would have been unclear, Steinitz, The Field, 1875) 13 \( \text{Qc}4 \) (or 13 c3 \( \text{Wf}8 \), Steinitz) 13...a6 14 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) with advantage for Black, Gutman.

12...a6 13 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Wg}5 \)

13...\( \text{Wh}4 \) 14 \( \text{Qh}3 \) (14 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qd}4 \)) 14...\( \text{We}7 \) was suggested by Steinitz, therefore 15 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 16 \( \text{Qd}4 \) \( \text{Qxd}4 \) 17 \( \text{Wxd}4 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) 18 \( \text{Qxe}8+ \) \( \text{Wxe}8 \) 19 \( \text{Wd}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 20 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) (or 20...\( \text{Qe}6 \) 21 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \) 22 \( \text{Qf}3 \) c6 23 \( \text{He}1 \)) 21 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wg}6 \) 22 \( \text{Qf}3 \) creates serious problems for Black, Gutman.

14 \( \text{Qc}3 \)!

Other continuations are less challenging:

I) 14 \( \text{Qg}3 \), indicated by Steinitz, 14...\( \text{Wc}5 \)?? 15 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) leads nowhere for White, Gutman;

II) 14 \( \text{Qba}3 \) with two examples:

A) 14...\( \text{Qf}5 \) 15 c3 \( \text{Qe}6 \) (15...\( \text{d}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) seems to be more logical) 16 \( \text{Qc}2 \)?? (MacDonnell-Wisker, fourth match game, London 1875, went 16 b4 \( \text{Qg}6 \) 17 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 18 \( \text{b}5 \)
axb5 19 axb5 hx3 20 bxc6 xa2 21
e5 c6 22 c4 x6 23 c1 dxe5 24 d3+ d6 and here White
should have played 25 f4! with a
winning advantage, Steinitz)
16...g6 17 d2e3 gives Black a
little counterplay, Gutman;
B) 14...d6!?, Steinitz, when 15
e3 f5 16 xf5 x5 17 g3
f6 18 c3 leads to an unclear
position, Gutman.

14...d6
14...f5 15 d3 h4 (15...cd4?
can be met by 16 xf5 xf5 17
d5 d6 18 e3) 16 g3 h6 17
d2! xd2 18 x2 g6 19 f4
and White has considerable
pressure, Gutman.
15 g3 f6 16 d5 d4 17 d3!
h4
17...xc4 is tactically suspect on
account of 18 e3! c5 19 xe8+
xe8 20 xc7+ d7 21 x4a8,
Gutman.
18 g3 h3 19 f4 f5 20 d5
White has excellent compensation
for his pawn, Gutman.

"At times open lines of rooks and
bishops may have a value
equivalent to that of a few pawns",
Lasker.

Sequel 11
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4
d4 h4 5 b5 b4+ 6 d2
e4+ 7 e2 d8 8 0-0 xd2 9
xd2 f4)
10 g3
"In improving our understanding
of the Scotch Game we shall have to
make rediscoveries as well as
discoveries! ... In both previous
text-move", Botterill/Harding.
However, 10 b3!? ge7 11 g3 is
superficial, after 11 f6 12 c3
h5? 13 d2 h4!? 14 ad1 h6 15
c5 xd2 16 xd2 b6 17 e4
hxg3 18 fxg3 f6 Black was clearly
better in Golmaya-Steinitz, fifth
match game, Havana 1883.
10...h6!?
10...f6 was preferred by Mikhail
Chigorin.

White has two ideas worth
consideration:
A) 11 e4 e5!? 12 d3 and here:
A1) 12...a6 13 bc3 h5 14 h4 f6 15
e1 d4 16 e2!? xxb2 17 f4
e5 18 e2 (after 18 c4 h6 19
e2 g6 20 b1 a5 21 d4,
 Nielsen-Kuhl, corr. 1994, 21...d6 would have been satisfactory for Black) 18...wb6 19 d6 (or 19...wd6 20 wxd6 cxd6 21 xe4) 20 d6+ xe6 21 xe6+ c8 22 x6 23 f4 and Black is in trouble, Gutman;
A2) 12...xf6!? 13 xd8 x8 is a more sensible way to play, 14 f3 c5!? (Meitner-Chigorin, Vienna 1882, went 14...wh5 15 xe2 a6 16 bd4 xd4 17 wd4 xe5 18 f3 c5 19 db3 xe6 20 wd2 db8 21 xe1 f5 22 x6 x6 fx6 23 wd6 xf3 24 xb8 g4 25 wf4 x6 26 gx6 with advantage for White) 15 wd2 h6 16 xe1 d6 17 xe8+ xe8 18 xe1 xe6 leads nowhere for White, Gutman.
B) 11 xe1?? might be a better choice, after 11...xg7 (11...wb2?! 12 c3) 12 d4!? (12 xc4 a6 13 dxe4 wg6 14 xf7 xf7 15 dg5 wf6 16 xe6+ x6 17 x6 axb5 18 xe1 d6 19 c3 x7 20 f4 h5 gave Black sufficient compensation for the queen in Soerens-fors-Karlsson, corr.1999) 12...f6 (or 12...wh6 13 h4 f6 14 xc5) 13 cb8 xf8 14 wd2 f6 15 ad1 White retains pressure, Gutman.
11 xe4

11...xg7
A3) 13...\(\text{Qxd4}\) 14 \(\text{Wxd4 Wf6}\) 15 \(\text{Wd3}\) was indicated by Botterill/Harding, however 15...h5 16 h4 \(\text{Ab8}\) (Black did not have time for 16...g5 on account of 17 \(\text{Ad1}\)! \(\text{Ab8}\) 18 hxg5 \(\text{Wxg5}\) 19 \(\text{Qd6!}\) cxd6 20 \(\text{Wxd6 Ma8\textcolor{red}{21 \text{Axh7 Mh6 22 Wd4, and White wins}}\) 17 \(\text{Ad1}\) d6 18 \(\text{Wxa3 Mh6}\) 19 \(\text{Qd2 Qg4}\) 20 \(\text{Qg2}\) condemns Black to a difficult defence, Gutman.

B) 12...d6!? by all counts is a must, according to Botterill/Harding.

Can White exploit Black’s king position?

We examine:

B1) 13 \(\text{Qbxd6 cxd6}\) 14 \(\text{Qxd6}\) “is seen to be not quite correct after 14...\(\text{Cc7}\) 15 \(\text{Qxf7 Wf6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxh8 Qh3!}\)”, Botterill/Harding, nevertheless 17 \(\text{Qg2 Axg2}\) 18 \(\text{Qxg2 Mxh8}\) 19 c3 \(\text{Qd8}\) 20 \(\text{We2}\) keeps matters unclear, Gutman;

B2) 13 \(\text{Wd3 a6}\) (not 13...\(\text{Qh3?!}\) 14 \(\text{Qfd1 a6 15 \text{Wxa3}\}) 16 \(\text{Qbxd6 cxd6}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd6 Qc7\textcolor{red}{16 Qxf7 Wf6 17 Qxh8 Af5 18 We3 Mxh8 with approximately equal chances, Gutman;}}\)

B3) 13 \(\text{Qe1}\) appears critical.

And then:

B3a) 13...\(\text{Qd7?!}\) 14 \(\text{Wd3!}\) (“White should strive to intensify the pressure by less drastic means”, Botterill/Harding) 14...a6 15 \(\text{Wxa3 Ab8}\) 16 \(\text{Qxd6 cxd6}\) 17 \(\text{Ad1}\)!! (17 \(\text{Qxd6}\) can be met by 17...\(\text{Wf6}\) 18 \(\text{Ad1 Qc7}\)!) 17...d5 18 \(\text{Qxd5 Qxd5}\) 19 \(\text{Qxd5 Qc7\textcolor{red}{20 Md6 is hopeless, Gutman;}}\)

B3b) 13...a6 14 \(\text{Qd4 Qxd4}\) 15 \(\text{Wxd4 Wf6}\) 16 \(\text{Wd3 h5}\) 17 h4 \(\text{Ab8}\) 18 \(\text{Ad1 Qd7}\) 19 \(\text{Wxa3 Mh6}\) 20 \(\text{Qd2}\) still secures White some pressure, Gutman;

B3c) 13...\(\text{Wf6?!}\) is the best answer; 14 c3 (14 \(\text{Qg2 a6 15 \text{Qc3 Wd4) 14...a6 15 \text{Qd4 Qxd4 16 cxd4 h5 leaves Black with no problems, Gutman.}}\)

C) 12...\(\text{We6?!}\) is perhaps even stronger since the endgame resulting from 13 \(\text{Wd3 Wf5}\) 14 \(\text{Wxf5 Qxf5}\) 15 \(\text{Qf6}\) a6!? (15...\(\text{Qc4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxc4 Qxd4}\) 17 \(\text{Qe4 f5}\) 18 \(\text{Ad1 Qe8}\) 19 \(\text{Qxd4 d6 20 Qd2 fxe4 21 Qxe4 Qxe4}\) 22 \(\text{Qxe4 c6}\) 23 c4 \(\text{Qf5}\) 24 \(\text{Qf4}\) g6 25 g4 gave White some edge in Hiarcs2-Chess Pro, computer game, 1994) 16 \(\text{Qc3 Qfd4, promises White insufficient compensation for his pawn, Gutman.}}\)

12...a6 13 \(\text{Qd4}\)

13...\(\text{Qxd4}\)

Golmoyo-Steinitz, third match game, Havana 1883, went 13...\(\text{Wg6}\)
14 Qxc6+ Qxc6 15 Wd2 Wf6 16 c3
d6 17 Mad1 Qe6 18 Qe3 Qe8 19
c4! Wc8 20 Qfe1 Qb8 21 b4 Qa7
22 b5 Qe5 23 f4 Qd7 24 bxa6 b6,
and now 25 Qf3?! Rab8 26 Qc6
would give an advantage for White,
Gutman.
14 Wxd4 Qc6 15 Wc3 Qe8
15...Wf6 16 Wxf6+ gxf6 17 Qh5
Qf8 18 Qe3 d6 19 Qd5 Qe6 20
Qxf6 Qe7 21 Qe4 Qg8 22 f4 gives
White an excellent ending, Gutman.
16 Qfe1!?
After 16 Qf3 Wf6 17 Wxf6+ gxf6
18 Qd5 Qe7 (18...Qb4 19 Qxf7
Qe7 can be met by 20 c3 Qxf7 21
cxb4 b6 22 Mad1 Qb7 23 f3) 19
Qfe1 (“Winning this ending is no
easy task for Black, but evidently
the position achieved is not a happy
outcome for White”, Botterill/
Harding) 19...Qe5!? (Mieses-
Chigorin, Hastings 1895, continued
19...d6 20 Qxe7 Qxe7 21 Qe1+ Qf8
22 Qe4 Qe6 23 Qe3 Qg7 24 Qd5
Qxd5 25 Qxd5 Qb4 26 Qb3 Qf8
27 Qe4 Qc6 28 Qh4 Qg7 29 Qg4+
with equality) 20 f4 (or 20 Qe3 c6
21 Qf5 exd5 22 Qxe7 Qxe7 23 f4
d6 and Black has fair compensation
for the exchange) 20...Qxc4 21
Qxc4 c6 22 Qxe7 Qxe7 23 Qe1+
Qf8 24 Qd3 h6 and the endgame is
clearly better for Black, Gutman.
16...d6
16...Wf6?! is wrong in view of 17
Qxf6+ Qxf6 18 Qh5 Qf8 19 Qe3.
17 Qf3 Qd7
17...Qf6? loses because of 18 Qxc6
bxc6 19 Qxd6! Qxe1+ 20 Qxe1
Wxc3 (20...Wxd6 21 Wxg7) 21
Qxf7+ Qd7 22 bxc3, Gutman.
18 Qd5
White has obvious pressure and
Black must play carefully, Gutman.

Sequel 12
The Blackburne Variation
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4
Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qb5 Qb4+ 6 Qd2
Qxe4+ 7 Qe2 Qd8 8 0-0 Qxd2)
9 Wxd2!?

This recapture was introduced by
Blackburne in his match against
Wilhelm Steinitz, London 1876.

“Joseph Henry Blackburne was
for more than twenty years one of
the first six players in the world and
for even longer the leading English-
born player. Blackburne had remar-
kable combinative powers and is
remembered for his swinging king’s
side attacks, often well prepared but
occasionally consisting of an ingeni-
ous swindle that would deceive even
the greatest of his contemporaries”,
Hooper/Whyld, The Oxford Com-
ppanion to Chess.
9...Qf6
9...Wh4 is a recent try, after 10 g3
Wh6 11 f4 a6 12 Q5c3 Wf6
(12...Qg7 13 Qe4 d5 14 Qg5) 13
Qd1 Qe7 (13...Qg7 can well be
met by 14 Qe4!? Wxb2 15 Qbc3)
14 Qd5 Wc5+ 15 Qg2 Qg7 16 c4
b5 17 Qf3 bx4 18 Qbc3 (18 Qxe7
Qxe7 19 Wc3 f6 20 b4 Wb6 21 Qa3
\[ \text{Bb8 22 Hab1 He8 23 Qxc4 also favours White, Gutman} \] 18...Hb8 19 Hac1 Qxd5 20 Qxd5 He8 21 b3 Qd4 22 Hxd4 Hxd4 23 Hxd4 cxb3 24 axb3 Hxb3, Marusenko-Varley, South Wales 2000, 25 Hxc7!? Hb2+ 26 Kh1 a5 27 Ha7 would have been decisive, Gutman.

10 Qe1c3 We5

Alternatively:

I) 10...Wg6 11 Whf4! ("If then White attacks by 11 Qd3 Black should not mind his pawns being doubled, and he may safely oppose queens for exchange by 11...Wh6!", Steinitz, International Chess Magazine, 1885)

11...d6 12 Qxc7? Hxc7 13 Qb5+ Qd8 14 Mad1! (after 14 Whd6+ Qd7 Black can defend himself)

14...Qd7 15 Qxd6 Hb8 16 Qc4 Hf8 17 Hf1 yields White strong pressure, Gutman;

II) 10...Wh4 11 Qd5! Qxd5 12 Hxd5 Wf6 (or 12...He8 13 Whf7 Hxe2 14 Ife1 We7 15 Wg8+ We8 16 Wxe8+ Hxe8 17 Whxe8+ Whxe8 18 Qxc7+ Qd8 19 Qxa8 b6 20 He1 Qb7 21 Qxb6 axb6 22 He4 and White maintains an edge, Gutman)

13 Qc4 Wf8 14 Mad1 a6 15 Qc3 d6 16 Wh5 Qf5 (16...Wg6 17 Wh4+ f6 18 Qd3 Qf5 19 Whf4 Qxd3 20 Hxd3) 17 Qd3 Qg6 18 Wh3 Qe5 19 Qe4 (19 Qd5!? Wh6 20 Wh4+ f6 21 Qxg6 hxg6 22 f4 Qc6 23 Hf1 Qd7 24 e4 is also quite promising, Gutman) 19...We6 20 Wg3 axe4 21 Qxe4 f5 22 Qc5 Whf6 23 Wb3 b6 24 Qe6+ Qd7 25 Qxf8+ Wxf8 26 f4 with a clear advantage to White in Olenin-Kholmov, Moscow 1996.

11 Hf1!

11 Mad1 seems less effective.

Black has two options:

A) 11...h5?! ("Worse than premature. His position did not warrant his attempting any counterattack at all"); Steinitz) 12 Hfe1 Wc5 13 Wh4 ("Excellent. White assumes the attack with great vigour", Steinitz)

13...Qe5? ("13...We5 14 Wh4, threatening 15 Qd5 as well as 15 Qd3 with a strong attack"); Steinitz)

14 Qd4 (14 Qd5!? Qxd5 15 Wxe5 is also crushing, Gutman) 14...We7 15 Qf3 d6 (15...Qxf3+ 16 Qxf3) 16 Wxe5 led to a quick win for White in Taubenhaus-Ladislas, simultaneous game, Paris 1885;

B) 11...d6!? ("He ought to have made speed for developing defensive forces by 11...d6"); Steinitz) 12 Hfe1 We6!? 13 Qg4 Wc5 14 Qxe6 fxe6 15 Qxe6 Qd7 is equal, Gutman.

11...a6

11...d6 runs into the disruptive 12 Qc4! Wc5 (12...Wh5 loses due to 13 Qxd6! cxd6 14 Wxd6+ Qd7 15 Mad1 He8 16 Qb5 Hc8 17 Qxe8+ Whxe8 18 Qe1+ Qd8 19 Whf8+) 13 Qxf7 a6 14 Qa3 Wh8 15 Qd5, and White has regained his pawn with an edge, Gutman.

12 Qa3
12...\texttt{wc5}!

A new idea.

Other continuations are:

I) 12...\texttt{b5}? is ruled out by 13 \texttt{Af3 wc5 14 b4 wb6 15 wg5 hg8 16 Ad5, Steinitz;}

II) 12...\texttt{wd4} 13 \texttt{wg5 h8 14 Ad1 h6} 15 \texttt{wg3 we5} 16 \texttt{wh4 wg5 17 wc4} De5 looks like a more testing line, with a further split:

A) 18 f4 Dxc4 19 fxg5 Dxa3 20 gxf6 Dxc2 21 Ad3 Dxe1 22 h7 gxf6! (Steinitz' analysis gives 22...\texttt{De8} 23 fxg7 Dc2 is refuted by 24 Ad5!) 23 Dg8 Dc2 24 Ad5 d6 25 Axh7 Ad5 and Black is at least no worse, Gutman;

B) 18 \texttt{wb4!} Dc6 19 wb3 Af8 (19...b5 20 Ad3 Ab7 is dubious because of 21 Dxf7 De5 22 Dxe5 Dxe5 23 Dxb7 Ab8 24 Ac6, Steinitz) 20 Dc4 b5 (20...\texttt{wc5} was indicated by Steinitz as an possible improvement, however, 21 Da4! \texttt{wb4} 22 wg3 Ag8 23 Ab6! cxb6 24 Ad6 Ae4 25 Dxf7+ Ae7 26 Ad3 d5 27 Axe4 dxe4 28 Dxe6 gxh6 29 Dg8 leaves Black's king caught in the centre) 21 Ab3 Ab7 (21...bxc4? fails to 22 wa3, Steinitz) 22 Ad5, with a critical position.

White's queen has done an excellent job, and Black now has a difficult choice from:

B1) 22 Ab8?! 23 wa3 Ag8, played by Steinitz, gives White three powerful continuations:

B1a) 24 De5 Dxe5 25 We7+ Ac8 26 Dxe5 Dxd5 27 Dfx7 Ad8 28 Dxd5 Adx5 29 Dxd5! (Blackburne-Steinitz, second match game, London 1876, went 29 Dxd5 20 Ad5 D8 31 Ad5 Af8 32 Dd4 Af6 33 Dc3 Dc6 34 De1 Ab7, when White was only slightly better) 29...d6 30 Ae7 with a clear advantage to White, Steinitz;

B1b) 24 Ae5?! Wh4 (or 24...Dxe5 25 We7+ Ac8 26 Dxb6+ cxb6 27 Dc7 28 Dd6+ Ab8 29 Dxb8+ Ac8 30 Ab7, Steinitz) 25 Dxf6 gxf6 (25...Dxf6 loses to 26 Dxd7+! Ac8 27 Dxf7) 26 Ae4 Wh3 27 Ag4! and Black is helpless, Gutman;

B1c) 24 Dd6! is the most incisive response, 24...cx6 25 Dxd6 Dxd6 26 Dxd5 leads to a completely lost position for Black, Gutman.

B2) 22 Ac8!! was necessary according to Steinitz, although 23 Dxf6 (more impressive than 23 De7+ Dxe7 24 Dxe7 wc5! 25 Da5
\[ \text{\textbf{Sequel 13}} \]

(1 e4 e5 2 \textdaggerdbl} f3 \textdaggerdbl} c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \textdaggerdbl} xd4 \textdaggerdbl} h4 5 \textdaggerdbl} b5 \textdaggerdbl} b4+ 6 \textdaggerdbl} d2 \textdaggerdbl} xe4+ 7 \textdaggerdbl} e2 \textdaggerdbl} d8 8 0-0 \textdaggerdbl} xd2 9 \textdaggerdbl} xd2)

9...a6

"An improvement on 9...\textdaggerdbl} f6", Botterill/Harding.

10 \textdaggerdbl} c3!

Three more moves come into consideration, without any one being particularly effective:

A) 10...\textdaggerdbl} g6 11 \textdaggerdbl} d4 (11 \textdaggerdbl} xc6 bxc6 12 \textdaggerdbl} d4 c5) 11...\textdaggerdbl} xd4 12 \textdaggerdbl} xd4 \textdaggerdbl} f6 13 \textdaggerdbl} c3 d6 (13...\textdaggerdbl} xc2? is bad because of 14 \textdaggerdbl} e4) 14 \textdaggerdbl} fe1 \textdaggerdbl} e8 15 \textdaggerdbl} xe8+ \textdaggerdbl} xe8 (or 15...\textdaggerdbl} xe8 16 \textdaggerdbl} e1+ \textdaggerdbl} f8 17 \textdaggerdbl} c4 c6 18 \textdaggerdbl} b4 \textdaggerdbl} e8 19 \textdaggerdbl} b6) 16 \textdaggerdbl} e1 and White retains the pressure, Gutman;

B) 10...\textdaggerdbl} e5 with a further split:

B1) 11 \textdaggerdbl} c5 \textdaggerdbl} ge7 12 a4 d6 13 \textdaggerdbl} a3 \textdaggerdbl} d4?! (improving on 13...\textdaggerdbl} e6 14 \textdaggerdbl} ad1 \textdaggerdbl} d7 15 \textdaggerdbl} fe1 \textdaggerdbl} a5 16 \textdaggerdbl} e2 \textdaggerdbl} ae8 17 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 18 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 \textdaggerdbl} hf8 19 b4 \textdaggerdbl} xb4? 20 \textdaggerdbl} xc7+ 1-0, Schiller-Shannon, USA 1990) 14 \textdaggerdbl} e2 \textdaggerdbl} e8 15 \textdaggerdbl} fe1 \textdaggerdbl} e6 favours Black, Gutman;

13...\textdaggerdbl} d6

13...\textdaggerdbl} e8 allows White to transfer the a3-knight to the centre, 14 \textdaggerdbl} c4 d6 15 \textdaggerdbl} e3!? (15 \textdaggerdbl} a4 \textdaggerdbl} b4 16 c3 \textdaggerdbl} xa4 17 b3 \textdaggerdbl} xe2 18 \textdaggerdbl} xd6! \textdaggerdbl} b5! 19 c4 \textdaggerdbl} xd2 20 \textdaggerdbl} xf7+ \textdaggerdbl} d7 21 \textdaggerdbl} xd2+ \textdaggerdbl} d5 22 cxb5 \textdaggerdbl} ce7 23 bxa6 \textdaggerdbl} xa6 (double edged) 15...\textdaggerdbl} e6 16 a3!? \textdaggerdbl} c8 17 b4 \textdaggerdbl} e5 18 \textdaggerdbl} f3 gives Black a little counterplay, Gutman.

14 \textdaggerdbl} f3?! \textdaggerdbl} e6

14...\textdaggerdbl} d7 can be answered by 15 \textdaggerdbl} d5!? \textdaggerdbl} xd5 16 \textdaggerdbl} xd5 f6 17 c3 b5 18 b4 \textdaggerdbl} b6 19 \textdaggerdbl} e2 since Black's queen is rather misplaced now.

15 \textdaggerdbl} a4 \textdaggerdbl} b4

15...\textdaggerdbl} a5 16 \textdaggerdbl} f4 \textdaggerdbl} b4 (16...\textdaggerdbl} c8?! is more risky as 17 \textdaggerdbl} xc6 bxc6 18 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 19 \textdaggerdbl} xc4 \textdaggerdbl} b7 20 \textdaggerdbl} e3 \textdaggerdbl} e8 21 \textdaggerdbl} b3+ \textdaggerdbl} a7 22 \textdaggerdbl} c3 shows) 17 \textdaggerdbl} xb4 \textdaggerdbl} xb4 transposes back into the main line.

16 \textdaggerdbl} xb4 \textdaggerdbl} xb4 17 \textdaggerdbl} c5 \textdaggerdbl} e7 18 \textdaggerdbl} xb7 \textdaggerdbl} ab8 19 \textdaggerdbl} a5 \textdaggerdbl} d7 20 c3

The endgame might ensure White an edge, Gutman.
We survey Black’s defences:

A) 10...\textit{We}5 11 \textit{Dd}5 (11 \textit{Da}3 will transpose into the main line)

B) 10...\textit{Df}6 12 \textit{Dc}3 \textit{Dxd}5 13 \textit{Dxd}5 \textit{Dd}6 14 \textit{Dc}1 \textit{Dc}6 when 15 \textit{Df}3! \textit{Wxb}2 16 \textit{Dab}1 \textit{Wd}4 17 \textit{Wg}5+ \textit{Dc}8 18 c3 h6 19 \textit{Wg}3 is crushing for White, \textit{Gutman};

B) 10...\textit{Wh}4 11 \textit{Dd}5! \textit{Df}6 (or 11...\textit{Wd}4 12 \textit{Wg}5+ \textit{Dg}7 13 \textit{Dxe}7 \textit{Dxe}7 14 \textit{Dc}3) 12 \textit{Dc}3 d6 13 \textit{Dad}1 \textit{Dxd}5 14 \textit{Dxd}5 \textit{Dc}6 15 f4 yields White an excellent game, \textit{Gutman};

C) 10...\textit{Wd}4! is the best way to play; after 11 \textit{Wg}5+ \textit{Wf}6 (11...\textit{Dg}7 12 \textit{Da}3) 12 \textit{Wg}3 (12 \textit{Dc}4 \textit{Wxg}5 13 \textit{Dxg}5 \textit{Dh}6) 12...\textit{Dg}7 White’s initiative has run out of steam, \textit{Gutman}.

10...\textit{Wd}4!?

There are two other retreats:

I) 10...\textit{Wg}6 11 \textit{Dd}4!? (preferable to 11 \textit{Da}3 \textit{Dg}7 12 \textit{Dc}4 d6) 11...\textit{Dxd}4 12 \textit{Wxd}4 \textit{Df}6 13 \textit{Df}3 reaches a position covered after 10 \textit{Df}3 \textit{Wg}6;

II) 10...\textit{We}5 11 \textit{Da}3, when Black has two options:

A) 11...b5 12 \textit{Df}3 \textit{Dg}7 is nowadays considered dubious on account of 13 \textit{Df}1!!.
A1) 13...\textit{W}f5? loses due to 14 \textit{A}xe7 \textit{W}xe7 15 \textit{A}e1+;
A2) 13...\textit{W}c5 14 \textit{A}ad1 (suicidal is 14 \textit{A}xe7? \textit{W}xe7 15 \textit{A}e1+ \textit{W}f8) 14...\textit{A}b8 was recommended by Steinitz, however 15 \textit{A}xc6! \textit{A}xc6
(15...\textit{W}xc6 16 \textit{A}xe7 \textit{W}xe7 17 \textit{W}g5+) 16 \textit{A}d5 f6 17 \textit{W}f4 \textit{A}b7 18
\textit{A}xf6 \textit{A}f8 19 \textit{A}e4 gives White a winning attack, \textit{Gutman};
A3) 13...\textit{A}d6 (14 \textit{A}xd6 cxd6 was suggested by \textit{Lasker}, when 15 \textit{A}e4
(15 \textit{A}d5 \textit{A}xd5 16 \textit{A}xd5 \textit{A}b8 17 c4 is also good for White) 15...\textit{A}c7 16
c4\textit{B}xc4 17 \textit{A}c3 \textit{A}b7 18 \textit{A}xc4 condemns Black to a very difficult defence, \textit{Gutman}.
B) 11...\textit{A}e7 is more logical (\textit{Gutman}).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{B2a)} 16...\textit{A}e5 17 \textit{W}e3 d6 18 c4 bxc4 (18...b4 19 \textit{W}a7 \textit{A}d7 20 \textit{A}e4
\textit{W}e5 21 \textit{A}c2) 19 \textit{A}xc4 and Black is helpless;
\textbf{B2b)} 16...\textit{A}e7 17 \textit{W}e3 and now:
\textbf{B2b1)} 17...\textit{A}e8 18 c4! b4 (18...bxc4 19 \textit{A}xc4 d6 20 \textit{W}a7 \textit{A}b5 21 \textit{A}xf7!) 19 \textit{A}c2 yields White an overwhelming position;
\textbf{B2b2)} 17...\textit{W}f6 18 c4! bxc4 (18...\textit{A}xd5 19 cxd5 \textit{A}b6 20 \textit{A}d4)
19 \textit{A}xc4 \textit{A}xd5 (or 19...d6 20 \textit{A}a5
\textit{A}e6 21 \textit{W}a7 \textit{A}d7 22 \textit{A}b3) 20 \textit{A}xd5
d6 21 \textit{W}a7 \textit{A}b5 22 \textit{A}xb5 axb5 23
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
11...\textit{Wd4}!?

A more restrained alternative. Black has two more possibilities:

I) 11...b5 is a dynamic conception — Black prefers to seek immediate counterplay. 12 \textit{Qd}5 (after 12 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Wh}6! 13 \textit{Qad}1 \textit{Wxd}2 14 \textit{Qxd}2 \textit{Qge}7 15 \textit{Qd}5 \textit{Qb}8 16 \textit{Qe}1 d6 17 \textit{Qde}2 \textit{Qe}6 18 \textit{Qf}4 \textit{Qd}4 19 \textit{Qe}4 \textit{Qxf}3+ 20 \textit{Qxf}3 \textit{Qf}5 21 \textit{Qxe}6+ \textit{fxe}6 22 \textit{Qxe}6 b4 23 \textit{Qc}4 \textit{Qd}4 Black won quickly in Gilmay-Stoitzitz, first match game, Havana 1883) 12...\textit{Qf}6 13 c4?! (more precise than 13 f4 \textit{Qxd}5 14 \textit{Qxd}5 \textit{Wf}6 15 \textit{Qad}1 \textit{Qb}8, when White cannot deliver a knockout blow because of his misplaced knight on a3) 13...\textit{Wd}4 14 \textit{Wg}5 h6 15 \textit{Wg}3 \textit{Qxd}5 16 cxd5 \textit{Qe}7 (or 16...\textit{Qe}5 17 \textit{Qfd}1 \textit{Wxb}2 18 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Qe}8 19 \textit{Qab}1 \textit{Wxa}2 20 \textit{Wc}3) 17 \textit{Qfd}1 \textit{Wxb}2 18 d6 cxd6 19 \textit{Qf}3 d5

II) 11...\textit{Qf}6 is a more natural approach, 12 \textit{Qad}1 (12 g3 \textit{Wd}4 13 \textit{Wg}5 \textit{Qg}8 14 \textit{Qad}1 h6 15 \textit{Wc}1 \textit{Qc}5 16 \textit{Qc}4 \textit{Qd}4 17 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Wxd}4 18 \textit{Qd}1 \textit{Wc}5 19 \textit{Wf}4 \textit{Qe}8 was okay for Black in Splinter-Rowland, Chicago 1994) 12...\textit{Qe}8 13 \textit{Qc}4 d6 14 \textit{Qe}3.

Black has serious difficulties in creating enough counterplay, and I hope that the following example is a good illustration of White's play in this variation.

The game Gutman-Leisebein, corr. 1999, went 14...\textit{Qe}6 (14...\textit{Qe}7 15 f4 \textit{Qf}5 can be met by 16 \textit{Qed}5 \textit{Qxd}5 17 \textit{Qxd}5 \textit{Qe}6 18 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qd}7 19 \textit{Wg}5) 15 f4 \textit{Hb}8 (after 15...\textit{Qg}4 I wanted to play 16 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qxf}3 17 \textit{Qxf}3 \textit{Qe}8 18 \textit{Qed}5 \textit{Qxd}5 19 \textit{Qxd}5 16 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qe}7 (16...\textit{Qe}8 17 g3 \textit{Wh}3 18 \textit{Qf}e1) 17 g3 \textit{Wh}6 (better than 17...\textit{Wh}3 18 \textit{Qfe}1 \textit{Qd}7 19 \textit{Wd}4 \textit{Qf}5 20 \textit{Wf}4+ c6 21 \textit{Qg}2 \textit{Wh}5 22 \textit{Wb}4 d5 23 \textit{Qc}4) 18 \textit{Qfe}1 \textit{Wg}6 19 \textit{Wd}4 h5 (19...\textit{Qf}5 20 \textit{Qxf}5 \textit{Wxf}5 21 \textit{Qe}4 \textit{Qxe}4 22 \textit{Qxe}4 20 \textit{b}4! \textit{h}4 21 \textit{b}5 \textit{hx}g3 (21...\textit{axb}5 22 \textit{Qxb}5 \textit{hx}g3 23 \textit{Qdx}6 \textit{gx}h2+ 24 \textit{Qh}1) 22 \textit{b}6 with
decisive threats against Black’s king, as 22...gxh2+ 23 Qh1 d5 (or 23...Qc8 24 bxc7+ Qxc7 25 f5 Qxf5 26 Qd5+ Qd8 27 Wc3) 24 Wc5 Qc8 25 Qcxd5 proves, Gutman.

12 Qd3!?

Other continuations are:

I) 12 Wg5+ Wf6 13 f4 b5 14 Qd5 Wxg5 15 fxg5 Qe5 and White achieves nothing, Gutman;

II) 12 Wc1 Qge7 (12...b5 13 Qd1 We5 14 Qf3 Qb7 15 Qe2 Qf6 16 Qf4 Qe8 17 c4! b4 18 Qc2 a5 19 Qd3 Wf5 20 Qe3 Qg5 21 h4! Wh6 22 Qc5 Qe8 23 a3! gives White full compensation for the pawn) 13 Qc4 d6 14 Qd1 Wh4 15 Qd2 Qe6 leaves matters unclear, Gutman.

12...Qg7

12...b5 must not be overestimated; after 13 Rab1 Qge7 (or 13...b4 14 Qe2 Wh4 15 Qc4 d6 16 c3!) 14 Qe2 Wh4 15 c4 b4 16 Qc2 a5 17 f4 Wh5 18 Qe3 Qe8 19 Qg3 Wh6 20 Qf1 Qb7 21 Qbd1 Black has serious difficulties, Gutman.

13 Qc4

13 Qf1 d6 (13...b5 can be answered by 14 Rab1! d6 15 Qe2 Wh4 16 c4 b4 17 Qc2 Rab8 18 Qg3) 14 Qe4 (14 Qc4 Qe6) 14...Qe5 15 Qg5 h6 16 Qxe5 hxg5 17 Qe4 Wxb2!? (17...Wf6 18 Qae1 Wh6 19 Qd4 Qe6 20 Qg5+ Qxg5 21 Qxe5 Qf5 22 Qf4 Qf7 23 Qd4 Qd5 24 Qf3 Qe5 25 Qxe5 dxe5 26 Qxf7 Qe8 27 Qxg7 Qd8 28 Qg3 Qd7 29 Qg6 Qf7 30 Qf6+ Qg7 31 Qf5 Qe7 32 Qd4 was level in Fleissig-Chigorin, Vienna 1882) 18 Qae1 Qe6 19 Qc4 (19 Qc4? Wxa3 20 Qxe6 fxe6 21 Qxe6 fails to 21...Qe8 22 Qxg5 d5) 19...Qf6 20 Qa5 Qe8 brings White no success either, Gutman.

13...b5 14 Qe3 d6

14...f5 was preferred by Chigorin. “Black has to prevent White’s knights taking up commanding positions in the centre, and at same time try to keep his queen alive”, Mikhail Chigorin, Rigaer Tagesblatt, 1892.

However, after 15 Qe2 We5 16 f4 Wc5 17 Qh1 d6 18 c3 a5 19 Qc2 b4 20 Qed4 Qb8 21 Qfe1!? (Vasilyiev-Kostrowitski/Lisel-Chigorin, consultation game, St. Petersburg 1892, went 21 Qae1 bxc3 22 bxc3 Qb2 23 Qb3 Wb6 24 Qc1 a4 25 Qe2 Qa5! 26 Qe1 Qd7 27 Qd4 Qxe2 28 Qxe2 Qe8 with a clear advantage for Black) 21...bxc3 22 bxc3 a4 (22...Qb2 23 Qb3 Qd5 24 c4 Wf7 25 Qxa5) 23 Qe2 Qb2 24 Qc1 Qxd4 (24...Qxc3 25 Qxc6+ Qxc6 26 Qd4) 25 cxd4 Qe3 26 Qc3, White’s pressure is still unpleasant, Gutman.

15 Rab1 Qe6 16 Qc1

White’s dominating position compensates for his sacrificed pawn, Gutman.

Still unresolved is the question whether White obtains more chances after 9 Qxd2 or after 9 Wxd2. In my opinion both are quite enjoyable for Black.
Chapter 3
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 Wh4 5 b5)
5...c5!?

"He (the writer of an article in Deutscbe Schachzeitung for October 1846) is of opinion, too, in common with most players here, that this move entirely foils the previous device of White. Upon this point I am disposed to differ with him", Staunton, The Chess-Player's Handbook.

"For some time 5...c5 was considered the proper reply to White's last move, and was supposed by Horwitz himself to be a complete answer to the first player's attack. But the following variation, which was first introduced by Staunton, will show this view to be erroneous", Steinitz/Potter, The Field, 1874.

"It seems that 5...c5 is not wholly satisfactory for Black", Botterill/Harding.

"This introduces two ideas (three if we include the threat of mate!). First, as in so many variations of the Scotch, Black wants to try to impede White's natural development, in this case virtually forcing the white queen to either e2 or f3. Second, this bishop may be headed for b6, to provide a less disruptive defence of c7 than...d8", Wells.

"The direct developing move, threatening mate, seems to give Black full satisfactory play", Hall.

We divide the material in two sections:
Section 1: 6 We2
Section 2: 6 Wf3

Section 1
6 We2

"This is a good quiet alternative (which nevertheless was preferred by Paul Keres) for those who distrust the complications of 6 Wf3", Botterill/Harding.

We consider the following lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 6...b6
Sequel 2: 6...d4
Sequel 3: 6...f6 7 xec7+
(7 d2, 7 g3)
Sequel 4: 6...f6 7 e3
Sequel 5: 6...f6 7 e3!
Sequel 6: 6...d8!
Sequel 1
6...\textit{\&}b6 7 \textit{\&}e3!
White intends to prevent Black's development by threatening to exchange the dark-squared bishop with pressure against the c7-point.
7...\textit{\&}a5+
7...\textit{\&}d8?! 8 \textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}g7 (Weichert-Kountz, Baden 1993, went 8...a6?! 9 \textit{\&}xb6 axb5 10 g3 \textit{\&}h6 11 \textit{\&}e3 \textit{\&}f6 12 \textit{\&}xh5 with advantage for White) 9 0-0-0 d6 10 g3 \textit{\&}g4 (10...\textit{\&}f6 11 f4) 11 f3 \textit{\&}e6 (11...\textit{\&}g6?! is bad because of 12 \textit{\&}xb6 axb6 13 e5) 12 f4 \textit{\&}d7 13 \textit{\&}g2 gives White a clear plus, \textit{Gutman}.
8 \textit{\&}d2?!
Two other ways of treating this position are:
I) 8 \textit{\&}d2 is the traditional reply, which leads to a tense positional struggle.

\textbf{B1}) 9...\textit{\&}e7?! 10 \textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}f6 11 \textit{\&}g5 \textit{\&}a5 12 0-0-0 \textit{\&}xc3 13 \textit{\&}xc3 \textit{\&}e6 14 h4 yields White strong pressure Kaufmann-Oesch, Sauliarmt 1991;
\textbf{B2}) 9...\textit{\&}d8?! 10 \textit{\&}e3 d6 11 \textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}f6 12 \textit{\&}g2 0-0 13 0-0 \textit{\&}g4 and Black has counterplay, \textit{Gutman}.
\textbf{B3}) 9...\textit{\&}f6?! is also possible. 10 \textit{\&}c3 (“Note that it would be a mistake to play 10 \textit{\&}c3? because of 10...a6 11 \textit{\&}d5 \textit{\&}xb2 12 \textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}a5”, \textit{Botterill/Harding}) 10...\textit{\&}h6 11 \textit{\&}d2?! (more effective than 11 \textit{\&}d2 a6 12 \textit{\&}a3 \textit{\&}f6 13 \textit{\&}ac4 \textit{\&}a7) 11...\textit{\&}g6 (11...\textit{\&}xd2+?! 12 \textit{\&}xd2 f6 13 \textit{\&}c4 favours White) 12 \textit{\&}g2 a6 13 \textit{\&}d4 \textit{\&}e7 (13...\textit{\&}f6?! 14 \textit{\&}f5) 14 0-0 0-0 15 \textit{\&}a3 d6 (after 15...\textit{\&}xd4 16 \textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}xd4 17 \textit{\&}xd4 d6 18 \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}c6 19 \textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}e6 20 \textit{\&}e3 White maintains a slight spatial plus) 16 \textit{\&}xc6 \textit{\&}xc6 17 \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}a7 appears equal, \textit{Gutman}.
II) 8 c3!? is a more purposeful move.

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

Black has two options:
A) 8...\textit{\&}xd2+ 9 \textit{\&}xd2 \textit{\&}d8 10 0-0-0 a6 11 \textit{\&}c3 d6 12 f4 \textit{\&}e7 13 f5 (13 \textit{\&}h5?! b5 14 \textit{\&}d3 is also good for White, \textit{Gutman}) 13...\textit{\&}e5 14 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}xf3 15 \textit{\&}xf3 \textit{\&}c6 16 h4 \textit{\&}d7 17 \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}e5 18 \textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}xc4 19 \textit{\&}xc4 0-0 20 g4 b5 21 \textit{\&}d4 \textit{\&}c6 22 g5 gave White the advantage in Rosenthal-Winawer, Paris 1867;
B) 8...\textit{\&}b6 9 g3 with three examples:

\begin{itemize}
\item 8...a6 (8...\textit{\&}xe4? is wrong due to 9 \textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}e7 10 b4 a6 11 \textit{\&}d4 \textit{\&}b6 12 \textit{\&}f5 \textit{\&}e5 13 \textit{\&}xb6) 9 \textit{\&}d4 \textit{\&}g7 (9...\textit{\&}xe4?! 10 \textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}xd4 11 \textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}xe2+ 12 \textit{\&}xe2 \textit{\&}e7 13 \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}c6 14 \textit{\&}xa5 \textit{\&}xa5 15 \textit{\&}xg7 \textit{\&}g8 16 \textit{\&}e5 should give White a superior
\end{itemize}
ending) 10 ∆d2 0-0 11 g3 ♦f6 12 ♦g2 ♦b6 13 ♦c2 ♦xe3 14 ♦xe3 d6 15 0-0 is slightly awkward for Black, Gutman.
8...a6 9 ∆d4 ♦xd2+
9...∆xd4 10 ♦xd4 ♦xd2+ 11 ♦xd2 ♦xe4+ 12 ♦e2 was indicated by Ftačnik, when 12...∆f6 (or 12...f6?)
13 0-0 ♢e7 14 ♢h5+ ♢d8 15 ♢fe1 and Black is helpless) 13 0-0 is fine
for White, Gutman.
10 ♦xd2 ♦xe4 11 0-0-0

Black has serious problems,
Gutman.

Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ♢c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♦xd4 ♢h4 5 ♦b5 ♢c5 6 ♦e2)
6...∆d4

A typical manoeuvre, hoping to ease the tension by an exchange of White's dangerous knight.
7 ♦xd4
7 ♦c4 was recommended by Karpov.
However, 7...∆xe4+ 8 ♦d1 ♢b6!? (8...∆e5 9 ♦d5!? ♦xd5 10 ♦xc7+ ♦d8 11 ♦xd5 ♢e7 12 ♦xe7 ♢xe7
13 ♢c3 ♢b6 14 ♢c4 ♢b7 15 ♢d5 ♢xd5 16 ♢xd5 ♢e6 leads to equality) 9 ♢e3 d5 10 ♢xc7+ ♢xe7 11
♦xd4 ♢e7?! (“after 11...∆e5 12 ♢b5+ ♢d7 13 ♢xd7+ ♢xd7 14 ♢xe4 dxe4 15 ♢d2 ♢f5 16 ♢e2, we believe White has no advantage”,
Hall) 12 ♢c3 (the endgame resulting from 12 ♢b5+ ♢d7 13 ♢xd7+ ♢xd7 14 ♢xe4 dxe4 15 ♢c3 ♢f5?!
appears quite comfortable for Black) 12...∆g6 (12...∆d4+ 13
∆xd4 0-0 14 ♢c5 ♢e8 15 ♢b5 ♢c6 16 ♢xd5 ♢d8 17 c4 ♢e6 is worth a
try) 13 ♢c1 0-0?! (13...∆b6 14
∆d2 0-0 15 ♢xb6 axb6 16 g3, indicated by Hall, seems less impressive) 14 ♢d2 (or 14 ♢xd5 ♢xd5 15
∆xd5 ♢f5 16 ♢xb7 ♢ac8 17 c3 ♢e5) 14...∆f5 favours Black,
Gutman.
7...∆xd4 8 ♦d2?!

Two other moves come into consideration:
1) 8 g3 ♢d7 and here:
A) 9 ♢g2 d6 (9...∆f6?! 10 c3 ♢b6
11 e5 ♢g8 12 a4 c6 13 b3 ♢e6 14
∆d2 ♢e7 15 ♢a3 gave White a
clear plus in Szurovszky-Varady,
Salgotarjan 1980) 10 ♢c3 ♢xc3+?!
(10...∆f6 11 ♢b5 ♢b6 12 ♢e3
∆xe3 13 ♢xe3 a6 14 ♢c3 ♢d7 15
0-0 0-0 16 ♢fe1 ♢f8 17 h3 ♢c6
was level in Gunnarsson-Knutson,
Reykjavik 2000) 11 bxc3 ♢f6 12
0-0 0-0 13 ♢g5 h6 seems fine for
Black, Gutman;
B) 9 c3 is more logical.
Black has two options:

B1) 9...\(\text{Ec5}\) 10 \(\text{Gg2}\) d6 11 0-0 (Gold-Zhidkov, Budapest 1994, went 11 \(\text{Oe2}\) a5 12 \(\text{Oe3}\) \(\text{Oe6}\) 13 0-0 \(\text{Oe6}\) 14 \(\text{Oe3}\) a4 15 \(\text{Oc1}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) 16 \(\text{Oxe3}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{Oe3}\) \(\text{Ec8}\) with some edge for Black) 11...\(\text{Oe5}\) 12 \(\text{Oe3}!\)? (12 \(\text{b4}?! \text{b6}\) 13 h3 0-0 14 \(\text{Od3}\) a5 15 \(\text{Oe2}\) \(\text{Oe6}\) 16 a3 \(\text{Oe2}\) 17 \(\text{Oe2}\) \(\text{Oe5}\) 18 \(\text{Wxe2}\) g5 19 c4 \(\text{Oxh3}\) 20 c5 dxc5 21 bxa5 \(\text{Oxe5}\) 22 \(\text{Oxe5}\) \(\text{Oxe5}\) led to decisive advantage for Black in Pira-Klarić, Montpellier 1989) 12...\(\text{Oxe3}\) 13 \(\text{Wxe3}\) 0-0 14 \(\text{Oe2}\) and chances are balanced, Gutman;

B2) 9...\(\text{b6}!\)? 10 \(\text{Og2}\) d6 has emerged as a more promising continuation for Black.

\(\text{Oc7}\) 19 a6 b5 20 c4 \(\text{Oab8}\) 21 \(\text{Oe1}\) bxc4 22 \(\text{Oxc4}\) \(\text{Oe5}\) 23 \(\text{Oe5}\)? \(\text{Oxd5}\) 0-1, Schuermans-Lane, Touquet 1991;

B2b) 11 \(\text{Oe4}\) \(\text{Oxe6}\) 12 a4 a6 13 0-0 is best answered by 13...h5?! 14 h3 d5 15 e5 \(\text{Oxe4}\) 16 \(\text{Oe2}\) \(\text{Oed2}\) 17 \(\text{Wxd2}\) c6 18 \(\text{Og5}\) \(\text{We6}\) 19 a5 \(\text{Oc7}\) 20 f4, Savushkin-Matvienko, Russia 1998) 14 \(\text{Oe2}\) \(\text{Oe5}\) 18, Gutman;

B2c) 11 0-0 with two examples:

B2c1) 11...h5 12 h3 (this is the simplest refutation of Black’s play, nevertheless, 12 \(\text{Oe3}!?!\) is a sound and logical reply, after 12...\(\text{Og4}\) 13 \(\text{Oe2}\) h4 14 \(\text{Oa3}\) hgx3 15 fxg3 \(\text{Oxe3}+\) 16 \(\text{Wxe3}\) \(\text{Oe3}\) 17 \(\text{Oxe3}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) 18 \(\text{Wxe3}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) in Hetland-Szalai, corr. 1990, 19 e5?!? d5 20 c6 f6 21 \(\text{Wd4}\) c6 22 \(\text{Oe2}\) would have been excellent for White) 12...\(\text{Oe6}\) (or 12...h4 13 g4) 13 \(\text{Oe2}\) (13 a4 a6 14 \(\text{Oa3}?!\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 15 \(\text{Oxe2}\) \(\text{Wxe4}\) 16 \(\text{Wf6}\) 17 \(\text{Oxe3}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) 18 \(\text{Wxe3}\) 0-0 19 \(\text{Oe3}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) 20 \(\text{Wf4}\) \(\text{We8}\) was clearly better for Black in Nisperos-Agagon, Manila 1997) 13...\(\text{Wd7}\) 14 \(\text{Oh2}\) \(\text{Oe7}\) 15 a4 c6 16 \(\text{Oc4}\) \(\text{Oe7}\) 17 h4 gives White a slight spatial advantage, Gutman;

B2c2) 11...\(\text{Oe6}!?!\) 12 \(\text{Oe2}\) \(\text{Og4}\) (12...0-0 13 \(\text{Oc4}\) \(\text{We8}\) is also possible) 13 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Oe7}\) 14 h3 \(\text{Oe5}\) 15 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Oe6}\) 16 \(\text{Oe2}\) h5 17 a4 a5 (17...h4 18 g4 a5 works out badly, as 19 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{a4}\) 20 \(\text{Oxe4}\) \(\text{Oxe4}\) 21 \(\text{Oe1}\) 0-0 22 b3 shows, Müller-Markus, Germany 1995) 18 \(\text{Oe3}\) (18 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Og4}+\)) 18...\(\text{Oxf3}\) 19 \(\text{Oxe3}\) h4 and Black has the initiative, Gutman.

B2d) 11 \(\text{Oe2}!?!\) might be more precise, 11...\(\text{Oe6}\) 12 \(\text{Oc4}\) \(\text{Og4}\) 13 f3 \(\text{Oe7}?!\) (less convincing is 13...\(\text{Oe6}\) 14 \(\text{Oxb6}\) axb6 15 b3 0-0 16 \(\text{Oe2}\) 

"This is our analysis. Practical tests are desirable, but we would assess the position as slightly better for White. White has more space (the Scotch centre!), a natural outpost at d5, and a chance to harry Black’s dark-squared bishop with \(\text{Oe2-c4}\) and \(\text{Oe3}\)”, Botterill/Harding.

We survey White’s possibilities:

B2a) 11 \(\text{Oe3}\) \(\text{Oe6}\) 12 \(\text{Oe2}\) 0-0 13 0-0 \(\text{Oe8}\) 14 \(\text{Oe1}\) \(\text{Oe7}\) 15 a4 \(\text{Og4}\) 16 \(\text{Oc4}\) \(\text{Oxe3}\) 17 \(\text{Oxe3}\) c6 18 a5
\( a7 \) 17 c4 \( \text{a}8 \) 18 0-0 \( \text{d}7 \) 19 \( \text{c}3 \) f6 20 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 21 \( \text{w}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 22 a4 \( \text{f}8 \) 23 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{a}8 \), Totsky-Zhidkov, Russia 1998) 14 \( \text{xb}6 \) axb6 15 0-0 0-0 and Black is at least no worse, Gutman.

II) 8 c3 \( \text{b}6 \) 9 g3 (or 9 \( \text{d}2 \) d6 10 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \)) 9...\( \text{e}7 \) (after 9...\( \text{f}6 \) 10 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11 0-0 0-0, Pokorna-Nicolini, Slovakia 1995, 12 a4!?) would be quite annoying for Black) 10 \( \text{g}2 \) reaches a position, covered after 8 g3 — I).

8...\( \text{b}6 \)

Alternatives are:

I) 8...\( \text{f}6 \) 9 c3 \( \text{b}6 \) 10 e5 \( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12 g3 \( \text{d}5 \) 13 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{g}2 \) d6 15 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16 0-0 \( \text{xe}5 \) 17 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 18 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{ae}8 \) 19 \( \text{xd}5 \) 1-0, Campora-Navarette, Benasque 1999;

II) 8...\( \text{e}7 \) 9 c3 \( \text{f}6 \) 10 \( \text{c}4 \)!? (Hergert-Leisebein, corr. 1997, went 10 \( \text{f}3 \) d6 11 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 12 h3 \( \text{xf}3 \) 13 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) 0-0 16 0-0 c6 17 \( \text{fe}1 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 18 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 19 f4 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)) 10...d6 11 g3 \( \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}2 \) 0-0-0 13 0-0 and Black’s dark-squared bishop is misplaced, Gutman;

III) 8...\( \text{d}8 \) 9 \( \text{f}3 \) (9 e5 \( \text{e}7 \) 10 c3 \( \text{b}6 \) 11 a4 \( \text{c}6 \) 12 b4 a6 13 \( \text{c}4 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{a}7 \) 15 \( \text{h}5 \) was

Rewitz-Loewenstein, Denmark 1998, when Black should have continued 15...d5! 16 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 9...\( \text{b}6 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 11 0-0-0 with a plus for White, Gutman.

9 \( \text{f}3 \)

9 e5 \( \text{e}7 \) (after 9...\( \text{e}7 \) 10 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 f4 f6 14 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 15 g3 Black lacks sufficient counterplay) 10 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 11 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 leads to a double-edged position, Gutman.

9...\( \text{h}5 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) !?

10 \( \text{e}3 \) d6 11 0-0-0 \( \text{f}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 13 e5 0-0 14 exd6 cxd6 15 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 16 a3 \( \text{f}5 \) and Black took over the initiative, Esswein-Trabert, Baden-Baden 1993.

10...\( \text{f}6 \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{g}4 \) 12 \( \text{e}1 \) d6 12...\( \text{h}6 \) 13 \( \text{b}1 \) 0-0 allows White to retain some pressure by 14 a4!

(14 h3 \( \text{e}8 \) 15 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 16 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 18 g4 \( \text{f}6 \) 19 \( \text{f}3 \) d6 is less promising) 14...\( \text{e}8 \) (14...a5 15 h3 \( \text{e}8 \) 16 e5 d6 17 \( \text{b}5 \) 15 a5 \( \text{c}5 \) 16 h3, Gutman.

13 h3 \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) Safer than 14...\( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}4+ \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 17 g3 \( \text{h}6 \) 18 f4, Gutman.

15 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{dx}e5 \) 16 \( \text{c}4 \)

White has a slightly better ending, Gutman.
Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 w h4 5 b5 c5 6 e2) 6...f6

B) 9 xc7+ d8 10 xa8 is perhaps too optimistic.

Black has two possibilities:
B1) 10...xf2+ with a further split:
B1a) 11 e2 d4+ 12 d3 d5 13 c3 (or 13 c3 f5 14 e3 e6 15 xd5 vg3+ 16 d2 xh1 17 g2 xe3+ 18 xe3 g6 19 xh1 c8) 13...c5+ 14 d2 e8 (14...e4+ 15 d3 c5+ would have drawn immediately) 15 xd4
c1+ 16 c2 f5+ 17 d1 g4+ and now 18 c2 (instead of 18
e2?!) xe2 19 h3 f3 20 dx5 xg3 21 g5+ f6 22 d2 h2+ 23
c2 xh1 24 e3 c5 25 e1 d4 26 g1 xh3 27 f2 d5 28 d1
c8 0-1, Azadmanesh-Bettman, Haarlem 1997). 18...f5+ should lead to a draw by repetition,
Gutman;
B1b) 11 d1!? c5 12 g2 f2+ 13 d2 xh1 14 xh1 b6 15 c3
e8 16 d1 b7 17 b4 f2 18 d2 c8 19 a3 b8 20 c2 maintains a clear plus for White,
Gutman.

B2) 10...xf2! is preferable; 11 g2 e8+ 12 f1 b6 13 c4 a6 could be troublesome for White,
Gutman.

7...d8 8 xa8 xe4!
8...e8 appears to be insufficient.
We examine:
A) 9 g3 \( \text{W} \text{x}e4 \) 10 \( \text{W} \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}f2 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{x}f2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e3+ \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}1 \) 14 a4 (14 \( \text{Q} \text{d}2?! \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}d2 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d}1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{g}5 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{b}5 \) was played in Pokorna-Vojenciakova, Slovakia 1993, when 16...\( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{h}1 \) b6 could have given Black a clear advantage) 14...b6 15 \( \text{Q} \text{a}6 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}b2 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{x}c8 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}c8 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{a}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e2+ \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{h}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}6 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{d}1 \) h5 offers Black enough counterplay, Gutman;

B) 9 \( \text{Q} \text{c}3! \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) (or 9...\( \text{Q} \text{g}4 \) 10 g3 \( \text{W} \text{h}5 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e}3 \) 10 \( \text{W} \text{d}3 \) (is better than 10 g3 \( \text{Q} \text{x}e2 \) 11 \( \text{x}g4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}c3 \) 12 bxc3 \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}f2+ \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{f}1 \) \( \text{x}h4 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d}3 \) d5 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}2 \) with an obscure position) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) will transpose into the variation after 6 \( \text{W} \text{f}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{Q} \text{x}c7+ \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}8 \) 8 \( \text{x}a8 \) \( \text{x}e8 \) 9 \( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) 10 \( \text{W} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) — Section 2, Sequel 3, a line regarded as good for White. 7...\( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \)!

7...\( \text{Q} \text{c}8 \) 8 \( \text{Q} \text{b}6 \) 9 \( \text{W} \text{g}4 \) 9 \( \text{W} \text{x}g4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}g4 \) 10 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) (10...\( \text{Q} \text{x}f2 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{h}2 \) a6 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}f3+ \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}8 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{e}3 \) gives White an excellent endgame, Gutman.

8 \( \text{Q} \text{x}d4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}d4 \) 9 \( \text{Q} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 10 \( \text{Q} \text{e}3 \) has been discarded since the game Stanishev-Mitkov, Bankia 1989, which continued 10...\( \text{Q} \text{a}5+ \! \) (after 10...0-0?! 11 \( \text{Q} \text{x}b6 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}b6 \) 12 g3 \( \text{W} \text{g}5 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{x}c7 \) \( \text{Q} \text{a}4 \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \), Bouchet-Malinin, Paris 2000, 15 \( \text{W} \text{b}5 \) ! \( \text{W} \text{x}b5 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{x}b5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \) 17 b3 \( \text{Q} \text{a}5 \) 18 a4 would have secured a clear plus for Black) 11 b4 (11 c3 a6 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{W} \text{x}e4 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{b}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{x}b6 \) \( \text{c}x \text{b}6 \) also favours Black) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{x}b4+ \) 12 c3 \( \text{Q} \text{a}5 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{c}2 \) a6 14 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{g}4 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e3 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{x}e3 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b}7 \) with advantage for Black.

9...\( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \)!
9...0-0 10 g3 \( \text{g}4 \) 11 f3 \( \text{e}6 \) is less effective due to 12 0-0-0! \( \text{xc}3 \) 13 \( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 14 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}4 \)!
(15 e5 c6 16 \( \text{c}5 \) b6 17 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 18 f4 \( \text{b}7 \) 19 \( \text{c}4 \) b5 20 \( \text{xd}5 \) cxd5 21 \( \text{hf}1 \) \( \text{fc}8 \) led to a double-edged position in Lazić-Mitkov, Skopje 1991) 15...\( \text{wb}6 \) 16 e5, and White's active bishops and space control are far more significant than Black's material advantage, Gutman.

10 \( \text{xc}3 \) 0-0 11 e5
11 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 12 0-0-0 d6 13 f3 \( \text{e}6 \) 14 \( \text{b}1 \) a5 was balanced in Nolsoe-Fuhroff, Copenhagen 1998.

11...\( \text{e}4 \) 12 \( \text{a}5 \) d5 13 g3 \( \text{h}6 \) 14 \( \text{g}2 \) b6 15 \( \text{xe}4 \) dxe4 16 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 17 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{ad}8 \)
Black has adequate counterplay, Gutman.

Sequel 5

(1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 5 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 6 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \))
7 \( \text{e}3 \)!

However, White has no need to assume an aggressive role, but may safely play for development. It re-

mains to be seen whether Black can find a satisfactory method of development after this simple bishop's move.

7...\( \text{b}4 \)+
7...\( \text{xe}3 \) 8 \( \text{xe}3 \) reaches a position after 6 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 8 \( \text{xe}3 \), covered in Part 3, Chapter 3, Section 2, Sequels 4 and 5.

8 \( \text{d}2 \)
8 c3 \( \text{a}5 \) gives White a choice:

A) 9 b4 a6 10 \( \text{d}4 \) (or 10 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{x}b4 \)!! 11 \( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) + 12 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 13 e5, Fuchs-Aschenbrenner, Austria 1997, when 13...\( \text{g}4 \)!! 14 g3 \( \text{h}5 \) 15 f4 \( \text{f}2 \) + 16 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \) would have given Black fine play for his piece) 10...\( \text{xd}4 \) 11 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 12 \( \text{xb}6 \) cxb6 13 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 14 g3 \( \text{h}6 \) with chances for both sides, Gutman;
B) 9 \( \text{d}2 \)?? goes back to the main line.

8...\( \text{a}5 \) 9 c3
This is a most natural and obvious way to play, though 9 0-0-0 a6 seems to be less worrying for Black. White has two possibilities:

A) 10 e5?? \( \text{d}5 \)!! (better than 10...\( \text{xb}5 \) 11 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 12 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 13 \( \text{x}g7 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 14 \( \text{x}e6 \) + \( \text{xe6} \) 15 \( \text{h}6 \) with an unclear ending) 11 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{a}4 \)!! (an improvement on 11...\( \text{e}4 \)?? 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 13 \( \text{f}3 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 16 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 17 g4 \( \text{h}4 \) 18 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 19 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 20 \( \text{c}5 \) d6 21 exd6 \( \text{f}6 \) 22 d7 \( \text{xd}7 \) 23 \( \text{xd}7 \) and White won easily in Milu-Dumitrasche, Bucharest 1991) 12 \( \text{a}3 \) (12 \( \text{xd}5 \) loses in view of 12...\( \text{xa}2 \)!! 13 \( \text{xc}7 \) + \( \text{xe}7 \) 14 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}1 \)+) 12...\( \text{c}3 \)!! (instead of 12...\( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{c}4 \), suggested by
Lane) 13 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) yields Black a winning material advantage, \textit{Gutman};

B) 10 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xd2}+ \) (10...\( \text{xd4} \)!!) 11 \( \text{xd4} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 13 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 14 g3 \( \text{h6}+ \) 15 \( \text{b1} \) is in White's favour) 11 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 14 \( \text{xe2} \) d6 15 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 16 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b8} \) with Black having an extra pawn, \textit{Gutman}.

9...0-0

9...a6 is a less common way to treat this position.

C) 10 \( \text{d4}! \) \( \text{xd4} \) 11 \( \text{xd4} \) seems a most dangerous try, 11...b5 12 a4!
(12 g3 \( \text{h6} \) 13 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 14 \( \text{xb6} \) cxb6 15 d4 d5 16 exd5+ \( \text{f8} \) 17 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 18 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e8}+ \) 19 \( \text{f1} \) gave White a plus in V.Ivanov-Dumitrache, Romania 1997)
12...\( \text{b6} \) (12...bxa4 13 \( \text{c4} \) 13 \( \text{xb6} \) cxb6 14 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 15 g3) yields White a decisive advantage, \textit{Gutman}.

10 g3 \( \text{wg4} \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{White has three moves worth consideration:}
\text{A) 10 e3 \( \text{xe4} \) 11 \( \text{c5} \), was recommended by Müller/Meyer, however, 11...d5!? 12 g3 \( \text{g5} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 14 \( \text{xe4}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) leads nowhere for White, \textit{Gutman};}
\text{B) 10 g3!? \( \text{wg4} \) 11 f3 \( \text{g6} \) (a lesser evil than 11...\( \text{w} \) 12 e3 14 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 15 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 14 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{gxb6} \) 15 0-0-0 d6 16 e5 dxe5 17 \( \text{xe5}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{c4} \) 0-0 19 \( \text{xe6} \) fxe6 20 \( \text{ch1} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 21 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{f2} \) 22 \( \text{d4} \) with a very unpleasant position for Black) 12 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 13 \( \text{xc6} \) dxc6 (or 13...\( \text{xe3} \) 14 \( \text{xe3} \) 15 \( \text{c5} \)! \( \text{h5} \) 16 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) 14 \( \text{xb6} \) cxb6 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 0-0-0 0-0 17 \( \text{f4} \) keeps some edge for White, \textit{Gutman};}
\text{11 f3!}
11 \( \text{wg4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) d6 13 \( \text{c4} \) a6 14 \( \text{ba3} \) b5 15 \( \text{a5a5} \) \( \text{a5a5} \) is quite acceptable for Black, \textit{Gutman}.

11...\( \text{h5} \)

After 11...\( \text{h6} \) 12 \( \text{c4} \) a6 13 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 14 \( \text{dxc4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 15 \( \text{xb6} \) cxb6 16 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 17 0-0-0 the weakness of Black's queenside does not bode well for his long-term prospects, \textit{Gutman}.

12 \( \text{d3} \) a6 13 \( \text{d5d4} \) \( \text{b6} \)

13...d5 14 \( \text{xc6} \) bxc6 can be met by 15 \( \text{g4} \)! (not 15 \( \text{a5} \)?! \( \text{dxe4} \) 16 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xf3} \)) 15...\( \text{dxc4} \) 16 \( \text{f4} \) 17 \( \text{h2} \), \textit{Gutman}.

14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 15 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 16 fc 17 \( \text{d5} \) 0-0-0 d5 18 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 19 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 20 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{g8} \) 21 \( \text{h2} \) Black's position is very difficult, \textit{Gutman}.
Sequel 6
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 wh4 5 b5 c5 6 we2)
6...wd8!

19 c3 xd3+ 20 xd3 wh1 21 xf6+ c5 22 e4+ b5 should lead to a draw by repetition) 18 c1 (Sommerfeld-Wisskirchen, corr. 1986, went 18 d1!? wd4+ 19 c1 bxc6 20 xf8+ c7 21 c3 c5 22 c2 b8 23 wh6 xb1 0-1) 18 we1+ 19 b2 wb4+ forces a draw by perpetual check, Gutman. 7...d6!?
7...xe3 8 we3 is considered to be a simpler method of equalising.

Once again, the black queen has done her job and returns home.
"The general claim must be that White has been forced to make sufficient concessions to justify the loss of tempo. In concrete terms after...", Wells.
7 e3
The alternatives have virtually disappeared:
I) 7 c3 a6 8 d5a3 d6 9 c4 d6 10 g5 e6 11 bd2 h6 12 h4 (or 12 e3 xe3 13 xe3 0-0) 12...0-0 13 w3 f5 14 xf6 xf6 15 xf6 gxf6 appears fine for Black, Gutman;
II) 7 wg4 d6! 8 wxg7 g8 9 xc7+ e7 10 d5+ xd5 11 g5+ d6 12 wh6+ f6 (12...g6 13 xg6+ hgx6 14 xd8 db4 15 h4 xc2+ 16 d2 xal 17 g3+ e7 18 c3 db4 19 d3 is clearly awkward for Black) 13 exd5 (13 c3? xc3 14 xf6 loses to 14...xf2+! 15 xf2 xe4+) 13...xg5 14 dxc6 xf2+ 15 xf2 wb6+ 16 e2 xb2 17 d2 wb4+! (17...d5+ 18 d3 xal

We see:
A) 8...d6 9 d1c3 (9 d2 0-0 10 d1c3 d6 11 0-0-0 a6 12 d4 w7 13 d5 dxd5 14 exd5 wxe3+ 15 fxe3 d5 16 h3 d7 was comfortable for Black in Salminen-Wisskirchen, corr. 1986) 9...0-0 10 0-0-0 d8 11 h3 d7 was in White's favour, Gutman;
B) 8...a6!?, immediately attacking the knight, makes more sense.

White has a choice:
B1) 9 d5c3 d6! (after 9...dxe7 10 c4 0-0 11 0-0 d6 12 f4 a5 13 d3 f5 14 exf5 xf5 15 d2 d6c6 16 f3 xd3 17 xd3 h6, Azadmenesh-Hendriks, Hoogoveen 1998, 18 d4!? would have given White some edge) 10 d2 0-0 11
0-0 e8 causes no problems for Black, Gutman;
B2) 9 d4!? is the principal response, when with 9...wb6!? "Black forces another concession", Wells.

16 f4 wb6 17 d1, and, although Black's position is solid enough, White, with his space advantage, has a slight plus, Gutman.

Here:
B2a) 10 xc6?! wb2! (this was my recommendation in Gewinnen mit Schottisch, 1992; improving on 10...bxc6?! 11 xc3 e7 12 0-0-0
g6 13 g3 d6 14 f4 0-0 15 h4 g4
16 xe2 xe2 17 xe2 f6 18 h5
e7 19 he1 wb6 20 e5 d5 21 g4
c5 22 b3 d4 23 da4 d5 24 be4
c3 25 xe3 dxc3 26 f5 wb6 27
e6 fxe6 28 h6 exh5 29 wd5+ 1-0,
Sveshnikov-Sher, Leningrad 1976)
11 wd4 cc1+ 12 he2 xc2+ 13
d2 (or 13 xe3 xc6 14 cc3
wf6) 13...wc6 14 wxg7 wf6 15
wxf6 xc6 gave White insufficient compensation for the pawn in K.Müller-Godena, Mitropa Cup 1995;
B2b) 10 c3 ge7 ("when Black has an easy game", Wells) 11 xc6! 
xc6 (or 11...wc6 12 d3 0-0 13
0-0 d5 14 d2 e6 15 d3 dx4
16 xe4 d5 17 d4 wd6 18
ed1 fe8 19 fe1) 12 xe2 0-0 13
0-0 d6 14 d2 e6 15 eae1 fe8

8 1e3
Alternatively:
I) 8 xc5 dx5 9 dd2 df6 10
0-0-0 we7 11 f3 0-0 12 g4 ee6
(12...a6 13 cc3 dd4 14 wf2 db5
15 xe2 ee6 16 db1 fd8 was
played in Rumuza-Bisguier, Saint
Paul 2000, when 17 g5 dd7 18 f4
puts Black under pressure) 13 cc3
fd8 is at least no worse for Black,
Gutman;
II) 8 c3, and then:
A) 8...df6 9 e5 (after 9 dd2 0-0 10
xc5 dx5 11 ee3 a6 12 da3 we7
13 cc2 b6 14 xe2 db7 15 0-0,
Shavtvaladze-Maximov, Russia
1999, 15...fe8 should promise
Black an excellent game) 9...gg4
10 edx6 axd6 11 axd6+ (11 gg5+
he7 12 xf4 0-0 13 h3 fd6 14
xc7 dd6 offers Black good
attacking chances) 11...xd6 12
cc5+ we6 13 da3 a6 14 0-0-0 with
some edge for White, Gutman;
B) 8...xe3 9 wee3 df6 is preferable, 10 dd2 0-0 leads nowhere for
White, Gutman.
III) 8 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}e6!?!\) (8...\(\text{a}6\) 9 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 10 0-0-0 0-0 is less convincing
due to 11 \(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{dxc5}\) 12 \(\text{Q}b3\) \(\text{Q}c7\)
13 \(\text{Q}d5\)) is a recent example. 9 \(\text{Q}b3\)
(or 9 \(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{dxc5}\) 10 0-0-0 \(\text{Q}f6\))
9...\(\text{Q}b6\) 10 \(\text{Q}xb6\) \(\text{axb6}\) 11 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}f6\)
12 \(\text{Q}e2\) 0-0 13 0-0 \(\text{Q}e8\) 14 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 15 \(\text{e}5\)
16 \(\text{f}4\) 17 \(\text{Q}c2\) 17 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}xb3\)
18 \(\text{Q}xb3\) \(\text{Q}e4\) 19 \(\text{Q}fd1\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 20 \(\text{Q}d3\)
\(\text{Q}c5\) led to advantage for
Black in Holzke-Hector, German
Bundesliga 1999/2000;

IV) 8 \(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 9 \(\text{W}xe3\) with a
further split:
A) 9...\(\text{a}6\) 10 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}f6\) (10...\(\text{W}f6?!\))
11 \(\text{Q}xc6!\) as 11...\(\text{W}xb2?\) 12 \(\text{W}d4\)
\(\text{W}c1+\) 13 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}xc2+\) 14 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}f6\)
15 \(\text{Q}b4\) does not give Black sufficient
compensation for his piece) 11 \(\text{Q}c3\) 0-0 is similar to lines after
9...\(\text{Q}f6\), covered in B);
B) 9...\(\text{Q}f6\) is probably better.

10 \(\text{Q}1c3\) 0-0 11 \(\text{Q}e2\) (Bjerring-
Schussler, Gausdal 1990, continued
11 0-0 \(\text{Q}e8\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{W}e7\) 13 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{a}6\)
14 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}xd4\) 15 \(\text{W}xd4\) \(\text{W}e5\) 16 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{b}5\) 17 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 18 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 19
\(\text{W}hf1\) \(\text{Q}ab8\) 20 \(\text{W}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 21 \(\text{axb5}\)
\(\text{axb5}\) 22 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{h}6\) 23 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{g}5\) 24 \(\text{hxg5}\)
\(\text{hxg5}\) 25 \(\text{fxg4}\) 26 \(\text{Q}xf4\) 27 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 28 \(\text{Q}a1\) \(\text{Q}be8\) 29 \(\text{Q}a5\)
\(\text{Q}xe4+\) 30 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 31 \(\text{Q}xb5\)
\(\text{Q}g2\) 32 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 33 \(\text{Q}f5\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 34
\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{a}2-\text{a}1\) 11...\(\text{Q}e8\) 12 0-0 \(\text{a}6\)
(12...\(\text{W}e7?!\) is premature in view of
13 \(\text{Q}d5!\)) 13 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}xd4\) 14 \(\text{W}xd4\)
\(\text{W}e7\) appears level, Gutman.
8...\(\text{a}6?!\)
I prefer this move to 8...\(\text{Q}xe3\) 9
\(\text{Q}xe3\) \(\text{a}6\) 10 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}f6\) since after 11
0-0-0-0!? (11 \(\text{Q}e2\) 0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{Q}e8\) 13
\(\text{Q}xc6\) \(\text{bxc6}\) 14 \(\text{W}d3\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 15 \(\text{Q}xe4\)
\(\text{Q}f5\) 16 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{d}5\) 17 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 18
\(\text{W}c3\) \(\text{dxe4}\) 19 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 20 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}5\)
21 \(\text{fxe}4\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 22 \(\text{W}xc6\) was equal in
Kuijpers-Van der Borgt, Vilssingen
2000) 11...0-0 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 13 \(\text{g}4\)
Black has difficulties (compare with
variation after 8 \(\text{W}d2\) — the
important difference is that White obtains
an extra tempo), Gutman.
9 \(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{dxc5}\) 10 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 11 \(\text{Q}a3\)
\(\text{Q}d4\) 12 \(\text{Q}e3\)
12 \(\text{W}h5\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 13 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 14 \(\text{W}g5\)
\(\text{b}5\) 15 0-0 \(\text{Q}c6\) 16 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 17
\(\text{W}xe7+\) \(\text{Q}xe7\) was fine for Black in
Lazarević-Akhmiloškaya, Tbilisi
1984.
12...\(\text{Q}f6\) 13 \(\text{Q}e2!?!\)
13 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{Q}g4\) 14 \(\text{W}g3\) 0-0 15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{b}5\) 16
\(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{b}4\) 17 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{cx}d4\) 18 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}e6\)
19 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Q}h6\) 20 \(\text{W}f2\) \(\text{Q}f5\) is good for
Black, Gutman.
13...\(\text{Q}c6\) 14 \(\text{Q}c3\) 0-0 15 \(\text{f}3\)

"Now it is becoming clear that
Black has easy play. The attack on
the c-pawn has been neutralised by
the timely 6...\(\text{W}d8\) (which makes
the \(\text{Q}b5\) sortie look ineffectual), and
Black will obtain good central
counterplay with the half-open e-
file", Hall.
15 \( \text{wx}c5 \text{e}8 \) 16 f3 b5 17 \( \text{d}d5 \) \\
\( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xd}5 \text{wh}4+ \) 19 \( \text{e}2 \text{xd}8 \) 20 \( \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 \) 21 \( \text{xc}6 \text{ed}8 \)

This seems to have a lot more punch here than 6 \( \text{we}2 \), when Black has the retreat 6...\( \text{d}8 \)”, Wells.

We consider the following lines in this section:

Sequel 1: 6...\( \text{d}8 \)

Sequel 2: 6...\( \text{b}6 \)

Sequel 3: 6...\( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{xc}7+ \)

Sequel 4: 6...\( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{e}3 \)

Sequel 5: 6...\( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 8 \( \text{xe}3 \) 0-0 8...\( \text{d}8 \), 8...\( \text{g}4 \)

Sequel 6: 6...\( \text{d}4 \) 7 \( \text{xc}7+ \) (7 \( \text{f}4 \))

Sequel 7: 6...\( \text{d}4 \) 7 \( \text{xd}4 \)

“6...\( \text{d}8 \) would be a droll move. The meanderings of the white knight have cost as much time as the excursion of the black queen, but 7 \( \text{f}4 \) d6 8 \( \text{d}2 \) and when convenient, 0-0-0 looks to give White some initiative”, Botterill/Harding.

“The difficulty is to find a palatable alternative. The first thing to note is that here 6...\( \text{d}8 ? \) fails to 7 \( \text{g}3 \)! (indicated by Gutman, Gewinnen mit Schottisch, 1992)”, Wells.

Sequel 1

6...\( \text{d}8 \)
This move is occasionally seen, although there is no certain logic in leaving the black king in the centre. 7 .gb3!?

Alternatives are less challenging: I) 7 .gf5  he7 8  gb5  f6 9  gb2  d6 leads nowhere for White, Gutman; II) 7  xf4  xf4 8  xf4  d6 9  gb2  gb6 10  gb3  h6 11  gb3  gb6 was approximately equal in Skoko-Nestorović, Belgrade 1991; III) 7  gb4  d6 8  gb7  gb7 8 (not 8...  gb6?!) 9  gb4  a6 10  gb7  1-e0, Sakirsanov-Ussanov, Russia 1983) 9  hxc3  gb6 with a level ending; IV) 7  gb6  a6 seems more testing.

White has two possibilities:
A) 8  gb7  gb7 9  g3 and now:
A1) 9...  wd8 10  xf7  gb8 11  gb4+  gb7 12 0-0-0  he7 13  gb4  b5 14  xb5+  xb5 15  gb5  gb6 16  gb3  wd8 (Pasman-Welling, Biel 1982, went 16...  wb4? 17  xd7+! 1-0) 17  gb3+  gb7 18  gb6  gb6 19  wd5+  gb5  20  wb5  gb5 forces a draw; A2) 9...  gb4?! is the critical reply since 10  wd1  wd8 11  gb4  gb7 12  gb5+  gb8 13  gb2  gb6 gives White very little compensation for his piece, Gutman.
B) 8  gb5 might be more realistic, 8...  xf2+ 9  xf2  xf2+ 10  gb2

9...a6
9...  gb4?! 10  g3 (or 10  gb4  he8 11  gb3  f5 12  g3  he7 13  gb6  wd3+ 14  gb3  cxd6 15  gb5  g6 16  gb3  wd3+ 17  gb2 with a clear plus for White, Gutman) 10...  he7 11  gb4  he8 12  gb3  f5 13 0-0-0  gb4 14  gb1 yields White a promising attack, Müller/Meyer.

10  gb4
10  g3  wb6! 11  gb4  wd3+ 12  gb3  he8 (12...  gb4 13  gb5) 13  gb4  d6 (while 13...  gb4?! 14  xd4  gb4 15  gb4  f5 16 0-0  gb4 17  gb4 gave White some pressure in Kotsur-Locht, Shenyang 1999) 14 0-0  gb5 is comfortable for Black, Gutman.

10...  gb4 11  wd4  he8 12  gb3!
12  g3  wb6 13  gb2 is less precise, 13...b5?! 14  c5  gb7 15 0-0  wh3 16  f3  c5 17  gb4  gb5 18  gb5+  gb7 19  gb4  h6 20  wb2  gb5 21  gb4  c4 22  bxc3 23  bxc3  he8 (Habershon-Chandler, corr. 1988, went 23...  gb8?! 24  gb1  gb6 25  gb6
f5 26 Qxc5 f4 27 gxf4 Ke3 28 Qc4 Qxf3 29 Qa6+ Qd6 30 Qfd1 Qg4+ 31 Qh1 Qe3 32 Qb4 Qxf4 33 Qf1 Qae5 34 Qxc6 1-0) 24 Qab1 (24 Qxc5 Qb6 25 Qd4 d6 26 Qxb7 Qxe2 favours Black) 24...d6 25 Qfd1 Qc6 with chances for both sides, Gutman.
12...d6 13 0-0-0

Black’s position is difficult to play, Gutman.

Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qb5 Qc5 6 Qf3)
6...Qb6

“The thematic 6...Qb6 is more testing”, Wells.
7 Qe3!

Less effective are:
I) 7 Wh4 Qxf4 8 Qxf4 d6 9 Qc3 a6 10 Qa3 Qf6 11 Qd3 0-0 12 0-0 Qe6 13 Qc4 Qxc4 14 Qxc4 Qf6 15 Qd3, Smagacz-Jedrzychka, Mikolajki 1991, when Black could play 15...Qd4?!, Gutman;
II) 7 Qf4 d6 has been often seen in praxis.

Here are some typical examples:
A) 8 Qxd6 cxd6 9 Qxd6+ Qe7 10 Qxf7+ (Mikheev-Rodin, Smolensk 2000, went 10 Qxc8+ Qxc8 11 Qg3 Qf6 12 g3 Qg5 13 Qh3 Qd4 14 Qd3 Qcd8, and Black won easily) 10...Qxd6 11 Qc3 is only an illusion, “11...Qxf2+! (11...Qd7? 12 0-0-0+ Qd4 13 e5+ Qc7 14 Qd5+ is a wishful piece of analysis by Schlechter) 12 Qxf2 Qxf2+ refutes White’s sacrifices”, Botterill/Harding;
B) 8 h3 Qe6 9 Qxd6 cxd6 10 Qxd6+ Qf8 11 Qxb7 Qb8 12 Qd6 Qd8 13 Qc4 Qd4 14 Qd3 Qxc4 0-1, Arqueros-Revenu, corr. 1994;
C) 8 Qc3 a6 9 Qa3 Qg4 (9...Qa5!? 10 Qc4 Qxc3+ 11 bxc3 Qf6 12 Qd1 Qge7 is also fine for Black) 10 Qg3 Qxg3 11 Qxg3 (or 11 hxg3 Qa5 12 Qc4 Qxc3+ 13 bxc3 Qf6 14 f3 Qe6 15 Qc3 Qd7 16 Qd5 0-0-0) 11...Qa5 12 Qc4
The other recent additions to White’s arsenal are:

I) \[8 \text{d}2 \text{d}6 9 \text{x}c3 \text{f}6 (9...\text{g}5?! 10 \text{c}4!) 10 \text{x}f6 represents an original treatment.

Black has a choice:

A) \[10...\text{xf}6 11 \text{c}1\text{c}3 a6 (11...\text{e}5 12 \text{g}3! \text{wx}e3 13 \text{hx}e3 a6 14 \text{a}3 \text{a}5 15 \text{c}4 \text{xc}4 16 \text{xc}4 gives White a promising ending) 12 \text{a}3 \text{a}5 (12...\text{g}8 13 g3 \text{e}5 14 \text{e}2 \text{g}4 15 0-0-0 \text{wx}e2 16 \text{xe}2 \text{xf}2 17 \text{xd}5 \text{d}8 18 \text{hf}1 maintains a clear plus for White) 13 0-0-0 \text{e}5 14 \text{g}3 \text{wx}e3 15 \text{hx}e3 \text{xc}3 16 \text{bx}c3 \text{b}5 17 \text{c}4 \text{b}4 18 \text{b}1 is slightly awkward for Black, \text{Gutman};

B) \[10...\text{wx}f6 11 \text{wx}f6 gx\text{f}6 12 \text{c}5\text{c}3 (12 \text{c}1\text{c}3 can be answered by 12...\text{a}5!? 13 0-0-0 a6 14 \text{d}4 \text{xd}4 15 \text{xd}4 \text{xc}3 16 \text{bx}c3 \text{d}6) 12...\text{d}4?! (S.Polgar-Horvath, Brno 1993, continued 12...\text{d}6 13 \text{d}5 \text{f}5 14 \text{bc}3 \text{xe}4 15 \text{xe}4 \text{e}6 16 \text{e}6+ \text{f}8 17 0-0-0 \text{e}7 18 \text{xb}6 \text{xb}6 19 a3 \text{a}5 20 \text{d}3 \text{g}7 21 \text{e}4 \text{g}6 22 \text{c}3 \text{d}7 23 \text{e}4 \text{c}6 24 \text{h}1 with a minute advantage for White) 13 \text{e}2 (or 13 a3 0-0 14 \text{d}5 \text{xb}2 15 \text{a}2 \text{e}5 16 \text{d}6 17 \text{xf}6+ \text{h}8 18 \text{e}5 \text{e}7 19 \text{d}5 \text{d}8) 13...0-0 14 0-0 \text{d}6, and Black is no worse, \text{Gutman}.

"However, this is good for White according to \text{Gutman}, \text{Wells}.

8...\text{a}6 9 \text{g}3 \text{f}6 10 \text{c}3 \text{a}5 11 \text{c}4 \text{e}6 12 \text{b}3 \text{f}3 13 \text{xf}3 \text{d}6 14 \text{d}2 \text{d}4 (14...0-0 15 0-0-0 \text{xb}3 16 \text{xb}3 \text{xc}3 17 \text{bx}c3 \text{h}5 18 \text{h}4 \text{f}4 19 \text{g}4 \text{e}5 20 \text{f}3 \text{h}6 21 \text{b}2 \text{fg}6 led to equality in Birmingham Chess Club versus Bristol Chess Club, corr. 1870/72) 15 0-0-0 \text{xc}3 16 \text{bx}c3 \text{e}2+ 17 \text{b}2 \text{xd}3 18 \text{h}x\text{g}3 0-0-0, when the situation still remains pleasant for Black, \text{Gutman}.

7...\text{a}5+

Alternatively:

I) 7...\text{xc}3?!! 8 \text{wx}e3 is exactly what White wants;

II) 7...\text{e}5 8 \text{we}2 \text{a}5+ (8...\text{wd}8?! can be met by 9 \text{c}1\text{c}3) 9 \text{d}2 returns to the main line.

8 \text{d}2?!
II) 8 c3 a6 9 \( \text{Q}d4 \text{Qe}5 \) 10 \( \text{W}e2 \) is playable but obviously less critical.

Black has two options:

A) 10...\( \text{b}b6 \) 11 \( \text{Q}f5 \) (11 \( \text{Q}d2 \) d6) 11...\( \text{W}f6 \) 12 \( \text{Q}xb6 \) \( \text{W}xb6 \) 13 \( \text{Q}a3 \) (13 \( \text{Q}xg7+?! \) is premature in view of 13...\( \text{Q}f8 \) 14 \( \text{Q}f5 \) d5) 13...\( \text{Q}f6 \) 14 0-0-0 0-0 15 \( \text{Q}c7+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 16 f4 yields White strong pressure, Gutman;

B) 10...d6 is necessary, and here:

B1) 11 g3?! \( \text{W}xe4 \) (11...\( \text{W}e7 \) 12 \( \text{Q}g2 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 13 0-0 should be equal) 12 f3 \( \text{W}g6 \) (12...\( \text{d}5! \) 13 \( \text{Q}d2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) looks like a reasonable continuation) 13 \( \text{Q}b3 \) b6 14 \( \text{Q}d3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 15 \( \text{W}g2 \) \( \text{c}6! \) (instead of 15...0-0-0? 16 \( \text{Q}xa6+ \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) 17 0-0 b5 18 \( \text{Q}xb5+ \) \( \text{e}7 \) 19 \( \text{Q}a3 \) c6 20 f4 \( \text{Q}g4 \) 21 \( \text{a}ae1 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 22 \( \text{W}xe6 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 23 \( \text{w}b7 \), and White won quickly in Kislov-Novichkov, Podolsk 1993) 16 b4 allows Black obtain a dangerous attack by 16...\( \text{Q}xb4 \) 17 cxb4 \( \text{Q}xb4 \), Gutman;

B2) 11 \( \text{Q}b3! \) is the best answer, but even here 11...\( \text{b}b6 \) 12 \( \text{Q}xb6 \) cxb6 13 h3 \( \text{Q}e7 \) 14 \( \text{Q}d2 \) 0-0 gives Black sufficient counterplay, Gutman.

8...a6

8...\( \text{Q}f6 \) is worth consideration; although White is ahead in development, the e-pawn may become an object of attack.

And now:

A) 9 \( \text{Q}d3 \) reaches a position after 5...\( \text{c}c5 \) 6 \( \text{W}f3 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \) 7 \( \text{Q}d3 \), covered in Sequel 4;

B) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{a}6 \) 10 g3 (10 \( \text{Q}d4! \) fails due to 10...\( \text{Q}xd2+ \) 11 \( \text{Q}xd2 \) \( \text{Q}xe4! \)) 10...\( \text{g}4 \) 11 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}xd2+ \) 12 \( \text{Q}xd2 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 13 \( \text{Q}xf3 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) 14 \( \text{Q}d1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 15 \( \text{g}2 \) 0-0 should be superior for Black, Gutman;

C) 9 \( \text{c}3! \) \( \text{a}6 \) 10 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}e5 \) 11 \( \text{W}e2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) (is safer than 11...\( \text{d}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{Q}b3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{Q}xb6 \) \( \text{cxb6} \) 16 \( \text{f}4 \) with advantage for White) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) (or 12...\( \text{h}5?! \) 13 \( \text{Q}h5 \) \( \text{Q}xh5 \) 14 \( \text{Q}b3 \) 13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{Q}b3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{Q}xb6 \) \( \text{cxb6} \) 16 \( \text{f}4 \) and I would certainly prefer White, Gutman.

9 \( \text{Q}d4!? \)

"The knight will retreat comfortably to d4, and Black's play looks untidy", Wells.

After 9 \( \text{Q}c3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 10 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{Q}xg3 \) 11 h\(x\)g3 \( \text{Q}xe3 \) 12 \( \text{b}xc3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 13 \( \text{Q}e2 \) \( \text{Q}e7 \) (13...\( \text{e}6?! \) 14 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Q}g4?! \) 15 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \) 16 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 18 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 19 0-0-0 left Black badly placed in Baudoin-Burger, corr. 1990) 14 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}3 \) 0-0 White achieves nothing, Gutman.
9...\text{\textit{D}}e5
There are some other tries:
I) 9...\text{\textit{D}}xd4 10 \text{\textit{D}}xd4 \text{\textit{D}}xd2+ 11 \\
\text{\textit{D}}xd2 \text{\textit{W}}g5+ 12 \text{\textit{W}}e3 \text{\textit{W}}g6 13 \text{\textit{A}}d1 \\
\text{\textit{D}}f6 14 f3 0-0 15 \text{\textit{C}}c1 d6 16 g4 and \\
White has the initiative, Watson-
Steck, e-mail game 1999;
II) 9...\text{\textit{D}}xd2+ 10 \text{\textit{D}}xd2 \text{\textit{D}}e5 (or \\
10...d5 11 \text{\textit{W}}g3! \text{\textit{W}}xg3 12 hxg3 \\
xex4 13 \text{\textit{D}}xc6 bxc6 14 \text{\textit{D}}f4) 11 \\
\text{\textit{W}}f4 \text{\textit{W}}xf4 12 \text{\textit{D}}xf4 d6 13 \text{\textit{D}}d1 \text{\textit{D}}f6 \\
14 f3 gives White an excellent end-
game, thanks to the powerful black-
squared bishop, \textit{Gutman}.
10 \text{\textit{W}}e2!?
10 \text{\textit{W}}f4 \text{\textit{W}}xf4 11 \text{\textit{D}}xf4 d6 12 0-0-0 \\
\text{\textit{D}}b6 13 c3 \text{\textit{D}}e7 seems acceptable \\
for Black, \textit{Gutman}.
10...\text{\textit{W}}xe4 11 0-0-0 \text{\textit{D}}xd2+ 12 \\
\text{\textit{W}}xd2 \text{\textit{D}}e7
12...\text{\textit{W}}d5 can well be met by 13 \text{\textit{D}}f4 \\
d6 (13...\text{\textit{D}}e7 14 \text{\textit{W}}c3) 14 c4 \text{\textit{D}}xc4 \\
15 \text{\textit{W}}c3 b5 16 b3 \text{\textit{D}}a3 17 \text{\textit{D}}c2, and \\
White is winning, \textit{Gutman}.
13 f4 \text{\textit{D}}g4 14 \text{\textit{D}}g1 d6 15 \text{\textit{D}}xe1 \text{\textit{W}}g6 \\
15...\text{\textit{W}}d5 is suicide on account of 16 \\
\text{\textit{W}}e2.
16 \text{\textit{D}}d3 \text{\textit{W}}h6 17 \text{\textit{W}}a5 \text{\textit{W}}xf4+ 18 \\
\text{\textit{D}}b1 \text{\textit{D}}d8 19 g3 \text{\textit{W}}f6 20 \text{\textit{D}}b5

Black has no hope, \textit{Gutman}.

Instead of defending passively, 
would Black be better advised to 
play more ambitiously!??
"Neither does the attempt to generate counterplay against White's king by 6...\(\text{Qf6}\) promise much against the no-nonsense 7 \(\text{Qxc7+ Qd8 8 Wf4!}\)”, Wells.

We examine:

A) 8...\(\text{Qxf2+ 9 Wxf2 Wxf2+}\) (there is no point in trying 9...\(\text{Wxe4+?}\) as 10 \(\text{Ke2 Qxc7 11 Qc3 Wg6 12 Qf4+ Qd8 13 0-0-0 gives White an overwhelming position}) 10 \(\text{Qxf2 Qxc7 11 Qc3!}\) (after 11 \(\text{Qf4+ d6 12 Qc3 a6 13 Qd1 Qe5 14 Qg5, Suesman-Martin, Providence 1965, 14...h6?! 15 Qxf6 Qg4+ would have been satisfactory for Black}) 11...a6 12 Qg5 Qe5 13 h3!, and White has a clear advantage, Gutman;

B) 8...\(\text{Wxf4 9 Qxf4 Qxe4!}\) (not 9...\(\text{Qb4? 10 Qxa8 Qxc2+ 11 Qd2 Qxa1 12 Qc3) 10 Qxa8 Qxf2 11 Qd6 (11 Qc7+ Qe7 12 Qg1 Qg4) 11...Qe3 12 Qg1 Qe4 13 Qc7+ Qe7 14 Qd3 (14 Qh1 d6 15 Qd3 Qf2 16 Qc3 Qe6 17 Qf1 Qxd3+ 18 cxd3 Qxa8 19 Qb5 Qc5 seems quite comfortable for Black) 14...Qxg1 15 Qxe4 d6 16 Qc3 Qe6 17 Qxd6+ Qxd6 18 0-0-0+ Qe7 19 Qxg1 Qxa8 with a level ending, Gutman.

8...Qe8

This is a natural counter, trying to exploit the open e-file.

Black has two more possibilities which are worth exploring:

I) 8...Qd4, and then:

A) 9 Wd3?! Qxe4 10 g3 (10 Qe3? is bad because of 10...Qxe8 11 Qc2 Qxe2 12 Wxe2 Qxf2) 10...Wf6 11 Qf4 (Ekmark-Nieminen, corr. 1991, went 11 Wxe4? Qe8 12 Wxe8+ Qxe8 13 Qd3 Qxc2+ 0-1) 11...d6 12 Wxe4 Qe8 13 Wxe8+ Qxe8 14 Qd2 Qe6 15 Qe3 Qxb2 16 Qxc5 dxc5 17 Qc3 Qd4 18 Qd3 Qf3+ 19 Qe3 Qxc3 20 Qxf3 c4 favours Black, Gutman;

B) 9 Wf4! is the thematic reply, when 9...Qxc2+ (9...Wxf4 10 Qxf4 Qxc2+ 11 Qd2 Qxa1 will transpose into a variation after 6 Wf3 Qd4 7 Qxc7+ Qd8 8 Wf4 Wxf4 9 Qxf4 Qxc2+ 10 Qd2 Qxa1 11 Qxa8 Qf6 — Sequel 6) 10 Qd1 Wxf4 11 Qxf4 Qxa1 reaches a position after 6 Wf3 Qd4 7 Qxc7+ Qd8 8 Wf4 Qxc2+ 9 Qd1 Wxf4 10 Qxf4 Qxa1 11 Qxa8 Qf6, covered in Sequel 6. \(\text{\textcopyright} 1991\)
11) 8...\(\texttt{Q}xe4\) is a fairy tale approach.

White has a choice of:
A) 9 \(g3\)? was indicated by Butterill/Harding, however, 9...\(\texttt{W}e7\) 10 \(\texttt{A}e3\) (after 10 \(g2\) \(\texttt{Q}x\texttt{f}2+\) 11 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{E}e8\) 12 \(\texttt{A}d2\) b6 13 \(\texttt{A}a3\) \(\texttt{A}a6+\) 14 c4 \(\texttt{A}xa3\) 15 \(\texttt{W}xa3\) \(\texttt{W}e2+\) 16 \(\texttt{A}g1\) \(\texttt{W}x\texttt{d}2\) 17 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{A}g4\) White is helpless) 10...\(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2!\)? (10...\(\texttt{A}d4!\)? 11 \(\texttt{W}d1\) \(\texttt{A}e8\) 12 \(\texttt{A}d3\) \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2\) 13 \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2\) \(\texttt{W}xe3+\) 14 \(\texttt{A}g2\) b5 15 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{A}b7+\) 16 \(\texttt{A}h3\) \(\texttt{W}h6+\) is a lively variation) 11 \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2\) \(\texttt{A}e5\) 12 \(\texttt{W}f4\) (or 12 \(\texttt{W}e4\) f5 13 \(\texttt{W}g2\) \(\texttt{A}g4+\) 14 \(\texttt{A}e1\) \(\texttt{W}xe3+\) 15 \(\texttt{A}d1\) \(\texttt{A}f2+\) 0-1, Cavanaugh-Ernst, corr. 1984) 12...\(g5!\) 13 \(\texttt{W}e4\) f5 14 \(\texttt{W}d4\) \(\texttt{A}xd4\) 15 \(\texttt{A}xd4\) \(\texttt{W}b4\) 16 c4 b6 17 \(\texttt{A}e2\) \(\texttt{W}e8\) 18 \(\texttt{A}d1\) \(\texttt{A}b7\) does not give White enough material for his queen, Gutman;

B) 9 \(\texttt{A}e3!\) \(\texttt{A}d4\) (9...\(\texttt{A}e8\) can be met by 10 \(\texttt{A}e2\) \(\texttt{A}d4\) 11 \(\texttt{A}xd4\) \(\texttt{A}xd4\) 12 \(\texttt{A}c3!\)? \(\texttt{A}xf2+\) 13 \(\texttt{A}d1\) 10 \(\texttt{A}xd4\) \(\texttt{A}xd4\) 11 c3 was recommended by Palm, 11...\(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2\) 12 cxd4 \(\texttt{A}xh1+\) (or 12...\(\texttt{A}e8+\) 13 \(\texttt{A}d2\) \(\texttt{W}xd4+\) 14 \(\texttt{A}c2\) \(\texttt{A}xh1\) 15 \(\texttt{A}c3\) \(\texttt{A}f2+\) 16 \(\texttt{A}e2\)) 13 \(\texttt{A}d1\) \(\texttt{W}xd4+\) 14 \(\texttt{A}c2\) \(\texttt{A}e8\) (14...\(\texttt{A}f2\) 15 \(\texttt{A}c3\) \(\texttt{A}g4\) 16 \(\texttt{A}e1\)) 15 \(\texttt{A}c3\) \(\texttt{A}f2+\) 16 \(\texttt{A}e2\) \(\texttt{A}e3\) 17 \(\texttt{W}xf2\) \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}2\) 18 \(\texttt{A}d2\) \(\texttt{A}e8\) 19 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{A}e4+\) 20 \(\texttt{A}xe4\) \(\texttt{A}xe4\) 21 \(\texttt{A}xf7\), and White wins, Gutman.

9 \(\texttt{A}c3!\)
The other sub-variation is 9 \(\texttt{A}d3\) \(\texttt{A}xe4\).

After 10 \(\texttt{A}xe4\) (the analysis by Bird giving 10 0-0? \(\texttt{A}xf2\) 11 \(\texttt{A}xf2\) \(\texttt{A}e1+\) 12 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{A}d4\) 13 \(\texttt{W}x\texttt{f}7\) \(\texttt{A}c2+\) 14 \(\texttt{A}h1\) \(\texttt{A}g3+\) 15 \(\texttt{A}g1\) \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{f}1\) mate, has never been challenged) 10...\(\texttt{A}d4!\) (10...\(\texttt{A}xe4+\) ?) 11 \(\texttt{A}f1\) \(\texttt{A}d4\) fails tactically due to 12 \(\texttt{W}g3!\) \(\texttt{W}xg3\) 13 \(\texttt{A}x\texttt{g}3\) \(\texttt{A}xc2\) 14 \(\texttt{A}g5+\) f6 15 \(\texttt{A}c3\), Harding) 11 \(\texttt{W}d3\) (11 \(\texttt{W}g3\) is now less convincing in view of 11...\(\texttt{W}x\texttt{e}4+\) 12 \(\texttt{A}e3\) \(\texttt{A}xc2+\) 13 \(\texttt{A}d1\) \(\texttt{A}xe3+\) 14 \(\texttt{f}x\texttt{e}3\) \(\texttt{A}xe3\) 15 \(\texttt{A}c7+\) \(\texttt{A}e7\) 16 \(\texttt{W}c2\) \(\texttt{W}g4+\) 17 \(\texttt{W}e2\) \(\texttt{W}d4+\) 18 \(\texttt{W}d2\) d5) 11...\(\texttt{A}xe4+\) 12 \(\texttt{A}f1\) Black has two ideas in his disposal:

A) 12...\(\texttt{A}b3\) ("there seems to be nothing better than this move, cleverly regaining the rook"). Butterill/Harding 13 \(\texttt{A}e3\) (or 13 \(\texttt{A}g5+\) \(\texttt{W}xg5\) 14 \(\texttt{W}xe4\) \(\texttt{A}xa1\) 15 \(\texttt{W}h4\) 16 \(\texttt{A}e2\) d6 17 \(\texttt{g}3\) \(\texttt{W}h5+\) 18 \(\texttt{A}d2\) \(\texttt{A}xc2!\) with Black having the initiative) 13...\(\texttt{A}xe3\) 14 \(\texttt{f}x\texttt{e}3\) \(\texttt{A}xa1\) (14...\(\texttt{A}c5?!\) 15 \(\texttt{W}d6\) b6 16 \(\texttt{W}c7+\) \(\texttt{A}e7\) 17 \(\texttt{A}c3\) is clearly in White's favour).
“Both colours have a marauding knight hopelessly stranded at a1 and a8, so that a major issue is clearly: which of the two knights will the more easily fall prey to the forces that surround it? In fact White has the initiative because, on move, he can at once start to implement the sequence \( \mathcal{D}d2, \mathcal{E}e2, \mathcal{M}xa1 \). Added to this, there is a very great danger that the white queen will come to d6”, Botterill/Harding.

Nevertheless, 15 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{M}xe6 \) (not 15...\( \mathcal{M}a4? \) 16 \( \mathcal{E}e2 \mathcal{M}xa2 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}d6 \) and White wins, Botterill/Harding) 16 \( \mathcal{E}e2 \mathcal{M}g6 \) (or 16...\( \mathcal{W}g4+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{R}f2 \mathcal{M}f6+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{R}f3 \mathcal{W}h4+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{E}e2 \mathcal{W}g4 \) with a draw by repetition) 17 g3 \( \mathcal{W}h5+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{R}f3 \mathcal{M}xg3 \) 19 \( \mathcal{H}xg3 \mathcal{W}xh1 \) 20 \( \mathcal{R}f2 \mathcal{C}c1 \) 21 \( \mathcal{W}d6 \mathcal{W}xc2+ \) 22 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{E}e8 \) 23 \( \mathcal{C}c7+ \mathcal{D}d8 \) 24 \( \mathcal{D}d5 \mathcal{W}xd2+ \) 25 \( \mathcal{F}f3 \mathcal{W}d1+ \) should lead to a draw by perpetual, Gutman;

B) Detailed study confirmed 12...\( \mathcal{D}xc2! \), a recent successful try used in one computer game.

Now:

B1) 13 \( \mathcal{W}xc2 \) b6 14 \( \mathcal{G}g5+ \) (14 h3 \( \mathcal{A}a6+ \) 15 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \) is no better as 15...\( \mathcal{A}xf2+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xf2 \mathcal{M}e1+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}xe1 \mathcal{W}xe1+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{H}h2 \mathcal{W}e5+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \mathcal{A}b7 \) shows) 14...\( \mathcal{W}xg5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{C}c7 \mathcal{A}xc7 \) 16 g3 \( \mathcal{A}a6+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{G}g2 \mathcal{M}e2 \) 18 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \mathcal{W}xe2 \)

12 \( \mathcal{D}d1 \)

“Here White must avoid 12 \( \mathcal{A}e3? \mathcal{X}xe3+ \)”, Botterill/Harding.

12...d5

12...d6 deserves attention, with a further split:

A) 13 \( \mathcal{G}g5+?! \mathcal{W}xg5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \mathcal{G}g4+ \) 15 f3 \( \mathcal{A}f5 \) 16 h4 (or 16 f4 \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}xb7 \mathcal{G}g4+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \mathcal{W}e6+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{D}f3+ \) ) 16...\( \mathcal{W}h6 \) is without hope for White;

B) 13 \( \mathcal{W}g3 \mathcal{G}g4+ \) 14 f3 \( \mathcal{D}xf3 \) (revealing the point behind 12...d6, namely that the diagonal h2-b8 is closed for the white queen) 15 \( \mathcal{W}xh4+ \mathcal{D}xh4+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{D}f3+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \mathcal{D}e5 \) 18 a3 \( \mathcal{D}d4+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \mathcal{E}e6+ \) 20 c4 \( \mathcal{C}c8 \) yields Black sufficient counterplay;

C) However, White has a much superior resource in 13 \( \mathcal{D}d2! \mathcal{F}f5 \) 14
13 ♂g3!
13 ♦e3 ♦g4+ does not appear to offer White more than a draw.

We survey White's defences:
A) 14 ♦d2 ♦xe3 15 fxe3 ♦f2+ 16 ♦c3 ♦f5 17 exd4 (17 ♦d1? loses due to 17...♕xe3+ 18 ♦d3 ♦a5 19 ♦b4 ♦b5 + 20 ♦b3 ♦d4) 17...♕xd3 18 ♦xd3 ♦xd4+ 19 ♦d2 ♦b4+ 20 ♦e2 ♦g4+, when Black is at least no worse;
B) 14 ♦f3 ♦xe3 15 ♦xe3 ♦xf3 16 ♦c3 ♦g5+ 17 ♦e2 ♦xe2+ 18 ♦xe2 ♦g4+ 19 ♦f1 ♦f4+ with a draw by perpetual, Gutman.

13...♕g4+ 14 ♦f3 ♦xg3 15 hxg3 ♦xf3 16 ♦d2
Black does not have enough pressure to justify his material deficiency, Gutman.

Although, this variation looks like a refutation of Black's play, White mostly prefers to proceed safely...

Sequel 4
(1 e4 e5 2 ♦f3 ♦c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♦xd4 ♦h4 5 ♦b5 ♦c5 6 ♦f3 ♦f6) 7 ♦e3!?
This move has largely replaced the alternatives.
We consider here three more possibilities:
I) 7 ♦c3 can be powerfully met by 7...♕g4 8 g3 ♦c5 9 ♦xc7+ ♦d8 10 ♦f5 d6 11 ♦xa8 ♦e7! (11...♕xf5 12 gxh4 ♦f3+ 13 ♦e2 ♦d4+ 14 ♦d2 ♦f3+ 15 ♦e2 ♦d4+ forces a draw) 12 ♦xf4 g5 13 ♦d5 gxh4 14 ♦xe7 ♦xe7 15 ♦xf4 (Absmaier-Kaplan, Germany 1998, went 15 ♦e2 ♦f3 16 ♦d1 ♦xf2 17 ♦xf1 ♦xd1 18 ♦xd1 ♦f2 19 ♦xf4 ♦g4+ 20 ♦d2 ♦xa8 0-1) 15...♕xf2 16 ♦g2 ♦xh1 17 ♦xh1 ♦b4+ 18 ♦c3 ♦a5 19 ♦b4 ♦d8 20 0-0-0 ♦b6, and White loses the knight, Gutman;
II) 7 ♦d3 is more often seen.

Black has the following tries:
A) 7...♕g4? is questionable, 8 ♦xc7+ ♦d8 9 ♦xa8 ♦xf2+ 10 ♦d1 ♦d4 11 ♦xf7 ♦e3 12 ♦xe3 ♦xe3+ 13 ♦c1 ♦g5 14 ♦d2 1-0, Ihonen-Terho, Finland 1996;
B) 7...b6 8 ♦e3 ♦a5+ 9 ♦d2 (or 9 ♦d2 ♦b6 with a repetition of moves) 9...a6 10 ♦d4 ♦xd2+ 11 ♦xd2 ♦e5 (11...d5?! may be too provocative, 12 ♦xc6 bxc6 13 exd5
\[ \text{\textbf{A}} \] 7...\texttt{d4} 8 \texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 9 c3! (9 \texttt{c3} \texttt{xc3}+ 10 bxc3 d6 11 g3 \texttt{g4} 12 \texttt{w3} \texttt{w5} 13 \texttt{g2} 0-0 14 h3 \texttt{e6} was fine for Black in Rodriguez-Navarette, Argentina 1998) 9...\texttt{b6} 10 e5 \texttt{e4} 11 g3

\[ \text{\textbf{B}} \] 7...0-0 8 \texttt{c1c3} (8 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g4} 9 \texttt{e2} \texttt{d5} 10 \texttt{wxd4} \texttt{xd4} favours Black) 8...\texttt{d5}! 9 \texttt{g3} \texttt{w6} 10 \texttt{f4}? (10 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 11 exd5 \texttt{db4} 12 \texttt{d3} \texttt{xd3}+ 13 \texttt{xd3} \texttt{e8}+ 14 \texttt{f1} \texttt{g4} 15 \texttt{g1} \texttt{e2} 16 \texttt{e3} \texttt{xf2}+ 17 \texttt{fxe2} \texttt{xb5} leaves White very exposed) 10...\texttt{g5} (necessary since 10...\texttt{h4} 11 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g3} 12 \texttt{h3} \texttt{xe4} 13 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 14 \texttt{xe4} 15 \texttt{g5}?? \texttt{b6} 16 c3 secures a plus for White) 11 \texttt{d2} \texttt{g4} 12 \texttt{g3} \texttt{b4} 13 \texttt{d3} \texttt{dxe4} 14 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 15 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{w6} 16 0-0 \texttt{xe4} 17 h3 \texttt{h6} (an improvement on 17...\texttt{gxe2} 18 \texttt{ac1} \texttt{e2} 19 \texttt{c3} \texttt{w6} 20 \texttt{wxe2} \texttt{wxe8} 21 \texttt{w3} \texttt{wad8} 22 \texttt{c3} \texttt{w3} 23 \texttt{w4} \texttt{w5} 24 \texttt{w3} \texttt{wh6} 25 \texttt{w4} \texttt{a4} and White won quickly in Rud-Bach, Gausdal 2000) 18 \texttt{xd4} (this might be safer than 18 \texttt{hgx4} \texttt{xd4} 19 \texttt{ac1} \texttt{d8} 20 \texttt{c3} \texttt{g6} 18...\texttt{xd4} 19 \texttt{hgx4} \texttt{a6} appears equal, Gutman. 7...\texttt{e3} 8 \texttt{xe3}

And here:

8...0-0

“This loses a pawn with no real compensation”, Hall.

Other options are:
I) 8...\(\text{d}8\) reaches a position after 6...\(\text{d}8\), covered in Sequel 1; II) 8...\(\text{g}4\) 9 \(\text{f}4\) g5 10 \(\text{d}2!\) (10 \(\text{g}3 \text{g}x\text{g}3\) 11 h\(\text{x}\)g3 \(\text{d}8\) 12 \(\text{e}1\) c6 13 \(\text{d}3\) d6 14 \(\text{e}2\) is also slightly better for White) 10...\(\text{d}8\) 11 g3 \(\text{w}6\) 12 h4!? (Hergert-Leisbein, corr. 1997, went 12 \(\text{g}2\) d6 13 h4 g\(\text{x}\)h4 14 \(\text{w}x\)h6 \(\text{c}x\)h6 15 \(\text{h}x\)h4 \(\text{d}4\) 16 \(\text{d}2\) a6 17 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 18 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}4\) 19 0-0-0 \(\text{b}5\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) 12...a6 13 \(\text{d}5\) c6 \(\text{g}8\) 14 \(\text{e}2\) d6 15 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}6\) 16 \(\text{b}c\) c3 and Black has serious problems, Gutman.

9 \(\text{c}x\) c7! 9 \(\text{c}1\) c3 d5! 10 g3 \(\text{w}h\) 5 11 \(\text{e}2\) g4 (Janssen-Born, Dieren 1979, went 11...\(\text{w}e\) 5? 12 exd5 \(\text{w}x\) e3 13 fx3 \(\text{b}4\) 14 \(\text{c}x\) c7 \(\text{b}8\) 15 0-0-0 \(\text{f}5\) 16 \(\text{d}2\) e4 17 \(\text{x}\) e4 \(\text{x}\) e4 18 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}d\) 18 \(\text{f}d\) 4 19 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{g}2\) 20 \(\text{g}1\) 1-0) allows Black to get counterplay, 12 f3 \(\text{h}3\) (12...d4 is less effective due to 13 fxg4 \(\text{x}b\) 5 14 \(\text{x}\) b5 dxe3 15 \(\text{x}\) xe6 bxc6 16 g5 \(\text{g}4\) 17 \(\text{e}2\) ) 13 0-0-0 dxe4! (13...\(\text{a}d\) 8?! 14 g4 \(\text{w}h\) 4 15 \(\text{x}\) d5 \(\text{x}\) d5 16 \(\text{x}\) d5 \(\text{x}\) d5 17 exd5 \(\text{b}4\) 18 \(\text{w}d\) 2 \(\text{x}\) d5 19 \(\text{x}\) d5 c6 20 \(\text{w}e\) 5 cxb5 21 \(\text{g}3\) was excellent for White in Kislov-Biro, Harkany 1994) 14 \(\text{x}\) c7 \(\text{a}d\) 8 15 fx4 \(\text{w}e\) 5 16 \(\text{d}7\) d5 \(\text{x}\) d5 17 \(\text{x}\) d5 \(\text{g}2\) 18 \(\text{h}\) e1 \(\text{w}e\) 4 19 \(\text{w}e\) 4 \(\text{a}e\) 4 with balanced chances, Gutman.

9...\(\text{b}4\) 10 \(\text{d}3!\) 10 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}8\) 11 c3 \(\text{a}6\) 12 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{x}\) d5 13 \(\text{g}\) d5, indicated by Müller/Meyer as unclear, after 14 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{g}4!\)? (14...\(\text{d}7\) is too passive, 15 0-0-0 \(\text{f}8\) 16 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{w}6\) + 17 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{f}5\) + 18 \(\text{d}3\), and Black has no compensation for his pawn) 15 \(\text{w}d\) 4 \(\text{c}5\) 16 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}8\) 17 g3 \(\text{w}5\) 18 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}2\), gives Black good counterplay, Gutman.

II) 10...d5

"The point of Black's play is that he hopes to rip open lines in the centre to get at the black king. This is normally a correct strategy, often leading to a brilliant victory against the player with the king in the centre. However, in this case Black's judgement proves to be faulty; only three moves later White's king is able to castle into safety, leaving Black's intended attack in the dust", Hall.

11 e5!

Alternately:

I) 11 \(\text{x}\) a8 dxe4 12 \(\text{x}\) e4 (12 0-0
exd3 13 \(\text{a}3\) dxc2 14 \(\text{c}7\) \(\text{g}4\) 15 \(\text{w}3\) \(\text{x}\) g3 16 \(\text{h}\) xg3 \(\text{f}5\) is fine for Black) 12...\(\text{a}xe\) 4 13 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{f}5\)!
(13...\(\text{c}7\) 14 0-0-0 \(\text{f}2\) 15 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 16 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}h\) 17 \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{h}\) 18 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}3\) 19 \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{x}\) 3 20 \(\text{h}2\) \(\text{f}4\) 20 \(\text{d}e\) 7 \(\text{e}2+?! 21 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{x}\) e3+! 22 \(\text{x}\) e3 was a disaster for Black in Hergert-Leisbein, corr. 1997) 14 \(\text{c}7\) \(\text{h}\) 8 15 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 16 \(\text{d}a\) 7 \(\text{h}\) 17 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}a\) 18 g3 \(\text{e}5\) 19 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{x}\) g3 20 \(\text{h}x\) g3 \(\text{f}4\)+, and White is helpless, Gutman;

II) 11 \(\text{d}2\) dxe4 12 \(\text{x}\) e4 \(\text{f}d\) 5 13 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 14 \(\text{w}3\) \(\text{x}\) g3 15 \(\text{h}\) xg3
$\text{Qb4}$ is indicated by Müller/Meyer, when the endgame resulting after 16 $\text{Qc5}$ $\text{Qxd3+}$ 17 $\text{Qxd3}$ $\text{Qf5}$ 18 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{Qxd3}$ 19 $\text{cxsd}$ is not easy for White to win, Gutman.

11...$\text{Qg4}$

11...$\text{d4}$ 12 $\text{Wg3}$ is another important moment.

Black has a difficult choice:

A) 12...$\text{Qxd3+}$ 13 $\text{cxsd}$ $\text{Wh6}$ 14 $\text{exf6!}$ $\text{Wc1+}$ 15 $\text{e2}$ $\text{Qg4+}$ 16 $\text{Wxg4}$ $\text{Qf5+}$ 17 $\text{Qxe8}$ $\text{Qxe8+}$ 18 $\text{Qf3}$ $\text{Re3+}$ 19 $\text{Qe4}$ $\text{Qc7+}$ 20 $\text{Qg5}$ $\text{Qc6}$!

B) 21 $\text{Qh4}$ $\text{Wxf6+}$ 22 $\text{Qg5}$ $\text{Wxf2+}$ 23 $\text{g3}$ $\text{h6}$ 24 $\text{Qd5}$! (not 24 $\text{Qd8}?!\text{Qh7}$

19 $\text{Wxd4}$ $\text{g5+}$ 26 $\text{Qh3}$ $\text{Qxg3+}$ 27 $\text{hxg3}$ $\text{Wxd4}$) 24...$\text{Qe2}$ 25 $\text{Qc3}$ $\text{dxc3}$

26 $\text{Qaf1}$ $\text{g5+}$ 27 $\text{Qh3}$ $\text{Wh5+}$ 28 $\text{Qg2}$

and White wins, Müller/Meyer;

B) 12...$\text{Wh6}$ 13 $\text{exf6!}$ (Müller-Mitkov, Arnhem 1990, went 13 0-0?! $\text{Qh5}$ 14 $\text{Wh4}$ $\text{Qxd3}$ 15 $\text{cxsd}$ $\text{Qb8}$ when, according to Kramnik, 16 $\text{Qb5?!}$ would still have given White some advantage) 13...$\text{Qc1+}$

(13...$\text{Qxd3+}$ 14 $\text{Wxd3}$ $\text{Qc1+}$ 15 $\text{Wd1}$) 14 $\text{Qe2}$ $\text{Qg4+}$ 15 $\text{Wxg4}$ $\text{Qf5}$ 16 $\text{Qxe8}$ $\text{Qxe8+}$ 17 $\text{Qe4}$!

with a completely winning position for White, Müller/Meyer.

Müller/Meyer mentioned 12 $\text{Wf4}$ $\text{Qb8}$ 13 $\text{Wxb4}$ (13 $\text{h3}$ $\text{d4}$ 14 0-0 $\text{We7}$

15 $\text{hxg4}$ $\text{Wxc7}$ 16 $\text{Wxd4}$ $\text{Qxd3}$ 17 $\text{cxsd}$ $\text{Wh8}$ 18 $\text{Qc3}$ $\text{Qxc3}$ 19 $\text{Qxc3}$

$\text{Qg4}$ led to equality in Pokorna-

Brestak, Slovakia 1997) 13...$\text{Wxf2+}$ 14 $\text{Qd1}$ $\text{Qe3}$ 15 $\text{Qf1}$ $\text{Qxe5}$ 16 $\text{Qf4}$

$\text{Wxb2}$ 17 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{d4}$ as less convincing since after 18 $\text{Qb5}$ $\text{Qe3!?}$ 19 $\text{Qg1}$

$\text{Qe6}$ 20 $\text{Qa3}$ $\text{Wb4+}$ 21 $\text{Qc1}$ $\text{Qbd8}$

Black has good attacking chances,

Gutman.

12...$\text{Wxg3}$ 13 $\text{hxg3}$ $\text{Qxd3+}$ 14 $\text{cxsd}$ $\text{Qb8}$ 15 $\text{d4}$ $\text{f6}$ 16 $\text{exf6}$ $\text{Qxf6}$ 17 $\text{Qc3}$

The endgame is clearly better for White, Müller/Meyer.
Sequel 5
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd4 h4 5 b5 c5 6 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f3 f6 
7 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)e3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe3 8 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe3) 
8...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b4

"The right way, Black must look 
to 8...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b4 to achieve a playable 
game", Hall.

9 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)a6

"We think that 9...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d8 10 0-0 (10 
\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2!? \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd3+ 11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd3 a6 12 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d4 
d6 13 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)h5 14 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c1 and White 
has pressure, \textit{Gutman}) 10...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd3 11 
cxd3 a6 12 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d4 d6 13 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)e8 is 
about equal", Hall.

In my opinion 14 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)h5 15 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)ac1 
\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g4 16 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2 is clearly in White’s 
favour, \textit{Gutman}.

10 e5!?

By this thrust in the centre, sug-
gested by \textit{Palm}, White assumes the 
initiative.

Alternatives are:
I) 10 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d4 d6 11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b5+ \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7 12 
\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd7+ \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd7!? (keeps more control 
than 12...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xd7 13 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f5 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f6 14 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c3 
0-0 15 0-0-0) 13 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)he8, and 
Black is quite solid, \textit{Gutman};
II) 10 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2 0-0 (10...b6 is of du-
bious value in view of 11 e5 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g4 
12 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f4) has been tested.
11...d6 (11...b6 has been discarded since the game Al Hodarani-Mikov, Elista Olympiad 1998, which went 12 g3 \(\text{Wh}5\) 13 f4 \(\text{Ab}7\) 14 Hg1 \(\text{Cc}5\) 15 \(\text{Xxc}5\) bxc5 16 e5 \(\text{De}8\) 17 \(\text{Af}5\) \(\text{Db}8\) 18 \(\text{Xxd}7\) \(\text{Xxd}7\) 19 \(\text{Xxd}7\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 20 \(\text{He}7\) with a winning position for White) 12 g3 \(\text{Wh}3\) (after 12...\(\text{Wh}5\) 13 \(\text{He}2\) \(\text{Wh}5\) 14 f4 \(\text{We}7\) 15 \(\text{Af}3\) \(\text{Ad}7\) 16 e5 \(\text{Cc}6\) 17 \(\text{He}1\) dxe5 18 \(\text{Fx}5\) \(\text{Af}8\) 19 \(\text{Dd}4\) \(\text{Af}3\) 20 \(\text{Wx}f3\) \(\text{Dd}7\) 21 \(\text{Wx}b7\) \(\text{Dac}5\) 22 \(\text{Wx}c7\) \(\text{Dac}8\) 23 \(\text{Wd}6\) White won easily, Friedrich-Repp, corr. 1993) 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{Ce}6\) (13...\(\text{He}8\) 14 \(\text{Af}1\) \(\text{Wh}5\) 15 g4 \(\text{We}5\) 16 h4 \(\text{Ad}7\) 17 h5 h6 18 \(\text{Dg}1\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 19 g5 yields White a strong attack, Savushkina-Matvienko, Russia 2000) 14 \(\text{Af}1\) \(\text{Wh}5\) 15 g4 \(\text{Cc}5\) \(\text{Dxc}5\) promises Black some, but possibly not enough counterplay, Gutman.

10...\(\text{Dd}4\)

10...\(\text{Dd}5\) can be met by 11 \(\text{Ce}4\) \(\text{WXe}4+\) 12 \(\text{Xxe}4\) \(\text{Df}4\) 13 \(\text{Dc}1\) 0-0 14 0-0-0, Gutman.

11 \(\text{Wf}4\) g5 12 \(\text{Dd}4\) c5 13 g3 \(\text{Wxh}2\) 14 \(\text{Dxh}2\) cxd4 15 \(\text{Dxh}7\) \(\text{Dxh}7\) 16 \(\text{Dxh}7\) \(\text{Dxe}5\) 17 \(\text{Dd}4\)

White has a superior endgame, Gutman.

Sequel 6

(1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{Df}3\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 3 d4 exd4 4 \(\text{Dxd}4\) \(\text{Wh}4\) 5 \(\text{Dd}5\) \(\text{Cc}5\) 6 \(\text{Wf}3\) )

6...\(\text{Dd}4\)!

“This move was suggested by some members of the London Club, and has been supposed by those who have examined it, including the writer of the article (Deutsche Schachzeitung 1846) just spoken of and Mr. Horwitz himself, to compel the exchange of knights, and thus completely nullifying the first attack. I believe, however, that the exchange of pieces is not imperative, and that this play of bishop following the knight, so far from weakening your game, adds much to its power”, Staunton, The Chess-Player’s Handbook.

“This will be pretty conclusively found wanting”, Wells.

7 \(\text{Dd}7+\)

7 \(\text{Wf}4\) is a new idea, however of dubious value.

We see:

A) 7...\(\text{Wx}f4\) 8 \(\text{Dx}f4\) \(\text{Db}5\) 9 \(\text{Dxb}5\) c6 10 \(\text{Cc}4\) d6 11 \(\text{Cc}3\) b5 (or 11...\(\text{Dxe}6?!\) 12 \(\text{Dxe}6\) \(\text{fxe}6\) 13 \(\text{Da}4\) 0-0-0 14 \(\text{Dxc}5\) dxc5 15 \(\text{De}2\) )

Chernyshov-Biro, Zalakaros 1995) 12 \(\text{Db}3\) \(\text{Dd}6\) 13 f3 \(\text{Dd}7\) 14 0-0-0
0-0-0 is fine for White, Dochev-Marholev, Bulgaria 1995;
B) 7...\(\text{\#c2+!}\) appears to be the principal continuation since 8 \(\text{\#d1}\) \(\text{\#xf4}\) 9 \(\text{\#xf4}\) \(\text{\#xa1}\) 10 \(\text{\#xc7+}\) \(\text{\#e7?!}\) 11 \(\text{\#xa8}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 12 \(f3\) \(d5\) favours Black, G\textit{utman}.
7...\(\text{\#d8}\) 8 \(\text{\#f4!}\)

"In proof, I venture to submit the following train of play", Staunton.
8 \(\text{\#c3?}\) would have been a fatal error, as after 8...\(\text{\#b4}\) 9 \(\text{\#xb4}\) \(\text{\#xc2+}\) White loses his queen, G\textit{utman}.
8...\(\text{\#xc2+}\)

"He has apparently no stronger move", Staunton.
Mackenzie/Dill - Delmar/Brenzing/Rhelan, consultation game, New York 1869, went 8...\(\text{\#xf4?!}\) 9 \(\text{\#xf4}\) \(\text{\#xc2+}\) 10 \(\text{\#d2!}\) \(\text{\#xa1}\) 11 \(\text{\#xa8}\) \(d6\) (11...\(\text{\#f6}\) 12 \(f3\) \(d6\) 13 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(a6\) 14 \(\text{\#d3}\) \(\text{\#e6}\) 15 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 16 \(\text{\#a4}\) \(\text{\#b4+}\) 17 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#b3}\) 18 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{\#xb3}\) 19 \(\text{\#b6}\) \(\text{\#xb6}\) 20 \(\text{\#xb6}\) gave White a decisive advantage in Vilaviz, Segovia 1999) 12 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#e6}\) 13 \(\text{\#d3}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 14 \(\text{\#b5}\) \(\text{\#b3+}\) 15 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{\#xb3}\) 16 \(\text{\#xd6}\) \(\text{\#xd6}\) 17 \(\text{\#xd6}\) \(d7\) 18 \(\text{\#xb7}\) \(\text{\#b8}\) 19 \(\text{\#c5+}\) \(\text{\#d6}\) 20 \(\text{\#c7},\) and White won easily.
9 \(\text{\#d1}\)

9...\(\text{\#xf4}\)

"Any other play would be still more disadvantageous to him", Staunton.
9...\(\text{\#xf2}\) 10 \(\text{\#xf2}\) \(\text{\#xf2}\) gives White two possibilities:
A) 11 \(\text{\#xc2}\) \(\text{\#xc7}\) 12 \(\text{\#f4+}\) \(d6\) 13 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#e6}\) 14 \(\text{\#d1}\) \(\text{\#c5}\) (14...\(\text{\#d8}\) 15 \(\text{\#xd6+}\) 15 \(a3\) \(\text{\#d8}\) 16 \(b4\) \(\text{\#b6}\) 17 \(\text{\#b5+}\) \(\text{\#b8}\) 18 \(\text{\#xd6}\) \(\text{\#xd6}\) 19 \(\text{\#xd6+}\) with some pressure for White, G\textit{utman}.
B) 11 \(\text{\#xa8}\) \(\text{\#xa1}\) 12 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 13 \(\text{\#f4}\) \(d5\) 14 \(\text{exd5}\) (more precise than 14 \(\text{\#c1}\) \(\text{\#xe4}\) 15 \(\text{\#b1}\) \(\text{\#xc3+}\) 16 \(\text{bxce}\) \(\text{\#e8}\) 17 \(\text{\#d3}\) \(d4\) 18 \(c4\) \(\text{\#e3}\) 19 \(\text{\#b8}\) \(b5\) 20 \(\text{\#xa7}\) \(\text{\#xc4}\) 21 \(\text{\#xc4}\) \(\text{\#b7}\) 22 \(\text{\#d1}\) \(g5\frac{1}{2})\) Hergert-Leisebein, corr. 1997) 14...\(\text{\#f5}\) 15 \(\text{\#b5}\) \(\text{\#c2}\) 16 \(\text{\#f1}\) \(\text{\#d4}\) (or 16...\(\text{\#g4}\) 17 \(h3\) \(\text{\#g3+}\) 18 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#xf1}\) 19 \(\text{\#xf2}\) 17 \(\text{\#a4}\) and it is not easy for Black to free himself, G\textit{utman}.
10 \(\text{\#xf4}\) \(\text{\#xa1}\)

The whole variation "is supposed to be bad on account of analysis by Staunton following an ancient correspondence game between Berlin and Potsdam 1850, in which White established a big plus after 10...\(d6?!\) 11 \(\text{\#xc2}\) \(\text{\#c7}\) 12 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#e6}\) (12...\(\text{\#e7}\) 13 \(\text{\#c1}\) \(\text{\#c6}\) 14 \(\text{\#b5+}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 15 \(\text{\#d1}\) 13 \(\text{\#c1}\) \(\text{\#c8}\) (here 13...\(\text{\#e7}\), to meet 14 \(\text{\#b1}\) by 14...\(\text{\#c6},\) is critical, B\textit{otterill/Harding}; in my opinion this is losing straight away due to 15 \(\text{\#b5+}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 16 \(\text{\#xd6}\) \(\text{\#xd6}\) 17 \(\text{\#d1},\) G\textit{utman}) 14 \(\text{\#b1}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 15 \(\text{\#b5+}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 16 \(b4!\), B\textit{otterill/Harding}.
11 \(\text{\#xa8}\)

"I believe the best answering moves have been made by Black, and now, upon surveying the aspect
of the board, there can be no question, I apprehend, that your game is much superior. The knight, which has captured your rook, he can never extricate while, to secure yours in the same position, he must lose many moves, and thus afford you ample time for the development of your remaining forces”, Staunton.

11...d6!
11...\(\mathcal{Q}f6\) is already a crucial mistake, as the black knight is better placed on e7.

We see:
A) 12 f3?! d5!? (12...d6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 14 \(\mathcal{D}d3\) a6 15 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) \(\mathcal{X}a8\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xc5+\) dxc5 18 \(\mathcal{X}a1\) \(\mathcal{C}c6\) is less convincing, according to Leisebein) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 14 b4 \(\mathcal{D}d6\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xa1\) dxe4 16 fxe4 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 17 \(\mathcal{X}g7\) \(\mathcal{Q}g4+\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) \(\mathcal{X}a8\) 19 \(\mathcal{Q}e1\) \(\mathcal{D}f2+\) 20 \(\mathcal{Q}c2\) \(\mathcal{X}xb4\) 21 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 22 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) \(\mathcal{F}5+\) was fine for Black in Baer-Leisebein, corr. 1997;
B) 12 \(\mathcal{D}d3!\) is more consequent.

“It begins to become clear that everything comes down to a battle of which knight can get out, and that this is bad news for the black cause. The c7-square is simply too easy for White to access”, Wells.

There is only a choice of evils:
B1) “12...b6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}b7\) (13...\(\mathcal{Q}h5\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c7+\) does not help) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) \(\mathcal{Q}h5\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}d7d5\) is, for example, winning for White”, Wells;
B2) Korneev-Komljenović, Zaragoza 1996, continued 12...\(\mathcal{Q}g4\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xf2\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c1\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd3\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xd3\) d6 16 \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) g5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) dxe5 18 \(\mathcal{X}c5\) f5 19 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) fxex4+ 20 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e8\) 21 \(\mathcal{Q}c1\) \(\mathcal{F}6\) 22 \(\mathcal{Q}b5\) \(\mathcal{B}b6\) 23 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{X}b2\) 24 \(\mathcal{X}a1\) and, according to Wells, “Black could have resigned here”;
B3) 12...d6 is relatively the best; 13 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) (Sveshnikov's marked improvement on 14 \(\mathcal{Q}e2?!\) \(\mathcal{d}7?!\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) \(\mathcal{X}c7\) 16 \(\mathcal{X}a1\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}d1\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) 18 a3 a6 19 b4 \(\mathcal{Q}d4\) when 20 \(\mathcal{X}xa6?\) \(\mathcal{X}xc3\) 21 \(\mathcal{X}d6+\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 22 \(\mathcal{f}8+\) \(\mathcal{c}7\) 23 \(\mathcal{X}g7\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 24 \(\mathcal{h}6\) bxa6 25 \(\mathcal{Q}c1\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 26 \(\mathcal{e}3\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 27 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) \(\mathcal{B}b2\) gave Black a decisive advantage, Welz-Reyes, German Bundesliga 1999/2000) 14...\(\mathcal{Q}c8\) (14...\(\mathcal{d}7\) can be met by 15 \(\mathcal{b}5+\)!) 15 \(\mathcal{X}a1\) \(\mathcal{b}8\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}b6\)axb6 17 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) with an unpleasant position for Black, Gutman.

12 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\)
12 \(\mathcal{Q}c4\) \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}xe6\) \(\mathcal{fxe6}\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 15 \(\mathcal{f}3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}2\) \(\mathcal{b}3+\) 17
axb3 $\text{a}x\text{a}8$ is good for Black, according to Novoselski.

12...$\text{Q}e7$

13 $\text{Q}d2$!?

An interesting approach to gain time, instead of moving the light-squared bishop at once.

Less challenging are:

I) 13 $\text{Q}d3$ $\text{Q}e6$ 14 $\text{Q}d2$ $\text{Q}b3+?!$ 15 $\text{xb}3$ $\text{Q}d7$ 16 $\text{Q}b5+$ $\text{Q}c6$ 17 $\text{Q}d5$ $\text{Q}x\text{a}8$ and Black is at least no worse, Gutman.

II) 13 $\text{Q}c4$ $\text{Q}e6$ (after 13...$\text{Q}g4+?!$ 14 $f3$ $\text{Q}h5$ 15 $\text{Q}d2$ $\text{Q}d7$ 16 $b4!$ $\text{Q}x\text{b}4$ 17 $\text{Q}b1$ $\text{Q}x\text{c}3+$ 18 $\text{Q}x\text{c}3$ $\text{Q}x\text{a}8$ 19 $\text{Q}x\text{b}7+$ $\text{Q}d8$ 20 $\text{Q}x\text{d}6$ $\text{Q}c6$ 21 $\text{Q}x\text{f}7$ $\text{Q}x\text{f}7$ 22 $\text{Q}x\text{f}7$ $\text{Q}c8$ 23 $\text{Q}b2$ $\text{Q}c2$ 24 $\text{Q}f8+$ $\text{Q}d7$ 25 $\text{Q}x\text{c}8$ 26 $\text{Q}x\text{c}2$ White won in the ancient game Staunton-NNN, London 1856) 14 $\text{Q}b5$ $\text{Q}c6$ 15 $\text{Q}d2$ $\text{Q}d7$ 16 $\text{Q}x\text{a}1$ $\text{Q}x\text{a}8$ also leads nowhere, Gutman.

13...$\text{Q}e6$ 14 $\text{Q}b5$ $\text{Q}c6$ 15 $\text{Q}x\text{a}1$ $\text{Q}d7$ 16 $\text{Q}e2$ $\text{Q}x\text{a}8$ 17 $\text{Q}a4$ $\text{Q}c8$ 18 $\text{Q}d1$ $\text{Q}e8$ 19 $\text{Q}x\text{c}5$

19 $\text{Q}x\text{d}6$ $\text{Q}x\text{d}6$ 20 $\text{Q}x\text{d}6$ $\text{Q}c7$ 21 $\text{Q}d2$ $\text{Q}x\text{a}2$ is also equal, Gutman.

19...$\text{Q}x\text{c}5$ 20 $a4$ $a6$ 21 $\text{Q}x\text{c}6+$ $\text{Q}x\text{c}6$ 22 $\text{Q}d6$ $\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$.

Leisebein-Gutman, corr. 1999

"White must be resolute enough to go on his own way", Lasker.

Sequel 7

(1 e4 e5 2 $\text{Q}f3$ $\text{Q}c6$ 3 $d4$ $\text{ex}d4$ 4 $\text{Q}x\text{d}4$ $\text{Wh}4$ 5 $\text{Q}b5$ $\text{Q}c5$ 6 $\text{W}f3$ $\text{Q}d4$)

7 $\text{Q}x\text{d}4$

"White might well prefer to play simply", Botterill/Harding.

7...$\text{Q}x\text{d}4$ 8 $c3$

Other possibilities are:

I) 8 $\text{Q}c4$ $\text{Q}f6$ 9 $\text{Q}d2$ (9 c3 $\text{Q}e5$ 10 $\text{Q}d3$ $d5$ 11 $\text{ex}d5$ $\text{Q}g4$ 12 $\text{W}e3$ 0-0 13 $\text{W}g5$ $\text{W}x\text{g}5$ 14 $\text{Q}x\text{g}5$ $\text{Q}x\text{d}5$ 15 0-0 $h6$ 16 $\text{Q}h4$ $\text{Q}f4$ was fine for Black in Zoetemier-Den Hollander, Haarlem 1999) 9...$d6$ 10 $h3$ $\text{Q}d7$ 11 $g3$ $\text{W}h5$ 12 $\text{W}x\text{h}5$ $\text{Q}x\text{h}5$ 13 $\text{Q}b3$ $\text{Q}b6$ 14 $\text{Q}d2$ $\text{Q}c6$ 15 $\text{Q}d3$ 0-0-0 16 $g4$ $\text{Q}f6$ 17 f3 $\text{Q}d8$ 18 0-0-0 $d5$ 19 $\text{ex}d5$ $\text{Q}x\text{d}5$ 20 $\text{Wh}1$ $h5$ 21 $g5$ $\text{Q}d7$ 22 $h4$ $\text{Q}e5$ obtains some edge for Black, Orlova-Ovod, Russia 1997;

II) 8 $\text{Q}c3$ $\text{Q}f6$ (8...$\text{Q}x\text{c}3+$ 9 $\text{W}x\text{c}3$ $\text{W}e4+$ 10 $\text{Q}e3$ $\text{Q}f6$ 11 0-0-0 offers White good attacking chances) 9 $\text{Q}b5$ $\text{Q}e5$ 10 $g3$?! (10 $\text{Q}d3$ 0-0 11 $g3$ $\text{W}h3$) 10...$\text{W}x\text{e}4+$ 11 $\text{W}x\text{e}4$ $\text{Q}x\text{e}4$ 12 $f4$ $\text{Q}d6$ 13 $\text{Q}g2$ $\text{Q}d8$?! 14 $\text{Q}x\text{e}4$ $\text{Q}e8$ 15 $\text{Q}x\text{d}6$ $\text{cxd}6$ 16 $\text{Q}f2$ $\text{Q}x\text{e}4$ with equality, Gutman.

8...$\text{b}6$ 9 $\text{Q}d2$!?

The most modest continuation.

Here are some examples of other moves:
I) 9 g3 \(\text{We7}\) 10 \(\text{g2}\) d5 11 0-0 dx e4 12 \(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{Wxe4}\) 13 \(\text{exe4}\) Qf6, and Black is at least no worse, Gutman;
II) 9 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 10 \(\text{Qc4}\) (10 \(\text{Qd2}\) d5!? 11 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qg5}\) 12 e5 \(\text{Qg4}\) 13 \(\text{Wf4}\) \(\text{Wxf4}\) 14 \(\text{Qxf4}\) \(\text{Qh5}\) 15 \(\text{Qg5}\) h6 16 \(\text{Qh4}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 17 f3 c6 18 0-0-0 g5 19 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qxg3}\) 20 hxg3 \(\text{Qf2}\) 21 g4 \(\text{Qg3}\) 22 \(\text{Qb3}\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 23 \(\text{Qe5}\) 0-0-0 24 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 25 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qf4}\) 26 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) gave Black a clear plus in Feagin-Schuster, corr. 1996) 10...d6 11 \(\text{Qd2}\) 0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{Qe8}\) 13 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 14 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 15 \(\text{Qb2}\) \(\text{Qae8}\) turned out very well for Black in Sainson-Davy, Avoine 1999;
III) 9 \(\text{Qe3}\) “with a slight advantage in space”, Botterill/ Harding.

However, 9...\(\text{Qf6}\) (9...\(\text{Qxe3}\) 10 \(\text{Wxe3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 11 \(\text{Qd2}\) 0-0 12 0-0-0 d5 13 g3 \(\text{Wh5}\) 14 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Wg6}\) 15 e5 \(\text{Qg4}\) 16 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 17 \(\text{Qdf1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 18 \(\text{Qxg4}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 19 cxd4 \(\text{Qxg4}\) simplifies the game too much, Döhner-Bauer, corr. 1987) 10 \(\text{Qd2}\) d5?! 11 exd5 \(\text{Qg4}\) 12 \(\text{Wf4}\) 0-0-0 seems fine for Black, Gutman.

10 \(\text{Ab5}\) !?
Suggested by Palm.
Alternatives are:
I) 10 g3 \(\text{Wc7}\) 11 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 14 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Qfe8}\) is level, Gutman;
II) 10 h3 a6?! (after 10...h5 11 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 12 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 13 0-0 Black’s position can easily become over-extended) 11 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qa7}\) 12 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxe3}\) 13 \(\text{Wxe3}\) (13 \(\text{Qxe3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 14 \(\text{Qd3}\) 0-0 15 0-0 \(\text{Qe8}\) 13...\(\text{Qf6}\) 14 \(\text{Qd3}\) (14 e5 \(\text{dxe5}\) 15 \(\text{Wxe5+}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 16 \(\text{Wxc7}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qad8}\) 18 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qd5}\) 19 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 20 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 21 \(\text{Wg3}\) \(\text{Qc4}\) leaves White awkwardly placed) 14...0-0 15 0-0 \(\text{Qe6}\) 16 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qae8}\) 17 f4 \(\text{Qd7}\) 18 \(\text{Qae1}\) (Sibarević-Chiburdanidze, Banja Luka 1985, went 18 \(\text{Wd4}\)? \(\text{Qxh3}\) ? 19 \(\text{Qae1}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 20 e5 \(\text{Qe6}\) 21 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Hh6}\) 22 \(\text{Qf3}\) dxe5 23 \(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qxh4}\) \(\text{Qxh4}\) 25 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qf4}\) 26 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qxe8}\) 27 \(\text{Qg3}\) g5 28 \(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 29 \(\text{Qxh7+}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 30 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 31 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qxe4+}\) 0-1) 18...\(\text{f6}\) with equal chances, Gutman;
III) 10 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 11 \(\text{Qd3}\) 0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{Qe8}\), and Black has sufficient counterplay, Gutman.

10...\(\text{c6}\) 11 \(\text{Qe2}\) ?
11 \(\text{Qd3}\) can be answered by 11...\(\text{Qe6}\) (11...\(\text{Qf6}\) 12 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 13 \(\text{Wf4}\) \(\text{Wg4}\) is also playable) 12 g3 (or 12 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qxc4}\) 13 \(\text{Qxc4}\) d5) 12...\(\text{Wg4}\) 13 \(\text{Wxg4}\) \(\text{Qxg4}\), Gutman.

11...\(\text{Qf6}\)
11...\(\text{Qe6}\) 12 g3 \(\text{Wh3}\) 13 \(\text{Qc4}\) favours White, Gutman.
12 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 13 \(\text{Wf4}\) \(\text{Wxf4}\) 14 \(\text{Qxf4}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qxh2}\) 16 \(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 17 \(\text{Qf4}\) 0-0 18 0-0 \(\text{Qfd8}\)

Black should be able to keep the balance, Gutman.

9...\(\text{d6}\)
9...\(\text{Qf6}\) is less precise since 10 g3 \(\text{Wg4}\) 11 \(\text{Wxg4}\) \(\text{Qxg4}\) 12 h3! \(\text{Qe5}\) (12...\(\text{Qxf2}\)! 13 \(\text{Qh2}\) 13 \(\text{f4}\) yields White some pressure, Gutman.
Part Four: The Modern Variation

(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 d3 c3)

5...b4

Applying the usual pressure on White’s centre.

Other possibilities are:
I) 5...f6? 6 f5 Wh5 7 e2 Wh6 8 h4 1-0, Fraser-Taubenhaus, Paris 1888;
II) 5...c5 6 e3 reaches a position after 5 e3 c5 6 c3, covered in Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 1.

This has frequently been quoted as a refutation of the Steinitz System.

"Too natural and honest a move to meet the requirements of this eccentric variation", Botterill/Harding.

"This is a move which causes Black the most problems; White aims for rapid development and is not afraid of sacrificing the e4-pawn...Whilst the Steinitz Variation can be dangerous for White if he reacts carelessly, accurate play should enable him to claim an advantage with 5 d4", Lane.

"White hopes to profit from Black’s inability to adopt the ...c5 or ...b4+ defences, as after 5 b5. The first player will often accept a fractured queenside pawn structure, and will again plan to sacrifice his e-pawn. In return White has free and easy piece play as well as a target in Black’s stranded king on d8. Yet Black’s position is solid and without weaknesses", John Hall.

"Black pins the knight and renews the attack on the e-pawn. The pin is an extremely useful weapon for Black: not only does he increase the pressure on the centre, but he also has the positional threat of doubling the c-pawns, intending to attack them later on", Daniel King, English Defence.

The material is divided into five chapters:
Chapter 1: 6 f5
Chapter 2: 6 xc6
Chapter 3: 6 Whd3 (6 Whd2)
Chapter 4: 6 b5
Chapter 5: 6 e2!

6 f3 Whxe4+ 7 e2 transposes to a position, covered after 5 f3 Whxe4+ 6 e2 b4+ 7 c3 — Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 2.
Chapter 1
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 w4 h4 5 c3 b4) 6 f5
This variation is occasionally seen. The idea is the same as in the
Paulsen Variation, nevertheless White hopes to have a few more re-
sources to develop his initiative with the black bishop on b4.
6...wx4e+ 7 e3
7 w2 wxe2+ 8 xe2 has also been tried.

Black has a choice:
A) 8...d5 9 xg7+ f8 10 h5 d4
11 a3 dxc3 12 axb4 xb4 13 0-0
c2 14 a4 d7 15 f4!?
(Denuenille-Schuermans, Le Tou-
quet 1993, went 15 c4 c6 16
c5 f6 17 c5 e8 18 d3 e1 19
c4 dxc3 with advantage for
Black) 15...e8 16 d3 e5 17
g3 a1 18 e3 b3 19 c2, and
White stands very well, Gutman;
B) 8...xc3+ 9 bxc3 f8 (9...g6
weakens the dark squares, after 10
g3 ge7 11 0-0 0-0,
Knotkova-Michalkova, Pilsen 1995,
White could play 12 h6 e8 13
e4 d5 14 f3 with strong pres-
sure) 10 b1 (or 10 e3 f6 11 c4
d6 12 b2 e6 13 0-0 e8 14 fe1
d7) 10...d6 11 d4 xd4 12
cxd x6 13 c4 f6 14 0-0 f5 15
b3 e8 did not give White suffi-
cient compensation for the pawn;
C) 8...f8? may well be the best
answer as 9 e3 (9 0-0 allows an
immediate 9...d5) 9...f6 10 d2
d4 11 d3 c6!? 12 a3 (12 0-0-0
d5) 12...a5 13 0-0 d5 14 ad1
c7 clearly favours Black, Gutman.

7...f6!?
Previously Black played:
I) 7...xc3+ 8 bxc3 f6, Schoel-
Petek, Pilsen 1996, and now White
could gain good attacking chances
by 9 b1 0-0 10 d3 w5 11 c4
e4 12 b5 w6 13 b2 e8 14
0-0, Gutman;
II) 7...d5!? seems more solid.
After 8 wxd5 (8 d2 xc3 9 bxc3
c6 10 d3 w7 11 0-0 0-0 12
e1 w6 13 c4 d4 14 f5 xf5 15
xf5 e7 16 d3 g6 was fine
for Black in Salvador-Mico, Alzira
1993) 8...f6 9 wxe4+ xe4 10
ed5 0-0 11 xb4 (11 xc7 b8
12 db5 e8 13 e3 a6 14 a3 a5
15 b4 xb4 16 0-0-0 xc3 17
c3 c6 with an edge for Black)
11...xb4 12 xe4 e8 (not
12...xc2?!) 13 d2 xa1 14
d3 f5 15 c3 ad8 16 f3, and
Black loses his knight) 13 ęd3 f5 14 a3 0xd3+ 15 cxd3 fxe4 16 dxe4 
  6xe4+ 17 ęd3 the position is about level, Gutman.

8 źd2

9 źc4 0-0 10 0-0 can be met by 10...d6 11 ęd1 ęd7 12 0edx5 0wd4, 
  Gutman.

9...d5 10 0-0 0-0

10...źd6 11 f4!? (better than 11 g3 0-0 12 ęd1 0wd4 13 0xb5 0wc5) 
  11...0wd4 12 0zd1 0-0 13 0wf3 leads to a balanced position, Gutman.

11 ęd1 0wd4 12 a3 0xe7 13 0xb5 
  0wb6 14 a4 a5

White’s compensation appears inadequate, Gutman.

Chapter 2
(1 e4 e5 2 0f3 0c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
  0xd4 0wh4 5 0c3 0b4)

A very unpretentious line of play, which, however, is worth 
  consideration.

Comparative to variations with 5 
  0xc6 (Part 2, Chapter 2), both sides might have a few more possibilities.
II) 7...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{a1}}$}}x3c3+ 8 bxc3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b1}}$}}xc6 9 0-0 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{g1}}$}}f6 seems more logical, giving up the black-squared bishop, but damaging White’s pawn structure.

A) 10 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f3}}$}} d5 11 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e1+}}$}}+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$}} 12 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{a3}}$}} (after 12 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wd4}}$}} 0-0 13 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{g5}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e4}}$}}! 14 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} dxe4 15 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} f6 16 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f4}}$}} d5 17 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e7}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{hxg2}}$}} 18 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xc7}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e4}}$}} 19 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} the endgame is better for Black) 12...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xc3}}$}} (12...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wd7?}}$}}! 13 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b1}}$}} c6 14 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wd2}}$}} 0-0-0 15 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wd4}}$}} b6 16 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e2}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b8}}$}} 17 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{c5}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{a8}}$}} 18 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xb6}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b8}}$}} 19 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{a4}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b7}}$}} 20 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d4}}$} led to a winning position for White in Ipek-C. Foisor, Mangalia 1992) 13 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xc3}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e4}}$} 14 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b1}}$}} 0-0-0 15 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{eb3}}$} b6 favours Black, Gutman;}

B) However, 10 c4! 0-0 11 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b2}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e8}}$}} 12 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e1}}$} secures White good attacking chances, Gutman.

8 0-0 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wh4}}$} 9 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f3}}$}}}

White has two more options:

I) 9 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d2}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d6}}$}} 10 a3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d6}}$}} 11 g3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wh3}}$}} 12 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f3}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{g4}}$}} 13 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} 14 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{we1+}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d7}}$}} 15 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{we4}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{ae8}}$}} 16 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wxe2}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wh5}}$} with a decisive advantage to Black, Katsampes-Wall, San Antonio 1994;

II) 9 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d3}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xc3}}$} (9...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f6}}$}) 10 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e1+}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$} is possible) 10 bxc3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$} 11 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b1}}$}} b6 12 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f3}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d5}}$} 13 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{we3+}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e7}}$}} 14 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{a3}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$}} 15 f4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d5}}$}} 16 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{we4}}$} 0-0-017 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wa4}}$}, Naiditsch-Tronenko, St. Lorenzo 1995, when 17...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{b8!}}$} 18 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{wxe6}}$} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e3}}$} 19 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{xe4}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d5}}$} would be critical for White, Gutman.

9...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{f6}}$}}

Fedder-Norby, Copenhagen 1975, ended abruptly with 9...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$}?! 10 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{de4}}$} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{d8?}}$} 11 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{g5}}$} 1-0.

10 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e1+}}$}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{$\texttt{\textnormal{e6}}$}

According to Bruno Parma, White has insufficient compensation for his pawn.
Section 1

6...\(\text{Q}e5\) 7 \(\text{W}e2!?\)

7 \(\text{W}e3\) is another important possibility, which is often seen in practice.

Black has a choice:

A) 7...\(\text{Q}c5\) 8 \(\text{Q}d5\) (8 \(\text{Q}cb5\) \(\text{Q}b6\) 9 \(\text{W}f4\) \(\text{W}x\!f4\) 10 \(\text{Q}xf4\) \(d6\) was approximately equal in Higgelke-Schwertlick, Germany 1992) 8...\(\text{Q}b6\)
(or 8...\(\text{Q}d8\) 9 \(\text{W}g5+\) \(\text{W}xg5\) 10 \(\text{Q}xg5+\) \(f6\) 11 \(\text{Q}e3\) 9 \(\text{W}f4!\) \(\text{W}x\!f4\) 10 \(\text{Q}xf4\) \(d6\) (10...\(\text{Q}xd4\) would be answered by 11 \(\text{Q}c3\) 11 \(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 12 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}g4\) 13 \(a5\) \(\text{Q}xf2+\) 14 \(\text{Q}e2\) is definitely better for White, Gutman;

B) 7...\(\text{Q}xc3+\) 8 \(\text{W}xc3!\) (8 \(\text{bxc3} \!d6\) 9 \(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{Q}d8\) yields an unclear position) 8...\(\text{W}xe4+\) 9 \(\text{Q}e3\) with White having the initiative, Gutman;

C) 7...\(d6\) 8 \(\text{Q}e2!??\) (8 a3 \(\text{Q}xc3+\) 9 \(\text{W}xc3\) loses an important tempo, 9...\(\text{W}xe4+\) 10 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(c6\) 11 0-0-0 \(\text{Q}e7\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{W}g6\) 13 \(f4\) \(\text{Q}d5\) 14 \(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Q}g4\) 15 \(\text{Q}gl\) 0-0 16 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{W}h6\) 17 g3 \(\text{Q}e8\), and White's compensation appears inadequate, Zdrowski-Stanley, corr. 1999) 8...\(\text{Q}f6\) 9 0-0 \(\text{Q}c5\)
(9...\(\text{Q}xe3\) 10 \(\text{W}xc3\) 10 \(\text{Q}b3\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 11 \(\text{Q}xh4\) \(\text{Q}b6\) 12 \(\text{Q}g5\) would have restricted White to a slight edge, Gutman;

D) 7...\(\text{Q}f6!?\) is imperative.

White has tried a range of moves:

D1) 8 \(\text{W}f4\) \(\text{W}x\!f4\) 9 \(\text{Q}xf4\) \(\text{Q}g6\) 10 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}xc3\) 11 \(\text{Q}xc3\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 12 \(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{Q}xc3\) 13 \(\text{Q}xc3+\) 14 \(\text{Q}d8\) 14 \(\text{Q}xa8\), Zakova-Martinkova, Chrudim 1993, when 14...\(\text{Q}e8+!\) would be decisive;

D2) 8 \(\text{Q}d3\) with two examples:

D2a) 8...0-0 is too slow, 9 0-0 (Nieuwenbroek-Cerritte, Hengelo 1999, went 9 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{W}g4\) 10 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(d5\) 11 0-0 \(\text{Q}xc3\) 12 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 13 \(f4\) \(\text{Q}xd3\) 14 \(cx\!d3\), and now 14...\(\text{W}h4\) should promise Black an excellent game) 9...\(\text{Q}d6\) 10 \(\text{W}g5!\) (not 10 \(\text{Q}e4?)
(9eg4 11 \(\text{W}g3\) \(\text{W}xg3\) 12 \(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 13 \(\text{Q}ce2\) \(d6\) 14 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 15 c3 \(f5\) 16 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 17 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}f5\) 18 \(\text{Q}xf5\) \(\text{Q}xf5\) 19 \(\text{Q}xf5\) \(\text{Q}h2\) mate, Prassas-Braun, Donauesschingen 1985) 10...\(\text{W}xg5\) 11 \(\text{Q}xg5\) with a plus for White, Gutman;

D2b) 8...\(\text{Q}fg4!\) 9 \(\text{W}g3\) \(\text{W}xg3\) 10 \(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 11 \(\text{Q}cb5\) (11 \(\text{Q}db5\) \(\text{Q}x\!f2+\) 12 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}b6\) 13 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 14 \(\text{Q}f4\) \(d6\) gave Black an advantage in Tan-Langrock, Eberstadt 1996) 11...\(e6?!\) 12 \(\text{Q}c7+\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 13 \(\text{Q}xa8\) \(\text{Q}xd4\) 14 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}xd3+\) 15 \(\text{cx}\!d3\) \(b6\) is clearly in Black's favour, Gutman.

D3) 8 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}xf3+\) 9 \(\text{Q}xf3\) \(d6\) (9...\(\text{b6}\)
10 a3 \(\text{Q}c5\) 11 \(\text{Q}e2\) a5 12 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{a}6\) 13 \(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 14 \(\text{W}xe3\) \(Qxf1\) 15
\( \text{xxf1 } w^2h2 \ 16 \ 0-0-0 \ w^6h6 \) was played in Bell-Wall, Statesville 1978, and now 17 f4! would have retained the pressure) 10 a3 \( \text{cc5 } 11 \ w^2e2 \ e^66 \ 12 \ e^3 \ c^4 \ 13 \ w^d2 \ \text{xf1} \ 14 \ w^x^f1 \ 0^00 \) leaves White with self-inflicted weaknesses;

D4) 8 \( \text{d}^2 \) is preferable.

Black has two options:

D4a) 8...d6 9 \( \text{d}^3 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{ff}3 \ w^5h5 \ 11 \ e^x^e5 \ dxe5 \ 11... \ w^x^e5 \), indicated by Staunton, can be met by 12 0-0-0 \( e^88 \ 13 \ f^4 \) 12 0-0-0 \( \text{xc}^3 \) 13 \( \text{xc}^3 \) \( e^88 \) 14 \( w^g^3 \ w^h^6 \) 15 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{xh}^5 \) 16 \( w^f^3 \) \( \text{ff}6 \) 17 \( w^h^3 \) was better for White in Popert-Staunton, London 1840;

D4b) 8...\( \text{cc}^5 \)?? 9 \( \text{cb}^5 \) \( \text{b}^6 \) 10 \( \text{ff}5 \) \( \text{xe}^3 \) 11 \( \text{xh}^4 \) \( \text{b}^6 \), and Black is at least no worse, Gutman.

II) 7...d6 8 \( \text{d}^2 \)?? \( \text{xc}^3 \) (8...\( \text{gg}^4 \)?? 9 \( \text{bb}^5 \) led to a quick win in Winter-Germann, German Women’s Bundesliga 1991/92) 9 \( \text{xc}^6 \) a6 (9...\( \text{ff}^6 \) 10 \( \text{bb}^5 \)) 10 g3 \( \text{w}^7 \) 11 f4 \( \text{g}^4 \) 12 0-0-0 with advantage for White, Gutman.

8 bxc6 a6 9 g3!?

Bouma-Kroll, Haarlem 1995, went 9 \( \text{ff}^5 \) \( \text{ff}^6 \) 10 \( \text{ee}^3 \) d6 11 \( \text{gg}^3 \) \( \text{ff}^3 \) 12 \( \text{dd}^1 \) \( \text{xc}^3 \) 13 \( \text{bb}^1 \) \( \text{ee}^5 \) 14 \( \text{d}^2 \) \( \text{aa}^3 \) 15 \( \text{ff}^4 \) \( \text{gg}^4 \), and Black won easily.

9...\( \text{ff}^6 \) 10 f4 \( \text{cc}^6 \) 11 \( \text{ee}^3 \) d6 12 \( \text{gg}^2 \) \( \text{ee}^7 \) 13 0-0-0

White is slightly better because of the two bishops, Gutman.

Section 2
(1 e4 \( \text{ee}^5 \) 2 \( \text{ff}^3 \) \( \text{cc}^6 \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{xd}^4 \) \( \text{wh}^4 \) 5 \( \text{cc}^3 \) \( \text{bb}^4 \) 6 \( \text{dd}^3 \)) 6...\( \text{ge}^7 \)

There are three more alternatives:

I) 6...d5 is an interesting attempt to seek immediate counterplay.

However, after 7 \( \text{xc}^6 \) (7 \( \text{bb}^5 \) dxe4 8 \( \text{xc}^7 \) \( \text{ff}^8 \) 9 \( \text{wc}^4 \) b8 10 \( \text{ee}^3 \) \( \text{gg}^4 \) 11 \( \text{wh}^4 \) \( \text{ff}^6 \) 12 \( \text{cc}^4 \) \( \text{cc}^8 \) 13 \( \text{dd}^5 \) \( \text{xd}^5 \) 14 \( \text{xd}^5 \) \( \text{ee}^8 \) appears unclear) 7...bxc6 8 exd5 (8
d2!? \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 9 0-0-0 is also possible, 9...0-0 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) cxd5 11 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}xd5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W}g5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xd2+ \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}xd2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xa2 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}a5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e6 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{F}d8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) c6 18 g3 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) \( \mathcal{A}b8 \) 20 \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) with an edge for White) 8...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) (or 8...\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)) 9 dxc6 0-0 10 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 11 0-0 Black does not have adequate compensation, Gutman;

II) 6...\( \mathcal{Q}xc3+ \) is more natural.

7 bxc3 (David Bronstein, in 200 Open Games, mentioned 7 \( \mathcal{W}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe4+ \) 8 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \), however, after 8...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) "we think Black is clearly better", Hall) 7...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) "with advantage for Black", according to Staunton.

It seems to me that 8 \( \mathcal{Q}f5!? \) (8 \( \mathcal{Q}xc6 \) will transpose into variation 6 \( \mathcal{W}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 7 \( \mathcal{Q}xc6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xc3+ \) 8 bxc3 — Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 3, Sequel 3; while Bronstein mentions 8 \( \mathcal{B}b5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d8 \) "and White cannot protect the e4-pawn") 8...\( \mathcal{W}g4 \) (8...\( \mathcal{X}xe4+?! \) 9 \( \mathcal{W}xe4+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xg7+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}d8 \) 11 c4 \( \mathcal{G}g8 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}b2 \) d6 13 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) gave White two raking bishops in Wenke-Zehner, Germany 1993) 9 f3 \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) 10 c4 d6 11 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) 0-0 12 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) 13 g3 \( \mathcal{A}h3 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}b2 \) favours White, Gutman.

III) 6...\( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \) 7 \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xc3+ \) has been the starting point for numerous games.

A) 8 bxc3 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) (8...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 9 e5 \( \mathcal{W}e4+ \) 10 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \) 11 cxd4 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) gave White an edge in Cervinka-Lahner, Svetla 1994):

A1) 9 \( \mathcal{W}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xf6 \) 10 f3 0-0 11 \( \mathcal{Q}c4 \) d6 12 0-0 \( \mathcal{E}e6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \) a5 14 a4 \( \mathcal{G}a6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{H}b1 \) \( \mathcal{B}b8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{H}d1 \) \( \mathcal{E}c6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{B}b2 \) \( \mathcal{D}d7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{D}d5 \) \( \mathcal{B}b6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}a3 \) \( \mathcal{X}xd5 \) 20 exd5 \( \mathcal{A}xb1 \) 21 \( \mathcal{X}xb1 \) \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) led to a decisive advantage for Black in Vettor-Martinkova, Mu-reck 1998;

A2) 9 e5 \( \mathcal{W}c6 \) 10 f3 \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) (not 11 e6? \( \mathcal{W}xe6+ \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) and White loses a piece, Brujin-De Vries, Hengelo 1997) 11...\( \mathcal{W}e6 \) (11...0-0 12 \( \mathcal{A}a3 \) 12 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{H}h4 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}g3 \) when White’s dark-squared bishop poses some problems for Black, Gutman;

A3) 9 \( \mathcal{A}d3! \) d6 10 0-0 gives White a very pleasant game, Gutman.

B) 8 \( \mathcal{W}xc3! \) is more effective, 8...\( \mathcal{W}xe4+ \) (8...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{W}e5+ \) 9 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 10 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{W}c6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{W}e5+ \) (11 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \) a6 12 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) h6 14 h4 d5 was unclear in Simon-Hohmeister, Kassel 1994) 11...\( \mathcal{W}e6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{X}xc7 \) \( \mathcal{X}xa2 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}c5! \) with a dreadful position for Black, Gutman.
7 d2?! 

Other moves are less critical:
I) 7 db5 a5 8 g3 wf6 9 f4 d6!? (Tuzil-Martinkova, Plsen 1995, went 9...de5?! 10 xe5 xe5 11 f4 wc5, and now White could get some edge by 12 a3!? b6 13 0-0-0 a6 14 d4 xd4 15 xd4 xd4 16 xd4 d6 17 g2) 10 0-0-0 a6 11 d4 xd4 12 xd4 xd4 13 xd4 xc3 14 bxc3 se6 is fine for Black, Gutman;
II) 7 e2 0-0 (7...xc3 is premature in view of 8 bxc3 0-0 9 db5) 8 0-0 xd4 (8...d6 9 f3) 9 xd4 cc6 with equality, Gutman.

7 c5

7...e2 can be met by 8 f3 wh5 9 e2.

8 e3 xd4?!

This restraining move is safer than 8 de5 9 we2! d6 10 db5 g4 11 d2 xe3 12 xe3.

9 xd4 xd4 10 xd4 0-0 11 e2

White has a slight edge, Gutman.

Section 3

(1 e4 e5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 wh4 5 cc6 6 db5)

6...f6!?

"Consistently pressuring the White e-pawn", Hall.

We consider four lines in this section:

Sequel 1: 7 db5
Sequel 2: 7 d2
Sequel 3: 7 xc6
Sequel 4: 7 f5

Sequel 1

7 db5

The most direct and quite popular continuation.

7...a5!

Less challenging are:
I) 7...xc3+ 8 cc3 db4 9 we2 0-0 10 a3 xe4 11 axb4 cc8 12 xe4 cc4 13 e3 d5 14 0-0-0, and White won easily, Nappen-Sidran, corr. 1993;
II) 7...xe4 8 g3 we7 9 cc7+ d8 10 d5 we6 11 e3 cc3 12 cc3 cc5 13 g2 (13 h3 wh3 14 xc5 cc8+ 15 d2 cc5 16 cc5 cc6 was fine for Black in Tsarouhas-Mastrokoukos, team championship, Greece 2000) 13...xe3 14 xe3 with a plus for White;
III) 7...d8 is strongly met by 8 a3!. And here:
A) 8...xe4 9 axb4 xf2 hardly makes sense in view of 10 g5+! wg5 11 xf2 xb4 12 wc4 cf6+ (12...xc2? 13 xc7+ ce8 14 cc4...
\(W^f6+ 15 \, ^e^e2 \, ^x^a^1 \, 16 \, ^f^f1 \) yields White a decisive attack. 13 \( ^g^g1 \, ^w^b^6+ \, 14 \, ^w^d^4 \, ^w^x^d^4+ \, 15 \, ^o^x^d^4, \, Gutman;\)

B) 8...\( ^a^5 \, 9 \, ^b^4 \, ^e^e^5 \) (or 9...\( ^b^6 \) 10 \( ^g^3 \, ^w^h^5 \) 11 \( ^w^e^2 \, ^w^h^3 \) 12 \( ^w^e^3 \, ^e^e^5 \) 13 \( ^w^d^2 \, ^w^g^2 \) 14 0-0-0) 10 \( ^w^g^3 \, ^w^x^g^3 \) 11 \( ^h^x^g^3 \, ^b^6 \) 12 \( ^e^g^5 \, ^e^g^4 \) (more reliable than 12...a6 13 \( ^d^5 \) axb5 14 \( ^x^f^6 \, ^d^d^4 \) 15 0-0-0) 13 \( ^f^3 \) a6 14 \( ^f^x^g^4 \) axb5 15 0-0-0 \( ^e^8 \) 16 \( ^x^f^6 \, ^g^x^f^6 \) 17 \( ^a^b^5 \, ^d^6 \) 18 \( ^e^2 \, ^d^7 \) 19 \( ^c^3 \, ^f^2 \) 20 \( ^a^d^5 \) \( ^d^8 \) 21 \( ^d^3 \) with a fine endgame for White, Gutman;

C) Black’s best response may well be 8...\( ^a^c^3+ \) 9 \( ^a^x^c^3 \, ^e^8 \).

Still, after 10 \( ^g^3 \, ^w^h^5 \) (Mass-Bacher, Germany 1998, went 10...\( ^w^g^4 \) 11 \( ^g^2 \, ^e^e^5 \) 12 \( ^w^e^2 \) d6 13 \( ^f^3 \, ^w^e^6 \) 14 0-0 b6 15 f4 \( ^c^6 \) 16 e5 \( ^a^b^7 \) 17 \( ^e^x^f^6 \, ^w^x^e^2 \) 18 \( ^a^x^e^2 \) \( ^a^x^e^2 \) 19 \( ^f^x^g^7 \, ^d^7 \), and now 20 \( ^a^f^3 \, ^a^x^c^2 \) 21 \( ^a^e^4 \, ^e^2 \) 22 \( ^a^f^5+ \, ^e^7 \) 23 \( ^d^3 \) would have given White a decisive advantage) 11 \( ^g^2 \) d6 12 0-0 (12 \( ^a^f^4 \, ^e^e^5 \) 13 \( ^a^x^e^5 \) 14 0-0 is worth consideration) 12...\( ^e^e^5 \) (or 12...\( ^g^4 \) 13 h3 \( ^a^g^5 \) 14 \( ^w^d^1 \)) 13 \( ^w^e^2 \, ^w^x^e^2 \) 14 \( ^a^x^e^2 \) White is better due to his bishop-pair, Gutman;

IV) 7...0-0 is more forthright. 8 \( ^a^x^c^7 \) !? (but not 8 \( ^a^d^2 \) ? \( ^a^x^c^3 \) 9 \( ^c^3 \), Klapsić-Zelić, Pula 1999, when 9...\( ^b^b^4! \) would be crushing) 8...\( ^a^x^e^4 \) with two examples:

A) 9 \( g^3 \)! \( ^w^f^6 \) 10 \( ^w^x^e^4 \, ^a^x^c^3+ \) 11 \( ^d^1 \) (11 bxc3 \( ^w^x^c^3+ \) 12 \( ^d^1 \) is strongly met by 12...d5! 13 \( ^w^f^4 \, ^a^b^4 \) 11...d5 12 \( ^a^x^d^5 \, ^w^x^f^2 \) ! (not 12...\( ^a^d^8 \) 13 \( ^a^d^3 \, ^a^g^4 \) + 14 \( ^w^x^g^4 \) \( ^a^x^d^5 \) 15 \( ^w^e^4 \, ^a^x^d^3+ \) 16 cxd3 \( ^a^x^b^2 \) 17 \( ^a^e^1 \), Finlay-Saint, corr. 1992) 13 bxc3 (13 \( ^a^d^3 \) f5) 13...\( ^f^5 \) 14 \( ^w^e^2 \)

\( ^a^x^e^2+ \) 15 \( ^a^x^e^2 \, ^a^e^4 \) 16 \( ^a^f^6+ \, ^g^x^f^6 \) 17 \( ^f^f^1 \, ^a^d^8+ \) 18 \( ^a^d^2 \, ^a^e^8 \) gives Black some edge, Gutman;

B) 9 \( ^a^e^3 \) ?? is more precise; 9...\( ^b^b^8 \) 10 \( ^a^d^7 \, ^a^x^c^3 \) 11 bxc3 \( ^a^d^6 \) 12 g3 \( ^w^d^8 \) 13 \( ^a^g^2 \, ^a^e^8 \) 14 0-0, and I prefer White, Gutman.

\( ^w^e^2 \)

Other possibilities are:

I) 8 \( ^g^3 \, ^w^x^e^4+ \) 9 \( ^w^x^e^4+ \, ^a^x^e^4 \) 10 \( ^a^x^c^7+ \, ^a^x^c^7 \)! (10...\( ^d^8 \) 11 \( ^a^d^7 \, ^a^x^c^3 \) 12 \( ^a^x^c^3 \, ^a^b^4 \) 13 \( ^a^d^1 \) d5 14 a3 \( ^a^g^4 \) 15 \( ^a^e^2 \, ^a^x^e^2+ \) 16 \( ^a^x^e^2 \)

\( ^c^6 \) led to equality in Poljak-Pujek, Pula 1992) 11 \( ^a^x^e^4 \) 0-0 12 \( ^a^c^3 \)

\( ^a^b^4 \) 13 \( ^a^d^3 \) d5 looks fine for Black, Gutman;

III) 8 \( ^w^f^3 \, ^w^x^e^4+ \) 9 \( ^w^x^e^4+ \, ^a^x^e^4 \) 10 \( ^a^x^c^7+ \, ^a^x^c^7 \)! 11 \( ^a^x^e^4 \) 0-0 12 \( ^a^c^3 \, ^a^b^4 \) 13 \( ^a^d^3 \, ^a^x^d^3+ \) 14 cxd3

\( ^b^6 \) 15 0-0 \( ^a^a^6 \) 16 \( ^a^d^1 \, ^a^c^8 \) 17 \( ^a^e^3 \) f5 18 \( ^a^d^5 \, ^a^d^6 \) 19 \( ^a^d^4 \) f4 20 \( ^a^c^3 \, ^f^3 \) 21 g3 \( ^a^c^6 \) 22 \( ^a^a^c^1 \, ^a^f^8 \) gave Black an edge, Nightmare-Woodpoosher, computer game, Paris 1997.

\( ^a^x^g^4 \, ^a^x^g^4 \) 12 \( ^a^a^3 \, ^a^b^6 \) ?

Black has a good alternative in 12...b5! 13 \( ^a^e^2 \) (or 13 \( ^a^d^1 \, ^a^x^d^2+ \) 14 \( ^a^x^d^2 \) \( ^a^b^7 \) 15 h3 \( ^a^f^6 \) 16 \( ^a^g^2 \, ^a^f^8 \) 17 \( ^a^e^1 \, ^a^d^8 \) 18 f3 \( ^b^h^5 \)
19 g4 ♗f4 20 ♗f1 ♗de6 21 ♗f2 d5 22 c3 ♗ad8, Sustarsic-Lorbek, corr. 1993) 13...d6 14 h3 ♗f6 15 ♗d5 ♗xd2+ 16 ♗xd2 ♗xe4+ 17 ♗e3 ♗c5 with advantage to Black, De Koning-Gosme, corr. 1996.
13 ♗d1 ♗e8 14 ♗f3 ♗ge5 15 ♗g2 d5 White is in danger, Gutman.

Sequel 2
(1 e4 e5 2 ♗f3 ♗c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♗xd4 ♗h4 5 ♗c3 ♗b6 6 ♗d3 ♗f6)
7 ♗d2

This bishop’s move has been analysed by Rudolph Bilguer.
7...♗xc3!
7...♗g4 is a more recent try.

Now:
A) 8 ♗d1 ♗xd2+ 9 ♗xd2 ♗f6 (9...♗xh2?? 10 ♗b5 0-0 11 ♗xc7 ♗b8 is quite risky as 12 ♗e3 ♗f3+ 13 gxf3 ♗xh1 14 0-0-0 ♗xf3 15 ♗d6! ♗xe4 16 ♗d3 ♗h4 17 ♗f5 shows) 10 ♗xc6 (10 ♗c3 ♗xe4 11 ♗e3 fails to 11...♗xf2+! 12 ♗xf2 ♗xf2 13 ♗xc6 ♗xh1 14 ♗b4 c6 15 ♗d3 d5) 10...♗xe4+ 11 ♗e3 dxc6 12 ♗d3 ♗xe5 13 0-0-0 0-0 favours Black, Gutman;
B) 8 ♗e3 ♗ce5 (after 8...♗xe3 9 ♗xe3 ♗c5 10 ♗f5 ♗xe3 11 ♗xh4 ♗b6, Tertyse-Kviatkovska, Bratislava 1993, 12 ♗d5 would be a logical consequence) 9 ♗e2 ♗xe3 10 ♗xe3 ♗xc3+ 11 bxc3 0-0 is approximately equal, Gutman;
C) 8 g3!? ♗f6 9 ♗f5 (not 9 f3? ♗ge5) 9...0-0 (9...d6?? 10 ♗d5 ♗xb2 11 ♗xc7 ♗d7 12 ♗xb4 ♗xb4+ 13 c3 ♗xf2 14 ♗d5 ♗xc3+ 15 ♗xf2 ♗b2+ 16 ♗e2 ♗b6+ 17 ♗g2 ♗xc7 18 ♗hd1 leaves the black king helplessly stuck in the centre) 10 ♗e2!? (Hidegh-Majdanić, Gyongyos 1998, went 10 f4 d5 11 ♗xd5 ♗xb2 12 ♗d1 ♗xf5 13 exf5 ♗xe8+ 14 ♗e2 ♗d4 15 ♗xb4 ♗xe2+ 16 ♗f1 ♗xf2+ 0-1) 10...d5 11 ♗xg4 dxe4 12 ♗xg7+ ♗xg7 13 ♗xg7 ♗xg7 14 a3 ♗d6 15 ♗g2 might ensure some edge for White, Gutman.
8 ♗xc3
8 ♗xc3 ♗xe4 (less impressive is 8...♗xe4+ 9 ♗e3 ♗xd4 10 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 11 ♗xd4, Colomer-Sebastia, Alzira 1993) 9 ♗e3 0-0-0? (9...♗xf2+ 10 ♗xf2 ♗xf2 allows White to struggle on with 11 ♗xc6 ♗xh1 12 ♗b4 c6 13 ♗e3) 10 ♗xc6 bxc6 11 g3 ♗d8 12 0-0-0 ♗xd2 13 ♗d3 d5 14 ♗xd2 ♗f6 gives Black an advantage, Gutman.
8...♗xe4+

Other moves are:
I) 8...♗e5? 9 ♗e3 ♗xe4 10 ♗b5 ♗xe3+ 11 fxe3 ♗eg4 12 ♗xc7 ♗d8 13 ♗xa8 and White wins, Vinamaki-Terho, Kankaanpaa 1989;
II) 8...0-0 9 ♗xc6 dxc6 will transpose into variation 5 ♗d3 ♗f6 6 ♗xc6 dxc6 7 ♗c3 ♗b4 8 ♗d2 ♗xc3 9 ♗xc3 ♗xc6 0 — Part 1, Chapter 3, Section 4, Sequel 4.
10 \(\texttt{Qb5} \texttt{Qxc3}\) 11 \(\texttt{Qxc3}\) (11 \(\texttt{bxc3}\) \(\texttt{Qd8}\)) 11...\(\texttt{d6}\) (instead of 11...\(\texttt{Qd4}\) 12 0-0-0 \(\texttt{Qe6}\), Frenkofsch-Hamilton, Parsippany 2000, when 13 \(\texttt{g3}\) 0-0 14 \(\texttt{f4}\) yields White sufficient counterplay) 12 \(\texttt{Qd5} \texttt{Qd8}\), and Black keeps the pawn, \textit{Gutman}.

10...\(\texttt{Qxc3}\) 11 \(\texttt{Qxa7}\)

11 \(\texttt{Qb4} \texttt{Qe4}\) 12 \(\texttt{Qd5} \texttt{Qd8}\) 13 \(\texttt{f3}\) \(\texttt{Qc5}\) 14 0-0-0 \(\texttt{c6}\) 15 \(\texttt{Qf4} \texttt{Qc7}\) 16 \(\texttt{Qh5} \texttt{Qe6}\) 17 \(\texttt{c4} \texttt{d6}\) 18 \(\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qd7}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qad8}\) is no better, Stassen-Gelfenboim, Wiesbaden 1998.

11...\(\texttt{Qxa7}\) 12 \(\texttt{bxc3} \texttt{d6}\)

The ending is clearly better for Black, according to \textit{Bilguer}.

Petković-Lundh, Malmö 1998, continued 13 \(\texttt{Qc4} \texttt{Qe6}\) 14 \(\texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Qd7}\) 15 \(\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qha8}\) 16 \(\texttt{Qxe6}\)\(+\) \(\texttt{fxe6}\) 17 \(\texttt{Qhb1}\) \(\texttt{b6}\) 18 \(\texttt{Qb4}\), when 18...\(\texttt{Qxa2}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qxa2}\) \(\texttt{Qxa2}\) 20 \(\texttt{Qh4}\) \(\texttt{h6}\) 21 \(\texttt{Qg4}\) \(\texttt{g5}\) 22 \(\texttt{h4}\) \(\texttt{Qa5}\) could give Black good winning chances.

\textbf{Sequel 3}

(1 \(\texttt{e4} \texttt{e5}\) 2 \(\texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qc6}\) 3 \(\texttt{d4} \texttt{exd4}\) 4 \(\texttt{Qxd4} \texttt{Wh4}\) 5 \(\texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Qb4}\) 6 \(\texttt{Wd3}\) \(\texttt{Qf6}\))

7 \(\texttt{Qxc6}\)

This move has taken over as the main response.

7...\(\texttt{Qxc6}\+)

The alternatives are:

I) 7...\(\texttt{dxc6}\) will transpose into variation 5 \(\texttt{Wd3} \texttt{Qf6}\) 6 \(\texttt{Qxc6} \texttt{dxc6}\) 7 \(\texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Qb4}\) — Part 1, Chapter 3, Section 4, Sequels 3 and 4;

II) 7...\(\texttt{bxc6}\) may well be playable.

White has two options:

A) 8 \(\texttt{e5}\) appears double-edged, with a further split:

A1) 8...\(\texttt{Qd5}\) 9 \(\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qxc3}\) 10 \(\texttt{Qxc3}\) 0-0 11 \(\texttt{g3} \texttt{We7}\) 12 0-0 0-0 \(\texttt{Qxc3}\) 13 \(\texttt{Wxc3}\) \(\texttt{Mb8}\) 14 \(\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Mb6}\) 15 \(\texttt{Qhe1}\) \(\texttt{Qa6}\) 16 \(\texttt{Qe4} \texttt{Qe6}\) 17 \(\texttt{b3} \texttt{Qe8}\) 18 \(\texttt{Qf4}\) \(\texttt{Qxd3}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qxd3} \texttt{Qe7}\) 20 \(\texttt{Qa4}\) gave White a clear advantage in Nyers-Oniscenko, corr. 2000;

A2) 8...\(\texttt{Qxc3}\) + 9 \(\texttt{Wxc3}\) \(\texttt{Qe4}\) 10 \(\texttt{Wd4}\) \(\texttt{c5}\) 11 \(\texttt{We3} \texttt{Qb7}\) (Black does not have time for 11...0-0?, Gergelits-Cervinka, Svetla 1995, on account of 12 \(\texttt{g3}\)) 12 \(\texttt{Qd3}\), and White keeps the pressure, \textit{Gutman};

A3) 8...\(\texttt{Qg4}\) 9 \(\texttt{g3}\) (9 \(\texttt{Wd4}\) \(\texttt{c5}\) 10 \(\texttt{Qf4}\) \(\texttt{Wh5}\) 11 \(\texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qxe5}\) 12 \(\texttt{Qxg4}\) \(\texttt{Qxc3}\) + 13 \(\texttt{bxc3} \texttt{Wxc3}\) + 14 \(\texttt{Qd1}\) \(\texttt{Qb8}\) 15 \(\texttt{Qg3} \texttt{Qxa1}\) 16 \(\texttt{Wxc7} \texttt{Qa8}\) 17 \(\texttt{Qf3}\) \(\texttt{Wd4}\) + 18 \(\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qa1}\) + leads to a draw by repetition) 9...\(\texttt{We7}\) 10 \(\texttt{f4} \texttt{d6}\) 11 \(\texttt{Qg2} \texttt{Qd7}\) 12 \(\texttt{h3}\) (instead Delorme-Wendling, French League 1998, went 12 \(\texttt{Qa6} \texttt{dxe5}\) 13 \(\texttt{Qxc6}\))
exf4+ 14 ♕f1 0-0 15 ♖xa8 ♖xc3 16 bxc3 ♙c5 and Black won quickly) 12...♗f6 13 ♗d2 dxe5 14 0-0-0 is good for White, Gutman;

A4) 8...♗e4+!? looks like the best move, 9 ♕e3 ♙xe3+ 10 ♖xe3 ♗d5 11 ♗d2 ♕xc3 12 bxc3 ♕a5 13 ♗d3 0-0 14 0-0 d5 15 ♖ad1 ♖e6 with a slight edge to Black, Klavčić-Muri, Zupan 1992.

B) 8 ♗d2!? seems more obvious.

![Chess diagram]

Black has a choice:

B1) 8...♗xc3 9 ♗xc3 with two examples:

B1a) 9...0-0 10 e5 ♗e8 (or 10...♗d5 11 g3 ♕e7 12 ♗g2 ♖xc3 13 ♕xc3 ♗e8 14 0-0 ♙b8 15 b3) 11 ♗e2 ♗d5 (11...d6? 12 ♖xf6 ♕g4 fails due to 13 ♕g3!) 12 ♗g3 ♕e7 13 ♖c3 ♖xc3 14 ♕xc3 ♙b8 (14...♗f6 15 0-0 ♕xe5 16 ♕xe5 is fine for White since after 16...♕xe5? 17 ♖ae1! Black has no adequate defence) 15 0-0-0 gives White some edge, Gutman;

B1b) 9...♗xe4 10 ♕d4 ♕e7 11 0-0-0 ♖xc3 (11...♖g5+ 12 ♖f4! ♕xf4+ 13 ♖d2 ♕g4 14 ♕e5+ ♖d8 15 ♖f4 ♖e8 16 ♕xc7+ ♖e7 17 ♖d3 ♖f5 18 ♖he1 is without hope for Black) 12 ♕xg7 ♖xd1 (or 12...♖xa2+ 13 ♖bl ♖c3+ 14 ♕xc3 0-0 15 ♕g3+ ♖h8 16 ♕xc7 ♕b4 17 ♕d6) 13 ♕hx8+ ♕f8 14 ♕xf8+ ♖xf8 15 ♖xd1 with a better endgame for White owing to Black's poor pawn structure, Gutman.

B2) 8...0-0!? should be preferred, 9 g3 ♕g4 10 ♖g2 ♖e8 11 0-0 a5 12 ♖fe1 ♖a6 13 ♕f3 is approximately equal, Gutman.

8 ♖xc3!?

8 bxc3 was played in the vast majority of games but I doubt whether it is really sufficient.

We see:

A) 8...bxc6 is far from being the most severe test, 9 e5 ♕e4+ (more precise than 9...♕g4?!) 10 ♕d4 d5 11 ♗e2 ♕h5 12 h3 0-0, Goeppli-Neufindt, Friedrichroda 1997, when 13 0-0 wins immediately) 10 ♕e3 ♕xe3+ 11 ♖xe3 ♕g4 12 ♖f4 0-0 13 ♖e2 d6 14 exd6 ♕xd6 15 0-0 d5 16 c4 ♖f6 17 ♕xd5 ♕xd5 18 ♖d3 ♕g4 19 ♖ab1 ♕fe8 20 ♖fe1 gave White a distinct plus in Gerber-Staechelin, Grans Montana 2000;

B) 8...♖xc6!? 9 e5 seems critical.

Black can consider two moves:

B1) 9...♕e4+ 10 ♕xe4 ♖xe4 11 ♗c4!! (Tscheprunoff-Kleczynski, Paris 1924, continued 11 ♖b2?! ♖e6 12 ♖d1 ♖d8 13 ♖xd8+ ♖xd8 14 ♖d3 ♖c5 15 c4 ♖c8 16 ♖e2 ♖d8 17 ♖e3, and now 17...♖d7 would have been slightly better for Black) 11...♖e6 with a few possibilities:

B1a) 12 ♖a3 0-0-0 (12...b6 13 ♖d3 ♖c5 14 ♖xc5 bxc5 transposes to B1c) 13 ♖d3 ♖c3 14 0-0 a6 15 ♖e7 ♖d7 16 ♖g5 b5 17 cxb5 cxb5 18 a3 c5 19 ♖f1 c4 20 ♖e4 h6 21 ♖f4 ♖d4 is clearly in Black's favour, Moix-Martinez, Onati 1994;

B1b) 12 ♖d3 ♖c5 13 ♖e3 ♖d7 (13...b6 14 ♖xc5 bxc5 — B1c) 14 ♖f4 ♖b6 15 ♖b1 0-0-0 16 ♖xb6
cxb6 17 f5 \( \mathcal{A}\)d7 18 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}\)c7 was still slightly better for Black in Ball-Harding, corr. 1986;

B1c) 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)e3!?? b6 (not 12...0-0-0? 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)d3 \( \mathcal{A}\)c3 14 a4) 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)d3 \( \mathcal{A}\)c5 14 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)xc5 bxc5 15 f4 g6 16 \( \mathcal{A}\)e4 0-0-0 17 \( \mathcal{A}\)xc6 \( \mathcal{A}\)d4 appears level, Gutman.

B2) 9...\( \mathcal{A}\)g4!? is more forthright.

There are three continuations worth mentioning:

B2a) 10 \( \mathcal{A}\)d4 \( \mathcal{A}\)e7 11 \( \mathcal{A}\)e2 c5 12 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)a4+ \( \mathcal{A}\)d7 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)b3 \( \mathcal{A}\)xe5 14 h3 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)f6 15 \( \mathcal{A}\)f1 \( \mathcal{A}\)c6 16 \( \mathcal{A}\)b2 0-0 17 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)e1 \( \mathcal{A}\)e4 was winning for Black in Socrates-Zarkov, computer game 1993;

B2b) 10 g3 and now:

B2b1) 10...\( \mathcal{A}\)h5 11 f4 \( \mathcal{A}\)f5 \\
(11...\( \mathcal{A}\)e6?! can be met by 12 h3 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)d5 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)e2) 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)e2 \( \mathcal{A}\)g6 13 h3 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)h6 14 g4 \( \mathcal{A}\)xc2 15 \( \mathcal{A}\)h2 \( \mathcal{A}\)e4 16 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)xe4 \( \mathcal{A}\)xe4 17 \( \mathcal{A}\)d2 gives White enough compensation for his pawn,

Gutman;

B2b2) “Incidentally, there is an effective example of this line being played with colours reversed. White ingeniously takes over Black’s customary role: 10...\( \mathcal{A}\)e7! 11 f4 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)e6 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)g2 \( \mathcal{A}\)d8 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)e2 \( \mathcal{A}\)c5 and Black is clearly better, as in

Meystre-Ciupek, corr. 1967”, Botterill/ Harding.

B2c) 10 \( \mathcal{A}\)e2 0-0 11 g3 \( \mathcal{A}\)h5 12 f4 \\
f6, Sveshnikov, 13 h3 fxe5 14 \( \mathcal{A}\)h2 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)f6 15 fxe5 \( \mathcal{A}\)e8 16 \( \mathcal{A}\)f4 \( \mathcal{A}\)f7 17 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)f2 \( \mathcal{A}\)d5 18 \( \mathcal{A}\)g2 \( \mathcal{A}\)xf4 19 gxf4 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)f5 secures Black a very pleasant position, Gutman.

8...\( \mathcal{A}\)xe4+

8...\( \mathcal{A}\)xc6? 9 \( \mathcal{A}\)e5+ \( \mathcal{A}\)e6 10 \( \mathcal{A}\)f4 appears fine for White, Gutman.

9 \( \mathcal{A}\)e3

9...\( \mathcal{A}\)xc6

After 9...\( \mathcal{A}\)xc6 10 \( \mathcal{A}\)e5+ \( \mathcal{A}\)e6
(Ihonen-Linstedt, Kuopio Kalakukko 1989, continued 10...\( \mathcal{A}\)f8 11 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)b5 d6 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)xc6 dxe5 13 0-0-0 g6 \\
14 \( \mathcal{A}\)h6+ \( \mathcal{A}\)e7 15 \( \mathcal{A}\)f3 \( \mathcal{A}\)g4 16 \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)he1 \( \mathcal{A}\)e6 17 \( \mathcal{A}\)f4 with advantage to White) 11 \( \mathcal{A}\)xc7 \( \mathcal{A}\)d5 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)g3 \\
(more precise than 12 \( \mathcal{A}\)c5 \( \mathcal{A}\)xe3 13 \\
fxe3 b6?! 14 \( \mathcal{A}\)d4 \( \mathcal{A}\)b7 15 0-0-0 \\
0-0) 12...\( \mathcal{A}\)xe3 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)xe3 \( \mathcal{A}\)xe3+ 14 \\
fxe3 d6 the chances are equal,

Gutman.

10 \( \mathcal{A}\)d3!?? \( \mathcal{A}\)d5

10...\( \mathcal{A}\)xg2 is too risky, 11 \( \mathcal{A}\)e5+ \\
\( \mathcal{A}\)e6 12 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{A}\)d5 13 \( \mathcal{A}\)xc7 \( \mathcal{A}\)xa2 \\
14 \( \mathcal{A}\)c5 \( \mathcal{A}\)d7 15 \( \mathcal{A}\)a3, and Black’s position is not easy to defend.

11 \( \mathcal{A}\)c5 \( \mathcal{A}\)e6 12 0-0
White has sufficient compensation for his pawn, Gutman.
The most lively continuation.
7...\textit{\textbf{Wxe4+}} 8 \textit{\textbf{Wxe4+}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe4}} 9 \textit{\textbf{Qxg7+}} \textit{\textbf{Qf8}}
9...\textit{\textbf{Qd8}} 10 a3! \textit{\textbf{Qxc3+}} 11 \textit{\textbf{Bxc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qg8}}
12 \textit{\textbf{Qd3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxg7}} (12...d5 13 \textit{\textbf{Qxe4}}
dxe4 14 \textit{\textbf{Qg5+}}) 13 \textit{\textbf{Qxe4}} d6 14 \textit{\textbf{Qh6}}
\textit{\textbf{Qg4}} 15 f4 f5 16 \textit{\textbf{Qf3}} \textit{\textbf{Qg6}} 17 \textit{\textbf{Qg5+}} is clearly better for White, \textit{\textbf{Gutman}}.
10 \textit{\textbf{Qh6}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}}
10...\textit{\textbf{Qg8?!}} 11 \textit{\textbf{Qe6+}} \textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 12 \textit{\textbf{Qxc7}}
\textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 13 \textit{\textbf{Qxa8}} \textit{\textbf{Qe4+}} 14 c3 \textit{\textbf{Qc5}}
(14...\textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 15 a3 \textit{\textbf{Qa5}} 16 b4) 15
\textit{\textbf{Qe3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe3}} 16 fxe3 \textit{\textbf{Qd8}} 17 \textit{\textbf{Qd3}} with advantage for White, \textit{\textbf{Gutman}}.
11 \textit{\textbf{Qh5+}}
Koszta-Balint, corr. 1997, went 11 \textit{\textbf{Qf5+??}} \textit{\textbf{Qe8}} 12 \textit{\textbf{Qg7+}} \textit{\textbf{Qd8}} 13
\textit{\textbf{Qg5+}} \textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Qf6}} \textit{\textbf{Qcd5+}} 15 c3
\textit{\textbf{Qxf6}}, and Black won easily.
11...\textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 12 \textit{\textbf{Qg7}} \textit{\textbf{Qg8}}
12...\textit{\textbf{Qe4+}} 13 c3 \textit{\textbf{Qe8}} 14 f3 \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 15
\textit{\textbf{Bxc3 Qd8+}} 16 \textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qf8}} 17 \textit{\textbf{Qf6+}}
\textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 18 \textit{\textbf{Qc4}} favours White, \textit{\textbf{Gutman}}.
13 \textit{\textbf{Qf6+}} \textit{\textbf{Qf8}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Bxc3 Qe7}} 15
\textit{\textbf{Qxe7+}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe7}} 16 \textit{\textbf{Qf4}} d6 17 \textit{\textbf{Qd3}} h6
18 \textit{\textbf{Ab1}} \textit{\textbf{Ab8}}
The position is balanced, \textit{\textbf{Gutman}}.

"By a transposition of moves the same position may be arrived at in one of the ordinary variations already in vogue, viz.: 5 \textit{\textbf{Qb5 Qb4+}} \textit{\textbf{Qc3}}, Steinitz, \textit{\textbf{Modern Chess Instructor}}.

"This is not best; it allows Black to conveniently protect the c7-pawn with 6...\textit{\textbf{Qa5}}, achieving a sound position", \textit{\textbf{Hall}}.

"A standard and dangerous idea in an inappropriate setting. The problem is simple. Black's bishop covers the threat to c7 without undue inconvenience, and then White's knights will be driven back when they rather step on each other's toes", \textit{\textbf{Wells}}.

"The attack, which is undertaken by a minority of pieces, should lead to trouble", \textit{\textbf{Lasker}}.

We divide the material into four sections:
- \textit{\textbf{Section 1:}} 6...\textit{\textbf{Qd8}} (6...\textit{\textbf{Wd8}})
- \textit{\textbf{Section 2:}} 6...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}}
- \textit{\textbf{Section 3:}} 6...\textit{\textbf{Qa5}}
- \textit{\textbf{Section 4:}} 6...\textit{\textbf{Wxe4}}
Section 1

6...\texttt{d}d8

6...\texttt{d}d8?! is of dubious value, 7 \texttt{g}4! g6 8 a3 (or 8 \texttt{g}3?! d6 9 a3 \texttt{a}5 10 b4 a6 11 \texttt{x}d6+ \texttt{cxd6} 12 bxa5, and Black’s position is a wreck) 8...\texttt{a}5 9 b4 a6 10 bxa5 axb5 11 \texttt{b}2 d6 12 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{d}4 13 \texttt{d}2 (13 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}6 14 \texttt{e}3 c6 15 \texttt{x}b5 f6 16 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{x}a5 17 0-0 \texttt{e}7 18 f4 0-0 was less convincing, Kohvakka-Kiltti, Helsinki 1997) 13...\texttt{e}6 14 \texttt{d}5 f6 15 \texttt{x}b5+ with a clear advantage for White, Gutman.

II) 7 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{f}6!? (safer than 7...\texttt{w}xe4 8 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{g}6 9 a3 \texttt{x}c3 10 \texttt{x}c3 \texttt{f}6 11 f3 \texttt{e}8 12 0-0-0) 8 a3 \texttt{x}c3+ 9 \texttt{x}c3 \texttt{x}e4 10 \texttt{x}e4 (10 \texttt{w}d5?! \texttt{x}c3 11 bxc3 \texttt{e}8 12 \texttt{d}d3 was played in Omari-Safvat, Varna Olympiad 1962, and now 12...d6 would have been in Black’s favour) 10...\texttt{x}e4 11 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{g}6 12 \texttt{h}a4+ f6 13 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{f}7 14 0-0 \texttt{e}5 when White’s two bishops balance Black’s extra pawn to give equality, Gutman;

III) 7 a3!? \texttt{w}xe4+ 8 \texttt{e}3! is probably best, transposing into variation 5 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{w}xe4 6 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{d}8 7 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}4 8 a3 — Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequel 3. 5 7 5

7 \texttt{w}d5!?

With this move we follow an analysis by Steinitz. Other moves:

I) 7 \texttt{c}e2 a6! 8 \texttt{d}d4 (8 \texttt{w}d5 can be met by 8...h6 9 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{f}6! 10 \texttt{x}c6+ bxc6 11 \texttt{w}xf7 \texttt{x}e4 12 0-0 \texttt{x}c3 13 bxc3 \texttt{xe}3 14 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{w}6 15 \texttt{w}c4 d5 16 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{d}7) 8...\texttt{w}xe4 9 \texttt{x}c6+ (Kummerov-Sulskis, Groningen 1996, went 9 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{w}xg2 10 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{xc}3+ 11 bxc3 \texttt{w}g6 12 \texttt{x}c6+ bxc6 13 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{b}8 14 0-0-0 \texttt{e}7 15 \texttt{d}4 f6 16 \texttt{w}h1 \texttt{f}7 17 \texttt{c}5 \texttt{e}8 18 \texttt{g}4 d5 19 \texttt{xc}8 \texttt{x}xc8 20 \texttt{w}xe8+ \texttt{e}8 21 \texttt{w}f4 \texttt{b}5 22 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{d}8 with a winning position for Black) 9...bxc6 10 0-0 \texttt{w}e5 gives Black a plus, Gutman;

II) 7 \texttt{f}6 8 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{g}4 9 f3 \texttt{w}e6 10 0-0-0!? (10 \texttt{w}xg5 \texttt{x}e6 11 0-0-0 a6 12 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{x}d4 13 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{xc}3 14 bxc3 e5 15 \texttt{d}2 d6 leads nowhere, Palasti-Kirjak, Hungary 1996) 10...h6 (or 10...a6 11 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{x}d4 12 \texttt{x}d4 11 \texttt{h}4 g5 12 \texttt{w}xe6 \texttt{x}e6 13 \texttt{g}3 with advantage for White, Gutman.

7...h6!?

Other possibilities are:

I) 7...\texttt{w}e7 8 a3 “and we prefer White, for if 8...\texttt{f}6 9 \texttt{g}5”, Steinitz;

II) 7...\texttt{f}6 8 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{g}4 9 f3 \texttt{w}e6 10 0-0-0!? (10 \texttt{w}xg5 \texttt{x}e6 11 0-0-0 a6 12 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{x}d4 13 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{xc}3 14 bxc3 e5 15 \texttt{d}2 d6 leads nowhere, Palasti-Kirjak, Hungary 1996) 10...h6 (or 10...a6 11 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{x}d4 12 \texttt{x}d4 11 \texttt{h}4 g5 12 \texttt{w}xe6 \texttt{x}e6 13 \texttt{g}3 with advantage for White, Gutman.
8 g3
Retaining more tension in the position, while the ending resulting from 8 \( \text{Wxf7 a6 9 Wxg7} \) \( (9 \text{ Qa3 Wxe4+ 10 Qe3 We7}) \) 9...\( \text{Wf6 10 Wxf6+ Qxf6 11 Qa3 Qxe4 12 Qab1 We8} \) 13 Qe3 d5 14 a3 d4 15 axb4 Qxb4 16 Qa3 dxe3 17 0-0-0+ Qd7 18 Qxe4 Qxe4 19 fxe3 Qxe3 20 Qc4 is only slightly better for White, Gutman.

8...\( \text{Wf6} \) 9 Qf4 d6 10 0-0-0
10 a3 Qge7 11 Wd2 Qa5 (11...Qc5 12 0-0-0 a6 13 e5) 12 0-0-0 is another possibility, 12...a6 13 Qxd6 cxd6 14 Wxe3 Qe8 (14...Qxc3 15 Qxd6+ Wxd6 16 Qxd6 Qd4 17 Qd2 favours White) 15 Qxd6 Qe6 16 Qd5 Wg6 17 b4 Qd8 18 Qh3 Wh5 19 Qxe6 fxe6 20 Qxe6 Qc8, and although White has three pawns for the piece, Black is no worse.

10...Qe6 11 Wd3 a6 12 Qxc7 Qxc7 13 Qxd6+ Qc8 14 e5 Wd8 15 Qg2 Qxd6
15...Qge7 fails to 16 a3 Qa5 17 Qa4.

16 exd6 Qf6 17 f4
Black is so cramped that it is extremely difficult to coordinate his forces.

I like White's position, Gutman.

Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qc3 Qb4 6 Qdb5)
6...Qf6

This is an intriguing idea, Black prefers to seek immediate counterplay in the centre. However, the straightforward development of the knight to f6 seems to be asking a little too much of the position.

We consider seven lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 7 Qd2 (7 e5)
Sequel 2: 7 Qe2
Sequel 3: 7 Qd3 0-0
Sequel 4: 7 Qd3 Qa5 8 Qe3 (8 g3)
Sequel 5: 7 Qd3 Qa5 8 Qd2
Sequel 6: 7 Qd3 Qa5 8 0-0
Sequel 7: 7 Qxc7+

Sequel 1

7 Qd2
The obscure 7 e5 Qe4 8 Wf3 runs into the disruptive 8...0-0! (Bartos-Kudryavtcev, corr. 1998, went 8...Qxc3 9 Qxc7+ Qd8 10 bxc3 Qxc7 11 cxb4 Wxb4+ 12 Qd2 Wc5 13 0-0-0 Qxe5 14 Qf4 d6 15 Qd5
\[ \text{for the exchange in Najer-Soloviev, St. Petersburg 2000;} \]

**B2)** 8...\text{\textit{xc3!!}} is the correct reply, 9 \text{\textit{xc3}} (or 9 \text{\textit{xc3 d8}) 9...f5 (after 9...d4 10 \text{\textit{xe4+}} \text{\textit{xe4+}} 11 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{xc2+}} 12 \text{\textit{d1}} \text{\textit{xa1}} 13 \text{\textit{d3 0-0}} 14 \text{\textit{xe2}} \text{\textit{e8}} 15 \text{\textit{f3}} d5 16 \text{\textit{c3}} \text{\textit{d3}} 17 axb3 c6 18 b4 I prefer White) 10 0-0 0-0 0 10...\text{\textit{xf2}} 11 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{xe2}} can be met by the annoying 12 \text{\textit{d6+}}! \text{\textit{xd6}} 13 \text{\textit{xe2}} d5 14 \text{\textit{f3}}) 11 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{xe4}} 12 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{xe4}} +13 \text{\textit{c4+}} \text{\textit{h8}} 14 \text{\textit{d5}} d6 15 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{d7}} 16 f3 \text{\textit{a8}} is satisfactory for Black, \textit{Gutman}.

**C)** 8 g3! \text{\textit{e7}} 9 \text{\textit{xc7}}+ \text{\textit{d8}} 10 \text{\textit{d5}} \text{\textit{xc3}}+ (10...\text{\textit{xc3}} 11 bxc3 \text{\textit{w6}} 12 \text{\textit{e3}) 11 \text{\textit{xe7}} \text{\textit{xd1}} 12 \text{\textit{xc6}}+ \text{\textit{xc6}} 13 \text{\textit{xb4}} \text{\textit{xb2}} 14 \text{\textit{c3}} \text{\textit{e8+}} 15 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{a4}} 16 \text{\textit{xe7}} \text{\textit{c5}} 17 \text{\textit{d4}} \text{\textit{e4+}} 18 \text{\textit{c1}} with a promising ending for White, \textit{Gutman}.

White has three possibilities:

**A)** 8 \text{\textit{xe4?!} \text{\textit{xe4+}} 9 \text{\textit{e2}} (Patsourakis-Aleksieev, Rimavskaja Sobota 1996, continued 9 \text{\textit{e2? \text{\textit{xe2+}} 10 \text{\textit{f3 \text{\textit{xd2+}} 11 \text{\textit{xd2 \text{\textit{g5+}} 0-1}} 9...\text{\textit{xd2+}} 10 \text{\textit{xd2 \text{\textit{xe2+}} 11 \text{\textit{xe2 \text{\textit{d8 is in Black's favour, Gutman;}}}}}}}}}}

**B1)** 8...\text{\textit{d8}} 9 \text{\textit{xe4}} (another method is 9 \text{\textit{xe4 \text{\textit{xe4+}} 10 \text{\textit{xe4 \text{\textit{e8}} 11 \text{\textit{f3 \text{\textit{f5}} 12 \text{\textit{c3 \text{\textit{f8}} 13 \text{\textit{g5+ \text{\textit{e7}} 14 \text{\textit{de6! \text{\textit{xd6}} 15 \text{\textit{xe7+ \text{\textit{xe7+}} 16 \text{\textit{f2 \text{\textit{d5}} 17 \text{\textit{d1 keeping the pressure, Gutman}}}}}}}}}}}}} 10 \text{\textit{c3 \text{\textit{xe4}} 11 \text{\textit{g5+ \text{\textit{e7}} 12 \text{\textit{xe4 \text{\textit{xe2+}} 13 \text{\textit{xe2 \text{\textit{xe4}} 14 \text{\textit{f0-0 and Black had inadequate compensation}}}}}}}}}}

**8 \text{\textit{xc3}}**

Other recent additions to White’s arsenal are:

**I)** 8 bxc3 \text{\textit{d8}} (8...\text{\textit{xe4+}} 9 \text{\textit{e2 \text{\textit{d8}} 10 0-0 \text{\textit{e8 is also fine for Black}) 9 \text{\textit{e2 \text{\textit{xc4}} 10 0-0 \text{\textit{d6, when White has yet to prove that he has enough for his pawn;}}}}}}}

**II)** 8 \text{\textit{xc3 \text{\textit{xe4}} 9 g3 \text{\textit{e7 10 \text{\textit{e2 \text{\textit{d8}} 11 \text{\textit{xe7 \text{\textit{e8}} 12 \text{\textit{f3 f5 (another}}}}}}}}}}}
option is 12...<Qxd3 13 hxg3 <Wb4+ 14 <Qc3 <Qxe2+ 15 <Qxe2 <We7 16 <Qxh7 d6 17 g4 a6 18 <Qd4 <Qxd4 19 <Qxd4 c5) 13 fxe4 <Wxc7 14 0-0-0 fxe4 with an edge to Black.

8...<Qxe4!

8...d6 9 g3 <Wg4 10 f3 <We6 11 <Qe3 <Qe5 12 <Qe2 <Qd7 13 0-0-0 looks good for White.

9 g3 

9 <We2?! fails due to 9...<Qd4 10 <Wxe4+ <Wxe4+ 11 <Qxe4 <Qxc2+.

9...<Qxc3 10 <Qxc3 <We7+ 11 <Qe2 0-0 12 0-0 d5

White stands worse, Gutman.

Sequel 2

(1 e4 c5 2 <Qf3 <Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 <Qxd4 <Wh4 5 <Qc3 <Qb4 6 <Qdb5 <Qf6)

7 <Qe2 <Qxe4 8 0-0

8...<Qxc3!?

8...<Qxc3?! is a respectable alternative, 9 bxc3 (after 9 <Qxc7+?! <Qd8 10 <Qxa8 <Qd4 11 <We1 <Qe8 12 c3 <Qc5 13 <Qe3 b6?! 14 <Qxc5 bxc5 15 f3 <Wxe1 16 <Qxe1 <Qf6 White cannot save his knight on a8) 9...0-0-0? (9...<Qd8 10 <Wd5?! a6 11 <Qd3 <Qe7 12 <Wxf7 axb5 13 <Qxe4 <Wxe4 14 <Qg5 <We5 15 f4 <Wc5+ 16 <Qh1 h6 17 <Wxg7 <Qe8 18 <Wxh6 <Ma6 19 <Wg7 yields White a lethal attack) 10 <Qxc7 <Qxc3 11 <We1 <Qxe2+ 12 <Wxe2 <Qb8 13 <Qd3 d6 14 <Qxd6 <Qd8 15 <Qe1 h6 16 <Qg3 <Qa4 17 <Qb5 <Qa8 18 <Qc7 <Qb8 and White has nothing better than 19 <Qb5 (19 c4?! <Qd4 20 <We7 <Qd7 21 <Qd5 <Qf5 22 <We5 <Qbc8 23 c5 <Qe8 was fine for Black in Nadev-Mitkov, French team championship, 1993) 19...<Qa8 20 <Qc7 with a draw by repetition, Gutman.

9...<Qxc7+

9 bxc3 <Qa5 causes no problems.

We see:

A) 10 <Qb2 d6 11 <Qd3 0-0 12 <Qe1 <Qg4 13 f3 <Qd7 14 <Qe4 <Wh5 15 g3 <Qae8 16 <Qh4 <Qc5+ 17 <Qg2 h6 18 <Qa3 <Qe3 19 <Qc1 <We1 gave Black the advantage in Andersson-Larsson, Sweden 1998;

B) 10 <Qa3 with two examples:

B1) 10...d6 11 <Qf3 (11 g3 <Wf6 12 <Qxd6 cxd6 13 <Qxd6+ <Qf8 14 <Qb1 <Qb6 15 <Qc4 <We7 16 <Qe1 <Qe6 was winning for Black in Doring-Jablesnik, Litomysl 1997) 11...0-0 leads nowhere for White, Gutman;

B2) 10...a6 11 <Qe1 axb5 (instead of 11...d6?, Fargere-Tronenno, St.Lorenzo 1995, when 12 <Qxd6+! cxd6 13 <Qh5+ <Qe7 14 <Wxd6 <Qd8 15 <Qad1 <Qf5 16 <Qf3 was decisive) 12
\( \text{x}b5 + \text{d}8 13 \text{x}c6 \text{x}c3 14 \text{x}e7 + \text{x}e7 15 \text{x}e7 \text{x}e7 16 \text{d}5 \text{x}a1 17 \text{x}a1 f6 18 \text{c}3 \text{d}8 \) yields Black more than enough for the queen, Gutman.

C) 10 \text{w}d5!? 0-0 (10...a6 11 \text{g}5 \text{wa}4 appears dangerous for Black in view of 12 \text{c}4! 0-0 13 \text{ae}1 h6 14 \text{e}8) 11 \text{g}5 \text{wa}4 12 \text{d}3 a6 (12...d6 can be met by 13 \text{fe}1 \text{e}6 14 \text{xe}6 \text{fxe}6 15 \text{xe}6+ \text{f}7 16 \text{e}1 threatening 17 \text{e}4) 13 \text{w}f5 g6 14 \text{w}f6 \text{axb}5 15 \text{h}6 \text{xc}3 16 \text{xc}4 \text{d}4 17 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 18 \text{xf}8 \text{xf}8 19 \text{c}3 \text{a}3 is still good for Black, Gutman.

9...\text{d}8 10 \text{bx}c3 \text{xc}3

11 g3!?

11 \text{xa}8 \text{xa}1 12 \text{wd}5 \text{ae}5 13 g3 is rather doubtful.

There are two possibilities:

A) 13...\text{we}7 14 \text{b}5 \text{d}4 15 \text{a}4 \text{d}6 16 \text{ae}3 \text{e}6 17 \text{wa}5+ \text{b}6 18 \text{xb}6 \text{wc}7 19 \text{d}1 \text{axb}6 20 \text{wa}8+ \text{wc}8!? (an improvement on 20...\text{e}7 21 \text{wh}8 \text{e}2+ 22 \text{g}2 \text{b}5 23 \text{g}5+ \text{f}6 24 \text{xg}7 \text{wc}6+ 25 \text{f}3 \text{h}3+ 26 \text{xh}3 \text{f}4+ 27 \text{g}4! \text{wc}8+ 28 \text{xf}4 \text{wc}4+ 29 \text{e}3 \text{wc}3+ 30 \text{f}2 \text{wc}5+ 31 \text{e}3 \text{wf}5 32 \text{g}4 1-0, Borge-Loeffler, Taastrup 1992)) 21 \text{wc}8+ \text{xc}8 22 \text{xd}4 \text{wc}7 with equality, Gutman;

B) 13...\text{w}f6!? is worth consideration, 14 \text{b}5 \text{e}8 (14...\text{e}7 15 \text{w}b3 \text{d}5 16 \text{e}1 \text{h}3 17 \text{wa}3 \text{c}8 18 \text{xa}7 \text{d}4 19 \text{b}6+ \text{d}8 20 \text{c}3 \text{xe}3 21 \text{fxe}3 \text{wc}3 22 \text{f}2 \text{xc}2+ 23 \text{e}2 \text{c}7 24 \text{a}8+ \text{c}8 25 \text{b}6+ \text{c}7 and White should repeat moves) 15 \text{xc}6 \text{wc}6 16 \text{wa}5+ \text{b}6 17 \text{wa}7 \text{b}7!? (17...\text{d}4 18 \text{f}4 \text{b}7 19 \text{w}b8+ \text{e}7 20 \text{g}5+ \text{f}8 21 \text{e}7+ \text{xe}7 22 \text{e}1+ \text{f}6 23 \text{w}f4+ \text{g}6 24 \text{w}g4+ is a perpetual) 18 \text{xb}6+ \text{xb}6 19 \text{xb}6 \text{c}7 20 \text{a}4 \text{e}2 21 \text{c}5 \text{c}6 22 \text{a}6 \text{d}6 gives Black some edge, Gutman.

11...\text{wd}4 12 \text{f}4 \text{xa}1 13 \text{wa}1 \text{wa}1 14 \text{xa}1 g5 15 \text{d}6 \text{bb}8 16 \text{b}5 \text{xa}8!?

Safer than 16...a6 17 \text{xb}8 \text{xb}8 (Apitzsch-Leisebein, corr. 1997, went 17...\text{axb}5 18 \text{dd}6 \text{e}8 1/2-1/2, however, 19 \text{xb}5 \text{d}4 20 \text{c}4 \text{xc}2 21 \text{dd}1 looks good for White) 18 \text{dd}6 \text{e}7 19 \text{dd}1, when Black can do very little because of the white knight on d6, Gutman.

17 \text{c}7+ \text{e}7 18 \text{d}6+ \text{f}6 19 \text{c}7 \text{bb}8 20 \text{b}5 \text{a}8 with a draw.

Sequel 3

1 e4 e5 2 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 3 d4 exd4 4 \text{xd}4 \text{wh}4 5 \text{c}3 \text{b}4 6 \text{db}5 \text{gf}6

7 \text{dd}3

More or less consequent, though the e4-pawn is now protected.

7...0-0

To maintain mobility is obviously not the best strategy, and in praxis Black has been successful with this ambitious move: that is why this risky way of playing became popular.

I don’t quite see the point behind Black’s pawn sacrifice.
8 \( \text{dx}c7 \!\)!  

Less challenging are:  

I) Smits-Van Berkel, Breda 1985, went 8 \( \text{d}d2 \text{d}5\!\)! 9 \( \text{ex}d5 \text{ex}d5\!\) 10 \( \text{ex}d5 \text{g}4\!\) 11 \( \text{w}c1 \text{e}ae8+\!\) 12 \( \text{f}f1 \text{c}5\!\) 13 \( \text{e}1 \text{e}5\!\) 14 \( f4 \text{ex}d3 0-1\);  

II) 8 g3 \( \text{w}h3\!\) 9 \( \text{dx}c7 \text{w}g2\!\) 10 \( \text{f}f1 \text{d}5\!\) 11 \( \text{ex}d5 \text{g}4\!\) 12 \( \text{e}2 \text{xe}2\!\) 13 \( \text{w}xe2 \text{d}4\!\) 14 \( \text{w}d3 \text{f}3\!\) + 15 \( \text{e}2 \text{e}5\!\) 16 \( \text{w}d4 \text{f}3\!\) + 17 \( \text{e}1 \text{xc}3\!\) + 18 \( bxc3 \text{w}h5\!\) 19 \( f4 \text{f}3\!\) + 20 \( \text{xf}3 \text{xf}3\!\) 21 \( \text{e}3 \text{ac}8\!\) 22 \( d6 \text{xf}8\) winning, Trost-Ledfuss, Germany 1997;  

III) 8 \( \text{w}f3 \text{d}5\!\) 9 0-0 \( \text{g}4\!\) 10 \( \text{f}4 \text{d}xe4\!\) 11 \( \text{dxe4} \text{d}5\!\)? (11...\( \text{dxe4} 12 \text{xe4} \text{h}5\!\) 13 \( \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6\!\) 14 \( \text{xb}4 \text{cxb}5\) 15 \( \text{e}3\) was equal in Vaida-Duminica, Baile Herculane 1994) 12 \( \text{w}g5 \text{w}xg5\!\) 13 \( \text{xe}5\!\) h6 with some edge to Black, Gutman.  

8...\( \text{d}5\)  

8...\( \text{b}8\) is fairly slow, 9 g3 \( \text{w}h3\!\) 10 \( \text{f}1 \text{g}4\!\) 11 \( \text{w}g4 \text{w}xg4\!\) 12 \( \text{e}2\) secures a clear advantage for White.  

9 g3 \( \text{w}h3\!\) 10 \( \text{f}1 \text{d}7\!\) 11 \( \text{xd}5\!\) 11 \( \text{dxa}8\)! fails to 11...\( \text{dxe}4\!\) 12 \( \text{w}d3 \text{dxc}3\!\) 13 \( \text{bxc}3 \text{xe}5\!\) 14 \( \text{w}3\!\) d4, when Black had a decisive attack.  

11...\( \text{dxe}4\!\) 12 \( \text{xb}4 \text{w}d1\!\) + 13 \( \text{dx}1 \text{xb}4\!\) 14 \( \text{e}3\)  

The ending looks totally lost for Black, Gutman.

Sequel 4  

(1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{d}f3 \text{c}6\!\) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{d}4 \text{w}h4\!\) 5 \( \text{c}3 \text{b}6\!\) 6 \( \text{db}5 \text{f}6\!\) 7 \( \text{d}3\)!)  

7...\( \text{a}5\)!  

This is a most common move for Black in such type of positions, after which White faces something of a dilemma: what to do with the knight on b5?  

8 \( \text{e}3\)  

There is no argument for White trying 8 g3, as 8...\( \text{w}h3\!\) 9 \( \text{g}5\!\) (9 \( \text{f}1 \text{w}e6\!\) 10 \( \text{g}2\) would have been answered by 10...\( \text{dxe}4\!\) 11 0-0 \( \text{dxc}3\!\) 12 bxc3 0-0) 9...\( \text{w}g2\!\) 10 \( \text{f}1\!\) a6 11 \( \text{xf}6 \text{gx}f6\!\) 12 \( \text{a}3\) d6?! (Heller-Gulich, corr.1983, went 12...\( \text{e}5\!\) 13 f4 \( \text{w}xh2\!\) 14 fxe5 \( \text{w}xg3\!\); when White should force a perpetual check by 15 \( \text{d}2 \text{w}g5\!\) + 16 \( \text{e}1 \text{w}g3\!\) + 13 \( \text{c}4 \text{dxc}3\!\) + 14 bxc3 \( \text{e}6\!\) 15 \( \text{e}3\!\) \( \text{w}xh2\!\) 16 \( \text{d}5\!\) 0-0-0 favours Black, Gutman.  

8...\( \text{a}6\)!?  

Alternatives are:  

I) 8...\( \text{g}4\!\) 9 \( \text{w}d2 \text{dxe}3\!\) 10 \( \text{w}xh2\!\) \( \text{b}6\!\) (10...\( \text{a}6\!\) 11 \( \text{d}4\!\) \( \text{b}6\!\) can be met by 12 \( \text{f}5 \text{x}e3\!\) 13 \( \text{xh}4 \text{d}4\!\) 14 \( \text{d}5\)!) 11 \( \text{g}3 \text{w}xg3\!\) 12 h\(x\!\)g3 \( \text{a}6\!\) 13 \( \text{a}3\!\) \( \text{a}5\)!? (13...\( \text{b}4\!\) 14 \( \text{c}4\!\) \( \text{a}7\!\) 15 \( \text{d}5 \text{xd}5\!\) 16 \( \text{ex}d5\!\) b5 17 \( \text{e}3\!\) g6 18 a4 b4 19 \( \text{h}4\) gave
White a plus in Botterill-Wade, Islington 1972) 14 ♛c4 ♛xc3+ 15 bxc3 d6 16 ♛e3 ♛e6 17 c4 h6 18 f4 f6 is about equal, Gutman;
II) 8...0-0 9 0-0 (9 ♛d2 a6 10 ♛d4 ♛xd4 11 ♛xd4 ♛xe4 12 ♛xe4, De Souza-Loureiro, Araraquara 1999, is less impressive on account of 12...♛e8 13 0-0-0 ♛xe4) 9...a6 10 ♛d4 ♛xd4 11 ♛xd4 ♛xc3 12 ♛xc3 ♛xe4 13 ♛xe4 ♛xe4 14 ♛e1 ♛h4 15 ♛d5 d6 16 ♛e3 with White having enough compensation for the pawn, Gutman.

9 g3
In a few games White tried the immediate 9 ♛d4. And then:
A) 9...d5 10 ♛xc6 (more precise than 10 exd5?! ♛xd5 11 ♛xc6 ♛xe3 12 ♛f3 ♛b6 13 ♛d2, Iosif-Olarasu, Romania 1994, when 13...♛g4! 14 ♛he1+ ♛e6 should give Black a clear advantage) 10...bxc6 11 exd5 ♛xd5 12 0-0 ♛xc3 13 ♛e1 0-0 14 ♛d2 ♛h3?! 15 ♛xc3 ♛xc3 16 ♛xc3 ♛xg2 17 ♛xg2 ♛g4+ leads to a draw, Gutman;
B) 9...♛xe4! 10 ♛xe4 ♛xe4 11 0-0 ♛xc3 12 bxc3 0-0 13 ♛e1 d6 14 ♛xc6 ♛xc6 15 ♛d3 ♛g4 16 ♛d4 ♛h5 17 f4 ♛d7 18 f5 f6 with a clear plus for Black, Schmid-Holzhauer, Germany 1990.
9...♛h3 10 ♛d4 d5!
This is the most natural and obvious way to play.

Other moves are:
I) 10...♛xd4?! 11 ♛xd4 ♛g2 12 ♛f1 ♛xe4 13 ♛e2 is fine for White, Botterill/Harding;
II) 10...♛g2?! is no better since 11 ♛f1! (instead of 11 ♛f3 ♛xf3 12 ♛xf3 d5, and White is in difficulties, Botterill/Harding)
11...♛xe4 12 ♛g4! ♛xc3 13 ♛xg7 ♛f8 14 ♛xc6 ♛xc6 15 ♛e5+ ♛e6 16 ♛xa5 wins for White, Gutman.
11 ♛xc6 bxc6
Black has already the better chances, Gutman.

Sequel 5
(1 e4 e5 2 ♛f3 ♛c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♛xd4 ♛h4 5 ♛c3 ♛b4 6 ♛db5 ♛f6 7 ♛d3 ♛a5)
8 ♛d2 a6 9 ♛a3

9...b5!?
"A useful gain of space, preventing 10 ♛c4", Hall.
9...♛b6 would have been a less dynamic way of playing the position, 10 g3 ♛h3 11 ♛f1 ♛e6 12 ♛g2 0-0
13 0-0 \(\mathcal{D}e5\) (or 13...\(d6\) 14 \(\mathcal{D}d5\)) 14 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(d6\) (while Schneider-Krüger, Berlin 1996, continued 14...\(\mathcal{A}d4\)? 15 \(\mathcal{A}a1\) \(b5\) 16 \(\mathcal{D}d5\) \(\mathcal{D}xd5\)? 17 \(\text{exd}5\) \(\mathcal{W}g4\) 18 \(c3\) 1-0) 15 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \(\mathcal{A}xe3\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xe3\) \(\mathcal{A}d7\) with a double-edged position, Gutman.

10 0-0

Schmaltz-Karpachev, Capelle la Grande 1993, went 10 g3?! (“Disastrous”, Wells) 10...\(\mathcal{W}h3\) 11 \(\mathcal{D}d5\)

(“Now White will be massacred by a fine attacking sequence, but it is hard to suggest anything very satisfactory. Black threatens ...\(\mathcal{W}g2\) and ...\(b5\)-\(b4\), and after, for example, 11 \(\mathcal{A}fl\) \(\mathcal{W}e6\), the e-pawn would again be weak”, Wells) 11...\(\mathcal{D}xd5\)!

(11...\(\mathcal{W}g2\)? 12 \(\mathcal{A}xf6+\) \(gxf6\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}fl\) \(\mathcal{A}b6\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}h5\) \(\mathcal{A}b7\) 15 0-0-0 0-0-0 16 \(f3\) \(\mathcal{D}e5\) 17 \(\mathcal{A}c3\) \(d6\) 18 \(\mathcal{Ab}1\) \(\mathcal{D}xd3\) 19 \(cxd3\) \(b4\) 20 \(\mathcal{A}xb4\) \(d5\) 21 \(\mathcal{A}e7\) was winning for White in Massy-Van Berkel, corr. 1991) 12 \(\text{exd}5\) 0-0 13 \(\text{dxc6}\) \(\mathcal{A}e8+\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) \(\text{dxc6}\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}fl\) (15 \(f3\) \(\mathcal{W}g2\) 16 \(\mathcal{A}xa5\), indicated by Hall, is no improvement: after 16...\(\mathcal{A}h3\)! White is helpless) 15...\(\mathcal{A}g4\) 16 \(f3\) \(\mathcal{W}xh2\) 17 \(\mathcal{A}xa5\) \(\mathcal{A}ad8\) 18 \(\mathcal{A}d2\) \(\mathcal{W}xg3+\) 19 \(\mathcal{F}f2\) \(\mathcal{A}h3\) 0-1.

“An extraordinary picture of paralysis. White has two extra pieces, but almost everything is pinned, and he is quite incapable of dealing with the threat of ...\(\mathcal{W}g1\) mating. A clear warning for White not to neglect his development”, Wells.

Black avoids 10...b4 11 \(\mathcal{D}d5\) \(\mathcal{B}xa3\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}xa5\) \(\mathcal{D}xd5\) 13 \(\text{exd}5\) \(\mathcal{A}xa5\) when 14 \(\mathcal{W}e1+\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 15 \(\mathcal{W}xa5\) \(\mathcal{A}xb2\) 16 \(\mathcal{A}ab1\) \(\mathcal{W}d4\) 17 \(d6\) \(\mathcal{W}xd6\) 18 \(\mathcal{W}g5+\) \(\mathcal{W}f6\) 19 \(\mathcal{W}xf6+\) \(\mathcal{G}xf6\) 20 \(\mathcal{A}xb2\) is approximately equal, Gutman.

11 \(\text{bxc}3\) \(d6\) 12 \(f4\) 0-0

“This natural move may not be the best, and Anatoly Karpov suggests instead 12...\(\mathcal{A}g4\). We like this suggestion”, Hall.

In my opinion White has a startling refutation in 13 \(\mathcal{W}c1!\) (contrary to Hall’s analysis: “for example, play could continue 13 \(\mathcal{W}e1\) \(\mathcal{W}xe1\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}xe1\) \(\mathcal{A}e6\) 15 \(h3\) \(\mathcal{A}b8\) 16 \(c4\) \(b4\) 17 \(\mathcal{D}b1\) \(a5\) 18 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \(a4\) with somewhat better chances for Black”) 13...0-0 14 \(f5\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) \(\mathcal{W}h5\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}e3\)
\( \text{Qc5} 17 \text{h3 Qd1} 18 \text{g4}, \text{winning a piece, Gutman.} \)

13 f5 Qd7 14 Qe2 Qe8 15 Qf3 Qce5 16 Kg3 h6 17 Kh1 Qf6 18 Qh5 Qf8 19 h4 d5!

"One other bit of advice: Watch out for central counterplay. One of the finest rules of chess that should be used religiously by the defender and carefully considered by the attacker is: the best reaction to an attack on the wing is a counterattack in the centre", Yasser Seirawan.

20 exd5 Qb7 21 c4

21...bxc4!

"After resourceful play, Black falters. Correct was 21...Qxd3 22 cxd3 bxc4 23 dxc4 He4. In this position Black has at least full compensation, and probably stands a little better", Hall. In my opinion, 24 Qb4+ Qg8 25 Qc3 Qe5 26 Ke1 Qxh4 27 Qe2 Qb6+ 28 Qe3 Qe4 29 Qxb6 Qxe1+ 30 Qxe1 cxb6 31 Qc3 favours White, Gutman.

22 Qxc4 Qxc4!

Zhuravlev-Bronstein, USSR 1980, continued 22...Qb6? 23 Kg5! (a nice shot which wrecks Black's defensive plans", Hall) 23...Qd6 24 Qf6 Qg6 25 Kg5 Qxc4 26 Qxc4 Qxd5 27 fxg7+ Qg8 28 Qxh6 Qd4+ 29 Qf2 Qe2 30 h5 Qe4 31 Qe3 1-0.

23 Qxc4 Qd4+ 24 Qf2

24 Qe3 Qf6 25 Qd1 Qe4 26 Qg4 h5 27 Qgf4 Qxd2 28 Qxe4 Qxd1 29 Qxe8+ Qxe8 30 Qxd1 Qxd5 maintains a clear plus for Black, Gutman.

24...Qf6!

More precise than 24...Qxc4 25 Qxg7 Qxg7 26 Qxh6+ Qg8 27 f6 Qxf6 28 Qg5+ Qh7 29 Qxf6 Qd4+ 30 Qf1 Qc4+ 31 Qg1 Qd4+ with a perpetual check, Gutman.

25 Qb4+ Qg8 26 Qxh6 Qe4 27 Qf4 Qxd5

White's position collapses, Gutman.
Sequel 6
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 Wh4 5 ∆c3 ∆b4 6 ∆db5 ∆f6 7 ∆d3 ∆a5)
8 0-0
This is a more accurate continuation. The reason is that White saves
time on the relatively useless move
∆c1-d2.
8...a6 9 ∆a3

9...b5
Less challenging are:
I) 9...∆xc3?! 10 bxc3 b5 11 e5 ∆g4
12 ∆f4 h5 (after 12...∆gxe5 13
∆xe5 ∆xe5 14 Wh2 Wh7 15 ∆ae1
f6 16 f4 Whxa3 17 fxe5 White’s at-
tack is lethal) 13 f3 Wh7 14 fxg4
Whxa3 15 gxf5 ∆b7 16 c4 0-0-0 17
cx5 axb5 18 ∆b1 Whc5+ 19 ∆f2 b4
20 ∆e4 with advantage for White,
Sax-Menyhart, Hungary 1996;
II) 9...0-0 10 ∆c4?! (10 ∆d5 ∆xd5
11 exd5 ∆e5 12 ∆e3 ∆b4 13 ∆d4
d6 14 ∆e2 ∆f5 15 c3 ∆xa3 16
bxa3 ∆ae8 17 ∆d2 ∆e7 18 f3 ∆f8
19 Wh2 ∆c8 20 ∆f1 ∆g6 21 g3
Wh5 22 c4 b6 23 ∆e1 ∆h3 was
equal in Thesing-Ninov, Antwerp
1992) 10...∆xc3 11 bxc3 d6
(11...∆xe4?! can be met by 12 g3
Wh7 13 ∆a3 d6 14 ∆e1) 12 f3?!
(more ambitious than 12 f4 ∆e8 13
∆d2 ∆g4 14 ∆e1 Wh1 ∆xe1 15 ∆xe1
∆d5 16 exd5 ∆xe1+ 17 Wh2 ∆xc1
18 ∆xc1 ∆e7 with equality in
Scherer-Hasecic, Baden 1996)
12...∆e6 13 ∆e3 fxe8 14 c4 ∆d7
15 ∆d5 ∆ac8 16 Whd2 f6 17 ∆b2
∆c5 18 ∆ae1, and the bishop-pair
might provide White with an ini-
tiative, Gutman.
10...∆ab1
10 ∆d5 ∆xd5 11 exd5 ∆e5 12 Wh2
d6 13 f4 ∆g4 14 ∆f3 ∆b6+ 15 Wh1
∆xf3 16 gxf3 0-0 17 fxe5 ∆ae8 favours
Black, Gutman.

10...0-0!
Other continuations are:
I) 10...∆b6 11 Whd2?! (11 Wh1 ∆e5
12 ∆e3 ∆gf4 13 h3 ∆xe3 14 fxe3
Whxe1 15 ∆xe1 c6 16 ∆d2 d6 gave
Black the advantage, Higatsberger-
Leventic, Velden 1994) 11...0-0
(Medvegy-Naznedaroglu, Patras
1999, went 11...∆d4?! 12 ∆d5 ∆g4
13 h3 h5 14 ∆xc7+ Wh8 15 ∆xa8
f5, when 16 c3! ∆c5 17 ∆c2 would
be decisive) 12 Whg5 Whxg5 13 ∆xg5
with a plus to White, Gutman;
II) 10...d6 was played in the vast
majority of games.
White has a choice:
A) 11 ∆d2 ∆e5! (not 11...∆g4 12
∆e2 ∆d4 13 ∆xg4 ∆xg4 14 h3
∆e5 15 f4 ∆g6 16 ∆f3 ∆xf3+ 17

\[ \text{\textit{\textbf{B)}} 11 a4!} \text{? b4 is imperative.} \]

With two examples:

**B1)** 12 \textit{\textbf{Qe2}} \textit{\textbf{Ab6 13 Qf4 Ag4?}} (Relange-Flear, Clichy 1995, continued 13...\textit{\textbf{Qh5 14 Wh2 Qxh4 15 Qxh4 Qe5 16 Qd5 Ah3 17 Qxb6 Axc2 18 Axc2 Qg4+ 19 Ah1 Qf3+ 20 Ag1 Qg4+ with a draw by repetition}) 14 Qg3 Wh5 and Black retains some pressure, Gutman;

**B2)** 12 \textit{\textbf{Qd5!}} \textit{\textbf{Qxd5 13 exd5 Qe5 14 Qd2!}} (an improvement on 14 \textit{\textbf{Ae2 0-0 15 Qd2 Af5 16 Ab3 Ab6 17 a5 Aa7 18 c3 bx3 19 bx3 Axe8 20 Qd4 Aa4, Houkasa-Flear, Hastings 1995/96}) 14...0-0 (while 14...Qxd3 15 Ab3! Ab6 16 Wxd3 0-0 17 a5 Aa7 18 Ae3 Aex3 19 fxe3 favours White) 15 Qf3 Qxf3+ 16 Wxf3 Ae8 17 Qd2 Wd4 18 Afe1 Ad7 19 Axe8+ (or 19 b3 Ab6 20 Wf4 a5 21 Wxd4 Axd4 22 Axe8+ Axe8 23 Axa1 1/2-1/2 Krull-Veltkamp, Hengelo 1994) 19...Axe8 20 c3! bx3 21 bx3 Ab6 22 Ab1 Ac5 23 Ax6 Axa4 seems equal, Gutman.

11 Qd2
11 a4 b4 12 Qd5 is wrong due to
12...Qxd5 13 exd5 Qe5 14 Qd2 Qxd3 15 Ab3? Qxf2, Gutman.

11...Qe5?!
11...Axc3 12 bx3 is another possibility, with a further split:

**A)** 12...d5 13 exd5 Qxd5 14 Qf3 Wh5 15 Axc3! Wh6 16 Wd2! (instead of 16 Ae4 Axc3 17 Wd3 Aexe4 18 Wxe4 Ab7, Ferrer-Ponce, Spain 1993) 16...Af6 17 Ad3 Ag4 18 Qd4, when White retains the extra pawn, Gutman.

**B)** 12...d6 13 a4! Ag4 14 f3 Ad7 15 axb5 ab5 16 Ab1 and White is no worse, Gutman;

**C)** 12...Qf4 13 Ad3 (13 f4? fails to 13...Qf4!) 13...d6 (not 13...Axe4? 14 Aexe4 Wxe4 15 Ae1) 14 f3 Ad7 secures Black a slight edge, Gutman.

12 Qf3
Vajda-Khamatgaleev, Gyunguos 1999, continued 12 f3 Ab7 13 Ae1 Ab6+ 14 Ah1 Wxe1 15 Wxe1 d5 16 a4 d4 17 Qd1 c5 18 axb5 Qxd3 19 cxd3 axb5 20 Axa8 Axa8 21 b4 Qd7 22 Qf2 Ab2 with a clear advantage for Black.

12...Qxf3+ 13 Wxf3 Axc3 14 bx3 Ab7
I prefer Black’s position, Gutman.
Sequel 7
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 w4 5 c3 b6 6 db5 f6)
7 xc7+

7...d8 8 d5!

An attempt to keep all the material with 8 xxa8 yields Black good attacking chances after 8...xe4 9 e3 xc3.

We see:

A) 10 w3 e5!? (Kocić-Nemes, Hungary 1996, went 10...a4+ 11 c3 xxb2 12 w2 1-0) 11 f5 e8! (Black wants more than 11...d5+ 12 c3 xe3 13 xe5 c2+ 14 d1 xf2 15 d3 xg2 16 cb4 xh1+ 17 xc2 xal 18 c7+ e7 19 e5+ d8 20 c7+ with perpetual check) 12 bxc3 (12 g5+ xg5 13 xg5+ is well met by 13...f6 14 e3 d5+ 15 c3 xe3 16 fxe3 xc5) 12...xc3+ 13 e2 (or 13 d1 g4! 14 e2 xe3+ 15 fxe3 xe3) 13...f6 14 b1 b6 15 d1 g4 16 e2 xe3 17 xg4 xf2 and Black launches a massive attack, Gutman;
B) 10 bxc3 xc3+ has been seen in a couple of games.

B1) 11 e2 b6! (11...c4+? 12 f3 w4 13 d3 d5 14 h3 leads nowhere for Black) 12 g3 (or 12 w5 e8 13 b1 a6+ 14 d1 xe3) 12...f6 13 f3 a1 14 h3 d4 15 xd4 xd4 16 xd4 d4+ 17 d3 xf3 18 g2 e5+ 19 c3 xc6 20 b1 b7 21 xb6 axb6 22 xb6 c7 0-1, Eichmuller-Stader, corr. 1979;

B2) 11 d2 c4+! (11...e8+ 12 e2 xa1 13 xal d4 14 g5+ c5 15 xd4 b6 16 xb6 w1+ 17 d1 xd1+ 18 xd1 axb6 was equal in Makinen-Heinola, Tampero 1982) 12 e2 xa1 13 xal d4 14 d1 e8 15 e3 xe3+ 16 f1 xe3+ 17 fxe3 wxe3 18 d2 w4+ 19 f3 b6 20 f2 b7 21 c1 e3+ 22 g3 w5+ 23 h3 e6 24 c7+ e7 25 e1 xe1 26 xb7 xe6 and Black won easily, Gaspar-Silva, Spain 1993.

8...xe4

According to Hall, 8...xe4+ 9 e3 is unclear.

In my opinion, 9...xc3+ 10 bxc3 e8 11 e2 e5 12 0-0 e4 13 c4 w6 14 b2 b6 (or 14...xc3 15 d3 xd1 16 xf6+ gxf6 17 xxd1) 15 e3 does not give Black sufficient counterplay.
Section 3
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxe4 w4 5 d3 b4 6 d5)
6...e5

"Also quite possible, if not actually to be preferred", Botterill/Harding.

"After 6 d5 Black obtains convenient play by 6...e5", Hall.

We consider three lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 7 d3 (7 e3, 7 d5)
Sequel 2: 7 e2
Sequel 3: 7 d2!

Sequel 1
7 d3
Insufficient attention has been given to White's following two alternatives:
1) 7 e3 a6 (7...f6 8 d3 will transpose into the variation 6...f6
7 d3 a5 8 e3 — Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 4) 8 d4 e4 9 e3 (9 e2 reaches a position after 7 e2 a6 8 d4 e4 9 e3, covered in Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 3, Sequel 2)
9...e5 10 e2 d6 11 0-0 xc3 12 bxc3 f6 13 xe5 xe5 14 e1 c6 15 d4 c4 16 d3 0-0

The position is clearly in White's favour despite the pawn minus, Gutman.
(16...\textit{\$e}6?! 17 \textit{\$}xf6 exd3 18 \textit{\$}d4 dxc2 19 \textit{\$}xc2 0-0 is also fine for Black, \textit{Gutman}) 17 \textit{\$}xf6 \textit{\$}xf6 18 \textit{\$}xe4 \textit{\$}xc3 19 \textit{\$}e3 \textit{\$}f6 20 \textit{\$}b1 \textit{\$}b8 turned out quite well for Black in Krivc-Pujek, Pula 1993;
II) 7 \textit{\$}d5 \textit{\$}d6 8 \textit{\$}g5 \textit{\$}xd5! (8...\textit{\$}xe4+ 9 \textit{\$}xe4+ \textit{\$}xe4 10 \textit{\$}xc7+ \textit{\$}xc7 11 \textit{\$}xe4 is less effective) 9 \textit{\$}xh4 \textit{\$}xc3 10 \textit{\$}xc3 \textit{\$}xc3+ 11 \textit{\$}bxc3 d6 12 0-0-0 \textit{\$}e6 13 \textit{\$}d1 0-0 14 \textit{\$}d4 \textit{\$}f5 15 \textit{\$}e1 \textit{\$}xe4 16 \textit{\$}xe4 \textit{\$}d5 (not 16...\textit{\$}ae8??, as in Mezera-Pribyl, Czech 1997, because of 17 \textit{\$}xe6!) 17 \textit{\$}c4 \textit{\$}xc4 18 \textit{\$}xc4 \textit{\$}ae8 and White has compensation for his poor pawn structure, \textit{Gutman}.
7...a6 8 \textit{\$}a3

9 \textit{\$}ab1
9 \textit{\$}d2 was played in some games.

Black has three possibilities:
A) “If 9...b4 10 \textit{\$}d5 is a good reply, renewing the problem of c7”, \textit{Wells};
B) 9...\textit{\$}b6 10 g3 \textit{\$}f6 11 0-0 \textit{\$}ge7 12 \textit{\$}h5!? (improving on 12 \textit{\$}d5 \textit{\$}xd5 13 exd5 \textit{\$}e5 14 \textit{\$}e4 d6 15 \textit{\$}g2 0-0 16 \textit{\$}c3 \textit{\$}h6 17 h4 \textit{\$}f5 18 \textit{\$}f3 \textit{\$}b7 19 \textit{\$}d4 \textit{\$}xf3 20 \textit{\$}xb6 \textit{\$}xh4+ 21 \textit{\$}xh4 cxb6 22 \textit{\$}d4 f4 23 \textit{\$}h1 \textit{\$}f5 0-1, Hawes-Gretarsson, Elista Olympiad 1998) 12...g6 (12...b4! can be met by 13 \textit{\$}d5 \textit{\$}xd5 14 exd5 bxa3 15 \textit{\$}ae1+) 13 \textit{\$}h6 with a double-edged position, \textit{Gutman};
C) 9...\textit{\$}f6!? is probably the best solution, reaching a position after 6...\textit{\$}f6 7 \textit{\$}d3 \textit{\$}a5 8 0-0 reaches a position after 6...\textit{\$}f6 7 \textit{\$}d3 \textit{\$}a5 8 \textit{\$}d2 a6 9 \textit{\$}a3 b5, covered in Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 5. 17 \textit{\$}f7?? 9...\textit{\$}d6!?
Superior to 9...\textit{\$}f6, when White has more ideas.

8...b5
More precise than 8...\textit{\$}xc3+ 9 \textit{\$}bxc3, when White’s bishop-pair compensates for his scattered pawns: 9...\textit{\$}f6 (9...\textit{\$}f6 10 0-0 reaches a position after 6...\textit{\$}f6 7 \textit{\$}d3 \textit{\$}a5 8 0-0 a6 9 \textit{\$}a3 \textit{\$}xc3 10 bxc3, covered in Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 1, Sequel 6) 10 \textit{\$}c4!? (10 0-0 is possible since 10...b5 can be met by 11 \textit{\$}b1 \textit{\$}ge7 12 a4) 10...\textit{\$}ge7 11 0-0 b5 12 \textit{\$}e3 \textit{\$}xc3 13 \textit{\$}b1 with good chances for White, \textit{Gutman}.

We see:
A) 10 0-0 transposes to Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 6;
B) 10 \textit{\$}d2 \textit{\$}xc3 (10...\textit{\$}b6 11 g3 \textit{\$}h3 12 \textit{\$}f1 \textit{\$}e6 13 \textit{\$}g2 b4 14 \textit{\$}a4 \textit{\$}a7 15 0-0 a5 16 e5 \textit{\$}d4 17 \textit{\$}b3 \textit{\$}gxe5 18 \textit{\$}f4 0-0 19 \textit{\$}e1
\textbf{b8} 20 \textit{\$xa5} gave White the advantage in Berndt-Graf, Germany 1999) 11 bxc3 d5 12 0-0 0-0 13 \textit{4f3} \textit{4h5} 14 exd5 \textit{4xd5} (14...\textit{axd5}?! 15 \textit{4xh7+} \textit{4h8} occurred in the game Jamey-Piraud, corr. 1992, and now 16 \textit{4d3!} g6 17 c4 \textit{4db4} 18 \textit{4c3}+ \textit{4xh7} 19 \textit{4b2} \textit{4g8} 20 a3 \textit{4xc2} 21 \textit{4xc2} looks quite promising for White) 15 \textit{4e1} (15 \textit{4g5} \textit{4e4} 15...\textit{4g4} favours Black, \textit{Gutman}) 10 h3! is the best try, aimed at preventing Black’s freeing manoeuvre.

C2) 13 \textit{4xc3}! 0-0 (13...\textit{4b7} 14 \textit{4e2} \textit{4b6} 15 \textit{4e3} c5 16 \textit{4d2} h6 17 \textit{4f4} when 17...0-0-0 allows the devastating 18 \textit{4xb5}! axb5 19 \textit{4d6} \textit{4c6} 20 \textit{4d5} 14 \textit{4f3} \textit{4c6} (14...\textit{axc3} 15 bxc3 \textit{4c6} can be met by 16 \textit{4a3} 15 \textit{4e4} \textit{4d8} 16 \textit{4d5} \textit{4b7} 17 \textit{4f5} with a crushing attack, \textit{Gutman}).

10 0-0

10 h3 leads nowhere in view of 10...\textit{4g7}! 11 g3 \textit{4f6}, \textit{Gutman}.

10...\textit{4f6}

Black reaches a position after 5 \textit{4c3} \textit{4b4} 6 \textit{4db5} \textit{4f6} 7 \textit{4d3} \textit{4a5} 8 0-0 a6 9 \textit{4a3} b5 10 \textit{4ab1} 0-0, covered in Chapter 4, Section 2, Sequel 6, a line regarded as good for Black.

\textbf{Sequel 2}
(1 e4 e5 2 \textit{4f3} \textit{4c6} 3 d4 exd4 4 \textit{4xd4} \textit{4h4} 5 \textit{4c3} \textit{4b4} 6 \textit{4db5} \textit{4a5})

7 \textit{4e2}

This move has been quite popular in practice.

7...\textit{a6}?

Alternatives are:

I) A couple of players have tried 7...\textit{4xe4}? at this point, failing to spot the intermezzo 8 \textit{4xc7+!} \textit{4d8} 9 \textit{4xa8} \textit{4xg2} (Indregard-Jacobsen,
Tromsoesjakken 1981, went 9...\textit{Qd}d4 10 0-0 \textit{Qe}5 11 \textit{Qc}3 \textit{Qxe}2+ 12 \textit{Qxe}2 \textit{Qb}8 13 \textit{Qg}4 \textit{Qe}7 14 \textit{Qg}5 \textit{Qxc}3 15 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{Qxa}8 16 \textit{Qc}5 1-0 10 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qg}6 11 \textit{Qe}3 (instead of 11 \textit{Qh}5? \textit{Qe}4+ 12 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qd}5+ 13 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qe}5+ 14 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qd}5+ 1-1) \textit{Qe}3 (instead of 11 \textit{Qh}5? \textit{Qe}4+ 12 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qd}5+ 13 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qe}5+ 14 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qd}5+ 1-1) \textit{Qhoehn-Hilge}, Germany 1990) 11...\textit{Qge}7 (or 11...\textit{Qf}6 12 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 13 \textit{Qd}4) 12 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qf}6 13 \textit{Qe}2 and White is winning, \textit{Gutman}; II) 7...\textit{Qf}6 8 0-0 a6 with a further split:
A) 9 \textit{Qd}d4 \textit{Qxe}4!? (9...\textit{Qxc}3 10 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{Qxe}4 11 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qd}5 12 \textit{Qe}1+ \textit{Qd}8 13 \textit{Qf}5 d6 14 \textit{e}4 \textit{Qc}5 15 \textit{Qe}3 gave White a crushing attack in Salinardi-Gianconne, Chivilcogy Archa 1998) 10 \textit{Qd}5 d6 11 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 12 g3 \textit{Qd}8 13 \textit{Qd}4 0-0 14 \textit{Qxe}4 \textit{Qe}8 15 \textit{Qf}6+ \textit{Qxf}6 16 \textit{Qf}3 d5 17 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qb}8 18 \textit{Qh}5 f5 19 \textit{Qxf}5 \textit{Qxf}5 20 \textit{Qxf}5 \textit{Qwd}6 should be equal, \textit{Gutman};
B) 9 g3 \textit{Qh}3 10 \textit{Qd}5! \textit{Qxd}5 11 \textit{Qg}4 \textit{Qxf}1+ 12 \textit{Qxf}1 \textit{Qf}6 13 \textit{Qc}3 leaves Black with insufficient compensation for his queen, \textit{Gutman}; III) 7...d6 appears more testing.

Killar-Horak, Nachod 1999) 8...\textit{Qge}7 9 \textit{Qd}5!? \textit{Qxd}5 10 \textit{exd}5 \textit{Qe}5 White has three possibilities:
A) 11 \textit{Qd}4 0-0 12 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qxf}3+ 13 \textit{Qxf}3 \textit{Qb}6 14 c3 \textit{Qe}8 15 a4 a5 16 \textit{g}3 \textit{Qf}6 17 h4 h6 18 \textit{Qxf}4 \textit{Qe}7 19 h5 \textit{Qd}7 20 \textit{Qwd}2 \textit{Qae}8 with a plus for Black, Fabre Perez-Sorin, Zaragoza 1992;
B) 11 \textit{Qe}3 0-0!? (11...a6 12 \textit{Qd}4 0-0 13 \textit{Qb}3 \textit{Qb}6 14 \textit{Qxb}6 \textit{Qxb}6 15 \textit{f}4 \textit{Qg}4 16 \textit{Qxg}4 \textit{Qxg}4 17 \textit{Qd}4 favours White) 12 \textit{Qxa}7 (12 c3 a6 13 \textit{Qa}3 \textit{Qe}8 14 b4 \textit{Qb}6 15 \textit{Qxb}6 \textit{Qxb}6 causes no problems for Black) 12...\textit{Qg}4!? (Vetesnik-Veltkamp, Budapest 1996, went 12...\textit{Qg}4 13 \textit{Qxg}4 \textit{Qxg}4 14 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qh}5 15 \textit{Qxc}1 \textit{Qe}2 16 \textit{Qb}3 \textit{Qae}8 17 \textit{Qb}5 \textit{Qxe}3 18 \textit{fxe}3 \textit{Qd}2, when 19 \textit{Qxc}7!? \textit{Qg}5 20 \textit{Qh}1 \textit{Qxc}1 21 \textit{Qxc}1 would be strong) 13 \textit{Qb}5 \textit{Qxe}2 14 \textit{Qxe}2 \textit{Qfe}8 yields Black good attacking chances, \textit{Gutman};
C) 11 \textit{Qd}2! \textit{Qb}6 12 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qe}7 13 \textit{Qwd}2 is comfortable for White, \textit{Gutman}.
8 \textit{Qd}4

Not 8 g3? \textit{Qf}6 9 e5 \textit{Qxe}5 10 b4 \textit{Qb}6 11 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qf}3+ 12 \textit{Qxf}3 \textit{Qxa}1 13 0-0 \textit{Qxb}5 14 \textit{Qe}1 \textit{Qe}7 15 \textit{Qd}6+ \textit{Qxd}6 16 \textit{Qxe}7+ \textit{Qd}8 17 \textit{Qxf}7 \textit{Qwd}4 0-1, Humphreys-Varley, Hastings 1999.

After 8 0-0 (8 \textit{Qf}3 a6 9 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qf}6 10 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 11 0-0 \textit{Qg}4 12 \textit{Qxg}4 \textit{Qxg}4 13 \textit{Qxg}4 \textit{Qxg}4 14 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qb}8 was slightly better for Black in
8...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xe4}}}

This is the principal test of 7 \texttt{\textbf{\textb{Q}e2}}.

Let’s take a look at what might happen if the pawn is not taken:

I) 8...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}f6}} 9 0-0 (White can also play more actively, 9 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}f5!? \textw{W}xe4}}
10 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}xg7+ \textw{D}d8}} 11 0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xc3}} 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}g6}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textb{D}h5}}, keeping the initiative) 9...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xd4}}
10 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xd4}} 0-0 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d5}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{E}e8}} 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}f3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{D}g4}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xg4}} 14 f3 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}g6}}
15 b4 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b6}} 16 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xb6}} cxb6 17 a4!? (17 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}f4}} b5 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{R}ad1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}c6}}
19 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{C}c5}} a5 is less convincing, Jakubovics-Varley, 4NCL Birmingham 1998)
17...d5 (or 17...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e6}} 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}f4}}) 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xd5}} with advantage to White, Gutman;

II) 8...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xd4}} 9 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xd4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b6}}
10 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xg7}}, when Black has nothing better than to enter an unpromising ending,
resulting from 10...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xf2+}} 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}d1}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}d4+}} 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xd4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xd4}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d5}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e5}}
14 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{D}f1}} c6 15 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b6}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b8}} 16 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{C}c4}}
16 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xe5}} dxe5 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{Q}c4}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e6}} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xe6}} fxe6 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{G}g5}}, Vorobjov-Zhidkov, Moscow 1994.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram 1}
\end{center}

9 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc6}}

Other possibilities are:

I) 9 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f3}} is a relatively new idea, but not a good one: compared to the position after 5 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xe4+}}
6 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e2}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b4+}} 7 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}c3}}?! — Part 5, Chapter 2,

Section 2, Sequel 1 — Black has his pawn already on a6.

Reefat-Jurtaev, Calcutta 2000, went
9...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3+}} 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}ge7}} (10...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}f6}}
11 0-0 0-0 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{G}g5}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}g6}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e4}}
14 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e1}} d5 is also playable) 11
0-0 d6 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}g6}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}h5}}
14 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}b1}} 0-0 15 h3 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e8}}
16 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d2}} h6 17
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}c5}}
18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e2}} b6 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}e1}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d7}}
with advantage for Black;

II) 9 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e3}} is more impressive.

“If I were looking to embroil my opponent in wild complications in the hope of tripping him up then this is the move that I would choose”,

Daniel King, English Defence.

And now:

A) Black runs a great risk by playing
9...\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xg2}} 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}h3}} as 11
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g1}}! (instead of 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}e2}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}ge7}}
12 0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e5}}
14 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{D}h1}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xf3}}
15 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xf3}} 0-0 16 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}e6}}
17 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}dg1}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f5}}
18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}d4}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xg3}}
19 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xg3}},
Dufek-M Chess Pro, Usti 1994, when Black could gain the advantage by 19...
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}f6?!}} 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g5}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}d6}}
21
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f5}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}e6}}
22 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g4}}
f6
23 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e3}} fxg5
24 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xe6}}
dxe6
25 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}e7+}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}f7})}
11...g6 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3+}}
13 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}h4}}
14 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc6}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xc6}}
15 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xe6}}
dxe6
16
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g5}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}g4}}
17 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{B}xg4}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}xh2}}
18 \texttt{\textbf{\textw{W}d4}}
shows, Gutman;
B) 9...\( \text{Qe7} \)?! is a better idea, 10 0-0 \( \text{Bxc3} \) 11 bxc3 0-0 12 \( \text{Qd2} \) (12 \( \text{Qe1} \) d6 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) g4 14 f3 d7 15 g5 f6 16 h4 Qc5 17 Qf1 Qf5 gave Black an edge in Sommers-Pujek, Elista Olympiad 1998) 12...d6 13 Qab1 g6 14 Qd3 wh5 15 f4 Qb8 (15...f5 16 Qf3 Qf6 17 h3 Qf7 18 Qf2 Qg6 19 Qf3 Qxa2 was a bit provocative in Jonny-Nicolini, Tatry 1997, but still possible) 16 Qfe1 (or 16 Qxc6 Qxc6 17 f5 f6) 16...Qxd4 17 cxd4 Qf5 and Black retains a clear plus, Gutman.

After 9...Qxc6 10 0-0 Wh4 Black has a few problems.

Two moves have been tried:

A) 11 Qd3 e6 12 Qe4 We7 13 Qg5 f6 14 Qxf6 (14 Qe3 can be met by 14...0-0-0) 14...Qxf6 15 Qxf6+ Qxf6 16 Wh5+ Qf7 17 Qxa5 0-0-0 (17...0-0 18 Rae1 Rae8 19 Qb4 b5 20 Qe3 Qd5 21 Wh4 h6 22 Qg3 turned out quite well for White in Reschun-Vreugdenhil, Finkenstein 1994) 18 Rae1 Rhe8 is equal;

B) 11 Qe1!? looks like the best option, 11...Qe7 (Landenbergue-Bukal, Reggio Emilia 1988/89, continued 11...Qe6 12 h5 g6 13 Qg4 Qf6 14 Qxe6 fxe6 15 Qxe6+ Qf7 16 g3 Wh3 17 Qxf6+ Qxf6 18 Qe4+ Qe7 19 Qd4 Qf5 20 Qg7+ Qe6 21 Qg5+ Qd5 22 Qe3 c5 23 b4 Qxb4 24 Qxc7 Qhf8 25 Qc4+ Qxc4 26 Qc1+ Qb5 27 Qxb7+ Qa4 28 Qe4 a5 29 Qxc5+ Qa3 30 Qb5 1-0) 12 Qd3 Qxc3 13 bxc3 Qe6 14 Qb1 0-0-0 15 We2 Wa4 with a draw in Makropoulou-Olarasu, Varna 1994. However, in the final position White can play on by 16 We3!? b6 (or 16...Qb8 17 Qc5 Qd5 18 a3) 17 We5, keeping the initiative, Gutman.

10 bxc3 Wxc6? 10...Qxc6 11 0-0 Qd5 has mostly been played.

White has a choice:

A) 12 Qf4 Qxd1 13 Qfxd1 Qf6 14 Qxc7 0-0 15 Qf3 Qg4 16 Qxg4 Qxg4 17 Qab1 b5 18 Qd6 Qac8 19 Qxc6 Qfe8 20 Qd1 h6 21 h3 Qe5 22 Qc5 Qc4 23 Qf1 Que6, and Black is at least no worse, Timmerman-Cassens, Holland 1991;

B) 12 We1 e6 13 Qf4 0-0-0 14 Qd1 Qxa2!? (not 14...Qa5 15 Qxd8+ Qxd8 16 Qd2+ Qe8 17 Qd4 Qf6 18 Qa7 Qd7 19 Qb1 Qb6 20 Qe3 Qxa2? 21 Qxb6 cxb6 22 Qa8+ Qd7 23 Qxb7+ Qd6 24 Qf4+ Qc5 25 We7+ Qd5 26 Qd6+ Qe4 27 We5 mate, S.Lalic-Wessels,
Guernsey 1994) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 16 \( \text{w}e5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) maintains a satisfactory position for Black, Gutman;
C) 12 \( \text{d}3! ? \) \( \text{e}6 \) 13 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{w}d7 \) 14 \( \text{b}1 \) is critical, 14...0-0-0 15 \( \text{w}e1 \) \( \text{g}5 ? ! (15...\text{d}f6 16 \text{w}a5) 16 \text{xb7}! \text{xb7} 17 \text{w}b4+ \text{e}8 18 \text{w}a5 \text{w}c8 19 \text{xf5} \text{w}b7 20 \text{e}3 \text{f}6 21 \text{h}3 \text{e}8 and White has two options:
C1) 22 \( \text{c}3 \text{e}4 \) 23 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 24 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) (instead Makropoulou- C. Fois, Mangalia Balkanod 1992, continued 24...\text{d}e8 25 \text{w}xg7 \text{f}5 26 \text{w}f6 \text{xe}4 27 \text{w}e7 \text{c}e4 28 \text{w}xf5 \text{h}6 29 \text{w}h7 \text{g}4 30 \text{b}1 \text{c}e8 31 \text{d}3 \text{c}5 32 \text{d}5+ \text{c}6 33 \text{xc}5 \text{d}7 34 \text{a}4 1-0) 25 \text{w}c5 \text{g}7 drawing;
C2) 22 \text{h}2! \text{b}8! (22...\text{e}4? loses at once in view of 23 \text{b}1) 23 \text{c}3 \text{e}4 24 \text{c}1, and Black’s position is difficult, Gutman.
11 0-0

\[ \]

11...\text{e}7!

Other moves for Black are less effective:
I) 11...d5 12 \( \text{f}3 \) (12 \text{d}4 \text{f}6 13 \text{a}3 \text{f}5 14 \text{ab}1 0-0-0 15 \text{a}7 \text{h}8 16 \text{d}3 \text{xd}3 17 \text{xd}3 \text{e}2 18 \text{c}5 \text{xa}2 19 \text{fe}1 \text{b}6 20 \text{d}4 \text{w}b7 21 \text{xb7}+ \text{xb7} 22 \text{e}7 \text{c}6 23 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 24 \text{xf7} \text{c}2 25 \text{h}4 \text{xc}3 26 \text{xb}7 \text{f}8 27 \text{h}5 \text{a}5 28 \text{h}6 \\
\text{b}5 29 \text{g}7 \text{b}4 30 \text{g}4 \text{b}3 was a disaster for White in Eschbach-Doll, Germany 1998) 12...\text{e}6 (12...\text{f}6 13 \text{a}3 reaches the same position after 11...\text{f}6 12 \text{f}3 \text{d}5 13 \text{a}3 — II) 13 \text{b}1 0-0-0 14 \text{d}4 \text{f}6 15 \text{w}7 \text{f}5 16 \text{c}4 yields White good attacking chances, Gutman;
II) 11...\text{f}6 12 \text{f}3 \text{d}5 13 \text{a}3 (13 \text{g}5 \text{xc}3 14 \text{e}1+ \text{e}6 15 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 16 \text{xd}5 0-0-0 17 \text{xe}6+ \text{xe}6 18 \text{w}e2 \text{d}6 left White with a pawn minus, Mladenović- Bokan, Niksic 1994) 13...\text{e}6 14 \text{b}1 \text{e}4 (14...\text{xc}3 is quite risky on account of 15 \text{b}2 \text{w}c6 16 \text{xf6} \text{gxf6} 17 \text{d}4) 15 \text{c}4 \text{xc}4 16 \text{xb}7 \text{c}3 17 \text{d}2 \text{b}5 (17...0-0-0 can be met by 18 \text{b}4 \text{w}c6 19 \text{b}2 \text{b}5 20 \text{w}3) 18 \text{e}2 \text{a}4 19 \text{c}5 \text{d}7 (19...0-0-0 20 \text{xb}5 \text{ab}5 21 \text{a}7 \text{w}c4 22 \text{xc}7+ \text{xc}7 23 \text{a}5+ \text{c}8 24 \text{w}a6+ \text{c}7 25 \text{b}6+ \text{c}8 26 \text{w}c6+ \text{b}8 27 \text{b}1 is crushing for White) 20 \text{c}4 \text{c}6 21 \text{b}4! (improving on 21 \text{xc}7+? \text{xc}7 22 \text{f}4 \text{b}7 23 \text{b}1+ \text{w}8 24 \text{b}6 \text{c}6 25 \text{a}5 \text{b}8 26 \text{c}1 \text{xc}4 27 \text{f}3 \text{c}5 0-1, Ramesh-Babu, Madras Zonal 1995) 21...\text{xb}7 22 \text{d}1 winning the queen, Gutman.
12 \text{f}3 \text{f}6 13 \text{b}1 0-0
14 \(\text{a}3\)
14 \(\text{a}e1\) d6 15 c4 (15 \(\text{w}d4\) w\(\text{x}d4\) 16 cxd4 \(\text{a}f5\) 17 c3 \(\text{a}b8\) 18 a4 \(\text{h}4\) 19 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{f}5\) 20 a\(\text{x}f5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 21 g4 \(\text{h}4\) 22 \(\text{e}7\) \(\text{f}c8\) 23 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}8\) favours Black, Balinov-Arbakov, Oberwart 1994) 15...\(\text{c}6\) (15...\(\text{g}6\) 16 \(\text{a}xb7\) \(\text{b}8\) 17 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{e}5\) 18 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}7\) with equality, Gliksman-Shipman, Concord 1995) 16 \(\text{a}b2\) \(\text{g}6\) seems fine for Black, Gutman.
14...\(\text{a}b8\) 15 \(\text{c}5\)
15 \(\text{e}1\) d6 16 c4 \(\text{e}6\) 17 \(\text{a}xb7\) (after 17 c5 \(\text{a}f5\) 18 \(\text{a}xb7\), Wynn Zaw Htun - Simonsen, Istanbul Olympiad 2000, 18...\(\text{w}c3!\) could be annoying) 17...\(\text{x}c4\) 18 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{g}6\) 19 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{w}h6\) 20 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 21 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 22 \(\text{d}4\) c5 23 \(\text{c}3\) can be met by 23...f5! (instead of 23...\(\text{a}b4\) 24 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}b8\) 25 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{w}h4\) 26 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{w}h5\) 27 h3 \(\text{e}5\) 28 f4, Nolsoe-Simonsen, Oyrabakki 2000) 24 \(\text{c}6\) (not 24 \(\text{h}3?\) \(\text{a}f4\)) 24...\(\text{e}5\), Gutman.
15...b6 16 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}8\)

Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3 d4 exd4 4 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{w}h4\) 5 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 6 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{a}5\))
7 \(\text{a}2!\)

This looks like a logical reply.

7...a6
7...\(\text{a}f6?\) is thought to be inaccurate due to 8 g3! \(\text{w}h5\) 9 \(\text{w}xh5\) \(\text{a}xh5\) 10 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{a}xh2+\) 11 \(\text{a}xh2\) with a terrible position for Black.
8 \(\text{a}3\)
8 g3?! would only benefit Black, since the endgame after 8...\(\text{w}e7\) 9 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{a}xh2\) 10 \(\text{a}xh2\) \(\text{a}xh2+\) 11 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{a}xh2+\) 12 \(\text{a}xh2\) \(\text{a}f6\) 13 0-0-0 d6 14 \(\text{a}e1\) (or 14 \(\text{d}3\) 0-0 15 \(\text{c}4\)) \(\text{a}4\) 16 \(\text{a}d1\) \(\text{f}3\) 17 \(\text{a}g1\) \(\text{d}5\) 18 \(\text{a}d2\) \(\text{d}b4\) 19 \(\text{a}xb4\) \(\text{a}xh4\), Jazbinsek-Kennaugh, Bled 1994) 14...\(\text{e}6\) 15 f4 0-0-0 16 \(\text{c}4\) h5 17 \(\text{c}e3\) \(\text{e}7\) is clearly in Black’s favour, Kohvakka-Kivimaki, Kuopio 1995.
8...b5
8...\(\text{a}xh2\) 9 \(\text{a}xh2\) has also been tried.
Black now has a choice:

A) 9...\(\text{w}xh2+\) 10 \(\text{a}e2!\) \(\text{a}f6\)
(10...\(\text{w}xg2\) is too dangerous as 11 \(\text{a}f3\) \(\text{g}5\) 12 h4 \(\text{w}e7+\) 13 \(\text{a}f1\) \(\text{a}f6\) 14 \(\text{w}d2\) 0-0 15 \(\text{e}1\) shows) 11 \(\text{a}xh2\)

After 17 \(\text{w}e2\) d6 18 \(\text{a}d4\) \(\text{w}e6\) 19 \(\text{w}d2\) \(\text{w}d7\) 20 c4 \(\text{b}7\) 21 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{c}6\) 22 \(\text{a}xh7\) \(\text{x}h7\) 23 h4 h6 24 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{b}8\) 25 h5 \(\text{e}5\) 26 c5 b7 27 cxd6 cxd6 28 f4, Housa-Ledger, British Championship 1999, 28...\(\text{g}4!\) would be fine for Black.
gxf6 12 0-0 and White dominates the board, Gutman;
B) 9...Qf6 10 Rd3 0-0 11 g3?! (instead, Wagner-Hund, German Women’s Bundesliga, 1994/95, continued 11 Wf3?! Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Ke8 13 0-0-0 Wxe4 14 He1 Ke6 15 g3 Wg5+ 16 h1 b5 17 Qe4 Wc7 18 Qg4 f6 with advantage for Black) 11...Wh6 12 Wf3?! (12 Wd2 Wxd2+ 13 Qxd2 Qg4 14 Qaf1 b5 causes no problems for Black) 12...d6 (or 12...d5 13 Qxf6 gxf6 14 We3!!?) 13 Qxf6 gxf6 14 Qc4 Qe5 15 Wf4, and White retains some pressure, Gutman.

9 g3

9 Qe2?! runs into the disruptive 9...b4 10 Qd5 (10 g3? We7 11 Qd5 Wxe4 12 0-0 Wxe4 13 Ke1 Qge7 led to an easy win for Black in Brhlrik-Martinkova, Klatovy 1997) 10...Wxe4 11 c4 Qge7!? (after 11...bxa3 12 Qxa5 Qxa5 13 Qxc7+ Qd8 14 Qxa8 axb2 15 h1 Qxa8 16 0-0 White has strong counterplay) 12 Qxe7 Wxe7 13 Qc2 0-0 14 0-0 Qb7 15 Qf3 Rae8 16 Qe3 We5 with advantage for Black, Gutman.

9...We7

9...Wf6 is another option.

A) 10 Qg2 Qge7 11 0-0 Qb6 (11...b4 is premature since 12 Qxd5 Qxd5 13 exd5 bx3 14 bx3! Qxd2 15 dxc6 dxc6 16 We2+!? We6 17 Wxd2 0-0 18 Wc3 favours White) 12 Qb1 (12 Qd5 Wxb2) 12...Qb7 13 Qd5 Qxd5 14 exd5 Qe5, and I don’t think that Black should have any difficulties, Gutman;

B) 10 Qd5!? is far more effective, 10...Qxd2+ (10...Wxb2 11 Qxa5 Qxa5 12 Qxc7+ Qd8 13 Qxa8 Wb4+ 14 Wd2 Wxe4+ 15 We3 Wxh1 16 Wb6+ Qe7 17 0-0 0-0 Qc6 18 Qxb5 was crushing for White in Jonsson-Berecz, Szeged 1993) 11 Wxd2 Wxb2 12 Qxc7+ Qd8 13 Qb1 Qxa3 (or 13...Wxe5 14 Qxa8 Wxe4+ 15 We3 Wxh1 16 Qb6+ Qe7 17 Qb3 Qf8 18 Qc7 Qge7 19 Qb6 Wxe4+ 20 Qe3) 14 Qxa8 Wf3 15 Qg1 Wxe4+ 16 Qd1 Qf6 17 Qg2 Wd4 18 Qxd4 Qxd4 19 Qb6 with a clear plus for White, Gutman.

10 Qg2 Qf6 11 0-0 Qxc3 12 Qxc3 0-0 13 e5 Qe8 14 Qd4!

14 b4?! Qb8 15 Qb1 is less convincing, 15...a5! 16 Qe1 axb4 17 Qxb4 Qxb4 18 Qxb4 Qa6! (improving on 18...c6 19 c4 Qa8 20 Qxb5 Qxa2 21 Qd4 Qa6 22 Qb1 Qa5 23 Qxc6 Qxe5, Linskens-Ader, San Rafael 1951, when 24 Qb7 Qxb7 25 Qxb7 would retain an edge for White) 19 c4 c5 20 Qb3 b4 gave Black the advantage in Wagner-Hund, German Women’s Bundesliga, 1991/92.

14...Qb7 15 c4! Qb8 16 Qc1 Qxd4 17 Wxd4 Qxg2 18 Qxg2 I prefer White, Gutman.
Section 4
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f}}\)4 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash h\textbackslash h}}\)4 5 c3 b4 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d}}\)5) 
6...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e}}\)4+!

This move should offer a modest way to play: if Black is to get anything from this variation, then he must capture the pawn.
7 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash e}}\)2

Other possibilities are:
I) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e}}\)2?! \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e}}\)2+ 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash e}}\)2 isn’t terribly inspired, 
8...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash a5}}\)!
(8...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) + 9 bxc3 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d}}\)8 is also promising, 10 f4 d6 11 0-0 0 a6 12 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d}}\)4 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash d4}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash d4}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e6}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f}}\)3 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash b\textbackslash b}}\)8 gave Black a plus in Ferguson-Bassett, Dublin 1992) 9 0-0 (9 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d}}\)2 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash g\textbackslash e}}\)7 10 c4 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e4}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash b6}}\) 11 c4 d6 12 c5 
dxc5 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c\textbackslash c1}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f}}\)5 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c5}}\) 0-0-0 15 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e\textbackslash e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d5}}\) is no better, Kocur-Van Herck, Geraardsbergen 1993) 9...a6 
10 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash a3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) (Knotkova-Buldrova, Pilsen 1995, went 10...b5 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d}}\)5 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash g\textbackslash e}}\)7 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f}}\), when 12...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash d5}}\) 13 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash d5}}\) 0-0 would leave White without compensation for the pawn) 11 
bxc3 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash g\textbackslash e}}\)7 with advantage for Black;
II) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e\textbackslash e3}}\) will transpose into the variation 5 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e\textbackslash e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e4}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash b5}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash b4}}\) + 
7 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash l\textbackslash c3}}\) — Part 2, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequel 5.

One of the most intriguing positions in the Scotch Game.
"Many players felt it was simply too risky to be subjected to such a violent attack. One false move and you get your head blown off. Nevertheless, I hope I will prove that there is still plenty of room for exploration, self-expression and discovery. And it is not only risky for Black: there are plenty of games where White has come to grief," Daniel King, English Defence.

Black’s position is quite solid, and still unresolved is the question whether White or Black obtains an advantage.

We divide the material into fifteen sequels:

Sequel 1: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f}}\)6 
(7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash a5}}\), 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e5}}\), 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash x\textbackslash g2}}\))

Sequel 2: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d8}}\)

Sequel 3: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) + 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c\textbackslash c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash d4}}\) 
(8...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash e7}}\))

Sequel 4: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) + 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c\textbackslash c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash w\textbackslash x\textbackslash g2}}\)!

Sequel 5: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) + 8 bxc3!? \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d8}}\) 
9 0-0 (9 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash a3}}\) 9...d6 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash f\textbackslash f3}}\) (10 
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a\textbackslash a3}}\))

Sequel 6: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash x\textbackslash c3}}\) + 8 bxc3 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d\textbackslash d8}}\) 9 
0-0 d6 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e\textbackslash e1}}\)!
Sequel 7: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 a6 10 \text{d}d4 \text{xd}4 (10...\text{e}ge7) 11 \text{cxd}4 \text{e}7 (11...\text{we}8, 11...d6)
Sequel 8: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 a6 10 \text{d}d4 \text{xd}4 11 \text{cxd}4 \text{f}6!
Sequel 9: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 a6 10 \text{f}3
Sequel 10: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 a6 10 \text{d}3!
Sequel 11: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 \text{e}ge7 10 \text{e}e3 (10 \text{a}3)
Sequel 12: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 \text{e}ge7 10 \text{d}3!? (10 \text{f}3!?, 10 \text{e}1!?)
Sequel 13: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 \text{f}6!? 10 \text{g}5 (10 \text{g}3, 10 \text{a}3, 10 \text{d}3, 10 \text{c}4, 10 \text{e}1)
Sequel 14: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 \text{f}6 10 \text{b}1 (10 \text{f}3 \text{wc}4 11 \text{b}1)
Sequel 15: 7...\text{a}xc3 + 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}d8 9 0-0 \text{f}6 10 \text{e}3

Sequel 1
7...\text{f}6

We mention here:
I) 7...\text{a}5? will transpose into the variation 5 \text{dc}3 \text{b}4 6 \text{db}5 \text{a}5 7 \text{e}e2 \text{exe}4 — Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 3, Sequel 2; 195
II) 7...\text{we}5? gives White a choice:
A) 8 0-0!? \text{xc}3 (8...a6 can be met by 9 \text{f}4! \text{xf}4 10 \text{d}5 \text{we}5 11 \text{bxc}7+ \text{d}8 12 \text{xa}8) 9 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}ge7 10 \text{e}1 0-0 11 \text{d}3 \text{f}6 12 \text{a}3 winning, Doring-Domlatt, Svetla 1995;
B) 8 \text{f}4!? \text{xc}3 + (8...\text{wc}5 9 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 10 \text{xa}8 \text{f}6 11 \text{d}3 \text{e}8 12 \text{f}1 \text{xc}3 13 \text{wc}3 \text{we}7 14 \text{f}3 b6 15 \text{d}2 \text{a}6+ 16 \text{f}2 \text{d}6 17 \text{e}3 \text{c}8 18 \text{ad}1, and White won easily, Eckert-Rizouk, Duisburg 1992) 9 \text{bxc}3 \text{wc}5 10 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 11 \text{xa}8 \text{f}6 (Paaso-Warsame, Hallstahammar 1995, continued
11...\text{xc}3+ 12 \text{d}2 \text{wc}5 13 \text{b}1 \text{d}4 14 \text{c}3 \text{xe}2 15 \text{xe}2 \text{f}6 16 \text{b}5 \text{wc}6 17 0-0 \text{b}6 18 \text{xe}1 \text{xa}8 19 \text{e}7+ \text{c}7 20 \text{xf}7 \text{wc}6 21 \text{b}4 \text{b}7 22 \text{c}4 1-0) 12 \text{w}d3 \text{e}8 13 \text{d}2 (13 \text{f}1!? \text{d}6 14 \text{f}5 is also good) 13...d6 (Olejarszyk-Szewczak, Warsaw 1996, went 13...\text{d}4 14 0-0-0!? \text{f}2 15 \text{wb}5 \text{a}3+ 16 \text{b}1 \text{xe}h1 17 \text{xe}h1) 14 0-0-0 \text{f}5 15 \text{wb}5 \text{d}4 16 \text{wc}5 \text{xe}2+ 17 \text{b}2 \text{dxc}5 18 \text{e}3+ \text{d}7 19 \text{xc}5 b6 20 \text{d}6 \text{e}3 21 \text{h}1 \text{xc}3 22 \text{c}1 \text{d}4+ 23 \text{a}1 \text{c}3 24 \text{e}7 was crushing for White, S.Lalic-Dambrink, Haarlem 1994;
III) 7...\text{wc}2 8 \text{e}3 \text{wh}3 (8...\text{we}6 9 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 10 \text{xa}8 \text{xc}3 + 11 \text{bxc}3 b6 12 \text{f}4 \text{f}6 13 \text{wd}2 \text{h}6 14 0-0-0 was a disaster for Black in Just-Chocholka, Passau 1997) 9 \text{xc}7+ \text{d}8 10 \text{xa}8 (not 10 \text{f}4?! \text{f}6 11 \text{wd}3 \text{a}5 12 0-0-0 \text{xc}7 13 \text{xc}7+ \text{xc}7 14 \text{b}5+ \text{d}8 15 \text{h}1 \text{h}2 16 \text{d}6 \text{f}4+ 17 \text{b}1 \text{f}8, Farah-Gonzalo Zavalia, San Fernando 1992) 10...\text{f}6 (10...\text{d}5 11 \text{d}5 \text{f}6 12 \text{e}3) 11 \text{e}3 will transpose into the main line.

“Black offers the queen’s rook in return for an attack”, Lane.
“A critical moment. Although play in this line is delightfully
unclear, it seems to us that Black might do better by omitting this natural development in order to reserve a tempo for...a7-a6", Hall.

8...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xc7+?!

According to Lane, White should prefer the routine 8 0-0?; "White sensibly declines the proffered material and concentrates on his development".

After 8...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 White has three options:

A) 9 bxc3 ("Attack before structure!", Wells) 9...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 reaches a position covered in Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequels 13-15;

B) 9 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 ("If instead the pawn structure is kept intact, White's momentum would peter out", Lane) 9...\(\mathcal{W}\)d4 (more precise than 9...\(\mathcal{W}\)e5 10 \(\mathcal{A}\)e1 0-0 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)d3) 10 \(\mathcal{A}\)d3 (after 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b5?! \(\mathcal{W}\)xd1 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd1 \(\mathcal{A}\)d8 12 \(\mathcal{A}\)f4 d6 Black is at least not worse, Azmaiparashvili) 10...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 (10...0-0? is bad in view of 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b5 \(\mathcal{W}\)b6 12 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathcal{A}\)a5 13 c3 threatening 14 b4) 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathcal{W}\)h4 12 \(\mathcal{W}\)d2 (12 g3 can be answered by 12...\(\mathcal{W}\)h5! 13 \(\mathcal{W}\)xh5 \(\mathcal{A}\)xh5 14 \(\mathcal{A}\)d5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7) 12...h6 13 \(\mathcal{A}\)f4 d6 (13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)h5? 14 g3 \(\mathcal{W}\)h3 is shown to be careless by 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc7+! \(\mathcal{A}\)xc7 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b5+ \(\mathcal{A}\)d8 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)d6) 14 \(\mathcal{A}\)fe1 \(\mathcal{A}\)e6 (after 14...\(\mathcal{A}\)e8 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)b5 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe1+ 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe1 \(\mathcal{A}\)a6 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc7! \(\mathcal{A}\)xc7 18 \(\mathcal{A}\)c4 \(\mathcal{A}\)g4 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd6+ \(\mathcal{A}\)b6 20 \(\mathcal{F}\)f6 21 \(\mathcal{A}\)e4! \(\mathcal{A}\)xe4 22 \(\mathcal{W}\)e3+ \(\mathcal{A}\)d4 23 \(\mathcal{W}\)xd4+ \(\mathcal{A}\)c6 24 g3 Black is helpless) 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)ad1 and White has the initiative, Gutman;

C) 9 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc7+! seems White's most dangerous try, 9...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa8 \(\mathcal{A}\)e5 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)f3 \(\mathcal{W}\)f5 12 c3 h5 13 h3 \(\mathcal{A}\)b8 14 \(\mathcal{W}\)b3, and Black will be hard pressed to explain such a large material deficit, Gutman.

8...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 9 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa8 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg2

Boelhke-Petersen, Copenhagen 2000, continued 9...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d4?! 10 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)d3 \(\mathcal{W}\)c6 12 bxc3 \(\mathcal{W}\)xc3 13 \(\mathcal{A}\)f4 \(\mathcal{E}\)e6 14 \(\mathcal{A}\)d6 \(\mathcal{W}\)c6 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)f5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e8 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe6 \(\mathcal{X}\)xe6 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)b8 \(\mathcal{W}\)c5 18 \(\mathcal{W}\)f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 19 \(\mathcal{W}\)e3 1-0.

10 \(\mathcal{A}\)f3 \(\mathcal{W}\)h3

Alternatively:

I) 10...\(\mathcal{W}\)g6 11 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathcal{W}\)e8 allows White to establish control with 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f1 d6 13 h4, Gutman;

II) The more recent try, 10...\(\mathcal{A}\)xc3+ 11 bxc3 \(\mathcal{W}\)h3 12 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathcal{W}\)e8 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d2 (13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g1!? looks very good) 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e5 14 \(\mathcal{A}\)e2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e4+ 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)c1 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc3 16 \(\mathcal{W}\)d2 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe2 17 \(\mathcal{W}\)xe2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g4, Rada-Fajardo, Baranquilla 1999, could be powerfully met by 18 \(\mathcal{W}\)c4! \(\mathcal{A}\)xe3 19 \(\mathcal{W}\)c7+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 20 \(\mathcal{A}\)e1 \(\mathcal{A}\)f8 21 \(\mathcal{W}\)c5+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)g8 22 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe3, Gutman.

11 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3

11 \(\mathcal{A}\)g5!? \(\mathcal{W}\)e8+ 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d2 is also difficult to meet, for instance:

A) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d4 13 \(\mathcal{A}\)g4 \(\mathcal{W}\)g2 is best answered by 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1!;

B) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c1 \(\mathcal{W}\)f5 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g1!? (14 \(\mathcal{A}\)xf6+ \(\mathcal{A}\)xf6 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)e4 \(\mathcal{W}\)f4+ 16 \(\mathcal{W}\)d2 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc3 17 \(\mathcal{W}\)xf4 \(\mathcal{A}\)xf4 was played in Kohvakka-Auvinen, Helsinki 1997, when 18 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc6! still would have secured a plus for White) 14...\(\mathcal{A}\)xc3 15 bxc3 leads to a decisive advantage for White;

C) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e5 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d5 \(\mathcal{W}\)f5 14 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)eg4 15 \(\mathcal{W}\)f3 h6 (or 15...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e3 16 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg4 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg4 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe3 \(\mathcal{A}\)c5+ 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d2) 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)xf6+ \(\mathcal{A}\)xf6 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)b3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e4+ 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c1 \(\mathcal{A}\)xc3 19 bxc3 b6 20 \(\mathcal{A}\)e1 \(\mathcal{A}\)b7 21 \(\mathcal{A}\)xb6 axb6 22 \(\mathcal{W}\)e3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c7 23 \(\mathcal{B}\)b2 and Black has insufficient compensation for the exchange, Gutman.
11...\textit{\texttt{Ke}}8

"There is a very nineteenth century feel to some of these lines and White should beware how quickly the initiative can pass if he places material before attack", Wells.

12 \textit{\texttt{Qg}}1!

This is the simplest refutation of Black's play. Instead, "Azmaiparashvili gives the instructive line 12 \textit{\texttt{Qxc6 bx}}c6 (not 12...\textit{\texttt{Kxe}}3++? 13 fxe3 \textit{\texttt{Wxe}}3+ 14 \textit{\texttt{We}}2 \textit{\texttt{Qxc3+}} 15 bxc3 \textit{\texttt{Wxc3+}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qf2, Lane}) 13 \textit{\texttt{We}}2 \textit{\texttt{Qd}}5 14 0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{Qxe}}3 15 fxe3 \textit{\texttt{Wxe}}3+ 16 \textit{\texttt{Wxe3 Qxe3}} when the knight is not coming out and the bishop-pair stands Black in good stead", Wells.

12...\textit{\texttt{Qe}}5 13 \textit{\texttt{Qg}}3 \textit{\texttt{Wxh}}2

Baudoin-Brake, corr. 1991, went 13...\textit{\texttt{We}}6 14 \textit{\texttt{Qg2 Qc4}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Qd4 Wa6}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qxg7 Qe6}} 17 \textit{\texttt{Qxf7 1-0.}}

14 \textit{\texttt{We2?! Qxf3+}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Wxf3 Qe4}} 16 0-0-0

White has a king evacuated to a safe zone and a material plus, Gutman.

"The defensive power of the king must not be underrated. If the hostile king retains mobility, he will simply flee and finally reach a point of comparative safety", Lasker.

Sequel 2

(1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\texttt{Qf3 Qc6}} 3 d4 exd4 4 \textit{\texttt{Qxd4 Wh4}} 5 \textit{\texttt{Qc3 Qb4}} 6 \textit{\texttt{Qdb5 We4+}} 7 \textit{\texttt{Qe2}})

7...\textit{\texttt{Qd8}}

Not a very usual continuation.

8 0-0 \textit{\texttt{Qxc3}}

There are some other moves:

I) 8...\textit{\texttt{We5?}} 9 \textit{\texttt{Qd5 Qf6}} (9...\textit{\texttt{Qa5}} 10 \textit{\texttt{Qf4 We4}} 11 \textit{\texttt{Qbxc7 Qb8}} 12 c3 \textit{\texttt{Qge7}} 13 \textit{\texttt{Qd3 1-0, Conde-Kish, e-mail game 1998}}) 10 \textit{\texttt{Qbxc7 Qxd5}} 11 \textit{\texttt{Qxd5 Qa5}} 12 c3 \textit{\texttt{Qe8}} 13 \textit{\texttt{Qf3 g5}} 14 \textit{\texttt{Wd3 Qg7}} 15 b4 and White has an overwhelming position, Antonio Nusez-Arabi Ahmed, Spain 1993;

II) 8...\textit{\texttt{We6}} 9 \textit{\texttt{Qd5 Qa5}} 10 \textit{\texttt{Qd2!}}

\textit{\texttt{Qb6}} (or 10...\textit{\texttt{Qf6}} 11 \textit{\texttt{Qxa5 Qxd5}} 12 \textit{\texttt{Qg4}) 11 Qc3 f6} 12 \textit{\texttt{Qg4 Wf7}} 13 \textit{\texttt{Qe1 Qge7}} with two options:

A) 14 \textit{\texttt{Qf3 Qxd5}} (Vetter-Pinto, corr. 1996, went 14...\textit{\texttt{Qd6?!}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Qxd6 cxd6}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qxe7 Qxe7}} 17 \textit{\texttt{Qxd6+}} 18 \textit{\texttt{Qxb7 Qc8}} 19 \textit{\texttt{Qd3 Qb8}} 20 \textit{\texttt{Qc6 Qc7}} 21 \textit{\texttt{Qg3+}} 22 \textit{\texttt{Qd6}} 22 \textit{\texttt{Qad1}}

\textit{\texttt{Qc5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{Qd4 Qxc6}} 24 \textit{\texttt{Qxe5 Qc4}} 25 \textit{\texttt{Qe7 Qg6}} 26 \textit{\texttt{Wf3+}} 1-0 15 \textit{\texttt{Qxd5 Qg6}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qe4 f5}} 17 \textit{\texttt{Qxc6 bxc6}} 18 \textit{\texttt{Qd4 Qe8}} 19 \textit{\texttt{Qf3}}, when White keeps the initiative, Gutman;
B) 14 \(\text{Qf4}!\) is more forceful, 14...d6 15 \(\text{Qe}6+\) (15 \(\text{Qe}6\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxe6}\) + \(\text{Qc8}\) 17 \(\text{Qxd6}\) also favours White) 15...\(\text{Qxe6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 17 \(\text{Qxd6}\) cxd6 18 \(\text{Qxd6}\) + \(\text{Qe}8\) 19 \(\text{Qd7}\) + \(\text{Qf7}\) 20 \(\text{Qe}6+\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 21 \(\text{Qb}4\) \(\text{Qf7}\) 22 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 23 \(\text{Qxe6}\) bxc6 24 \(\text{Qxe7}\) + \(\text{Qf7}\) 25 \(\text{Qae1}\) \(\text{Qhe8}\) 26 \(\text{Qxe2}\) giving White a clear endgame advantage, Gutman. 9 \(\text{Qxc3}\)!

Alternatively:

I) 9 bxc3 will go into Sequels 5-15;

II) 9 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) (9...\(\text{Qh}4\) 10 \(\text{Qxc3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) is insufficient on account of 11\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{Wh}3\) 12 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 13 \(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{We}6\) 14 \(\text{He}1\)) 10 \(\text{Qxc3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 11 \(\text{Qc3}\) d6 12 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{He}8\) 13 \(\text{Qfe}1\) (13 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{Qe}7!\)) 14 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 15 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\) 16 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Wd}8\) 17 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 18 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 19 \(\text{Qg}3\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 20 \(\text{Qfe}1\) \(\text{Qe}6\) was fine for Black in Dukaczewski-Heidenfeld, Erevan Olympiad 1996) 13...\(\text{Qe}5\) 14 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qg}6\) leaves Black with a very playable position, Gutman.

9...\(\text{Wd}4\)

Here are two examples with Black employing differing strategies:

I) 9...\(\text{Wg}6\) 10 \(\text{Qd}3\) f5 11 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 12 \(\text{Wd}2\) a6 13 \(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 14 \(\text{Qfe}1\) d6 15 \(\text{Qxe}8+\) \(\text{Qxe}8\) 16 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 17 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 18 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 19 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 20 \(\text{Qxd}5\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 21 \(\text{Qe}6\) h6 22 \(\text{Qxd}6\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 23 \(\text{Qxf}5\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 24 \(\text{Qe}6\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 25 \(\text{Qg}3\) 1-0, Cibulka-Hromada, Prague 1966;

II) 9...\(\text{Wh}4\) 10 \(\text{Qd}5!\) (10 \(\text{Qd}3\) d6 11 \(\text{Qe}4\) f6 12 g3 \(\text{Qg}4\) 13 f3 \(\text{Wh}5\) 14 \(\text{He}1\) \(\text{Qge}7\) 15 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 16 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Wd}5\) lead to a position in which Black probably has the slightly better chances, Harman-Bouchaud, Hastings 1995/96) 10...\(\text{Qe}7\) 11 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qf}6\) (11...\(\text{f}6\) 12 \(\text{Qf}4\)) 12 \(\text{Wd}2\) yields pressure for White, Gutman.

10 \(\text{Qe}1!\)?

There are two continuations, which are less impressive:

I) 10 \(\text{Qd}2\) a6!? ("We can find grounds for dismissing 7...\(\text{Qd}8\) in the game Schönmann-Pulvermacher corr. 1938: 10...\(\text{d}6\) 11 \(\text{Qb}5!\) \(\text{Wh}4\) 12 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 13 \(\text{Qxd}6\) cxd6 14 \(\text{Qxd}6+\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 15 \(\text{Qxg}7\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 16 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{Wb}4\) 17 \(\text{Wh}6\) \(\text{Qc}7\) 18 \(\text{Qfe}1\) f6 19 \(\text{Qxh}7\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 20 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 21 \(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{Qxg}7\) 22 \(\text{Wxg}7\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) 23 a3 \(\text{Qc}5\) 24 b4 1-0", Botterill/Harding) 11 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 12 \(\text{Qe}3\) (12 \(\text{He}1\) \(\text{Qe}8\)?) 12...\(\text{Wh}4\) 13 \(\text{Wd}2\) h6 14 \(\text{Qfe}1\) d6 when Black has a defensible position, Gutman;

II) 10 \(\text{Qd}3\) seems more natural.

Black has a choice:

A) 10...\(\text{Qf}6\) 11 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Wh}4\) reaches a position after 7...\(\text{Qf}6\) 8 0-0 \(\text{Qxc3}\) 9 \(\text{Qxc3}\) \(\text{Qd}4\) 10 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qd}8\), covered in Sequel 1;

B) 10...\(\text{Qge}7\) 11 \(\text{Wh}5!?\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 12 \(\text{Wxh}7\) d6 13 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 14 \(\text{Qfe}1!\) (14 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 15 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 16 \(\text{Wh}4\) \(\text{Wh}8\) 17 \(\text{Wf}4\) \(\text{Qxf}4\) 18 \(\text{Qxf}4\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 19

"Black, although cramped, has no obvious weaknesses and Black’s king has the necessary pawn shield. White should attempt to increase his spatial advantage. By developing and placing his pieces on better squares, he can then decide how to get at Black’s position", Yasser Seirawan.
 blacks 26 28 a6 20 2e2 2ae8 21 a3 c3c8 led
to equality in Berthelot-Bouton,
Paris 1993) 14...g6 (14...d7?! 15
2e4) 15 w4h4 wh4h4 16 xh4 with
an edge for White, thanks to his
strong dark-squared bishop,
Gutman;
C) 10...d6!? is more exact; 11 2e3
wh4 12 w2d2 h6 13 2fe1 2f6
would be satisfactory for Black,
Gutman.
10...2ge7
After 10...2f6 11 2e3 wh4 12 w2d2
h6 13 2ad1 a6 (13...d6 14 2b5) 14
f4 2g4 15 xg4 xg4 16 2d5 all
of White’s pieces are in the attack.
11 2e3 wh4 12 w2d2 h6
12...f6 can be met by 13 f4 d6 14
2f2 wh6 15 2ad1.
13 f4
13 2ad1 d6 14 2b5 2f5 15 2f4 a6
16 2xc7 2xc7 17 2xd6+ 2xd6 18
whd6+ 2b6 leads nowhere.
13...d6 14 2f2
14 2ad1 is less effective in view of
14...g4 15 2f2 wh5 16 xg4
xg4 17 2b5 wd7!.
14...wf6 15 b4! a6 16 a4

Sequel 3
(1 e4 e5 2 2f3 2c6 3 d4 exd4 4
2xd4 wh4 5 2c3 2b4 6 2db5
wx4+ 7 2e2)
7...xc3+ 8 2xc3

“Admittedly, White can avoid
coming to a disadvantage. But it is
doubtful if he can hope to gain any
advantage in this way. When one
combines this with the possibilities
of improvement at Black’s 8th turn,
it emerges that 5 2c3 does not
threaten to chastise Black for his
audacity”, Botterill/Harding.
8...wd4
“This is the move usually given, but
it isn’t all that clear that it’s the best.
Black may, very soberly, play
8...we7, ready to meet 9 2d5
(another method is 9 0-0!? wd8 10
2e1 2ge7 11 2d3 0-0 12 wh5 and
Black is overwhelmed, Gutman)
with 9...wd8, as recommended by
Schlechter”, Botterill/Harding.
This variation was indicated by
Steinitz, in every case, after 10 0-0
d6 11 2e1 2ge7 12 2g5 White has
a decisive attack, Gutman.
9 2d3
9 2d2 a6 10 0-0 2ge7 11 2d3 is
too slow, 11...d5 12 2g5 (or 12 2e1
2g4 13 wc1 0-0 14 2e3 wb4)
12...\( \text{Ag4} \) 13 \( \text{Wd2} \) 0-0-0 14 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) looks highly reliable for Black, Gutman.

9...\( \text{Qb4}?! \)

"Black must react quickly before he is overrun", Botterill/Harding.

Insufficient is 9...\( \text{Qge7} \) 10 0-0 a6 (10...0-0 11 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Wb6} \) 12 \( \text{Ke3} \) \( \text{Wa5} \) 13 c3 \( \text{Qd5} \) 14 b4 \( \text{Qxc3} \) 15 \( \text{Qxh7}+ \) \( \text{Kh8} \) 16 \( \text{Wh5} \) and wins — analysis by Steinitz) 11 \( \text{Fe1}! \) (11 \( \text{Wh5} \), suggested by Steinitz, "should also be good for White — but by that stage has to be tried", Botterill/Harding. I doubt whether it is really very promising in view of 11...d6 12 \( \text{Ke1} \) \( \text{Wg4} \), when Black has a solid pawn ahead) 11...d6 (Kuhn-Sewerin, corr. 1986, went 11...0-0? 12 \( \text{Qxe7} \) 1-0) 12 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 13 \( \text{Wd2} \) 0-0-0 14 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 15 b4 d5 16 \( \text{Qee1} \) h6 17 \( \text{Qh4} \) and White put strong pressure on Black’s king position, Gutman.

10 0-0!

"With 10 \( \text{Qb5} \) we continue to follow an analysis by Steinitz that has been refuted by Boris Chaplinsky", Botterill/Harding.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{\( \text{Qf1} \) 0-0, Wedemeyer-Schirmer, corr. 1987, 15 c4! \( \text{Qb4} \) 16 \( \text{Qxh7}+ \) \( \text{Qxh7} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe7} \) would be excellent for White) 13 \( \text{Qf4} \) d6, and the endgame is fine for Black, Gutman.}
\]

A2) 11 \( \text{Qe3} \) c6 12 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxd3}+ \) 13 \( \text{Qxd3} \) d5 14 0-0-0 \( \text{Qf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qe1} \) 0-0 should hold for Black, Chaplinsky; A3) 11 \( \text{Qe2}! \), retaining the bishop pair, seems more consequent. 11...a6 12 \( \text{Qd2} \) (White must play energetically as 12 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 13 0-0 0-0 14 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 15 \( \text{Qe3} \) d6 will allow Black to consolidate) 12...\( \text{axb5} \) (12...\( \text{Qd5} \) 13 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qgf6} \) 14 0-0 0-0 15 \( \text{Qe1} \) is also quite unpleasant for Black) 13 \( \text{Qxb4} \) with good attacking chances for White after 13...\( \text{Qe4} \) (13...\( \text{Wxb2} \) 14 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{We5} \) 15 0-0 is no better) 14 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Wxg2} \) 15 \( \text{Qe3}+ \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{Qxa2} \) 17 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Ma6} \) 18 \( \text{Mgl} \), Gutman."

B) 10...\( \text{Qxd3}+ \) is the critical line, when White has a choice:

B1) 11 \( \text{Qxd3} \) \( \text{Wb4}+ \) (11...\( \text{Qe5}+ \) is bad due to 12 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qxe2}+ \) 13 \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 14 \( \text{Qf4} \) d6 15 \( \text{Qac1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 \( \text{Qxc7} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 17 \( \text{Qd5} \) 12 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 a3 \( \text{Qh4} \) 14 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) (14...\( \text{Qd5} \) 15 \( \text{Qf3} \) 0-0 16 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qe8}+ \) 17 \( \text{Qe3}! \) \( \text{Qxe3}+ \) 18 \( \text{Qf1} \) is less clear) 15 0-0 a6 and White achieves nothing, Gutman;

B2) 11 \( \text{Qxd3}?! \) leaves Black with two options:

B2a) 11...\( \text{Qe5}+ \) 12 \( \text{Qe3} \) (12 \( \text{Qd1} \), indicated by Steinitz, also isn’t bad since 12...\( \text{Qd8} \) 13 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 14 \( \text{Qf4} \) d6 15 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 16 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 17 \( \text{Qe8}+ \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 18 b4 is crushing for White) 12...a6 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) seems hopeless for Black, Gutman;

B2b) 11...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd3} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 13 \( \text{Qf4} \) d6 14 \( \text{Qc1} \) is forced.

Black now has two possibilities:

A) 10...\( \text{Qe5}+ \) with a further split:

A1) 11 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qxe2}+ \) 12 \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) (after 12...\( \text{Qd5}?! \) 13 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 14...
“Steinitz evaluated this position as being considerably in White’s favour — an understandable view when one considers the imminent doom of Black’s c7-pawn. However, the Soviet analyst Chaplinsky has overturned this verdict by citing the further continuation 14...\( \mathcal{Q}\)d7 15 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xc7 \( \mathcal{Q}\)c8 so that after 16 \( \mathcal{Q}\)d5 (or 16 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xd6 \( \mathcal{Q}\)c6 17 d4 \( \mathcal{Q}\)d7 18 \( \mathcal{Q}\)f4 \( \mathcal{Q}\)f6) 16...\( \mathcal{Q}\)xc1+ 17 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xc1 \( \mathcal{Q}\)c6 Black has at the very least an even game in both cases”, Botterill/Harding.

And now the example: Aberg-Carlhammar, Helsingborg 1991, continued 18 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e3 \( \mathcal{Q}\)f6 19 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}\)d7 20 b3 \( \mathcal{Q}\)d5 21 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xd5 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xd5 22 \( \mathcal{Q}\)b2 \( \mathcal{Q}\)c8 23 \( \mathcal{Q}\)c1 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xc1+ 24 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xc1 with a draw.

10...\( \mathcal{Q}\)xd3 11 cxd3!? 11...\( \mathcal{Q}\)e7 runs into the disruptive 12 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e1.

12 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e3 \( \mathcal{W}\)g4 13 f3 \( \mathcal{W}\)f5 Repp-Grube, corr. 1989, went 13...\( \mathcal{W}\)d7 14 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e1 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e7 15 \( \mathcal{Q}\)g5 \( \mathcal{f}\)6 16 \( \mathcal{Q}\)d5 \( \mathcal{f}\)xg5 17 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xe7+ \( \mathcal{W}\)xe7 18 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xe7 \( \mathcal{Q}\)xe7 19 \( \mathcal{W}\)e2+ 1-0.

14 \( \mathcal{Q}\)e1

White can play on both sides of the board, and has full compensation for his sacrificed pawn, Gutman.
Sequel 4
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 c3 d4 exd4 4 d4 Wh4 5 c3 b4 6 db5 Whx4+ 7 e2 xc3+ 8 xc3)
8...Wxg2!

This seems the best way of cutting across White’s plans.
9 f3
9 Whd5 Wxd5 10 Qxd5 Qd8 11 Qg1 g6 (not 11...Qd4? 12 Qxg7 Qxc2+ 13 d1 Qxa1 14 Qg5+ f6 15 Qxf6 h6 16 Qh4 and Black is helpless) 12 Qg5+ Qce7 13 Qxe7 (13 0-0-0 d6)
13...Qxe7 14 Qf6 Qe8 does not give White compensation for the two pawns, Gutman.
9...Wg6!
9...Wh3+! 10 Qd5 (10 Qg1!! Wxh2 11 Qg3 is also quite promising as 11...Qd6 12 Qg5 Qd8 13 Qxc6 bxc6 14 Whf3 shows, Gutman) and now:
A) After 10...Qd8 11 Qf4 d6 12 Qxc7! Qxc7 13 Wxd6+ Qb6 14 Qe3+ Wa5 15 Wc5+ (15 Wa3+ Qb5 16 Qe2 mate, Gutman) 15...b5 16 Qd2+ “White mates in two more moves”, Steinitz, Modern Chess Instructor;
B) “However, we find it hard to see how White is to meet 10...Qc5”, Botterill/Harding; in my opinion
11 Qe2 Qd8 12 Qf4 Wg2 13 Qf1 f6 14 Wd4 d6 15 0-0-0 gives White a crushing attack, Gutman;
C) 10...We6+ 11 Qf1 Qd8 12 Qg1 g6 (or 12...Wh3+ 13 Qg2 Wh4 14 Qf4) 13 Qg4 f5 14 Qg5+ Qge7 15 Wd2 Re8 16 Re1 and Black is lost, Harding, Mega Corr CD 1999.
10 Wf2+!

Two more moves are worth consideration:
I) 10 Qd5 looks like an ideal destination for the knight.

Black has a choice:
A) Hayes-Reisttein, corr. 1995, continued 10...Qe6+?! 11 Qe3 Qd8 12 Wf2 (12 Wd2 is also good, after 12...Qf6 13 Qxf6 gxf6 14 Qd5 Wf7 15 0-0-0 d6 16 Whc3 Qe5, Bobovnik-Bross, Oberhausen 1995, 17 f4! would have been decisive) 12...Qge7 13 0-0-0 d6 14 Whg1 g6 15 Whc4 f6 16 Qd4 Re8 17 Qge1 Whf5 18 Qxe7 Whf3 19 Qe3 Whf5 20 Qxf6+ 1-0;
B) 10...Qd8 11 Qf4 d6 12 Wd2 (or 12 h4 Qg4! 13 Qxg4 Wh4+ 14 Qd2 Wxd5+) 12...Qg4! was indicated by Bruno Parma.
After 13 Qxg4 (13 Qg2 Qge7 14 Qe3 Qe8 15 f3 Qe6 16 Qf2 Wf6 17 Qxd6 cxd6 18 Wxd6+ Qd7 0-1,
Koronowski-Keller, corr. 1980)
13...\textbf{we}4+! (whilst 13...\textbf{wxg}4? courts disaster, 14 \textbf{dx}c7! \textbf{xc}7 15 \textbf{wdx}6+ \textbf{db}6 16 \textbf{ae}3+ \textbf{da}6 17
\textbf{wa}3+ \textbf{a}a5 18 \textbf{b}b4 \textbf{wf}5 19 \textbf{hg}1 \textbf{we}5 20 \textbf{xb}1 and Black's king becomes a hunted fugitive) 14 \textbf{ce}2 \textbf{wxh}1+ 15
\textbf{a}f1 \textbf{we}4+ 16 \textbf{ae}3 \textbf{dg}e7 Black has a winning advantage, Gutman.
II) 10 \textbf{ae}4 is a waste of time.

10...\textbf{f}5 (the meek 10...\textbf{we}6 11 0-0 \textbf{af}6 12 \textbf{ae}1 \textbf{af}8 13 \textbf{ag}2 \textbf{w}f5 14
\textbf{we}2 allows White to execute his idea unhindered) 11 \textbf{af}3 \textbf{we}6+ (less advisable is 11...\textbf{af}6 12 \textbf{ad}5 \textbf{ad}8 13
\textbf{af}4 \textbf{ad}5 14 \textbf{we}d5 \textbf{ae}8+ 15
\textbf{af}1 \textbf{w}f6 16 \textbf{ag}1 \textbf{h}6 17 \textbf{ah}5) 12
\textbf{ae}3 (12 \textbf{af}1 can be met by the annoying 12...\textbf{b}6) 12...\textbf{af}6 13 0-0 (or
13 \textbf{ad}5 \textbf{ad}5 14 \textbf{ad}5 \textbf{we}5) 13...\textbf{ae}5 (more precise than 13...0-0 14
\textbf{ad}5) 14 \textbf{ae}1 (14 \textbf{ab}5 \textbf{xb}3+ 15
\textbf{wx}f3 \textbf{wc}4) 14...0-0 15 \textbf{ag}2 06 leaves White with insufficient compensation, Gutman.
10...\textbf{ge}7
10...\textbf{we}6 11 \textbf{ae}3 (11 \textbf{ad}5 \textbf{w}xe2+ 12 \textbf{a}xe2 \textbf{d}8 favours Black) 11...\textbf{af}6 12 0-0 0-0 0-0 13 \textbf{ad}5
\textbf{ad}5 14 \textbf{wx}d5 \textbf{wf}5 15 \textbf{hg}1 yields White strong pressure, Gutman.
11 \textbf{ae}3

11...\textbf{ae}5
11...0-0 12 0-0 0-0 a6 is too passive,
13 \textbf{hg}1 \textbf{w}f6 14 \textbf{xa}c6 \textbf{xc}6 15
\textbf{xcg}7+ 1-0, Coffield-Saleh, corr.
1997.
12 0-0-0 \textbf{af}x\textbf{f}3 13 \textbf{wx}f3 \textbf{d}6
13...\textbf{w}c6 seems playable, 14 \textbf{w}g3
\textbf{ag}8 15 \textbf{a}g5!? (15 \textbf{hh}1 \textbf{d}6 16 \textbf{ag}5
\textbf{ae}6 17 \textbf{wh}\textbf{h}4 \textbf{wd}7 18 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{f}6 19 \textbf{ax}f6
\textbf{gx}f6 20 \textbf{wx}f6 \textbf{ae}7 21 \textbf{f}5 \textbf{ff}8 22
\textbf{wh}4 0-0-0 23 \textbf{xee}7 \textbf{wx}f5 maintains an edge for Black) 15...f6 16 \textbf{hh}1
\textbf{gd}8 17 \textbf{hx}e7 \textbf{xe}7 18 \textbf{dd}5+ \textbf{ff}7
19 \textbf{xc}d7 \textbf{bb}8 20 \textbf{wb}3+ \textbf{d}5 21 \textbf{xd}5
\textbf{gg}6 22 \textbf{dd}3+ \textbf{ff}7 23 \textbf{bb}3 should lead to a draw by repetition,
Gutman.
14 \textbf{bb}5?!
14 \textbf{hh}1 \textbf{w}f5 15 \textbf{we}2 \textbf{dd}7 16 \textbf{xcg}7
0-0-0 17 \textbf{xa}x7 \textbf{dd}6 18 \textbf{ee}3 \textbf{hh}8 causes no problems for Black,
Gutman.
14...\textbf{dd}8 15 \textbf{hh}1 \textbf{w}f5 16 \textbf{ee}2
\textbf{dd}7 17 \textbf{dd}4 \textbf{ee}5 18 \textbf{w}f3 \textbf{wd}5 19
\textbf{xcg}7 \textbf{wx}f3 20 \textbf{wx}f3 \textbf{dd}5 21 \textbf{xe}7
\textbf{ee}8 22 \textbf{ff}6 \textbf{ff}8
The chances are equal, Gutman.
"All the rest is speculative and is meant to be so and must in no way be considered as having gone through the mill of criticism and experience ", Lasker.
Sequel 5
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash w}h4 5 d3 b4 6 db5 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xe4+ 7 e2 xc3+)

8 bxc3!!?

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

"Of course, White can also play 8 bxc3", Botterill/Harding.

"It is more logical for White to deprive his opponent of castling rights with 8 bxc3!. Normally White would avoid saddling himself with doubled pawns in this fashion, but here they give White attacking options on the b-file while the important d4-square is controlled", Lane.

8...d8

"Now forced. Frankly, one can only say that the situation is unclear, but we doubt whether White has enough compensation for the pawn here", Botterill/Harding.

"Black's bedrock pawn-formation forms a solid defensive wall that White cannot hope to easily breach. However, the open d-file presents obvious attacking prospects and White has to strike quickly, before Black can organise himself", Larry Christiansen, Storming the Barricades.

Black is now always going to have some problems finding a per-

manently safe haven for his king, though:

"Either side can launch an attack from his strength, but must reckon on a counterattack against his weakness, and the rule is that once an attack has been repulsed, the counterattack is generally decisive (Richard Réti)", Mihai Suba, Dynamic Chess Strategy.

9 0-0

9 a3 is not very convincing.

Black has a choice:

A) 9...a6? is virtual suicide in view of 10 xc7! xc7 11 d6+ d8 12 f8+ e8 13 xg7 g7 14 f6 g8 15 h5 d5 (15...f8 16 c5 g7 loses immediately due to 17 xf7! threatening 18 b6 mate) 16 0-0-0 e6 17 he1 g6 18 xg6 hxg6 19 c4 and White has a dangerous initiative, Dszubasz-Salzmann, Jena 1984;

B) "However, we think Black can go the whole hog with 9...xg2! 10 f3 g6 11 f1 (11 d4 g7) 11...f6 12 b1 g7 13 d4 e8, and Black has a winning advantage", Hall.

9...d6

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

A daring move provoking complications, since Black will experience
some difficulties owing to the dominant white knight on b5 and the threat of a very dangerous sacrifice on d6.

10 \f3
10 \a3 now deserves more attention.

Black has to try:
A) 10...\e6? is ruled out by 11 \xc7! \xc7 12 \xd6+ \c8 13 \f3 \e5 14 \f8+ \d8 15 \fd1 \f6 16 \c5+ \b8 17 \d6+ \c8 18 \xb7 \xb7 19 \c6+ \b8 20 \d6+ 1-0, Dufek-Lamser, Germany 1994;
B) 10...\w6 11 \h5 \f6 (David-Germann, German Women's Bundesliga, 1999, went 11...\f5 12 \xc7 \xc7 13 \xd6+ \b6 14 \ab1+ \a5 15 \c1 b5 16 \e3 \xc2 17 \xc6 \b8 18 \c7+ 1-0) 12 \xd6! \xd6 13 \xd6 \d7 14 \xf7+ \c7 15 \d3! \g6 16 \g3+ \c8 17 \d6+ \d8 18 \xb7 \c8 19 \d6+ \d8 20 \f3 with a crushing attack, Gutman;
C) Black's best response may well be 10...\w6!? 11 \e1 \f6 when 12 \c4 (or 12 \d4 \d5 13 \f3 \c4) 12...\a6 13 \c3 \e8 14 \d5 \e5 leads nowhere for White, Gutman.

10...\w6

The sacrifices on d6 must be prevented:
I) 10...\w4? 11 \xc6 \bxc6 12 \xd6 \xd6 13 \w6+, and Black is helpless;
II) 10...\c4? is refuted by 11 \xd6! \xd6 12 \xd6+ \e8 13 \d5 \w4 14 \a3 \c7 15 \f1 \w7 16 \w5 \f8 17 \d1 \e8 18 \f4, Gutman.

11 \e1

The most popular continuation.

Alternatively:
D) 11 \d4 is less ambitious, 11...\xd4 12 \xd4 \f6 13 \b1 \f5 14 \xb7 \xc2 15 \w2 \e4 16 \xe4 \xe4 17 \w4 \c8 18 \b5 \e8 19 \g5 a6 20 \a5 and Black could defend adequately with 20...\d7 (while 20...\d5? 21 \w4 \d6 22 \w7 23 \e3 was better for White, Mittelberger-Donev, Germany 1998) 21 \w3 (or 21 \c4 \f6 22 \e3 \d6) 21...\w7 22 \c1 \f6 23 \f4 \d8, Gutman;
II) 11 \g5+!? (a computer will not find this, Markus Domanski) appears more impressive.

11...\w5 (better than 11...\f6 12 \f4 with the idea 13 \c6 or 11...\ge7 12 \e1! intending 13 \d6) 12 \xd6 \xd6 13 \w6+ \d7 14 \xc6 \xc6 15 \f3+ \e8 16 \f1 \c7 (16...\d7? loses instantly to 17 \d1 \c7 18 \d6+) 17 \xe8 \xe8 18 \w8 \w8 (instead Domanski-Woschkat, corr. 1997, continued 18...\w7? 19 \w5 \w5 20 \d1 1-0) 19 \w5+ \w6 20 \w7 \f6 21 \g3+ \w6 and White must be content with a draw by repetition after 22 \w7 (since 22 \w3 \c6 can only be good for Black) 22...\w6. Since White's brutal approach seems to be good
for a draw only, is 9...d6 really an option for Black?", Domanski, New in Chess Yearbook 46, 1998.
11...a6!
"Coolly pushing back the invader knight", Hall.
11...\[d7?? 13 \[f5 16 \[f4 b5 (16...\[c8 17 \[xh7 \[d8 18 \[c7+ 1-0, Dovzisik-Nemes, Nuirsegui Torna 1998) 17 \[d5 \[c8 18 \[c5 \[f6 19 a4 and White has a dangerous attack, Gutman;"

B) K.Müller-Heidenfeld, blitz game, Germany 1999, continued 12...\[d7 13 \[h5 \[f6 14 \[d2 h6 15 \[b1 g5 16 \[xd6! cxd6 17 \[xd6 \[b8 18 \[bd1 \[c7 19 \[e4 \[f5 when 20 \[d6+ \[c8 21 \[g3 should be decisive;

C) 12...\[f5!? 13 c4!? (after 13 \[d2 a6 14 \[d4 \[fxd4 15 cxd4 \[g4 16 \[xg4 \[xg4 17 \[a1, Escholz-Müller, corr. 1999, 17...\[d7?? 18 \[xb7 \[he8 19 \[bb1 \[e1+ 20 \[xe1 \[e8 21 \[xe8 \[xe8 22 d5 \[e7 23 f3 \[f5 24 e4 \[d7 would

have been close to equalising)
13...a6 (13...\[h4 14 \[d5 \[e6 fails due to 15 \[xd6 cxd6 16 \[xh6 14 \[c3 \[fd4 15 \[xh6 \[xc6 \[xh6 16 c5 is clearly in White's favour, Gutman.
12 \[d4

There are three possibilities:
A) 12...a6 13 \[xd6 cxd6 14 \[xd6 \[d7 15 \[b1 \[f5 16 \[f4 b5 (16...\[c8 17 \[xb7 \[d8 18 \[c7+ 1-0, Dovzisik-Nemes, Nuirsegui Torna 1998) 17 \[d5 \[c8 18 \[c5 \[f6 19 a4 and White has a dangerous attack, Gutman;"

B) K.Müller-Heidenfeld, blitz game, Germany 1999, continued 12...\[d7 13 \[h5 \[f6 14 \[d2 h6 15 \[b1 g5 16 \[xd6! cxd6 17 \[xd6 \[b8 18 \[bd1 \[c7 19 \[e4 \[f5 when 20 \[d6+ \[c8 21 \[g3 should be decisive;

C) 12...\[f5!? 13 c4!? (after 13 \[d2 a6 14 \[d4 \[fxd4 15 cxd4 \[g4 16 \[xg4 \[xg4 17 \[a1, Escholz-Müller, corr. 1999, 17...\[d7?? 18 \[xb7 \[he8 19 \[bb1 \[e1+ 20 \[xe1 \[e8 21 \[xe8 \[xe8 22 d5 \[e7 23 f3 \[f5 24 e4 \[d7 would

12...\[xd4!?
The immediate capture is safer than
12...\[ge7 13 \[xb1 \[e8 14 \[f4! (14 \[h4 h6 15 \[we2 \[d7 16 h5 \[f6 17 \[xb7 \[xd4 18 \[cxd4 \[f5 19 \[e3 \[xd4 20 \[xd4 \[xd4 was fine for Black, Walther-Pock, corr. 1994; while 14 \[e3 will transpose into the variation 9...\[ge7 10 \[e3 a6 11 \[d4 d6 12 \[f3 \[g6 13 \[b1 \[e8 14 \[e1 — Sequel 11) 14...\[f6 (Sepp-Killti, Laukka 1998, continued 14...\[xd4 15 \[xd4!?, keeping the pressure on the open d-file, 15...\[c6 16 \[d2 \[xe1+ 17 \[xe1 \[d7 18 c4 b6 19 \[e4 \[h5 20 \[xd6 cxd6 21 \[xc6 \[c8 22 \[d5 with advantage for White) 15 \[d2 h6 16 \[g3 \[xd4 (16...\[g5 17 \[d3) 17 \[cxd4 \[f5 18 \[xe8+ \[xg8 19 \[xb7 \[xb7 20 \[xb7 \[xd4 21 \[xc7 \[xb5 22 \[we1+ \[f8 23 \[xc6 \[e8, Astaschin-Ivannikov, USSR 1978, and now 24 \[f1! would have secured an edge for White.
13 cxd4 \( \square f6 \)!
13...\( \square e7 \) reaches a position after 9...a6 10 \( \square d4 \) \( \square x d4 \) 11 cxd4 \( \square e7 \) 12 \( \square e1 \) \( \square g6 \) 13 \( \check{\square} f3 \) d6, covered in Sequel 7.

14 \( \check{\square} b1 \) \( \check{\square} b8 \) 15 \( \check{\square} c6 \)
15 \( \check{\square} b3 \) can be met by 15...\( \check{\square} e8 \) 16 \( \check{\square} x e8+ \) \( \check{\square} x e8 \) 17 \( \check{\square} e3+ \) \( \check{\square} f8 \).
15...\( \check{\square} d7 \) 16 \( \check{\square} f3 \) \( \check{\square} g4 \) 17 \( \check{\square} b3 \) \( \check{\square} d7 \)
18 \( \check{\square} x g4+ \) \( \check{\square} x g4 \) 19 \( \check{\square} x g4+ \) \( \check{\square} x g4 \)
20 \( \check{\square} g3 \) \( \check{\square} b e8 \) 21 \( \check{\square} d1 \) h5 22 h3 \( \check{\square} f6 \)
23 \( \check{\square} x g7 \) \( \check{\square} h7 \) 24 \( \check{\square} x h7 \) 25 \( \check{\square} f1 \) \( \check{\square} f6 \) with a level ending, Zupe-Hiermann, Werfen 1992.

Sequel 6
(1 e4 e5 2 \( \check{\square} f3 \) \( \check{\square} c6 \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \check{\square} x d4 \) \( \check{\square} h 4 \) 5 \( \check{\square} c 3 \) \( \check{\square} b 4 \) 6 \( \check{\square} d b 5 \) \( \check{\square} x e 4 + \) 7 \( \check{\square} e 2 \) \( \check{\square} x c 3 + \) 8 bxc3 \( \check{\square} d 8 \) 9 0-0 d6)

10 \( \check{\square} e 1 \)!

11 \( \check{\square} f 3 \)

Generally regarded as the best way of keeping White’s attack alive.
10...\( \check{\square} f 6 \)

We survey other possibilities:
I) 10...\( \check{\square} e 6 \) 11 \( \check{\square} d 4 \) \( \check{\square} d 5 \) 12 \( \check{\square} b 1 \) \( \check{\square} e 7 \) 13 \( \check{\square} f 3 \) with White having the initiative, Apitzsch-Leisebein, corr. 1994;

II) 10...\( \check{\square} e 7 \) 11 \( \check{\square} a 3 ! ? \) \( \check{\square} e 6 \) 12 c4 a6 13 \( \check{\square} d 4 \) \( \check{\square} x d 4 \) (Guder-Zickelbein, Leipzig 1996, went

13...\( \check{\square} d 7 ! ? \) 14 c5 d5 15 \( \check{\square} x e 6 + \) \( f x e 6 \) 16 \( \check{\square} g 4 \) 1-0) 14 \( \check{\square} x d 4 \) \( \check{\square} f 6 \) 15 \( \check{\square} d 2 \) \( \check{\square} e 7 \) 16 c5 d5 17 \( \check{\square} a b 1 \), and White’s attack is potentially lethal, Gutman;

III) 10...\( \check{\square} e 7 \) 11 \( \check{\square} f 3 \) \( \check{\square} f 5 \)
(11...\( \check{\square} g 6 \) will transpose into the variation after 9...d6 10 \( \check{\square} f 3 \) \( \check{\square} g 6 \)
— Sequel 5) 12 \( \check{\square} x d 6 ! \) (12 \( \check{\square} d 4 ! ? \) \( \check{\square} f 6 \) 13 \( \check{\square} b 1 \) \( \check{\square} e 5 \) 14 \( \check{\square} x b 7 \) \( \check{\square} b 8 \) 15 \( \check{\square} b 5 \) \( \check{\square} d 7 \) 16 \( \check{\square} b 3 \) \( \check{\square} a 4 \) 17 \( \check{\square} b 4 \) \( \check{\square} d 7 \)
18 \( \check{\square} f 3 \) \( \check{\square} x f 3 + \) 19 \( \check{\square} x f 3 \) \( \check{\square} f 3 \) 20 \( \check{\square} x f 3 \) \( \check{\square} b 6 \) 21 \( \check{\square} e 3 \) c5 was level in Muruzaba-Molina, corr. 1996)
12...\( \check{\square} x d 6 \) 13 \( \check{\square} x d 6 + \) \( \check{\square} d 7 \) (or 13...\( \check{\square} d 7 \) 14 \( \check{\square} g 3 \) \( \check{\square} f 5 \) 15 \( \check{\square} f 4 \) 14 \( \check{\square} f 4 \) \( \check{\square} f 6 \) (14...\( \check{\square} c 8 \) 15 \( \check{\square} a d 1 \) 15
\( \check{\square} c 7 + \) \( \check{\square} e 8 \) 16 \( \check{\square} a d 1 \) \( \check{\square} d 8 \) 17 \( \check{\square} d 6 \)
(17 \( \check{\square} x c 6 ! ? \) bxc6 18 \( \check{\square} e 5 \) \( \check{\square} h 4 \) 19 \( \check{\square} d 6 \) is also decisive) 17...\( \check{\square} e 6 \) 18
\( \check{\square} x b 7 \) \( \check{\square} x c 3 \) 19 \( \check{\square} x e 7 \) \( \check{\square} x e 7 \) 20
\( \check{\square} x d 8 + \) \( \check{\square} x d 8 \) 21 \( \check{\square} d 1 + \) \( \check{\square} e 8 \) 22
\( \check{\square} b 5 + \) \( \check{\square} c 6 \) 23 \( \check{\square} x c 6 + \) \( \check{\square} e 7 \) 24
\( \check{\square} g 5 + \) 1-0, Gburek-Henk, Porz 1994.

There are two more alternatives:
I) 11 \( \check{\square} a 3 \) \( \check{\square} d 5 \) 12 \( \check{\square} d 4 \) \( \check{\square} d 7 ! ? \) (an improvement on 12...\( \check{\square} x d 4 \) 13 cxd4 \( \check{\square} e 8 \) 14 c4 \( \check{\square} g 5 \) 15 \( \check{\square} b 1 \) \( \check{\square} b 8 \) 16 \( \check{\square} f 3 \) \( \check{\square} g 4 \) 17 \( \check{\square} x e 8 + \) \( \check{\square} x e 8 \) 18 \( \check{\square} x g 4 \)
\( \check{\square} x g 4 \) 19 \( \check{\square} a 4 + \) \( \check{\square} d 7 \), Ostojić-Sarajlić, Mureck 1998, when 20
\( \check{\square} e 1 + ! ? \) \( \check{\square} d 8 \) 21 \( \check{\square} x a 7 \) b6 22 \( \check{\square} b 2 \)
should yield White a clear plus) 13 \texttt{\textit{xf3 w c4} leads nowhere for White, Gutman;}

\textbf{II}) 11 \texttt{\textit{g5 w f5}!} (not 11...\texttt{\textit{g6} 12 \texttt{\textit{f4 d d7} 13 \texttt{\textit{h5 w f6} 14 \texttt{\textit{d2 h6} 15 \texttt{\textit{xf7 cce5} 16 \texttt{\textit{b3 e8} 17 \texttt{\textit{ad1} a6} 18 \texttt{\textit{d4 c5} 19 \texttt{\textit{e6+ x e6} 20 \texttt{\textit{xe5, Markus-Bär, corr. 1999}}) 12 \texttt{\textit{h4} (or 12 \texttt{\textit{d2 h6} 13 \texttt{\textit{f4 w d5} 12...\texttt{\textit{e8} 13 \texttt{\textit{d3 x e1+} 14 \texttt{\textit{w x e1 w e5} 15 \texttt{\textit{w d2 e6} 16 \texttt{\textit{e1 w c5} 17 \texttt{\textit{w f4 d d7} 18 \texttt{\textit{x f6 gxf6} 19 \texttt{\textit{w x f6 e8} favours Black, Gutman.}})

11...\texttt{\textit{g6}}

This may be the only move.

We see:

\textbf{I}) 11...\texttt{\textit{w c4} is shown be careless by 12 \texttt{\textit{x d6! c x d6} 13 \texttt{\textit{w x d6+ d d7} 14 \texttt{\textit{g5 c8} 15 \texttt{\textit{f4 d d8} 16 \texttt{\textit{e5 d e6} 17 \texttt{\textit{b1 c6} 18 \texttt{\textit{x e6!}, Gutman;}})

\textbf{II}) 11...\texttt{\textit{w h4} 12 \texttt{\textit{x c6 b c6} 13 \texttt{\textit{x d6 c x d6} 14 \texttt{\textit{w x d6+ d d7} 15 \texttt{\textit{f4 d d5} 16 \texttt{\textit{e5 f6} 17 \texttt{\textit{g3 w g4} 18 \texttt{\textit{ad1}, and Black is helpless, Gutman.}})

12 \texttt{\textit{f4}!}

12 \texttt{\textit{x d6 c x d6} 13 \texttt{\textit{w x d6+} seems premature in view of 13...\texttt{\textit{d d7}.}}

12...\texttt{\textit{d e8} 12...\texttt{\textit{d d7} loses to 13 \texttt{\textit{x c7}!.}}

13 \texttt{\textit{c4 a6} 14 \texttt{\textit{e3}}

\textbf{Sequel 7}

(1 \texttt{\textit{e e4 c c5} 2 \texttt{\textit{f3 c6} 3 d d4 exd4} 4 \texttt{\textit{x d4 w h4} 5 \texttt{\textit{c3 b b4} 6 \texttt{\textit{d b5 w x e4+} 7 \texttt{\textit{c e2 b x c3}+ 8 b x c3 d d8} 9 0-0})

9...\texttt{\textit{a6}}

The text move is designed to prevent the pressure against the d6 square, forcing back the white knight and hoping to ease the tension by exchanges.

10 \texttt{\textit{w d4}}

10 \texttt{\textit{a a3} leaves the knight looking rather misplaced, 10...\texttt{\textit{f6} 11 \texttt{\textit{c c4} (or 11 \texttt{\textit{x f3 a a4} 12 \texttt{\textit{e e1 e e8}) 11...\texttt{\textit{e e8} looks quite comfortable for Black, Gutman.}})

10...\texttt{\textit{x d4}?}

10...\texttt{\textit{g g7} is less consequent, nevertheless, after 11 \texttt{\textit{e e1} Black still has the possibility to exchange the knights.

We now have four moves to consider:

\textbf{A}) 11...\texttt{\textit{w h4} (“We like this continuation”, Hall) 12 \texttt{\textit{x c6+!} (12 \texttt{\textit{f3 x d4} 13 c x d4 returns to the main line) 12...\texttt{\textit{x c6} (or 12...\texttt{\textit{b b6} 15 \texttt{\textit{b b4} f f6} 15 \texttt{\textit{f f4)} 13 \texttt{\textit{w d5 w e7} 14 \texttt{\textit{g g5 f6} 15 \texttt{\textit{h h5 w f8} (15...\texttt{\textit{a a3} 16 \texttt{\textit{e e3}) 16 \texttt{\textit{e e8+ w x e8} 17 \texttt{\textit{e e8 w x e8} 18 \texttt{\textit{e e3} does not

Black has a terrible position, Gutman.
give Black enough compensation for the queen, Gutman;
B) 11...\textit{Wg}6 can be met by 12 \textit{Kh}5! \textit{Wf}6 13 \textit{Kx}f7? ("A tremendous shot which pounds Black's defensive lines", Hall) 13...\textit{Qxd}4 (13...d6 14 \textit{Kb}3 is very unpleasant for Black) 14 \textit{Wxd}4.

There is only a choice of evils:
B1) 14...\textit{Wxf}7? loses to 15 \textit{Qg}5 \textit{Me}8 16 \textit{Qxe}7 \textit{Qxe}7 17 \textit{Me}1;
B2) 14...\textit{Qf}8 15 \textit{Wxf}6 \textit{gxf}6 16 \textit{Kb}3 \textit{Qf}5 (not 16...d6?! 17 \textit{Kh}6 1-0, Mrkvicka-Gosme, corr. 1995) 17 g4 \textit{Qh}4 18 \textit{Qd}5, and the endgame is clearly in White's favour;
B3) 14...\textit{Wxd}4 15 \textit{cx}d4 h6 16 \textit{Kb}3 ("Now White has recovered his gambit pawn with a winning advantage, due primarily to his lead in development and two dominating bishops", Hall) 16...d6 17 \textit{Qb}2 \textit{Qf}5 18 c4 \textit{Qf}8 19 \textit{Me}3 \textit{Qd}7 20 d5 \textit{Qf}7 21 \textit{Qa}4+ b5 22 cxb5 \textit{Qxd}5 23 b6+ c6 24 \textit{Cc}1 \textit{Qe}7 25 \textit{Kb}3 d5 26 \textit{Qe}5 \textit{Qg}8 27 \textit{Qa}4 \textit{Qf}8 28 \textit{Qe}c3 \textit{Qc}8 29 f3 g5 30 b7 \textit{Qb}8 31 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}6 32 \textit{Qxc}6+ \textit{Qe}6 33 \textit{Me}1 1-0, Smagin-Sermek, Vienna 1991.
C) 11...\textit{Wd}5 12 \textit{Kf}3 is the more recent try.

And here:

\textbf{C1)} Vojislav-Zarko, corr. 1994, continued 12...\textit{Wc}5 13 \textit{Qh}5 (13 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 14 \textit{Wf}3 f6 15 \textit{Qg}3 \textit{Qg}8 16 a4 d6 17 \textit{Qa}3 \textit{Wd}5 18 \textit{Qad}1 is also very good, Gutman) 13...g6 14 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qe}8 15 h4!? \textit{Qe}5 16 \textit{Qg}5 a5 17 \textit{Mb}1 d6 18 \textit{Mb}5 \textit{Qxf}3+ 19 \textit{Wxf}3 \textit{Wxa}3 20 \textit{Wxf}7 1-0;
\textbf{C2)} 12...\textit{Wd}6 seems still enjoyable for Black.

\textbf{Then:}

\textbf{C2a)} 13 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}6 14 \textit{Wh}5 \textit{Wg}6!? (after 14...\textit{Qxd}4 15 \textit{cx}d4 f6 16 c4 g6 17 \textit{Wh}4 \textit{Wf}8 18 \textit{Qg}5 c6 19 \textit{Qxf}6+ \textit{Qc}7 20 c5 White won easily in Ni Hua-Wenz, Shenyang 1999) 15 \textit{Qxc}6+ \textit{bxc}6 16 \textit{We}5 \textit{We}6 17 \textit{Wg}5+ \textit{Wf}6 18 \textit{Wg}3 h6 19 \textit{Qf}4 d6 20 \textit{Qad}1 \textit{Me}8 21 \textit{Qe}5 \textit{Wg}6 22 \textit{Qxg}7 \textit{Wxg}3 23 \textit{Qf}6+ \textit{Qd}7 24 hxg3 \textit{Qb}7, and the ending is level, Gutman;

\textbf{C2b)} 13 \textit{Kh}5! g6 14 \textit{Qg}5 is more promising, 14...\textit{Keg}8 15 \textit{Qxc}6+ dxc6 16 \textit{We}2 \textit{Qe}6 17 \textit{Qad}1 \textit{Qd}5 18 c4 gxh5 19 \textit{cx}d5 yields White a decisive advantage, Gutman.

\textbf{D)} 11...\textit{Qxd}4!? seems to be the best, transposing back into the main line.

\textbf{11 \textit{cx}d4 \textit{Qe}7}

We mention here:

\textbf{D1)} 11...\textit{We}8 12 \textit{Me}1 \textit{Qe}7 13 \textit{Kh}5 \textit{Wf}8 14 c4 d6 15 c5 \textit{Qg}6 16 \textit{Wb}3
ab8 17 cxd6 wxd6 18 wxf7, and White won quickly, Skorobogaty-Szymanski, Krakow 1996; II 11...d6 12 h1 wg6 13 ah5!? wc8 14 wb3 g6 15 af3 ab8 16 ab2 wg7 17 we1 de7 18 d5!? (18 we2 we8 19 c4 wf8 20 we3 ad7 21 d5 f6 22 ad4 b6 23 wb2 ag8 24 ae4 also favours White, Turzo-Kirjak, Korsopotros 1995) 18...f6 19 a4 af5 20 wa1 wf8 21 ae8+ ad7 22 a6e6, when Black lacks a respectable defence, Gutman.

12 ae1
The other sub-continuation is 12 af3 wg6, when White has a choice: A) 13 d5 d6 14 ae1 ad7 15 ab1 b6 16 ab4 f5 17 ab2 wf7 18 wd4 ag8 19 ab3 f4 20 ab4 (instead Erdos-Balint, Hungary 1996, went 20 axb6? af5 21 wb4 cxb6 22 wxb6+ wc8 with no compensation for the rook) 20...ag6 21 ah5 a5 seems satisfactory for Black, Gutman; B) 13 ab1 d5?! (13...ab8 14 ae1 d6 transposes back into the main line) 14 aa3 c6 15 ae1 (after 15 we1 af5 16 ac5 we8 17 wa5+ ad7 18 we1 ah4 19 wc3 a6 20 a4 b5 21 g3 afxf3+ 22 wxf3, Kiiik-Harju Antero, Tuusula 1996, 22...ab7 would have kept matters unclear) 15 af5 16 ac5 and the self-inflicted weaknesses of Black’s king position do not bode well for his long-term prospects, Gutman; C) 13 ae1 returns to the main line.

12...wg6
Now lets look at some less sound, but possibly more interesting ideas: I) “We suggest 12...wc6 13 c4 d5 14 ac3 ec8 15 ec1 ec6 16 cxd5 wxd5 17 af3 wa5 ”, Hall, but 18 axb7 ab8 19 af3 gives White an overwhelming position, Gutman; II) 12...wh4 13 ac4 (more ambitious than 13 af3 af5 14 te4 wf6 15 ab1 xe8 16 exe8+ xe8 17 c3 xa7 18 af4 ½-½ Bekemann-Shoup, corr. 1998) 13...f5 14 ab1 wf6 15 d5! (instead of the dubious 15 c3 d6 16 ac3 ec8, Hall) 15...d6 16 ab2 wf7 17 wd4 ag8 18 ae2 puts Black under strong pressure, Gutman; III) 12...ac6 with a further split: A) 13 d5!? af5 14 d6 wc6 15 dx7+ axc7 16 ab1 d6 17 ad4 ec8 18 ab3 ac6 19 ac3 af4 20 ad2 b5 21 af3 wc5 22 wxg7 ad5 23 ae3 wc6 24 wxh7 ah8 25 ff5 afxh3 26 wxf7+ ac8 27 gx3 wd7 28 wd5 ab8 29 ag5 and White won easily in Callisto-MChess, computer game, 1994;
B) 13 ∆c4!? ∏xd4 14 ∆xf7 h6 15 ∏xd4 ∏xd4 16 ∆b2 ∏f8 17 ∆d5! (more effective than 17 ∆g6 ∆e6 18 g3 a5 19 f4 c5 20 ∆ad1 ∆a6 21 ∆e4 b5 22 ∆d5 ∆e8, Prange-Crawford, corr. 1994) 17...∆xc2 18 ∆xg7 ∆xel 19 ∆xf8 ∆c2 20 ∆d1 d6 21 ∆xh6 yields White a clear advantage, Gutman;
C) 13 ∆h5!? ∏xd4 14 ∏f3 (14 ∆xf7 will transpose back into B) 14...∆f8 (14...f6 15 ∆b1) 15 ∆b1!? (15 ∆e3 ∏f6 16 ∏xf6+ gxf6 17 ∆h6 ∆e8 18 ∆g7 ∆xel+ 19 ∆xel d5 20 ∏xf6+ ∆d7 21 ∆xf7 also favours White, Cusimir-Amaro, corr. 1995) 15...f6 (15...f6 16 ∆e4) 16 ∏g3 h6 17 ∆b2 and White is on the road to victory, Gutman.

13 ∆f3

White has two alternatives:
I) 13 ∆h5 ∏f6 14 ∆b1 (14 ∆a3 ∆e8 15 ∆b1 d6 16 ∆f3 ∆b8, “with at least equal play for Black”, Hall) 14...d6 15 ∆b3 ∆f5 16 d5 ∆e8 17 ∆xe8+ (17 ∆b2 ∆xel+ 18 ∏xe1 ∏e7 19 ∏d2 f6) 17...∆xe8 18 ∆b2 ∏g5, when Black has sufficient counterplay, Gutman;
II) 13 c4!? causes more problems, for instance:

A) 13...h5 14 ∆a3!? (14 ∆f3 d6 returns to the main line) 14...d6 15 ∏b3 ∆b8 16 d5 ∆f5 (after 16...∆g4 17 c5 ∆f5 18 ∆d3 ∆f3 19 g3 ∆d4 20 ∏c4 ∏f6 21 ∆b2 ∆xd5 22 ∏xd4 ∏f3 23 ∆e4 White won easily in Krah-Drenckhahn, Germany 1994) 17 ∆d3 ∆g5 (or 17...∆d4 18 ∏c3 ∏g4 19 ∆h1l) 18 ∆c1 ∏g6 19 ∆b2 and White maintains a plus, Gutman;
B) 13...d6 14 ∆f4!? (14 ∆f3 is the main line) 14...f5 (14...h5 15 c5 ∆d5 16 ∆d2) 15 ∏d2 ∆g6 16 ∆g3 h5 17 h3 ∆d7 18 ∆ab1 ∆c8 19 ∆f3 ∆b8 20 c5 d5 21 ∏a5 ∆f4 22 ∆xf4 ∏xf4 23 ∏xd5 c6 24 ∆f3 ∏xd4 25 ∏ed1 ∏f6 26 ∏d6 ∏g5 27 ∏bd1 ∏d8 28 ∆xc6! bxc6 29 ∏xa6+ ∆c7 30 ∏xd7+ ∏xd7 31 ∏a7+ ∆b7 32 ∏xd7+ ∆xd7 33 ∏xb7+ ∆d8 34 ∏b8+ ∆d7 35 ∏d6+ ∆c8 36 ∏xc6+ ∆b8 37 ∏e8+ 1-0, Izeta-Claudio, Spain 1991.

13...d6 14 ∆b1

There is again nothing wrong with playing immediately 14 c4!?.

Black has a quite difficult choice:
A) 14...f6 15 ∆b2 ∆g6 16 ∏b3 and White has the initiative, Ravishareen, India 1992;
B) 14...h5 15 c5 d5 16 ∆f4!? (after 16 ∏e2 ∆e6 17 h4 ∆d7 18 ∆g5, Guder-Montavon, Leipzig 1997, 18...∆c6!? 19 ∏d2 a5 20 ∆ab1 ∆a7 should be about equal) 16...∆e6 17 ∆b1 gives Black no hope against White’s powerful bishops, Gutman;
C) 14...∆e8 15 ∆e4 ∏f6 16 ∏b3 ∏b8 17 ∆b2 ∆f5 18 ∆f3 ∏g6 19 ∆e3 ∆g4 20 ∆xg4 ∏xg4 21 ∆ae1 ∆d7 22 c5 ∏f5 23 cxd6 cxd6 24 h3 h5 25 ∆f3 ∏g6 26 ∆xf7 and White

14...\textbf{\textit{b8}}

Other defences fail miserably:

I) 14...c6 15 \textbf{\textit{d2}} a5 (not 15...d5 16 \textbf{\textit{a5+ d7 17 w6 e2 6 e6 18 g4 1-0, Remiro Juste-Reyes Alvarez, St.Feliu 1994}) 16 c4 \textbf{\textit{f5 17 w3 h4 18 e4 f5 19 w3 wf6 20 g3 h6 21 c2 e8 22 f4 xe1+ 23 xe1 d7 24 c5 dxc5 25 dxc5 d8 26 c7+ d7 27 b6 1-0, Schmaltz-Forgacs, Kecskemet 1991; II) 14...a7 15 b3 h5 16 we2 \textbf{\textit{f5 17 b2 (17 xh5 xe3 18 w3 xh3 w3 e8 21 xe8+ xx e8 22 w4 d8 23 d2 also favours White, Callisto-MChess, computer game, 1994) 17 h4 18 c4 with a horrible position for Black, Gutman.

15 \textbf{\textit{f4}} w6 16 w2 h6 17 c4

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

Black has to suffer from permanent cramp.

Pedersen-Christiansen, Aarhus 1993, continued 17 xe8 18 c5 \textbf{\textit{f5 19 e5 g5 20 cxd6 xxd6 21 w5+ hxg5 22 xg7 xe1+ 23 xe1 e8 24 f8 e6 25 d5 f5 26 e5 b1 27 g4 c6 28 d6 f5 29 h5 and Black resigns.

Sequel 8

(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 w4 5 e3 \textbf{\textit{b4 6 db5 xe4+ 7 e2 xc3+ 8 bxc3 d8 9 0-0 a6 10 d4 xd4 11 cxd4})

11...\textbf{\textit{f6}}?

This move is by all counts a must — the black knight now keeps more squares under control.

12 \textbf{\textit{f3}}

12 c4 is another frequently met alternative.

Other tries for Black:

A) 12...e8 already looks suspect to me, with a further split:

A1) 13 xe1 b5!? (13...d5? 14 g5 w5 15 xf6+ gxf6 16 b3 w4 17 cxd5 g4 18 xb7 led to a crushing defeat for Black in Turzo-Merenyi, Cseppek 1997) 14 g5 b7 15 xf6+ gxf6 16 f1 xe1 17 xe1 xe1 18 xe1 b4 turns out quite well for Black, Gutman;

A2) 13 f3 w5, when 14 c5! is the key move, which seriously hampers Black’s development, Gutman.

B) 12...d6!? 13 f3 returns to the main line.

12...w6

Worth consideration is 12...w5.

The two major ways of threatening this position are:
A) 13 c4 d6, and here:
A1) 14 a4?! ¤e8 15 ¤a3 g5!? 16 g3 g4 17 ¤g2 ¤e4 18 f3, Kuzminchev-Erneste, Riga 1992, when 18...¤c3! 19 fxg4 ¤xd1 20 gx{f}5 ¤e3 would have been excellent for Black;
A2) 14 ¤a3 ¤e8 (instead Zahn-Fischer, Bad Wiessee 1999, went 14...g5 15 ¤b1 ¤b8 16 ¤e1 g4 17 ¤c6 ¤a8 18 ¤e2 ¤e6 19 ¤d2 ¤f5 20 ¤e3 ¤d7 21 ¤e7+ 1-0) 15 ¤b1 ¤b8 16 c5 (or 16 ¤c6 ¤e7) 16...d5, and Black has solved his problems, Gutman;
A3) 14 ¤e1 is more precise, reaching a position after 13 ¤e1 d6 14 c4 from B2).
B) 13 ¤e1!? d6 looks like a critical continuation.

White has to choose between:
B1) 14 ¤b1 with two examples:
B1a) 14...h5 15 h4! (15 ¤a3 g5 16 ¤xb7 ¤xb7 17 ¤xb7 h4 18 ¤b3 g4 19 c4 h3 20 ¤b1 ¤xb1 21 ¤e1 hxc2 22 ¤xg2 ¤e4 23 ¤c1 ¤d7 led to equality in Jasik-Dziadykiewicz, Krakow 1996) 15...¤e8 16 ¤xe8+ ¤xe8 17 ¤g5 favours White, Gutman;
B1b) 14...¤b8 15 ¤c6 b5 (after 15...¤d7 16 ¤xb7 ¤xb7 17 ¤xb7 ¤a5 18 a3 c6 19 ¤f2 ¤e8, 13 c4!?)

Four other moves are:
I) 13 ¤e1 d6 reaches a position after 9...d6 10 ¤f3 ¤g6 11 ¤e1 a6 12 ¤d4 ¤xd4 13 cxd4 ¤f6, covered in Sequel 5;
II) 13 ¤e3 d6 (13...d5?! is premature, however 14 ¤b1 ¤b8 15 ¤d2 ¤g4 16 ¤xg4 ¤xg4 17 ¤f4 h6 18 ¤e5 ¤d7 19 ¤g3 ¤b6? 20 ¤xb6 White won quickly in Erdos-Balint, Hungary 1997) 14 ¤b1 ¤b8 15 c4
\( \text{g4 16 c5 d5 yields Black a quite secure position, } \text{Gutman; } \)

III) 13 \( \text{a3} \text{ d6 14 } \text{d2} \text{ (or 14 c4 } \text{g4}) 14...h5 15 \text{ e1 h8 16 } \text{a1 b6 (Black could play safely } \text{16...g4!?) 17 } \text{c6 d7 18 } \text{f3 } \text{g4, forcing a repetition) 17 } \text{c4 } \text{g4 18 } \text{c6 d7 19 } \text{xd7 xd7 20 } \text{c5 bxc5 21 } \text{b1 cxd4 22 } \text{a5 } \text{xc8 23 } \text{a4+ } \text{d8! (after } \text{23...xb5?) 24 } \text{a6 w5 25 } \text{xd6 } \text{b6 26 } \text{c7+ } \text{c7 27 } \text{wb6 White had a crushing attack in Butempi-Calabro, Porto San Gior-}

\text{gio 1997) 24 } \text{xd6 cxd6 25 } \text{wa5+ } \text{d7 26 } \text{wa4+ with a draw by perpetual, } \text{Gutman; } \)

IV) 13 \( \text{f4 d6 14 } \text{d2 b8 15 } \text{e1 (or 15 } \text{ab1 } \text{g4 16 } \text{c6 d7) 15...g4 16 } \text{axg4 } \text{axg4 17}

\text{h3 } \text{g6 18 c4 e8 19 } \text{xe8+ } \text{xe8 20 c5 } \text{d5 21 } \text{g3 dxc5!? (21...d7? 22 } \text{a5 } \text{d3 23 } \text{a4+ c6 24 } \text{d1 } \text{c3 25 } \text{b1 a5 26 } \text{xd6 b5 27 } \text{d1 } \text{e8 28 } \text{g4+ } \text{e6 29}

\text{wxc4 was winning for White in Szopka-Walkucz, Poland 1994) 22}

\text{dxc5 w6 23 } \text{d1 } \text{f6 24 } \text{f4 } \text{c8 25 } \text{f5 } \text{e6 26 } \text{f3 } \text{c6, and Black should keep the balance, } \text{Gutman.}

13...d6 14 \( \text{wb3}

This is generally regarded as the critical line.

14...\text{b8!?}

Others tend to run into trouble:

I) 14...\text{e8 15 c5! (15 } \text{xb7 b8 16 }

\text{e4 } \text{xb3 17 } \text{xe6 b4 18 } \text{d3 gives White only a slight edge) 15...d4 16 } \text{e1 b8 (or 16...f5 17}

\text{f4) 17 } \text{xe4 } \text{xe4 18 } \text{e4 } \text{xe4 19 }

\text{g5+ } \text{f6 20 } \text{xd6 xg5 (20...xd6 21 }

\text{b6+) 21 } \text{c1 cxd6 22 } \text{b6+}

\text{e8 23 } \text{a7, and Black is helpless, } \text{Gutman;}

II) 14...\text{g4 15 } \text{xb4 } \text{g4 16 c5}

\text{we6 17 } \text{xb7 } \text{d5 18 c6 } \text{e8 19}

\text{xa6 } \text{g8 20 } \text{e3 } \text{e7 21 } \text{ac1 h5}

22 \text{e1 h4 23 h3 f6 24 } \text{d2 } \text{b8}

25 \text{a5 } \text{c8 26 } \text{c3 g5 27 } \text{e2 } \text{h728}

\text{f3 f5 29 } \text{d2 } \text{e8 30 } \text{c5 1-0, Tsarushin-W.Saitz}

\text{ev, corr. 1990.}

15 c5 dxc5

15...d5 16 } \text{xd5 } \text{xd5 17 } \text{xd5+}

\text{d7 18 } \text{e1 is fine for White, } \text{Gutman.}

16 dxc5 \text{e6}

The point behind Black's 14th is that the pawn on b7 is now protected, and there is no decisive blow to be found for White. To me this complicated position offers approximately equal chances, \text{Gutman}.\)
Sequel 9
(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 Wh4 5 d3 c5 6 db5 Wxe4+ 7 e2 xc3+ 8 bxc3 d8 9 0-0 a6)
10 f3

This is a more popular move order.
10...wc4

As is so often the case in this variation: once Black's queen finds a decent square then he has normally solved his opening problems.
However, the text move is a very confrontational approach, keeping Black's queen in the middle of the board. Alternatively:
I) 10...wa4?! 11 d4 dge7 12 xc6! bxc6 (12...xc6? can be powerfully met by 13 wg4 cxd4 14 wxg7) 13 g5 xe8 (or 13...d6 14 xe7+ xe7 15 e1+ d8 16 Wh5) 14 d5!? (after 14 wg4 ac4 15 xe7+ xe7 16 wxg7 d6, Espinoza-Day, Moscow Olympiad 1994, 17 Wh8+! d7 18 eae1 xe1 19 xe1 b7 20 Wh7 would have secured a clear advantage for White) 14...f6 15 xg7 fxg5 16 xe8 xe8 17 Wh5+ d8 18 Wh7 d5 19 eae1 and Black has no defence, Gutman;

II) 10...g6! 11 d4 xd4 12 cxd4 d6 seems to be the correct way to play, with a transposition into Sequel 8. L! ?
11 xc6!?

Less effective are:
I) 11 a3 wc5! (instead of 11...xc3?! 12 b1 c5 13 b3 d4 14 e3 xf3+ 15 xf3 f8 16 c4 e7 17 d6 cxd6 18 b6+ e8 Mokhtar-Fekri, Cairo 1996, when 19 g4!, preventing the manoeuvre h8-h6-e6, 19...d5 20 e1 d6 21 xd5 e6 22 xb7 c8 23 c7 would have given White a crushing attack) 12 b1 d6 13 e3 f5 appears fine for Black, Gutman;

II) 11 d4 with two possibilities for Black:
A) 11...cxd4 12 cxd4 e7 13 e1 (13 f4 d5 14 wd2 c8 15 ab1 looks like a sensible alternative, Gerhold-Poscher, corr. 1993) 13...d5 14 a3 g6 15 wd2 c6 16 ab1 c8 17 e3 d4 18 c3 wa4 19 d6 f3+ 20 gxf3 d7 21 xc7+ gave White a decisive advantage in Mader-Poscher, corr. 1993;

B) 11...dge7 is more to the point, 12 xc6 xc6 (12...bxc6 will transpose into the following variation 11 xc6 bxc6 12 d4 d7 13 wg4 cxd4 14 cxd4 Wh8 15 Wh4+ (or 15 e1 d6 16 we4 c6) 15...f6 16 Wh7 d6 17 e1 c6 with a balanced position, Gutman;

11...xc6

11...bxc6 is an interesting attempt to get counterplay.

"Anatoly Karpov’s suggestion, and this seems very promising for Black", Hall.
I doubt whether, after 12 d4, it is really sufficient.
12...\(\Delta e_7\) (12...\(\Delta f_6\) 13 \(\Delta e_1\) \(\Delta e_8\) is shown to be careless by 14 \(\Delta g_5!\) \(\mathbb{W} x c_3\) 15 \(\mathbb{H} x e_8+\) \(\Delta x e_8\) 16 \(\mathbb{W} e_2+\) \(\mathbb{F} f_8\) 17 \(\Delta e_1\) \(\mathbb{F} b_7\) 18 \(\mathbb{W} e_7+\) \(\mathbb{G} g_8\) 19 \(\mathbb{X} x f_6\) \(g x f_6\) 20 \(\Delta f_5\) \(\mathbb{F} f_8\) 21 h3 \(\mathbb{W} a_5\) 22 \(\mathbb{W} x f_6\) 1-0, Adell Corts-Cubas, Casers 1993) 13 \(\Delta e_1\) d6 14 \(\mathbb{W} f_3!\) (not 14 \(\mathbb{W} d_3?!\) \(\mathbb{W} x d_3\) 15 \(c x d_3\) c5 16 \(\Delta f_3\) f6 “and Black has the upper hand”, Hall) 14...\(\Delta d_7\) (14...\(\mathbb{W} d_5?!\) is no better in view of 15 \(\Delta x c_6+!\) \(\mathbb{W} x c_6\) 16 \(\mathbb{W} x f_7\) \(\mathbb{W} e_8\) 17 \(\mathbb{W} f_3\) \(\mathbb{W} c_6\) 18 \(\mathbb{W} e_2\) \(\Delta e_8\) 19 \(\Delta g_5\) \(\mathbb{W} d_7\) 20 \(\mathbb{W} f_3\) \(\mathbb{A} b_8\) 21 \(\Delta x e_7\) 15 \(\mathbb{E} e_4\) \(\mathbb{W} d_5\) 16 c4! \(\mathbb{W} x c_4\) 17 \(\Delta g_5\) (17 \(\Delta f_5?!\) fails due to 17...\(\mathbb{W} x e_4\) 18 \(\mathbb{W} x e_4\) \(\Delta x f_5\) 17...f6 18 \(\Delta e_6+\) \(\mathbb{W} x e_6\) 19 \(\Delta x e_6\) \(\Delta x e_6\) 20 \(\mathbb{X} x f_6\), and White should win easily, Gutman.

12 \(\Delta d_4\) \(\mathbb{G} g_6\)

“We like this move, recommended by the Russian Chess Report, Hall.

12...\(\mathbb{W} c_4?!\) has been discarded since the game Kaushansky-Shinkar, Riga 1977, which continued 13 \(\mathbb{W} g_4\) g6 (13...\(\Delta e_7\) 14 \(\mathbb{W} x g_7\) \(\mathbb{G} g_8\) 15 \(\mathbb{W} x h_7\) 14 \(\Delta h_6!\) d6 15 \(\mathbb{W} h_4+\) \(\Delta e_7\) 16 \(\Delta f_1\) \(\Delta e_8\) 17 \(\Delta g_5\) f6 18 \(\Delta x f_6\) \(\mathbb{W} f_7\) 19 \(\Delta x e_7\) \(\Delta x e_7\) 20 \(\Delta e_1\) 1-0.

13 \(\Delta f_3\)

13 \(\Delta e_1\) is also possible, 13...\(\Delta e_7\) 14 \(\Delta e_3!?\) (instead of 14 \(\Delta f_3\) \(\Delta c_6\) 15 \(\mathbb{W} d_5\) \(\Delta e_8\) 16 \(\Delta x e_8+\) \(\Delta x e_8\), Hall) 14...h5 (14...h6 15 \(\Delta g_3\) \(\mathbb{W} h_7\) 16 c4 \(\Delta e_8\) 17 \(\Delta b_2\) yields White good attacking chances) 15 \(\Delta g_3\) \(\mathbb{W} h_7\) 16 \(\Delta g_5\) \(\Delta e_8\) 17 \(\Delta e_3\) \(\mathbb{G} g_6\) 18 \(\Delta x e_7+\) \(\Delta x e_7\) 19 \(\Delta x e_7\) \(\Delta x e_7\) 20 \(\mathbb{W} e_2+\) \(\mathbb{D} d_8\) 21 \(\Delta e_1\) c6 22 \(\mathbb{W} e_5\) b6 23 \(\Delta f_5\) \(\mathbb{W} e_6\) 24 \(\Delta x g_7\) \(\mathbb{W} x e_5\) 25 \(\Delta x e_5\) with a clear advantage for White in Shaper-Van Wieringen, corr. 1997.

13...\(\mathbb{W} f_6\)

13...d6 14 \(\Delta e_5\) \(\mathbb{W} f_5\) 15 \(\Delta e_1!\) (15 \(\Delta g_5+\) \(\Delta e_8\) 16 f4, planning 17 g4, Hall, gives Black too many pieces for his queen after 16...f6 17 g4 \(\mathbb{W} e_6\) 18 f5 \(\mathbb{W} x e_5\) 19 \(\Delta e_1\) \(f x g_5\) 15...\(\Delta e_6\) 16 \(\Delta a_3\) \(\mathbb{C} c_8\) 17 \(\Delta x d_6\) \(c x d_6\) 18 \(\mathbb{W} x d_6\) \(\Delta f_6\) 19 \(\mathbb{C} c_5+\) \(\mathbb{B} b_8\) 20 \(\mathbb{A} b_1\) and Black is helpless, Gutman.

14 \(\Delta d_4!\)?

More enterprising than 14 \(\Delta a_3\) \(\Delta e_7\) 15 \(\Delta x e_7+\) \(\Delta x e_7\) 16 \(\Delta e_1+\) \(\mathbb{D} d_8\), indicated by Hall.

14...d6 15 c4 \(\Delta e_7\) 16 c5
White maintains the initiative, Gutman.
Sequel 10
(1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 
Qxd4 W h4 5 Qxc3 Qb4 6 Qdb5 
Wxe4+ 7 Qe2 Qxc3+ 8 bxc3 Qd8 
9 0-0 a6) 
10 Qd3??

B) 12 Qf3!! f6 13 Qb1 h6 14 c4 
and White has pressure, Gutman.
12 g3 
12 cxd4 is less forcing in view of 
12...Qf6?, Gutman.
12...Wf6 13 cxd4

This could well be the only way 
forward for White.
10...W h4
10...Qe5 isn’t convincing in view of 
11 Qe1 Wf6 12 Qe8+! Qxe8 13 
Qxc7+ Qd8 14 Qxa8 Qge7 15 Qb1 
and White is clearly on top, 
Gutman.
11 Qd4 
11 g3 Wf6 12 Qd4 Qge7! 13 Qc3 
d6 14 Wd2 h6 15 Qfe1 Qd7 16 h4 
Qe5 17 Qf4 Qxd3 18 cxd3 Qd5 19 
Qe3 Qxe3 20 Qxe3 Qe8 was better 
for Black in Miller-Pantaleev, Bad 
Libenzell 1996.
11...Qxd4 
11...Qge7 keeps more tension in the 
position.

White has two possibilities:
A) 12 Qe1?! Wf6 (12...Qxd4 13 
Qe4 Wf6 14 cxd4 d6 15 Wh5) 13 
Qe4 reaches a position after 
9...Qge7 10 Qd3 Wh4 11 Qe1 a6 12 
Qe4 Wf6 13 Qd4, covered in Sequel 
12; 218

13...Wxd4
Accepting the sacrifice leaves Black 
with defensive problems, however, 
other continuations allow White a 
clearer plus:
I) 13...d5? 14 Wh5 h6 15 Wxd5+ 
Qd7 16 Qf4 Qb8 17 Wc5 1-0, 
Vallejo Pons-Chaves, Cuba 1993;
II) 13...d6 14 Qb1 Qe7 15 Qe1 h5 
16 c4 h4 17 Qe4 hxg3 18 fxg3 Qc6 
19 Qe3 yields White a very strong 
initiative, Gutman.
14 Wh5!? Qe7
After 14...g6 15 Wf3 f6 16 Qb1 
Wd6 (16...Wc5 17 Qh6! Wd7 18 
Qfe1 Wf7 19 Qc4) 17 Qb2 Black 
has serious difficulties in developing 
his pieces, Gutman.
15 Qa3 Wf6 
15...g6 16 Wf3 Qc3 can be answered 
by 17 Qxe7+ Qxe7 18 Qae1+ Wf8 19 Qe3, 
Gutman.
16 Qfe1 d6 17 Qab1 Qf5 18 Qb2 
Wg6 19 Wf3 f6 20 Qe4 
Black’s position is really uncom- 
fortable, Gutman.
Sequel 11
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{d}x\textsh{d}4}}\ \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}h4}}\ 5 \text{\textipa{d}c3} \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}4}}\ 6 \text{\textipa{\textsh{d}b}5} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{x}e4+}}\ 7 \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}2}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{x}c3+}}\ 8 \text{\textipa{b}xc3} \text{\textipa{\textsh{d}8}} 
9 0-0) 
9...\text{\textipa{\textsh{g}e7}}

The variation with 9...\text{\textipa{\textsh{g}e7}} had already been played by Mikhail Chigorin and had survived a severe test. However, in my opinion the black knight on f6 is much more active.

10 \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}3}}

There are two alternatives, worth mentioning:

I) 10 c4 a6!? (after 10...b6 11 \text{\textipa{\textsh{a}3}} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{b}7}}\ 12 \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}1}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}h4}}\ 13 \text{\textipa{\textsh{f}3}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}8}}\ 14 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{d}6}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{x}d6}}, Rix-Kunoeh, corr. 1995, 
15 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}d6}}! \text{\textipa{\textsh{c}8}}\ 16 \text{\textipa{\textsh{a}d1}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}8}}\ 17 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{x}b7}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e5}}\ 14 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}d2}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{f}5}}\ 15 \text{\textipa{\textsh{f}4}} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{w}d4}}\ 16 \text{\textipa{\textsh{d}3} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{e}6}}\ 17 \text{\textipa{\textsh{a}b1}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}8}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e6}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}d8} \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}6}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}7}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{f}5}} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{w}f6}}\ 13 \text{\textipa{\textsh{e}e5}}!\ 14 \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}1}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{x}f3}}+\ 15 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}f3} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{e}5}}\ 16 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e4} \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}8}}\ 17 \text{\textipa{\textsh{c}4} \text{\textipa{\textsh{f}8}}\ 18 \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}2} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{d}7}}\ 19 \text{\textipa{\textsh{c}2}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e6}}\ 14 \text{\textipa{\textsh{b}1}} \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e5}}\ 15 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e6}+} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{w}d6}}\ 16 \text{\textipa{\textsh{h}1} \text{\textipa{\textsh{d}8}}\ 17 \text{\textipa{\textsh{d}3} 
\text{\textipa{\textsh{e}6}}\ 18 \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e1}+ \text{\textipa{\textsh{w}e6}} left Black 

In principle this should present Black with some difficulties.
We examine:
A) 11 4d3 5h4 12 c1 (or 12 d2
a6 13 4g5 5h5 14 f6) 12...a6
13 4a3 4b8 14 d4 4xd4 15 cxd4
4f5 doesn't seem to lead anywhere
for White, Gutman;
B) 11 4e1 when Black has:
B1) 11...5d5 12 c1 4f5 (instead
Gros-Barle, Slovenia 1992, went
12...4e5?! 13 4a3 4d7 14 4ad1
4c4 15 4xc4 4xc4 16 4xd6 cxd6
17 4g5 4e6 18 4xd6 4c8 19
4xe7 b6 20 4d4 4c6 21 4ed1 4c7
22 4d8+ 4b7 23 4d7 4xd7 24
4xd7 1-0) 13 4f4 (13 4d1 4e5
14 4d3 4xb5 15 4xd6 4xd6 16
4xb5 4xb5 17 4c5 f6 18 4d2+
4d7 19 4d1 4b8 20 4c4 4d6 21
4xd6 cxd6 22 4xd6 4e8 is about
equal according to Harding) 13...a6
14 c4 4e6 15 4c3 4cd4 16 4d3
4g6 17 4h1 4e6 18 4d5 still fa-
vours White, Gutman;
B2) 11...4g6!? 12 4h5 (12 4f3 a6
13 4d4 4e5?! 14 4h5 4f6)
12...4f6 13 4d2 h6 14 4ab1 4f5,
when Black has little to fear,
Gutman.
C) However, White has a far
superior continuation in 11 4f3?!
4g6 (11...4c4?! 12 4b1 4e6 13
4d4 4d5 14 4xd5 4xd5 15 4g4
4e5 16 4xg7 4d7 17 4h6 b6 18
4h3+ 4e7 19 f4 turned out bad for
Black in Pribyl-Gebhardt,
Schwäbisch Gmuend 1995) 12
4f4?! h5 (12...a6 allows the crushing
13 4xd6! cxd6 14 4xd6 4d7
15 4b1 4f5 16 4f4 4a7 17 4d5)
13 c4 (13 4xd6 cxd6 14 4xd6
4g4) 13...4g4 14 c5, and Black's
position is doubtful, Gutman.
11 4d4

11...d6!?
There are no decent prospects for
Black after 11...4xd4 12 cxd4 d6
13 4f3 (13 4d3 4h4 14 4d2 h6)
13...4g6 14 4b1 4b8 15 4e1 (15
c4 h5 16 c5 4g4 is less effective)
15...h5 16 4d2, Gutman.
12 4f3
12 4d2 can be met by 12...h6.
12...4g6 13 4b1 4e8
13...h5 14 4e1! (14 4f4 4xd4 15
cxd4, Quintero-Pena, Mondariz
1997, allows Black to consolidate
with 15 4b8 16 4d2 4g4)
14...4e5 (or 14...4xd4 15 cxd4
4b8 16 4d2 since 16...4g4 17
4xb7 4xb7 18 4xb7 4f3 is refuted
by 19 4b8+ 4d7 20 4g5) 15 4xb7
4xb7 16 4xb7 4c8 17 4b1 h4 18
h3 appears good for White, Gutman.
14 4e1 4e5?!
14...4f6 15 4c1 h6 16 4a3 g5 17
4a4 d5!? (17...4d7 18 4xb7 4xd4
19 4xd4 4xd4 20 4xd4 4c6 21
4xc6 4xc6 22 4xe8+ 4xe8 23
4xc7 left Black with a pawn less in
Marxen-Seck, Germany 1993) 18
4ed1 4e5 is also quite acceptable,
Gutman.
15 4xb7 4xb7 16 4xb7 4f5 17
4xf5 4xf5
Black is at least no worse, Gutman.
Sequel 12
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 ∆h4 5 ∆c3 ∆b4 6 ∆db5 
∆xe4+ 7 ∆e2 ∆xc3+ 8 ∆xc3 ∆d8 9 0-0 ∆ge7)
10 ∆d3?!

The other recent additions to White’s arsenal are:
I) 10 ∆f3 is not very convincing in view 10...∆c4 (10...∆g6?! 11 ∆f4 
d6 12 ∆e1 will transpose into variation 9...d6 10 ∆e1 ∆ge7 11 ∆f3 
∆g6 12 ∆f4 — Sequel 5) as after 11 ∆b1 a6 12 ∆d4 ∆xa2 it is not 
easy for White to make progress, Gutman;
II) 10 ∆e1!! is a more solid way.

Black has a wide range of possibilities:
A) 10...h6 11 ∆a3 ∆a4 12 ∆b1 a6 
13 ∆xc7 ∆xc7 14 ∆d6+ ∆d8 15 ∆f3 ∆f5 16 ∆c5 ∆ce7 17 ∆b6+ 
∆e8 18 ∆xe7 ∆xe7 19 ∆xe7+ 1-0, Staudner-Schirmer, Germany 1995;
B) 10...∆d5 11 ∆f4 d6 12 ∆c1 
∆e5 13 ∆a3 ∆d7 (Randvir-Tomson, Tallin 1980, went 13...∆c4 14 ∆xc4 ∆xc4 15 ∆xd6 
∆xb5 16 ∆xe7+ 1-0) 14 ∆ad1 ∆e4 
15 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 16 ∆xd6 cxd6 17 ∆g4 ∆f4 18 ∆d4 ∆xd4 19 cxd4 
∆c8 20 ∆a5+ 1-0, Marfia-Hayward, corr. 1978;
C) 10...∆h4 11 g3 ∆f6 12 ∆f4 d6 
13 ∆d2 a6 14 ∆g5 ∆g6 15 ∆d3 
∆f5 16 ∆xf5! (quite playable is 16 
∆xe7+ ∆xe7 17 ∆xc7 ∆c8 18 
∆xf5 ∆xf5 19 ∆d5 h5 20 c4 h4 21 
∆a5+ ∆d7 22 ∆ab1 b5 23 ∆b6+ 
∆c7 24 ∆xc8+ ∆xc8 25 ∆xa6+ 
1-0, Zygoiris-Valleilis, Iraklion 
1992) 16...∆xf5 17 ∆d4 and Black is helpless;
D) 10...d6 with a further split:
D1) 11 ∆h5 ∆f5 (instead of 11...
∆c4? 12 ∆xd6 cxd6 13 ∆xd6+ 
∆d7 14 ∆g5 ∆c8 15 ∆ad1 ∆c6 16 
∆xf7 ∆xf7 17 ∆d7+ ∆b8 18 ∆d4 
∆g6 19 ∆xc4 ∆xc4 20 ∆e8+ ∆xe8 
21 ∆xe8+ ∆c7 22 ∆xa8 and White 
won easily in Gromit-Fortress, com-
puter game 1999) 12 ∆b1 a6 13 
∆d4 ∆f6 allows Black to establish 
control, Gutman;
D2) 11 ∆f3! is the best reply, when 
11...∆g6 (11...∆f5 reaches a posi-
tion, covered in Sequel 6) 12 ∆f4 
will transpose into the variation af-
after 9...d6 10 ∆e1 ∆ge7 11 ∆f3 ∆g6 
12 ∆f4 — Sequel 5. 1-0;
E) The more mundane 10...a6 
leaves White with three options:
E1) 11 ∆d4 ∆xd4 12 cxd4 reaches a 
position after 9...a6 10 ∆d4 ∆xd4 
11 cxd4 ∆e7 12 ∆e1, covered in 
Sequel 7; 0-1
E2) 11 ∆f3 ∆g6 (after 11...∆c4 12 
∆d4 ∆xc3, Martin-Fawbuck, corr. 
1979, 13 ∆g5! ∆e8 14 ∆xc6 ∆xc6 
15 ∆f5 would have been winning 
for White) 12 ∆d4 ∆xd4 (12...d6 
will transpose into the variation 
9...d6 10 ∆f3 ∆g6 11 ∆e1 a6 12 
∆d4 ∆ge7 — Sequel 5) 13 cxd4 d6 
reaches a position after 9...a6 10 
∆d4 ∆xd4 11 cxd4 ∆e7 12 ∆e1 
∆g6 13 ∆f3 d6, covered in Sequel 
7;
E3) 11 ∆d3 is the main line.
10...\textbf{Wh}4
10...\textbf{Wd}5 can also be considered.

There are two possibilities:
A) 11 \textbf{Wg}4 \textbf{d}6 (safer than 11...\textbf{Qe}5
12 \textbf{Wg}3 \textbf{d}6 13 \textbf{c}4) 12 \textbf{Wxg}7 \textbf{Bg}8 13
\textbf{c}4 \textbf{We}6 14 \textbf{Wxh}7 \textbf{Bxg}2+ 15 \textbf{Bxg}2
\textbf{Wg}4+ would lead to a draw by perpetual;
B) 11 \textbf{Be}1!? poses more problems
for Black, for instance:
B1) 11...\textbf{d}6 was played in some
games, then:
B1a) 12 \textbf{Qa}3 \textbf{a}6 13 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{Wg}5 14 \textbf{Qe}3
\textbf{Qg}4!? (14...\textbf{Be}8 15 \textbf{Bb}2 \textbf{f}5 16 \textbf{c}5
\textbf{d}5 17 \textbf{Qc}4 \textbf{Qd}7 18 \textbf{Qxd}5 \textbf{Qxd}5 19
\textbf{Qxe}8+ \textbf{Qxe}8 20 \textbf{Qxd}5 \textbf{Qe}7 21
\textbf{Wg}8+ 1-0, Margraf-Lorenzen, Germany 1996) 15 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{Qe}6 16 \textbf{Qe}4 \textbf{Wf}5
17 \textbf{Wc}1 \textbf{h}6 18 \textbf{Bb}1 \textbf{Bb}8 19 \textbf{Qd}1
\textbf{Qc}8 20 \textbf{Qb}2 \textbf{Qf}5 21 \textbf{Qc}3 \textbf{Wa}4 22
\textbf{Wf}4 \textbf{g}5 23 \textbf{Wd}2 \textbf{Qd}8 24 \textbf{Qf}6 \textbf{Qf}d4
25 \textbf{Qe}4 \textbf{Qf}5 26 \textbf{Qd}5 \textbf{Qf}e7 27 \textbf{Qe}1
still gave White sufficient compensation
in Held-Wächter, Germany 1999;
B1b) 12 \textbf{c}4! looks much stronger to
me, 12...\textbf{Wc}5 13 \textbf{Qe}3 \textbf{Wc}5 14 \textbf{c}5
could be troublesome for Black,
\textbf{Gutman}.

B2) 11...\textbf{f}6 12 \textbf{Qa}3!? (instead of 12
\textbf{Qf}4 \textbf{Qe}5 13 \textbf{We}2 \textbf{a}6 14 \textbf{Qd}4 \textbf{d}6 15
\textbf{Qad}1 \textbf{Wc}5 16 \textbf{Qf}3, Jazbinsek-
Krumkap, Ljubljana 1992, when
16...\textbf{Qd}7!? would be satisfactory for
Black) 12...\textbf{Be}8 13 \textbf{c}4 and White
keeps the initiative, \textbf{Gutman}.
11 \textbf{He}1
11 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{Wf}6 12 \textbf{Qf}4 \textbf{d}6 13 \textbf{Qe}4
\textbf{f}5!? (after 13...\textbf{Qe}5?! 14 \textbf{He}1
\textbf{Qd}6 15 \textbf{Qd}4 \textbf{Qd}7 16 \textbf{Qb}1 \textbf{He}8 17
\textbf{Qxb}7 \textbf{Qc}8, Ahmed-Harding, Thess-
aloniki Olympiad 1984, 18 \textbf{Qb}3!
would have been crushing for
White) 14 \textbf{Qg}2 \textbf{He}8 offers Black
sufficient counterplay, \textbf{Gutman}.
11...\textbf{a}6
11...\textbf{f}5 is a waste of time since 12 \textbf{c}4
(more effective than 12 \textbf{Qa}3 \textbf{Wf}6 13
\textbf{Wd}2 \textbf{a}6 14 \textbf{Qd}4 \textbf{d}6, De Greeff-Lane,
Wijk aan Zee 1992) 12...\textbf{a}6 13 \textbf{Qc}3
\textbf{d}6 14 \textbf{Qf}4 \textbf{He}8 15 \textbf{Qb}1 \textbf{Wf}6 16 \textbf{Wd}2
\textbf{Qb}8 17 \textbf{Qb}2 causes serious disruption,
\textbf{Gutman}.
12 \textbf{He}4 \textbf{Wf}6

“A fine example of determined
defence from the position is
Schiffers-Chigorin, St. Petersburg
1897”, Botterill/Harding.
13 \textbf{Qf}4
13 \textbf{Qd}4 returns to the main line.
13...\textbf{Wd}6 14 \textbf{Qe}4 \textbf{Wf}6
“Against the attempt to repeat the
position Mikhail Chigorin gave
14...\textbf{Qe}5”, Botterill/Harding,
however 15 \texttt{\bf \&d4} (not 15 \texttt{\bf \&xc7}?! \texttt{\bf \&xc7} 16 f4 d6 17 fxe5 dxe5 18 \texttt{\bf \&c4} \texttt{\bf \&f6} with advantage to Black, Chigorin) 15...\texttt{\bf \&f6} 16 \texttt{\bf \&h5}!? (preferable to 16 \texttt{\bf \&f4} \texttt{\bf \&d6}, Chigorin) 16...\texttt{\bf \&xd3} 17 \texttt{\bf \&xd3} h6 18 \texttt{\bf \&f4} d6 19 \texttt{\bf \&ae1} \texttt{\bf \&e8} 20 \texttt{\bf \&g3} \texttt{\bf \&d7} 21 f4 clearly favours White, Gutman.

15 \texttt{\bf \&f4} \texttt{\bf \&e6} 16 \texttt{\bf \&d4} \texttt{\bf \&xd4} 17 cxd4!

This recapture was indicated by Botterill/Harding.

Schiffers-Chigorin, first match game, St.Petersburg 1897, continued 17 \texttt{\bf \&xd4} f6 18 \texttt{\bf \&a3} \texttt{\bf \&c6} 19 \texttt{\bf \&e4} \texttt{\bf \&d5} 20 \texttt{\bf \&e2} (“Here the best line would seem to be 20 c4?! \texttt{\bf \&a5} 21 \texttt{\bf \&b4}, suggested by Isaak Romanov”, Botterill/Harding) 20...d6 21 \texttt{\bf \&e1} \texttt{\bf \&d7} 22 \texttt{\bf \&c4} \texttt{\bf \&a5} 23 \texttt{\bf \&e6}? (“After this White is lost. 23 \texttt{\bf \&b4} was the move, with everything still to play for”, Botterill/Harding) 23...\texttt{\bf \&xe6} (“Not so good is 23...\texttt{\bf \&xa3} 24 \texttt{\bf \&xd7} \texttt{\bf \&e5} 25 \texttt{\bf \&h3}”, Botterill/Harding) 24 \texttt{\bf \&xe6} \texttt{\bf \&e5} 25 f4 \texttt{\bf \&d5} 26 f5 \texttt{\bf \&xa2} 27 \texttt{\bf \&c1} \texttt{\bf \&d7} 28 \texttt{\bf \&e4} \texttt{\bf \&ae8} and Black won.

17...d6 18 \texttt{\bf \&e4} \texttt{\bf \&f6} 19 \texttt{\bf \&h5}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Sequel 13}
\end{center}

(1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{\bf \&f3} \texttt{\bf \&c6} 3 d4 exd4 4 \texttt{\bf \&xd4} \texttt{\bf \&h4} 5 \texttt{\bf \&c3} \texttt{\bf \&b4} 6 \texttt{\bf \&db5} \texttt{\bf \&xe4} 7 \texttt{\bf \&e2} \texttt{\bf \&xc3} 8 \texttt{\bf \&xc3} 9-0-0) 9...

\texttt{\bf \&f6}!

This is the most sensible, and I think the best move.

The value of 9...\texttt{\bf \&f6} is that it should hold up both of critical squares in the centre — d5 and e4.

10 \texttt{\bf \&g5}!?

The pin of the knight seems to be the logical way of meeting the relatively new variation.

We mention here five more possibilities:

I) 10 g3 a6 (10...\texttt{\bf \&e8}!?) 11 \texttt{\bf \&f4} \texttt{\bf \&e5} 12 \texttt{\bf \&e1} d6 is worth consideration) 11 \texttt{\bf \&xc7} \texttt{\bf \&xc7} 12 \texttt{\bf \&f4}+ \texttt{\bf \&d8} 13 \texttt{\bf \&f3} \texttt{\bf \&c4} 14 \texttt{\bf \&d6} \texttt{\bf \&e8} 15 \texttt{\bf \&d2} \texttt{\bf \&c5} (after 15...\texttt{\bf \&c7}?) 16 \texttt{\bf \&fe1} d5 17 \texttt{\bf \&xc7}+ \texttt{\bf \&xc7} 18 \texttt{\bf \&xd5} \texttt{\bf \&c5} 19 \texttt{\bf \&f4}+ \texttt{\bf \&b6} 20 \texttt{\bf \&xc6} \texttt{\bf \&xc6} 21 \texttt{\bf \&d4}+ \texttt{\bf \&c5} 22 \texttt{\bf \&ab1}+ \texttt{\bf \&c6} 23 \texttt{\bf \&e4}+ \texttt{\bf \&c7} 24 \texttt{\bf \&f4}+ \texttt{\bf \&c6}, Isepy-Berecz, Hungary 1994, 25 \texttt{\bf \&e5} \texttt{\bf \&xc3} 26 \texttt{\bf \&e4}+ \texttt{\bf \&c7} 27 \texttt{\bf \&e7}+ would be decisive) 16 \texttt{\bf \&fe1} d6 17 \texttt{\bf \&ab1} f6 gives White insufficient compensation for the piece, Gutman;

II) 10 c4 a6 11 \texttt{\bf \&c3} \texttt{\bf \&d4} 12 \texttt{\bf \&e1} \texttt{\bf \&e5}!? 13 \texttt{\bf \&e3} \texttt{\bf \&d4} 14 \texttt{\bf \&d2} \texttt{\bf \&xe2}+

White has a healthy initiative, Gutman.
15 \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Ke8} \) 16 \( \text{Kad1} \) d6 17 \( \text{Ke1} \) \( \text{Kd4} \) and Black is on top, \( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \), Grosar-Sermek, Maribor 1994; III) 10 \( \text{Kd3} \) is here less effective.

Black has tried two retreats:

A) 10...\( \text{Wg4?!} \) 11 f3 \( \text{Wh5} \) 12 \( \text{Ke3} \) (12 \( \text{Ke1} \) a6 13 g4 \( \text{Wh4} \) 14 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 15 cxd4 h5 16 g5 \( \text{Ke8} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe8+} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 18 c3 \( \text{Kd6} \) 19 \( \text{Ke2} \) b5 20 \( \text{Kd2} \) \( \text{Kb7} \) was fine for Black in Schmid-Bauer, Germany 1979) 12...\( \text{Ke8} \) 13 \( \text{Kf2} \) yields White an excellent game, Gutman;

B) 10...\( \text{Wh4} \) is more logical, for instance:

B1) 11 g3 \( \text{Wh3} \) 12 \( \text{Kf4} \) d6 13 f3 \( \text{Qd5} \) 14 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 15 \( \text{Wxf4} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) (perhaps 15...f6?! 16 c4 \( \text{Ke5} \) is even better) 16 \( \text{Kad1} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 17 c4 f6 (after 17...\( \text{Qxd3?!} \) 18 \( \text{Kxd3} \) \( \text{Wf5} \) 19 \( \text{Wd4} \) \( \text{Wf6} \), Helmond-Welling, Holland 1995, 20 \( \text{Wxf6+} \) \( \text{Kxf6} \) 21 c5 would have secured an edge for White) 18 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) 19 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Wc5} + + \) 20 \( \text{kg2} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) favours Black, Gutman;

B2) Schmidt-Metz, Germany 1991, continued 11 \( \text{Ke3} \) d6 12 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) (12...h6 is also possible) 13 c4 (Black has nothing to fear from 13 \( \text{Kg5} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 14 \( \text{Wf4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 13...a6 14 \( \text{Qc3} \) h6 15 c5 d5 16 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Ke8} \) 17 c4 \( \text{Qg4} \) 18 \( \text{Qf4} \) dxc4 (18...\( \text{Qd8} \) 19 cxd5 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 20 \( \text{Cc3} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) demonstrates another sound option for Black) 19 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 20 \( \text{Cc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 21 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 22 \( \text{Qxc6} \) bxc6 23 h3 \( \text{Qd3} \) with a clear advantage for Black.

IV) 10 \( \text{Kxa3} \) \( \text{Ke8} \) seems more testing.
V) 10 \( \text{Re}1 \text{ a6} \) is a more conservative continuation, which must be handled with great precision.

20 \( \text{Re}1+ \text{Fd}7 \) 21 \( \text{Wh}3+ \text{Cc}6 \) 1/2-1/2, Leisebein-Gutman, corr. 1999.

White has a choice:

A) 11 \( \text{Af}3 \text{ Wc}4 \) (11...\( \text{Wg}6 \) fails due to 12 \( \text{Dxc}7! \) \( \text{Dxc}7 \) 13 \( \text{Df}4+ \text{Fh}8 \) 14 \( \text{Wd}6 \text{ De}8 \) 15 \( \text{Dxe}8+ \text{Dxe}8 \) 16 \( \text{Df}6+ \text{Fxe}6 \) 17 \( \text{Af}6+ \) 18 \( \text{Af}4) \) 12 \( \text{Dd}4 \text{ Dxd}4 \) (not 12...\( \text{Dxe}8 \)?) 13 \( \text{Dxc}6 \text{ bx}c6 \) 14 \( \text{Dg}5 \text{ Wc}3 \) 15 \( \text{Dxe}8+ \text{Fxe}8 \) 16 \( \text{Df}2+ \text{Ff}8 \) 17 \( \text{Df}1 \text{ b}7 \) 18 \( \text{Df}7+ \text{Dg}8 \) 19 \( \text{Dxf}6 \text{ gxf}6 \) 20 \( \text{Df}5 \text{ Ff}8 \) 21 \( \text{h}3 \text{ Wa}5 \) 22 \( \text{Wf}6 \) 1-0, Adell-Cubas, Caceres 1993) 13 \( \text{cx}d4 \text{ h}6 \) 14 \( \text{Df}4 \) 15 \( \text{Dh}1 \text{ b}8 \) looks very reliable for Black, Gutman;

B) 11 \( \text{Dd}4 \text{ Dxd}4 \) 12 \( \text{cx}d4 \text{ Dxe}8 \) (after 12...\( \text{D}6 \) 13 \( \text{Dxa}6 \text{ Fd}5 \) 14 \( \text{Df}1 \text{ Dxa}2 \) 15 \( \text{c}4 \text{ Wa}5 \) 16 \( \text{Dxa}2 \) 17 \( \text{Dg}5 \text{ Dg}8 \) 18 \( \text{Dxe}8+ \text{g}8 \), Ungor-Kvusinovas, Zakopane 2000, 19 \( \text{Dxf}6+ \text{gxf}6 \) 20 \( \text{Dd}3 \) would have given White good chances) 13 \( \text{Dg}5 \text{ Dg}6 \) 14 \( \text{Dd}2 \) 16 with two examples: 

B1) 15 \( \text{Df}3 \text{ h}6 \) 16 \( \text{Dxf}6+ \) (or 16 \( \text{Dh}4 \) 16...\( \text{D}6 \) 17 \( \text{Dxe}8+ \) (17 \( \text{Dab}1 \text{ b}8 \) 1/2-1/2, Schilling-Herbst, Germany 1995) 17...\( \text{Dxe}8 \) 18 \( \text{Dc}3 \) \( \text{Dd}8 \) 19 \( \text{Df}1+ \) 20 \( \text{Dd}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) and Black is quite comfortable, Gutman;

B2) 15 \( \text{Dd}3 \) 16 \( \text{Dxf}6+ \) 17 \( \text{Dxe}8+ \) 18 \( \text{b}1 \) 19 \( \text{Dxd}3 \) (18...\( \text{b}8 \) 19 \( \text{Dxa}6 \) 19 \( \text{Dxd}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \)

10...\( \text{Df}5 \)

Less incisive are:

I) 10...\( \text{Df}5 \) 11 \( \text{Dd}2 \) 16 was suggested by Palm, however after 12 \( \text{Dd}3?! \) \( \text{a}6 \) 13 \( \text{Df}1 \text{ c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Df}4 \) Black has no answer to the threat of 15 \( \text{Dxf}6 \), Gutman;

II) 10...\( \text{a}6 \) is interesting, but not quite sufficient. We consider the following lines:

A) 11 \( \text{Dxf}6+ \text{gxf}6 \) 12 \( \text{Df}3 \) with a further split:

A1) 12...\( \text{Df}5 \) 13 \( \text{Dd}4 \) (13 \( \text{Dxc}6 \text{ axb}5 \) 13...\( \text{Dxd}4 \) (13...\( \text{Dc}5? \) is bad because of 14 \( \text{Dxc}6 \text{ bx}c6 \) 15 \( \text{Df}3 \)) 14 \( \text{Dxd}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 15 \( \text{Df}1 \) leaving Black under uncomfortable pressure, Gutman;

A2) 12...\( \text{Dc}4?! \) 13 \( \text{Dxc}6 \text{ Wxc}6 \) 14 \( \text{Dd}4 \text{ Fd}5 \) 15 \( \text{Dg}4 \text{ Dg}5 \) 16 \( \text{Dxe}4 \) 17 \( \text{Dd}3 \text{ Dg}8 \) 18 \( \text{g}3 \text{ Dg}6 \) 19 \( \text{Df}3 \) gave White the initiative in Grolleau-Piot, Paris 1994;

A3) 12...\( \text{Df}4 \) is imperative, 13 \( \text{Dd}4 \) (or 13 \( \text{Dxc}6 \text{ axb}5 \) 14 \( \text{Dxb}5 \text{ Dg}8 \) 15...\( \text{Dc}5 \) offers Black enough counterplay, Gutman;

B) 11 \( \text{Df}4 \), retaining the tension for a little longer, causes more problems for Black.
11...\(\boxtimes d4\) (11...\(\boxtimes e5\)? is too optimistic in view of 12 \(\boxtimes e1\)) 12 \(\boxtimes d4\) (12 \(\boxtimes x f6+\)? \(\boxtimes x f6\) 13 \(\boxtimes d4\) is also good for White) 12...\(\boxtimes f5\) (12...d6 13 \(\boxtimes b1\) \(\boxtimes a7\)? 14 \(\boxtimes d2\) h6 15 \(\boxtimes x f6+\) \(\boxtimes x f6\) 16 \(\boxtimes f3\) \(\boxtimes g6\) 17 \(\boxtimes x e1\) \(\boxtimes g5\) 18 \(\boxtimes e2\) f5 19 c4 clearly favoured White in Dorofeeva-Gavritenkov, Russia 1998) 13 \(\boxtimes h4\) and White dominates the board, Gutman.

11 \(\boxtimes h4\)?

Alternatively:

I) 11 \(\boxtimes d2\) a6 12 \(\boxtimes d3\) \(\boxtimes c5\) 13 \(\boxtimes b4\) \(\boxtimes e5\) favours Black, Dimitri Basanin;

II) 11 h4 d6 (after 11...a6? 12 \(\boxtimes d3\) \(\boxtimes c5\) 13 \(\boxtimes b3\) axb5 14 \(\boxtimes x f6+\) \(\boxtimes e7\) 15 \(\boxtimes x g 7\) \(\boxtimes g 8\) 16 \(\boxtimes x f 7\) White won quickly in Faugno-Bezzi, Bologna 1993) 12 \(\boxtimes d3\) \(\boxtimes g 4\) with equality, Gutman.

We survey Black's defences:

A) 12...\(\boxtimes d4\) 13 \(\boxtimes cxd4\) (13 \(\boxtimes x d4\) \(\boxtimes e 8\) 14 \(\boxtimes d 3\) \(\boxtimes e 5\)) 13...\(\boxtimes e 8\) 14 \(\boxtimes b 1\) h6 15 c4 g5 16 \(\boxtimes g 3\) \(\boxtimes e 4\) 17 \(\boxtimes d 3\) \(\boxtimes d 7\) 18 \(\boxtimes x e 4\) \(\boxtimes x e 4\) 19 \(\boxtimes f 3\) \(\boxtimes e 7\) 20 d5 f5 21 \(\boxtimes d 4\) f4 22 \(\boxtimes f 2\) \(\boxtimes h 7\) 1/2-1/2 Baer-Leisebein, corr. 1998; however, White could have carried on with 23 \(\boxtimes f 1\);

B) 12...\(\boxtimes f 4\) 13 \(\boxtimes g 3\) \(\boxtimes g 5\) 14 \(\boxtimes e 1\) \(\boxtimes g 4\)? (more precise than 14...

15 \(\boxtimes c 4\) \(\boxtimes x e 1+\) 16 \(\boxtimes x e 1\) \(\boxtimes x d 4\) 17 \(\boxtimes c x d 4\) \(\boxtimes g 4\) 18 \(\boxtimes e 3\) \(\boxtimes e 6\) 19 \(\boxtimes e 2\) \(\boxtimes e 4\) 20 \(\boxtimes d 2\) \(\boxtimes g 6\) 21 \(\boxtimes f 5\) 22 c4 \(\boxtimes d 7\), Schilling-Riepie, corr. 1999, and now 23 \(\boxtimes e 1\)? would retain an edge for White) 15 \(\boxtimes b 1\) \(\boxtimes x e 2\) 16 \(\boxtimes x e 2\) \(\boxtimes x d 4\) 17 \(\boxtimes x d 4\) (or 17 \(\boxtimes c x d 4\) h5!) 17...\(\boxtimes d 5\), when the endgame resulting from 18 \(\boxtimes h 4\) \(\boxtimes x d 4\) 19 \(\boxtimes c x d 4\) \(\boxtimes b 8\) 20 \(\boxtimes b 1\) b5 21 \(\boxtimes e 7\) \(\boxtimes f 8\) is at least no worse for Black, Gutman.

12...\(\boxtimes e 8\)

Other moves are less advisable:

I) 12...a6? loses to 13 \(\boxtimes x d 6\) \(\boxtimes x d 6+\);

II) 12...\(\boxtimes d 7\) 13 \(\boxtimes f 3\) and White, with his space advantage and two powerful bishops, keeps the initiative, Basanin.

13 \(\boxtimes f 4\)

13 \(\boxtimes f 3\) can be met by 13...\(\boxtimes e 5\) since 14 \(\boxtimes x d 6\) (or 14 \(\boxtimes b 7\) \(\boxtimes b 7\) 15 \(\boxtimes x d 6\) \(\boxtimes x d 6\) 16 \(\boxtimes b 7\) \(\boxtimes e 8\) 17 \(\boxtimes x d 6\) \(\boxtimes x b 7\) 18 \(\boxtimes b 1+\) \(\boxtimes c 8\) 19 \(\boxtimes e 5+\) \(\boxtimes d 8\) 20 \(\boxtimes d 1+\) \(\boxtimes d 7\) 14...\(\boxtimes x f 3+\) 15 \(\boxtimes x f 3\) \(\boxtimes c x d 6\) 16 \(\boxtimes x d 6+\) \(\boxtimes d 7\) 17 \(\boxtimes b 7\) \(\boxtimes e 7\) 18 \(\boxtimes d 1\) \(\boxtimes e 8\) does not lead anywhere for White, Gutman.

13...\(\boxtimes d 7\)

Black's position is quite solid, Gutman.
Sequel 14

(1 e4 e5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 exd4 Wh4 5 b3 b4 6 db5 Wxe4+ 7 e2 xc3+ 8 bxc3 d8 9 0-0 f6)

10 b1

10 f3 Wc4 11 b1, an attempt to refine White's move order, deserves attention.

We consider the following lines:

A) 11...h6?! 12 e1 a6 13 d6! cxd6 14 e3 e7 15 c5+ f8 16 Wxd6+ g8 17 e3 b5 18 e2 Wxa2 19 d1 b7 20 Wxf6! Wxc2 21 g3 h7 22 Wxd7 Wxe2 23 Wxf7+ Wh8 24 e3 e5 25 e7 W4 26 x5 c6 27 d8+ xd8 28 Wxd8+ Wg8 29 Wd6 Wc8 30 f5 1-0, Borulba-Dobrovolsky, Karvina 1992;

B) 11...e8 12 g5?! (after 12 e1 Wxe1+ 13 Wxe1 a6 14 d4 d4 15 cxd4 Wxa2 16 f4 d6 17 xb7, Pflichthofer-Oparau, Germany 1994, 17 xb7 18 Wxb7 Wd5 19 b4 Wf5 would have given a clear advantage for Black) 12...a6 (Hjartarson-Moulin, New York 1994, went 12...e5?! 13 Wd2! a6 14 d4 xc5?! 15 xf6+ gxf6 16 Wh6 e7 17 fe1+ e5 18 f5+ c6 19 e4 d5 20 d3 Wa4 21 Wf8 1-0) 13 d4!? (13 d5 Wc5 14 xf6+ gxf6 15 xf7 xe7 16 d4 d6 17 Wg5 Wxh5 18 Wh5 xe5 19 f3 xc5 leads to equality) 13...Wxc3 (or 13...xd4 14 cxd4 15 b8 15 Wd2 14 xc6 bxc6 15 b3 Wc5 16 Wd2 and White has pressure in return for his two pawns, Gutman;

C) 11...a6! is probably best, transposing into the main line after 12 d4.

10...a6

10 e8 is less convincing in view of 11 f3 Wf5 (11...c4 reaches a position after 10 f3 Wc4 11 b1 e8) 12 d4 cxd4 13 Wxd4! Wxe5 (or 13...e6 14 f4 g5 15 g3) 14 Wa4 d5 15 c4 d4 16 c5 e6 17 b4 d7 18 cxd4 e7 19 Wb4 a5 20 Wc3! (an improvement on 20 Wxb7?! Wxd4 21 Wxa8? b5 22 Wxa5 xf1 23 Wf4 24 Wxc7+ d7 and Black won easily, Felsberger-Opl, Austria 1994) 20...c6 21 f4 Wf5 22 Wxc7 Wxf3 23 a6+ e8 24 gxf3 with an edge for White, Gutman.

11 f3 Wc4?!
There are two more possibilities:

I) 11...\texttt{Wh4} 12 \texttt{Qd4} \texttt{Qxd4} 13 \texttt{cx4} \texttt{Bb8} 14 \texttt{c4} \texttt{Be8} 15 \texttt{c5} \texttt{Qe4} 16 \texttt{Wb3}!? (Hdiniuk-Walkusz, Jaroslaw 1997, went 16 \texttt{g3} \texttt{Wf6} 17 \texttt{Me1} d5 18 \texttt{Wb3} \texttt{Qe6} 19 \texttt{Qf4} g5 20 \texttt{Qe5} \texttt{Wg6} 21 \texttt{Qxe4} \texttt{dxe4} 22 \texttt{d5} \texttt{Qg4} 23 \texttt{Qxc7+} \texttt{Qxc7} 24 \texttt{d6+} \texttt{Qd7} 25 \texttt{Wxa4+} \texttt{b5} 26 \texttt{cxb6+} \texttt{Qd8} 27 \texttt{b7} 1-0) 16...\texttt{Wf6} 17 \texttt{Wd5} \texttt{Qc3} 18 \texttt{Wh5} h6 19 \texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Qb5} 20 \texttt{Qxb2} yields White a clear advantage, Gutman;

II) 11...\texttt{Wf5} 12 \texttt{Qd4} \texttt{Qxd4} 13 \texttt{Wxd4}! (while 13 \texttt{cx4} achieves nothing after 13...\texttt{Bb8} 14 \texttt{Me1} d6) 13...\texttt{Qe8} 14 \texttt{Qe3} (14 \texttt{Qf4}!? d6 15 \texttt{Qfd1} is also promising) 14...\texttt{Wd5} 15 \texttt{Wh4} h6 16 \texttt{Qfd1} \texttt{Qe6} 17 \texttt{Wb4} d6 18 \texttt{c4} a5 19 \texttt{Qa3} \texttt{Qe4} 20 \texttt{Qd4} f5 21 \texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Wf6} 22 c5 \texttt{Qa6} 23 \texttt{Qbd1} \texttt{Qe8} 24 \texttt{cx6} \texttt{Qex6} 25 \texttt{Qf4} \texttt{Qxd3} 26 \texttt{cx3} \texttt{Qxd6} 27 \texttt{Qe1}+ \texttt{Qf8} 28 \texttt{Qe5} \texttt{Wf7} 29 \texttt{Qc5} \texttt{Qe6} 30 \texttt{Qxb7} \texttt{Qb6} 31 \texttt{Qc6} left Black awkwardly placed in Rasik-Sarkozy, Bratislava 1991.
12 \texttt{Qd4} \texttt{Qxd4} 13 \texttt{cx4} h6 14 \texttt{Qf4} d6

The game is complicated, but Black keeps at it, Gutman.

Sequel 15

(1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qc6} 3 d4 \texttt{exd4} 4 \texttt{Qxd4} \texttt{Wh4} 5 \texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Qb4} 6 \texttt{Qdb5} \texttt{Wxe4}+ 7 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qxc3}+ 8 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{Qd8} 9 0-0 \texttt{Qf6})
10 \texttt{Qe3}

This was originally considered to be the refutation of the 9...\texttt{Qf6} variation. The main idea is \texttt{Wd1-c1-a3}, which enables the queen to attack laterally across the a3-f8 diagonal.

10...\texttt{Qe8}!

Clearly the best continuation, though “this doesn’t yield a satisfactory game”, Hall.

Alternatives are:

I) “If Black tries to dislodge the powerful knight from b5 then he runs into trouble: 10...\texttt{a6} 11 \texttt{Qf3} (11 \texttt{Qd6}?! \texttt{We6} 12 \texttt{Qxc8} \texttt{Qxc8} with only a very slight edge to White) 11...\texttt{We5} 12 \texttt{Qd4} \texttt{Qxd4} (after 12...\texttt{Qe7} 13 \texttt{Qe1} \texttt{Wa5}, Markus-Bär, corr. 1999, 14 \texttt{Qb3}?! \texttt{Wxc3} 15 \texttt{Qd4} \texttt{Wc4} 16 \texttt{Qa5} \texttt{Wb5} 17 \texttt{Wd2} would have given White a very strong attack, Gutman) 13 \texttt{Qxd4} and White is better according to Azmai-parashvili”, Lane;
II) "The best plan for Black was to activate the queenside rook by 10...d6, followed by ...\textit{e}6, ...\textit{d}7 and ...\textit{ae}8, although he must always be wary of a disruptive sacrifice on d6", Lane.

![Chess Diagram]

"We like it; the resourceful 10...d6 shows that Black’s position — seemingly under withering attack — retains remarkable durability", Hall.

White has a choice:

A) 11 \textit{xd}3 \textit{wh}4 reaches a position after 10 \textit{xd}3 \textit{wh}4 11 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}6, covered in Sequel 13;

B) 11 \textit{xd}4 \textit{wh}4 12 \textit{mb}1 h5!? (improving on 12...\textit{e}6 13 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 14 \textit{qd}4 \textit{d}5 15 \textit{b}5 \textit{xd}4 16 \textit{cx}d4 \textit{c}6 17 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}8 18 \textit{g}4+ \textit{b}8 19 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}8 20 \textit{xb}7+ \textit{xb}7 21 \textit{wb}1+ \textit{a}6 22 \textit{e}2+ \textit{a}5 23 \textit{wb}7 1-0, Phalanx-Arasan, computer game 1999) 13 \textit{xf}6+ (or 13 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}4) 13...\textit{xf}6 14 \textit{qd}4 \textit{e}5 and White’s position can easily become over-extended, Gutman;

C) 11 \textit{ee}1!? \textit{ee}8 12 \textit{mb}1 (12 \textit{xd}6 \textit{cx}d6 13 \textit{xd}6+ \textit{d}7 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}4 15 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}8 leaves White with no compensation for his piece) 12...\textit{ee}7! returns to the main line;

D) 11 \textit{f}3! is the most logical way to play, exposing the shortcomings of 10...d6.

After 11...\textit{wc}4 (Sa-Bailen, corr. 1999, went 11...\textit{f}5 12 \textit{mb}1 \textit{ee}8 13 \textit{qd}4 \textit{xd}4 14 \textit{xd}4! 15 \textit{wb}7 c6 16 \textit{mb}4 \textit{d}5 17 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 18 \textit{ff}8+ \textit{cc}7 19 \textit{xe}4 \textit{dx}e4 20 \textit{dd}1 \textit{b}6 21 \textit{ee}7+ \textit{bb}8 22 \textit{g}3 1-0) 12 \textit{mb}1. Black has two ideas at his disposal:

D1) 12...\textit{ee}8 13 \textit{gg}5!? (13 \textit{xd}6 \textit{cx}d6 14 \textit{xd}6+ is premature as 14...\textit{dd}7 15 \textit{dd}5 \textit{xc}3 16 \textit{xf}7 \textit{xe}3 17 \textit{fx}e3 \textit{xe}3+ 18 \textit{hh}1 \textit{ee}5 19 \textit{dd}3 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{be}1 \textit{wd}4 shows) 13...\textit{ee}7 14 \textit{xe}6 \textit{bx}e6 15 \textit{xd}6 \textit{cx}d6 16 \textit{xd}6+ \textit{dd}7 (16...\textit{dd}7 17 \textit{fe}1) 17 \textit{ff}8+ \textit{cc}7 18 \textit{xc}xg7 \textit{dd}5 19 \textit{ee}5+ \textit{dd}6 20 \textit{fd}1 \textit{dd}7 21 \textit{dd}4 \textit{xa}2 (21...\textit{xc}3 can be met by 22 \textit{ee}7) 22 \textit{bd}1 \textit{f}6 (or 22...\textit{h}6 23 \textit{hh}4 \textit{ee}6 24 \textit{gg}7 \textit{cc}7 25 \textit{cc}4 \textit{ee}7 26 \textit{xf}7 \textit{wa}5 27 \textit{g}4 \textit{wc}5 28 \textit{we}8) 23 \textit{xf}6 \textit{ee}6 24 \textit{gg}5! (24 \textit{xd}5+ \textit{cx}d5 25 \textit{xd}5+ \textit{cc}6 26 \textit{cc}5+ \textit{bb}7 27 \textit{wc}7+ \textit{aa}6 28 \textit{cc}6+ \textit{bb}5 29 \textit{cc}5+ \textit{aa}6 is only a draw by repetition) 24...\textit{cc}7 25 \textit{dd}8+ \textit{bb}7 26 \textit{gg}7+ \textit{aa}6 27 \textit{wh}7 \textit{xc}3 28 \textit{dd}3+ \textit{bb}5 29 \textit{bb}4 and Black is helpless since 29...\textit{xd}6 fails to 30 \textit{xb}5+ \textit{cx}b5 31 \textit{xd}6+ \textit{bb}7 32 \textit{xb}5 mate, Gutman;

D2) 12...\textit{ee}6 13 \textit{xd}6! \textit{cx}d6 14 \textit{wd}6+ \textit{dd}7 15 \textit{xb}7 \textit{ee}6 16
$\text{wc7+ $\text{we8}$ 17 $\text{xe1!}$ (more impressive than 17 $\text{dc5}$ $\text{xc8}$ 18 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xc6}$ 19 $\text{db8}$ $\text{dd7}$ 20 $\text{xc8+}$ $\text{xc8}$ 21 $\text{dd1}$ $\text{dd5}$, Ashley-Bokan, Cannes 1998) 17...$\text{xc8}$ (or 17...$\text{dd8}$ 18 $\text{dd2}$ $\text{exe1+}$ 19 $\text{exe1}$ $\text{xb7}$ 20 $\text{xb7}$) 18 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xc6}$ (18...$\text{xc7}$ 19 $\text{db8+}$ $\text{dd7}$ 20 $\text{c5mate}$) 19 $\text{db8}$ $\text{xb8}$ 20 $\text{xb8+}$ $\text{dd7}$ 21 $\text{dd1+}$ and White wins easily, Carsten Müller.

11 $\text{dxc6}$

11 c4 b6?! 12 $\text{xe1}$ $\text{b7}$ 13 $\text{d3}$ $\text{wh4}$ 14 g3 $\text{wh3}$ 15 $\text{f1}$ $\text{ff5}$ 16 $\text{f4}$ $\text{xc8}$ 17 $\text{g2}$ $\text{exe1+}$ 18 $\text{exe1}$ a6 19 $\text{d7}$ $\text{xa7}$ 20 $\text{xb7}$ $\text{bb8}$ 21 $\text{xa6}$ $\text{xc2}$ 22 c5 $\text{dc6}$ 23 $\text{exe1}$ $\text{exe2}$ 24 $\text{xe2}$ $\text{xb6}$ was clearly better for Black in Apitzsch-Leisebein, corr. 1999.

11...d6!

If Black gets too flashy he can end up in trouble:

I) 11...a6? 12 $\text{d6! cxd6}$ (not 12...$\text{gg6}$ 13 $\text{d3}$ 1-0, Kernazhitsky-Panchenko, USA 1998) 13 $\text{d3}$ $\text{we5}$ 14 $\text{b6+}$ and Black does not have full compensation for the queen, Gutman;

II) 11...$\text{we5}$ 12 $\text{wc1}$ d6 was suggested by Stefan Bücker.

A) 13 $\text{wa3}$ $\text{gg4}$ 14 $\text{xxg4}$ $\text{xxg4}$ 15 $\text{ab1?!}$ (15 $\text{wa4}$ $\text{dd7}$, Bücker) 15...$\text{dd7}$ (15...$\text{dd7}$ 16 $\text{wa4}$) 16 $\text{wb3}$ $\text{da5?!}$ 17 $\text{xf7}$ $\text{xe7}$ 18 $\text{ff8+}$ $\text{xe8}$ with a draw by repetition, Gutman;

B) 13 $\text{dd3}$ $\text{wh5}$ 14 $\text{wd2}$ $\text{xe6}$ 15 $\text{dd4}$ $\text{dd5}$ 16 $\text{gg5}$ $\text{de7}$ 17 f3 $\text{h6}$ 18 $\text{xf6}$ $\text{gx6}$ 19 $\text{ab1}$ a6 (instead of 19...$\text{dd7?!}$ 20 $\text{bb5}$ $\text{gg5}$ 21 f4 $\text{gg8}$ 22 $\text{xe7+}$ $\text{xe7}$ 23 $\text{xd5}$ $\text{ae8}$ 24 $\text{xf5+}$ $\text{dd8}$ 25 $\text{dc6+}$ 1-0, Kose-Kohoutek, corr. 1993) 20 c4 $\text{dc6}$ and Black is at least no worse, Gutman;

C) 13 $\text{dd4!}$ is the most dynamic continuation, 13...$\text{dd7}$ 14 $\text{bb1}$ b6 15 $\text{df3}$ d5 16 $\text{wd2}$ $\text{xd4}$ 17 $\text{dd4}$ $\text{ff5}$ 18 c4 c6 19 $\text{xd5}$ $\text{dd5}$ 20 $\text{xxg7}$ $\text{gg8}$ 21 $\text{ee5}$ $\text{gg6}$ 22 $\text{gg5}$ 1-0, Boeseberg-Gnirk, corr. 1994.

III) 11...$\text{wd5}$ 12 $\text{wc1!}$ was played in only one, but by far the most famous game in this system.

White has three possibilities:

12...$\text{ff5}$ 13 $\text{wa3}$ (“Clearing the back rank to speed his queen’s rook into the attack”, Hall) 13...d6 14 $\text{aad1}$ (“White has successfully managed to activate the whole of his army whilst Black’s forces remain largely dormant. A sacrifice on d6 is
now firmly on the horizon”, Lane) 14...\textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}7 15 \textit{c}4 (“White now begins to batter Black’s defensive bastions; the immediate threat is 16 \textit{c}5”, Lane) 15...\textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{e}6 16 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}3 (“Black has prepared 16 \textit{c}5 \textit{d}5 17 \textit{c}4 \textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{d}7 with a firm defensive barrier but White does not allow him this”, Lane. “The problem for Black in this type of position is that, even in the absence of a quick knockout, it is very difficult for him to free himself fully. Now there is a direct threat — 17 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{c}6 and \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}4”, Wells) 16...\textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}7 (“Clearly Black cannot accept the pawn sacrifice: 16...\textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{c}4? 17 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{d}6 \textit{cxd}6 18 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{c}6 \textit{bxc}6 19 \textit{\textbf{b}}\textit{b}6+”, Lane) 17 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{c}6 \textit{bxc}6 18 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}4 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{h}5 19 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}5 (“Much stronger than the routine capture on \textit{c}6, after which Black’s king could hope to escape to the kingside”, Wells. “Black could have wriggled on after 19 \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{c}6+ \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}8 20 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}4 \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{7}”, Lane) 19...\textit{c}5 (“The bishop is immune because the breakthrough on the e-file adds a decisive impetus to the onslaught after 19...\textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{xg}5 20 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{c}6 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{c}5 21 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{a}6”, Wells, when 21...\textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{xd}4 22 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{d}4 \textit{f}xe6 23 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{b}7 \textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{c}8 24 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{x}a7 should easily win for White) 20 \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}6+ \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{f}6 21 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{c}6+ \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}8 22 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{b}2 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{h}4 23 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{b}7 \textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{d}8 24 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}3! 1–0, Azmaiparashvili–Hector, San Sebastian 1991. “In this hopeless position Black resigned. One possible finish is 24...\textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{x}c4 25 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}8 26 \textit{\textbf{c}}x\textit{d}8 \textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{d}8 27 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{c}7 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}7 28 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{b}8+ \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}7 29 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}8, indicated by Azmaiparashvili”, Lane.

“The entry of the rook via \textit{g}3 finally breaks Black’s resistance. To the end White remained immune from the lure of material”, Wells.

I feel that Black’s position is strong enough to confront White’s threats.

“Nevertheless, there are certain factors which cloud the issue. First and foremost is the fact that Black’s king stands on a poor square. That gives White additional time to develop his pieces and he may be able to go on the attack. Second, the position is highly unorthodox and more rigid players might not be able to get a grip on the position”, Daniel King, English Defence.

12 \textit{\textbf{b}}\textit{b}1

A few other tries are:

I) 12 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{xd}6?! \textit{cxd}6 13 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{xd}6+ \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}7 14 \textit{\textbf{a}}\textit{b}1 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{d}5 15 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{g}3 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{e}8, Hergert-Leisebein, corr. 1997, when White resigned because of 16 \textit{\textbf{b}}\textit{b}5 (16 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}3 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{e}5 17 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{x}g7 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}4) 16...\textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{x}a2 17 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{g}7 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{e}6 18 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}3 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}8, Leisebein;

II) 12 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{c}1 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}6!? (12...\textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}6 13 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}6 14 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}4 \textit{a}6 15 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{a}3 \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{7}, indicated by Leisebein, is less clear in view of 16 \textit{e}4! 13 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{a}3 (13 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}5 14 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{xf}5 \textit{\textbf{x}}\textit{f}5 15 \textit{\textbf{b}}\textit{b}1 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}4 with a plus for Black, according to Leisebein) 13...\textit{\textbf{h}}\textit{h}3 14 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}1 \textit{\textbf{e}}\textit{e}5 15 \textit{\textbf{b}}\textit{b}6 (or 15 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{xd}6 \textit{cxd}6 16 \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{c}6+ \textit{\textbf{c}}\textit{e}8 17 \textit{\textbf{d}}\textit{d}1 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}7 18 \textit{\textbf{w}}\textit{g}6 \textit{hx}g6 19 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{h}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}\textit{f}3+ 20 \textit{\textbf{g}}\textit{g}2...
\( \text{xel} + 21 \text{xel} \text{e7} 22 \text{xd} 1 \text{c7} \\
\text{and Black won easily, Holzegel-Leisebein, corr. 1998) 15...\text{xf} 3+ 16 \text{h} 1 \text{xe} 1 17 \text{xe} 1 \text{xe} 1 18 \text{xc} 7+ \text{c} 8 19 \text{xd} 6+ \text{d} 7 0-1,} \\
\text{Hergert-Leisebein, corr. 1997; III) 12 \text{d} 4 \\
\text{with two examples:} \\
\text{A) 12...\text{de} 5 is a rather artificial attempt; after 13 \text{g} 5 \text{d} 5 14 \text{c} 1 \\
\text{c} 1 \text{when 14 \text{d} 3?! \text{de} 4 15 \text{xe} 8+ \text{xe} 8 16 \text{w} 2+ \text{e} 6 17 \text{f} 4 \text{f} 8 18} \\
\text{h} 3 \text{h} 6! 19 \text{xf} 6 \text{gxf} 6 20 \text{b} 1 \text{e} 8 21 \text{w} 2 \text{b} 6 \text{favour Black, Conde-} \\
\text{Collier, e-mail game 1998) 14...\text{de} 7 15 \text{d} 1 \text{White keeps the} \\
\text{initiative, Gutman;}} \\
\text{B) 12...\text{xd} 4 \text{is more solid, 13 \text{xd} 4} \\
\text{g} 4?! (Hindschess-Leisebein, corr. 1998, went 13...\text{g} 6 14 \text{c} 4 \text{f} 5 15 \text{f} 3 \text{e} 8 16 \text{d} 2 \text{e} 4 17 \text{xe} 4 \\
\text{ex} 4 18 \text{a} 5 \text{a} 6 19 \text{ab} 1 \text{e} 7 20 \text{d} 5 1/2-1/2) 14 \text{ex} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{f} 15 \text{wb} 1 \\
\text{b} 8 16 \text{c} 4 \text{g} 6 \text{and Black has nothing} \\
\text{with a plus for Black;}} \\
\text{V) 12 \text{g} 5 \text{f} 5?! (12...\text{g} 6 13 \text{d} 2 \text{h} 6 14 \text{h} 4 \text{e} 5 15 \text{ad} 1 \text{f} 5 \\
\text{16 \text{xe} 7 \text{xc} 7 17 \text{xd} 6+ \text{c} 8 18 \text{b} 5 \text{f} 3+ 19 \text{h} 1 \text{xe} 1+ 20 \text{xe} 1 \\
\text{xe} 1 21 \text{f} 8+ \text{c} 7 22 \text{g} 3+ \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \text{g} 3 \\
\text{w} 5+ 24 \text{h} 2 \text{g} 7 25 \text{f} 8+ \text{c} 7 26 \text{wa} 8 \text{xb} 5 27 \text{w} 8 \\
gave White a winning advantage in Jimenez-Aguasenosa,} \\
\text{Linares 1999) 13 \text{h} 4 (13 \text{d} 2 \text{h} 6 14 \text{h} 4 \text{g} 5) 13...\text{h} 6 14 \text{d} 6+(or 14 \text{d} 3 \\
\text{xe} 1+ 15 \text{xe} 1 \text{e} 6!) 14...\text{xd} 6 15 \text{c6} 15 \text{f} 6+ \text{d} 7 16 \text{xf} 6+ \text{g} 6 17 \\
\text{xf} 6+ \text{c} 7 \text{leads to some edge for} \\
\text{Black, Gutman; VI) 12 \text{f} 3 \text{c} 4 \text{is worth} \\
\text{consideration.}} \\
\text{And then:} \\
\text{A) 13 \text{e} 2 \text{wh} 4 14 \text{g} 3 \text{wh} 3 15 \text{f} 1 \text{f} 5 16 \text{d} 3 \text{g} 4 17 \text{e} 2 \text{doesn’t} \\
\text{look very ambitious, 17...\text{wh} 4 18} \\
\text{g} 5 (18 \text{xd} 6 \text{is premature due to} \\
\text{18...cxd} 6 19 \text{wh} 6+ \text{d} 7 20 \text{g} 5 \text{c} 8) 18...\text{d} 7 (after 18...\text{f} 5?! 19 \\
\text{xf} 6+ \text{gxf} 6 20 \text{c6} 20 \text{c6} 21 \text{wh} 6+ \text{d} 7 22 \text{ad} 1 \text{e} 7 23 \text{f} 1 \\
\text{c} 8 24 \text{f} 4 \text{b} 6 0-1, Schwartmann-} \\
\text{Birzer, internet game 1999, 25 \text{e} 3! \text{would have been} \\
\text{decisive) 19 \text{d} 2 \text{c} 8 \text{and Black is fine, Gutman;}} \\
\text{B) 13 \text{b} 1 \text{is the normal starting} \\
\text{position, when Black has two interesting ideas:} \\
\text{B1) 13...\text{de} 5?! with three examples:} \\
\text{B1a) 14 \text{d} 4 \text{xf} 3+ 15 \text{w} 3 \text{w} 16 \text{e} 1 \text{wh} 5 17 \text{xf} 6+ \text{gxf} 6 18 \text{w} 6+ \text{d} 7 19 \text{w} 7+ \text{c} 6 \\
yields White insufficient compensation} \\
\text{for his piece;}} \\
\text{B1b) 14 \text{wa} 7 \text{g} 4 15 \text{w} 4 \text{ex} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \text{g} 4 \\
\text{yb} 5 \text{w} 6?! (an improvement on} \\
\text{18...\text{wa} 2 19 \text{h} 3 \text{wh} 6 20 \text{xf} 6+ \text{gxf} 6 21 \text{d} 4, played in an e-mail} \\
\text{game Tay-Zundel, 1999) 19 \text{a} 3 \\
\text{exe} 1+ 20 \text{w} 1 \text{d} 7 21 \text{h} 3 \text{e} 5 \\
\text{and the endgame is good for Black, Gutman;}}
B1c) 14 \( \text{Le2} \) \( \text{We6} \) (instead Colombo Berra - Flores Gutierrez, corr. 1998, went 14...\( \text{Wxa2} \) 15 \( c4 \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 16 \( \text{Axd4} \) \( \text{Ae5} \) 17 \( c4 \) \( \text{Af5} \) 18 \( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{Wd5} \) 19 \( \text{Axe3} \) \( \text{Wa6} \) 20 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) 21 \( \text{cx}d6 \) 1-0) 15 \( a3 \) \( a6 \) 16 \( \text{Axd4} \) \( \text{Wd5} \) 17 \( \text{Ag5} \) \( b5 \) 18 \( a4 \) \( \text{Ab7} \) 19 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{bxa4} \) 20 \( c4 \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 21 \( \text{Ax}f6+ \) \( \text{gx}f6 \) 22 \( \text{Ax}e8+ \) \( \text{Af8} \) 23 \( \text{Bxb7} \) \( \text{Wxb7} \) 24 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Wxe4} \) 25 \( \text{Ad3} \) \( \text{Wd5} \) 26 \( \text{c3} \) \( a3 \) 27 \( \text{Wa4+} \) \( \text{Af8} \) 28 \( \text{Wxa3} \) \( c5 \) 29 \( \text{Wa5} \) \( \text{He8} \) 30 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{Me1} \) 31 \( \text{Cd3} \) \( \text{Mc1} \) 32 \( \text{Wxa6} \) \( \text{Ag7} \) was even in Cleto Junior-Moreira, corr. 1999.

B2) 13...h6!? with a further parting of the ways:

B2a) 14 \( \text{Wd3} \) \( \text{Ae5} \) 15 \( \text{Wxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 16 \( \text{Axd4} \) \( \text{Ae5} \) 17 \( \text{Axe5} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) gave White nothing for his pawn in Hoefer-Ventimiglia, corr. 1999;

B2b) 14 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{cx}d6 \) 15 \( \text{Wxd6+} \) \( \text{Ad7} \) 16 \( \text{Ad5} \) (or 16 \( \text{Af4} \) \( \text{Me6} \) 17 \( \text{Wc7+} \) \( \text{He8} \) 18 \( \text{Ag4} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 19 \( \text{Axe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 16...\( \text{Wxc3} \) 17 \( \text{Axf7} \) \( \text{He}7 \) 18 \( \text{De6} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 19 \( \text{Bxd1} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 20 \( \text{Wxc7+} \) \( \text{Qxc7} \) 21 \( \text{Axd7} \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) 22 \( \text{Ab6+} \) \( \text{axb6} \) 23 \( \text{Ax}e7 \) \( \text{Mxa2} \), and I prefer Black, Gutman;

B2c) 14 \( \text{Wc1} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 15 \( \text{Ae2} \) \( \text{We6} \) 16 \( \text{Axa7} \) \( \text{Ad5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxc8} \) \( \text{Qxc8} \) 18 \( \text{Ad2} \) \( g5 \) 19 \( a3 \) \( \text{Ab6} \), when Black’s prospects are still completely satisfactory, Gutman.

12...\( \text{Me7}! \)

This is the critical response. Black protects c7-square, prevents the sacrifices on d6, and last but not least, this manoeuvre enables the shift of the king ...\( \text{d8-e8-f8} \) in some variations.

Alternatives are less challenging:

I) 12...\( \text{Wd5}?! \) 13 \( \text{Wc1} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 14 \( c4 \) (or 14 \( f3 \) \( \text{Ad7} \) 15 \( c4 \) \( \text{We5} \) 16 \( \text{Ad3} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 17 \( \text{Wa3} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 18 \( \text{Af2} \) \( \text{Gg6} \) 19 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{Gg5} \) 20 \( \text{Gxd1} \) \( \text{Gxe8} \) 21 \( c5 \) \( \text{Gdx}c5 \) 22 \( g4 \) \( \text{Wxh4} \) 23 \( \text{Gxc5} \) \( \text{Wg5} \) 24 \( \text{Ad4} \) leaving Black horribly placed, Gräber-Leisebein, corr. 1998) 14...\( \text{W}h5 \) 15 \( \text{Af1} \) \( a6 \) 16 \( \text{Wxa3} \) \( \text{Mc6} \) 17 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{Gdx}c5 \) 18 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 19 \( \text{Ae3} \) \( \text{Qce}5 \) 20 \( \text{Ad4} \) \( \text{Ab6} \) 21 \( f3 \) \( \text{Ae6} \) 22 \( \text{Qxb6} \) \( cxb6 \) 23 \( \text{Qxe6+} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 24 \( \text{Wd6} \) \( \text{We8} \) 25 \( \text{Ad4} \) 1-0, Hoffman-Rizzi, email game 1999;

II) 12...\( \text{Wg6} \) 13 \( \text{Af4}?! \) (13 \( \text{Af3} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 14 \( \text{Ad4} \) 1-0, Golubev-Bergmann, internet game 1999, 14...\( \text{Qxf3}+ \) 15 \( \text{Wxf3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 16 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( f5 \) appears excellent for Black) 13...\( \text{Qe4} \) 14 \( \text{Wc1} \) (14 \( \text{Af3} \) \( \text{Ad7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxc7} \) \( \text{Qxc7} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Wxe4} \) 18 \( \text{Wxd6+} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 19 \( \text{Wf8+} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 20 \( \text{Wd6+} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) leads to a draw by perpetual) 14...\( \text{Qd7} \) 15 \( \text{Wa3} \) and White has the initiative, Gutman.
Two more continuations are worth exploring:


13...Ахd4 14. cd4

14. Axd4 can be met by 14...Af5.

14...Ag4 15. Axg4


21...Wxe2 22. Af2 Ac2 with a clear advantage for Black, Gutman.

15...Wxg4 16. Wxg4 Axg4 17. Ab7 Ad7

Black has reached a quite promising ending.

18. h3


18...Axе3 19. Axе3

19. Axе3 can be met by the annoying

19...Ac6 20. Ab3 Ad5, Gutman.

19...Axе3 20. fxe3 Ac8 21. Ab3


23...Ab7 24. Ab3 c5

The rook ending should be drawn, but I still prefer Black, Gutman.
Chapter 5
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 ∆h4 5 ∆c3 ∆b4)
6 ∆e2!??

For a long time 5 ∆c3 was regarded as a half-brother to 5 ∆b5, the assumption being that after 5...∆b4 White has nothing better than 6 ∆db5 with a transposition back into 5 ∆b5 lines.

But 6 ∆e2!? has stolen a lot of limelight in recent years.

"The sharpest and most promising line for White is 6 ∆e2. This pedestrian developing move holds considerable danger for Black; he must defend under very dangerous conditions", Hall.

"White has no sensible means of defending the e-pawn so elects to sacrifice it for active play", Lane.

"The most recent trend. By no means rejecting ideas of ∆db5, White would rather all but force Black to accept his pawn offer (otherwise Black has made unnatural moves without extracting any such concessions from his opponent) before setting his knight on this committal course", Wells.

We divide the material in three sections:

Section 1: 6...∆g7
Section 2: 6...∆f6
Section 3: 6...∆xc3+

The discovery of this pawn sacrifice has significantly improved the reputation of the whole variation with 5 ∆c3.

Formerly Black had been forced to rely upon 6...∆xe4! 7 ∆b5, transposing into Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 4.

One thing is certain: if Black does not capture on e4, and most players tend not to, then Black should have difficulties in equalising.

Section 1
6...∆g7
"An interesting deviation from the immediate 6...∆xe4", Hall.

7 0-0
7 ∆f3 is worth mentioning;
7...∆xc3+ 8 bxc3 ∆xe4 9 0-0 will transpose into the variation after 5 ∆f3 ∆xe4+ 6 ∆e2 ∆b4+ 7 ∆c3 ∆xc3+ 8 bxc3 ∆g7 9 0-0 — Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 2, Sequel 1.
7...∆xc3

Alternatives are:
1) 7...a6? 8 ∆f3 ∆f6 9 ∆g5 ∆d6 10 ∆d5 leads to a terrible position for
Black, Turzo-Jonas, Zalakaros 1996;
II) 7...d6 is more logical, when White has two possibilities:

A) 8 Qdb5 Qa5 9 Qd5 Qxd5 10 exd5 Qe5 11 Qd2! (11 Wd4!? Wxd4 12 Qxd4 0-0 13 h3 Qe8 14 Qe3 Qd7 15 a4 a6 16 c3 Qg6 17 Qfd1 Qe5 18 Qf3 Qe7 19 Qf1 Qae8 20 Qd2 Qe5 21 Qd4 Qb6 22 Qxb6 cxb6 23 f4 Qg6 24 Qc4 Qxa4 25 Qxa4 b5 26 Qxd6 bxa4 27 Qxe8 Qxe8 28 g3 also gave White a clear advantage in Krstić-Zelić, Pula 1999) 11...Qb6 12 Qe3 Qd8 13 Qxb6 axb6 14 f4 and White has pressure, Gutman;

B) 8 Qf3 Wf6 9 Qd5 Qxd5 10 exd5 Qe5 11 Qxe5 dxe5 12 Qb5+ Wf8 13 Qe3 Qg6 14 Qc3 Qd6 15 Wd2 Qe7 16 Qae1 and Black once again finds himself at a crossroads, Enigk-Wollmann, corr. 1995.

III) 7...Qa5 8 Qf3 Wf6 and now:

A) 9 Qd2 d6 10 Qd5 Qxd5 11 exd5 (11 Qxa5?! Qf4 12 Qc3 Wg6 13 Qe1 0-0 14 Qf3 f5 15 exf5 Qxf5 16 Qh1 Qe8 was fine for Black, Bianco-Riccia, Asti 1996) 11...Qxd2 12 Wxd2 Qe7 (12...Qe5? isn't good in view of 13 Qxe5 dxe5 14 Wc3) 13 Qd4 0-0 (13...Qxd5 can be met by 14 Qf3 Qe7 15 Qb5) 14 c4 Qd7 is equal, Gutman;

B) However, the immediate 9 Qd5! Qxd5 10 exd5 Qe5 11 d6! creates problems for Black, Gutman.

8 bxc3 Qxd4?!

Two other moves have been tried:

I) 8...a6 is too passive, 9 f4 d6 10 Qb1 0-0 11 Qd2 f5 12 Qxf5 Qxf5 13 exf5 Qxf5 14 Qe1 Qb8 15 Qf3 Qd7 16 g3 Wd8 17 c4 Qh8 18 Qd5 b5 19 Qc3 b4 20 Qa1 a5 21 Qb3 Wf8 22 Qbe3 Qd8 23 Qe4 Qf6 24 Wh5 h6 25 Qd5 and White won quickly, Gather-Frolík, e-mail 1997;

II) 8...Wxe4 is more often seen.

White has three main ideas:

A) 9 Qb5 0-0 (9...Qd8 reaches a position, covered in Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequels 11-12) 10 Qxc7 Qb8 11 Qd3?! (more precise than 11 Qb5 d5 12 Qa3 a6 13 Qd4 Qe8 14 Qe1 Qd7 15 Qb1, Bruemmel-Zickelbein, German Women's Bundesliga 1994/95, and now 15...Qxd4 16 Qxd4 Qf5 should be about equal) 11...Wh4 12 Wd2 d5 13 Wf4 with a plus for White, Gutman;

B) 9 Qf3 will transpose into the variation 5 Qf3 Wxe4+ 6 Qe2 Qb4+ 7 Qc3 Qxc3+ 8 Qxc3 Qe7 9 0-0 — Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 2, Sequel 1;

C) 9 Qf3 Qg6 10 Qe1 Qd8 11 Qh5 Wf6 12 Qxf7! d6 (after 12...Qxd4?! 13 Qxd4 Qxd4 14 Qxd4 Black has a grim position) 13 Qb3! (Mencinger-Osterman, Slovenia 1991, went 13 Qxc6+ bxc6 14 Qh5 Qd7 15 Qb1 Qf8 16 Qe3 Qd5 17 Qd4 Qg5 1/2-1/2) 13...Qd7 14 Qe3 favours White, Gutman.

9 Qxd4!
This is objectively better than 9 \textit{\textsc{Wxd4}} 0-0, when Black appears to have enough counterplay.

We survey White’s possibilities:
A) 10 \textit{\textsc{g3 \textsc{Wh3}}} 11 \textit{\textsc{Af4}} (or 11 \textit{\textsc{c4 d6}}
12 \textit{\textsc{Af3 \textsc{Dc6}}} 13 \textit{\textsc{Cc3 \textsc{Ag4}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Ag2 \textsc{Wh5}}} 11...\textit{\textsc{d6}} 12 \textit{\textsc{Aab1 b6}} (12...\textit{\textsc{Dc6}}
13 \textit{\textsc{We3 \textsc{Ee8}}} is worth consideration)
13 \textit{\textsc{Fe1 \textsc{Bb7}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Ff1 \textsc{Wc8}}} 15 \textit{\textsc{Ag2 \textsc{Gg6}}} 16 \textit{\textsc{Dd2 \textsc{f5}}}! (16...\textit{\textsc{We6}} 17 \textit{\textsc{Ff4 \textsc{Wxa2}}}
18 \textit{\textsc{c4 \textsc{Wa4}}} is less convincing,
therefore 19 \textit{\textsc{h4 \textsc{Fe8}}} 20 \textit{\textsc{h5 \textsc{Df8}}} 21
\textit{\textsc{h6 \textsc{Df6}}} 22 \textit{\textsc{Wc3 \textsc{Gxh6}}} 23 \textit{\textsc{f5 \textsc{Dc5}}} 24
\textit{\textsc{Axh6 \textsc{Me5}}} 25 \textit{\textsc{Ff3 \textsc{Hh8}}} 26 \textit{\textsc{Wh5}}
gave White good attacking chances in Sendoby-Krosinger, corr. 1994)
17 \textit{\textsc{Fxf5 \textsc{Dxf5}}} is fine for Black since
18 \textit{\textsc{Ah3}} can be met by 18...\textit{\textsc{De5}},
\textit{\textsc{Gutman}};
B) 10 \textit{\textsc{c4 \textsc{Dc6}}} 11 \textit{\textsc{Wd5 \textsc{Me8}}} 12 \textit{\textsc{f3 d6}}
13 \textit{\textsc{Ag5 \textsc{Wh5}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Wd2 \textsc{h6}}} (14...\textit{\textsc{f6}} 15
\textit{\textsc{Le3 \textsc{Wf7}}} 16 \textit{\textsc{c5 dxc5}} 17 \textit{\textsc{Axh5 \textsc{Axh5}}} 19 \textit{\textsc{f4 \textsc{Axh5}}}
20 \textit{\textsc{Axh5 \textsc{Df6}}} 21 \textit{\textsc{Le2 \textsc{Me8}}} 22 \textit{\textsc{c3 \textsc{Ac8}}} 23 \textit{\textsc{Dd3 \textsc{Ab7}}}
turned out quite well for Black in Norevall-Johnsen,
Gausdal 1992;
\textit{\textsc{C}}) 10 \textit{\textsc{f4 d6}} 11 \textit{\textsc{Ab1 \textsc{Dc6}}} 12 \textit{\textsc{Wd3 \textsc{b6}}}! (an improvement on 12...\textit{\textsc{Ab8}}
13 \textit{\textsc{Bb5 \textsc{We7}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Ag5 \textsc{f6}}} 15 \textit{\textsc{Ah5 \textsc{f5}}}
16 \textit{\textsc{Af3 \textsc{Wf6}}} 17 \textit{\textsc{h3 \textsc{h6}}} 18 \textit{\textsc{g4 \textsc{fxg4}}} 19
\textit{\textsc{hxg4 \textsc{Gg6}}} 20 \textit{\textsc{g5 \textsc{Hxg5}}} 21 \textit{\textsc{hxg5 \textsc{Wh6}}} 22 \textit{\textsc{Af2 \textsc{Dd6}}} 23 \textit{\textsc{Bf2 \textsc{Df7}}} 24
\textit{\textsc{Ah2 \textsc{Df6}}} 25 \textit{\textsc{e5 \textsc{dxe5}}} 26 \textit{\textsc{Wh7+}} with a crushing attack for White,
H.Olafsson-Hector, Copenhagen 1992) 13 \textit{\textsc{c4 \textsc{b7}}}, and White’s activity provides some compensation
for the shattered pawns, although Black must be a bit better, \textit{\textsc{Gutman}}.
9...\textit{\textsc{Wxe4}} 10 \textit{\textsc{Le1 \textsc{Wh4}}} 11 \textit{\textsc{Dd3 \textsc{d5}}}

12 \textit{\textsc{We2}}!
After the less forceful 12 \textit{\textsc{Ab1 0-0}}
13 \textit{\textsc{Aa3 \textsc{Me8}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Wf3 \textsc{Me6}}} 15 \textit{\textsc{c3}}, occurring in P.Nielsen-Hector, Festuge
1991, 15...\textit{\textsc{Ab8}}! would have secured an edge for Black.
12...\textit{\textsc{Le6}} 13 \textit{\textsc{We5 \textsc{Dc6}}} 14 \textit{\textsc{Wxg7 \textsc{Wxd4}}} 15 \textit{\textsc{Wxd4}}!?
Another method is 15 \textit{\textsc{Bb2 \textsc{Wxg7}}} 16 \textit{\textsc{Axg7 \textsc{Hg8}}} 17 \textit{\textsc{Ff6 \textsc{h6}}} 18 \textit{\textsc{f4}}, and White has a sufficient compensation
for his pawn, \textit{\textsc{Gutman}}.
15...\textit{\textsc{Dxd4}} 16 \textit{\textsc{b2 \textsc{c5}}} 17 \textit{\textsc{Dxd4 \textsc{cxd4}}} 18 \textit{\textsc{Ab1 0-0-0}} 19 \textit{\textsc{Db4}}
The ending is clearly better for White, \textit{\textsc{Gutman}}.
Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4
exd4 Wh4 5 c3 b4 6 c2)
6...d6
“The only real alternative to
6...Wxe4”, Wells.
7 0-0!

We consider three lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 7...Wxe4
(7...d6, 7...exd4)
Sequel 2: 7...c3 8 bxc3
Sequel 3: 7...c3 8 f5!

Sequel 1
7...Wxe4

Other possibilities are:
I) 7...d6 8 f3 Wh5 9 d5 c5x5 (Gburek-Freise, corr. 1995, went
9...0-0 10 g5 Wh6 11 d3 h6 12
exd5 b8 13 e5 f5 14 xf5
Wh5 15 exf6 hxf5 16 f4 g7 Wh7
17 Wh5 Wh5 18 d3 Wh5 19 f3
Wh8 20 h4 Wh2 21 a3 c5 22
Wh5 ex5 23 Wh5 Wh6 26 Wh6 27
Wh6 Wh7 28 Wh4 1-0, H.Olafsson-
8 f5 c3 9 bxc3!
“9 f5 +?! is a nice case in point.

After 9 Whd8 (9 Wh8 10 bxc3
Wh5 11 c5 Wh4 12 d3 Wh6+ also
White a massive attack) 10
bxc3 Wh5 11 Wh5 Wh6 12 Wh6!
White saves the rook by the threat
of Wh5, and retains a tremendous
initiative”, Wells.
Nevertheless, Black has to try
12...Wh8 13 Wh1 d6, and there is still
everything to play for, Gutman.
9 Whf6 10 cxb4 Wha1 11 b5!
11 Whd2?! is a serious loss of time,
11...d6 12 d3 Whf6 13 e1+ Wh5
14 Wh5+ d7 15 c4 0-0-0 gave
Black a decisive advantage in
Pribyl-Opuragau, Schwäbisch
Gmuend 1994.
11...\textit{\textbf{xd}8}

There is only a choice of evils:

I) 11...g6 12 bxc6 gxf5 13 \textit{\textbf{xf}3};

II) 11...\textit{\textbf{w}f6} 12 bxc6 \textit{\textbf{w}xf5} 13 \textit{\textbf{g}4} with a devastating attack, \textit{Gutman}.

12 \textit{\textbf{a}3} \textit{\textbf{w}f6} 13 \textit{\textbf{e}7} c6 14 \textit{\textbf{e}1} \textit{\textbf{e}6} 15 \textit{\textbf{f}3} a5

15...d5 16 bxc6 bxc6 should lose immediately due to 17 \textit{\textbf{x}d}5! (however, 17 \textit{\textbf{w}d}3 \textit{\textbf{d}7} 18 \textit{\textbf{f}5} \textit{\textbf{b}8} 19 c4 d4 20 \textit{\textbf{d}6} \textit{\textbf{d}8} 21 \textit{\textbf{e}5} \textit{\textbf{g}6} 22 \textit{\textbf{x}g}7+ \textit{\textbf{r}8} 23 \textit{\textbf{w}x}g6 \textit{\textbf{x}g}6 24 \textit{\textbf{x}e}6+ \textit{\textbf{x}e}6 25 \textit{\textbf{a}x}h8 was also winning for White in Ferseck-Sermek, Pula 1997) 17...cxd5 18 \textit{\textbf{x}d}5, \textit{Gutman}.

16 bxc6 bxc6 17 \textit{\textbf{x}c}6 \textit{\textbf{a}6} 18 \textit{\textbf{e}5}

\textit{\textbf{8} bxc3}

8...\textit{\textbf{x}d}4!

Alternatives are:

I) 8...\textit{\textbf{w}xe}4? 9 \textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{w}g}6 10 \textit{\textbf{e}1}+ \textit{\textbf{e}7} 11 \textit{\textbf{a}3} d6 12 \textit{\textbf{b}5} is without hope for Black, \textit{Gutman};

II) 8...\textit{\textbf{x}e}4 9 \textit{\textbf{f}3} will transpose into the variation after 6...\textit{\textbf{x}xc}3+ 7 bxc3 \textit{\textbf{w}f}6 8 \textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{x}e}4 9 0-0 — Part 4, Chapter 5, Section 3; \textit{\textbf{2}} \textit{\textbf{f}4} \textit{\textbf{e}5} 0-0

III) 8...0-0 with two possibilities:

A) 9 \textit{\textbf{f}3}!? d6 (Rytshagov-Kiltti, Helsinki 1996, went 9...d5 10 \textit{\textbf{x}xc}6 bxc6 11 e5 \textit{\textbf{d}7} 12 f4 \textit{\textbf{b}8} 13 \textit{\textbf{e}3} \textit{\textbf{b}6} 14 f5 \textit{\textbf{w}e}4 15 \textit{\textbf{d}4} \textit{\textbf{a}4} 16 \textit{\textbf{w}d}2 \textit{\textbf{b}2} 17 \textit{\textbf{a}3} \textit{\textbf{w}h}4 18 \textit{\textbf{f}4} \textit{\textbf{w}g}5 19 \textit{\textbf{e}3} \textit{\textbf{b}6} 20 \textit{\textbf{b}4} 1-0) 10 \textit{\textbf{a}3} a6 11 \textit{\textbf{w}d}2 h6 12 \textit{\textbf{a}b}1 \textit{\textbf{e}5} when 13 \textit{\textbf{f}2}! (improving on 13 \textit{\textbf{f}5}?! \textit{\textbf{x}f}5 14 \textit{\textbf{e}f}5 \textit{\textbf{c}4} 15 \textit{\textbf{x}c}4 \textit{\textbf{w}c}4 16 \textit{\textbf{x}b}7 \textit{\textbf{d}5}, Barski-Sosnowska, Warsaw 1993) 13...\textit{\textbf{w}h}5 14 f4 \textit{\textbf{w}e}4 15 h3 \textit{\textbf{x}e}4 16 hxg4 \textit{\textbf{x}d}2 17 gxh5 \textit{\textbf{x}f}1 18 \textit{\textbf{x}f}1 maintains a plus for White, \textit{Gutman};

B) 9 \textit{\textbf{f}5}!? \textit{\textbf{x}e}4 10 \textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{w}e}5 (or 10...\textit{\textbf{w}g}4 11 f3 \textit{\textbf{w}a}4 12 \textit{\textbf{x}g}7!) 11 \textit{\textbf{e}1} reaches a position, covered in Part 4, Chapter 5, Section 2, Sequel 3.

\textit{\textbf{2}} \textit{\textbf{g}3}

\textbf{Black is helpless, \textit{Gutman}.}

\textbf{Sequel 2}

(1 e4 \textit{\textbf{e}5} 2 \textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{c}6} 3 d4 \textit{\textbf{e}xd}4 4 \textit{\textbf{x}d}4 \textit{\textbf{w}h}4 5 \textit{\textbf{c}3} \textit{\textbf{b}4} 6 \textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{f}6} 7 0-0)

7...\textit{\textbf{x}c}3

“Consistent, as Black wants to capture on e4 with the knight rather then the queen. The problem is that the queen is always vulnerable to \textit{\textbf{f}5} anyway”, \textit{Wells}.\textit{\textbf{2}}
9 cxd4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xe4

10 \( \mathcal{A} \)d3

White has two more options:

I) 10 \( \mathcal{A}f3 \) d5 11 c4 0-0!? 12 cxd5 \( \mathcal{A}f5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W} \)b3 \( \mathcal{A} \)d6 (13...\( \mathcal{A} \)fe8?! 14 \( \mathcal{W} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{A} \)xf2 15 \( \mathcal{A} \)e3! \( \mathcal{A} \)d3?! 16 d6 cxd6 17 \( \mathcal{A} \)d5 gave White a clear advantage in Wieweg-Furhoff, Copenhagen 1994) 14 \( \mathcal{A} \)e3 \( \mathcal{A} \)g4 15 \( \mathcal{A} \)xg4 \( \mathcal{W} \)xg4 favours Black, Gutman;

II) 10 \( \mathcal{A}a3! \) ? d5 11 \( \mathcal{W} \)e1 looks like a more testing approach.

Black must make an important choice:

A) 11...\( \mathcal{A} \)e6? is virtual suicide, 12 \( \mathcal{A} \)b1 \( \mathcal{A} \)d6 (or 12...0-0-0 13 \( \mathcal{W} \)a5) 13 \( \mathcal{W} \)c3 0-0-0 14 \( \mathcal{A} \)a6 bx\( \mathcal{A} \)a6 15 \( \mathcal{W} \)c6 \( \mathcal{W} \)xd6 16 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd6 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd6 17 \( \mathcal{A} \)a8+ \( \mathcal{A} \)d7 18 \( \mathcal{W} \)xh8 \( \mathcal{A} \)f5 19 \( \mathcal{A} \)b8 \( \mathcal{A} \)c6 20 \( \mathcal{W} \)e8+ \( \mathcal{A} \)d7 21 \( \mathcal{W} \)xf7 \( \mathcal{A} \)g6 22 \( \mathcal{A} \)b3 \( \mathcal{W} \)e4 23 \( \mathcal{A} \)c3+ \( \mathcal{A} \)d6 24 \( \mathcal{W} \)f8+ \( \mathcal{A} \)e7 25 \( \mathcal{W} \)f4+ \( \mathcal{A} \)e5 26 \( \mathcal{W} \)b4+ 1-0, Fersec-Zelić, Pula 1999;

B) In my opinion, 11...\( \mathcal{A} \)d8!? 12 c4 \( \mathcal{A} \)e8 is here the best method of creating counterplay, Gutman.

10...d5 11 \( \mathcal{A} \)a3 \( \mathcal{A} \)e6 12 c4

12...0-0-0-0? 12...\( \mathcal{A} \)c3? may be even better, as it appears that, after 13 \( \mathcal{W} \)b3 \( \mathcal{W} \)xd4 14 \( \mathcal{W} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{A} \)d7 15 cxd5 \( \mathcal{W} \)xd5 16 \( \mathcal{A} \)a6 \( \mathcal{A} \)h8 17 \( \mathcal{A} \)ad1 \( \mathcal{W} \)e8 18 \( \mathcal{A} \)e4!? \( \mathcal{W} \)xe4 19 \( \mathcal{W} \)fe1 \( \mathcal{A} \)b6 20 \( \mathcal{W} \)a5 \( \mathcal{A} \)e2+ 21 \( \mathcal{A} \)h1 \( \mathcal{A} \)d8 22 \( \mathcal{W} \)g5 \( \mathcal{A} \)d7! (instead of 22...\( \mathcal{A} \)xd6 23 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd6 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd6 24 f3 \( \mathcal{W} \)b4 25 \( \mathcal{A} \)b1 \( \mathcal{W} \)c4 26 \( \mathcal{A} \)b8+ \( \mathcal{A} \)d7 27 \( \mathcal{A} \)d8+ \( \mathcal{A} \)c6 28 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd6+ cxd6 29 \( \mathcal{W} \)e3 \( \mathcal{A} \)d4 30 \( \mathcal{A} \)c1 \( \mathcal{A} \)c2 31 \( \mathcal{W} \)e4+ \( \mathcal{A} \)xe4 32 fxe4 \( \mathcal{A} \)c5 33 \( \mathcal{A} \)xc2+ when Black does not have full compensation for the exchange, Petersen-Furhoff, Copenhagen 1995) 23 \( \mathcal{W} \)xg7 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd1 24 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd1 \( \mathcal{A} \)d5 Black could secure a clear advantage, Gutman.

13 \( \mathcal{A} \)a4 \( \mathcal{W} \)b8

Black is quite comfortable, Gutman.

Sequel 3

(1 e4 e5 2 \( \mathcal{A} \)f3 \( \mathcal{A} \)c6 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd4 \( \mathcal{W} \)h4 5 \( \mathcal{A} \)c3 \( \mathcal{A} \)b4 6 \( \mathcal{A} \)e2 \( \mathcal{A} \)f6 7 0-0 \( \mathcal{A} \)xc3)

8 \( \mathcal{A} \)f5!

The most consequent reply, hoping to exploit White's temporary lag in development.
8...\texttt{wxe4} 9 \texttt{d3} \\

9...\texttt{we5} \\

Other squares for the queen are: \\
I) 9...\texttt{wa4} gives White a choice between two possibilities: \\
A) The more mundane 10 \texttt{bxc3} 0-0 with a further split: \\
A1) 11 \texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 12 \texttt{h6+} is wrong due to 12...\texttt{xe6}! 13 \texttt{d2}+ \texttt{h5} 14 \texttt{f3} \texttt{d5} 15 \texttt{c4} \texttt{b4} 16 \texttt{g4}+ \texttt{xe4} 17 \texttt{fxe4}+ \texttt{xe4}, \textit{Gutman}; \\
A2) 11 \texttt{f3} \texttt{e5} (11...d5? 12 \texttt{xe7}!) 12 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g6} 13 \texttt{b2} (13 \texttt{xe7} d5) 13...d5!? (after 13...d6 14 \texttt{xe7}! \texttt{g4} 15 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 16 \texttt{f5} \texttt{xf5} 17 \texttt{xf5} \texttt{d8} 18, \textit{Chery-Negre}, corr. 1995, 18 c4! would have given White an edge) 14 \texttt{xe7} 14 (14 \texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 15 f4 can be met by 15...c5!) 14...\texttt{xf5} 15 \texttt{xf5} \texttt{h4} gives Black enough counterplay, \textit{Gutman}; \\
A3) 11 c4! d6 12 \texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 13 \texttt{d2} \texttt{g8} (or 13...\texttt{g4} 14 \texttt{g5}+ \texttt{h8} 15 \texttt{f3} \texttt{g8} 16 \texttt{h4} \texttt{g7} 17 \texttt{fxg4}) 14 \texttt{g5}+ \texttt{h8} 15 \texttt{b2}+ \texttt{e5} 16 \texttt{h4} f5 17 f4 \texttt{wa5} 18 \texttt{h1} yields White a crushing attack, \textit{Gutman}. \\
B) 10 \texttt{xe7}+! is the most direct approach, since after 10...\texttt{f8} 11 \texttt{h6} \texttt{xb2} (or 11...\texttt{g8} 12 \texttt{e6}+ \texttt{e7} 13 \texttt{xf8}+ \texttt{xe6} 14 \texttt{bxc3}) 12 \texttt{h1} Black has no defence, \textit{Gutman}. \\

II) 9...\texttt{g4} 10 \texttt{f3} \texttt{a4} 11 \texttt{bxc3} looks more testing. \\

"The bishop pair and the excellent knight on f5 obviously give White good compensation. The full extent of Black’s problems is not at first evident", \textit{Wells}. \\

Black has a choice: \\
A) 11...0-0 ("is splattered by the memorable combination", \textit{Wells}) 12 \texttt{xe7}! \texttt{xe7} (\textit{Vlad-Dumitrasche, Tigru Mures 1992}, went 12...\texttt{d6} 13 \texttt{d2} \texttt{h4} 14 \texttt{g3} \texttt{h3} 15 \texttt{g5} 1-0) 13 \texttt{h6}+ \texttt{g8} (or 13...\texttt{h8} 14 \texttt{xe8} d6 15 \texttt{xe2} \texttt{h4} 16 \texttt{h6} \texttt{g8} 17 \texttt{g5} \texttt{a4} 18 \texttt{c4} \texttt{wa5} 19 \texttt{f4} \texttt{e5} 20 \texttt{f6}+ \texttt{xf6} 21 \texttt{xf6}+ \texttt{g8} 22 \texttt{g5}+ 1-0, \textit{Vuković-Mozetic, Banja Vruca 1991}) 14 \texttt{d2} (14 \texttt{e1} is also good, 14...\texttt{h5} 15 \texttt{f4} \texttt{wa3} 16 \texttt{h4} \texttt{c5}+ 17 \texttt{h1} \texttt{e8} 18 \texttt{f5} \texttt{f6} 19 \texttt{hxe5} \texttt{e7} 20 \texttt{f3} \texttt{h8} 21 \texttt{g3} \texttt{wd5} 22 \texttt{wh4} \texttt{f7} 23 \texttt{c4} d5 24 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{e6} 25 \texttt{fxe6} and White won easily, \textit{Nimzo 98 - Hiarcs 6, computer game 1998}) 14...\texttt{h4} 15 \texttt{g5} \texttt{h5} 16 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{e8} 17 \texttt{g4} \texttt{c5}+ 18 \texttt{h1} \texttt{e6} 19 \texttt{h6} \texttt{xf6} 20 \texttt{hxh7}+ \texttt{h8} 21 \texttt{xf6}+ \texttt{h7} 22 \texttt{xf7}+ 1-0, \textit{Fersec-Rupeni, Italy 1994};"
B) 11...∥f8 ("is maybe necessary", Wells) 12 ∥e1 d6 13 ∥xg7!
("Anyway. Black is so desperately weak on the dark squares that White can drive his king around at leisure", Wells) 13...∥xg7 14 ∥g3+ ∥f8 15 ∥h6+ ∥e7 reaches a critical position.

![Chess Diagram]

"The black king stands immobile and strongly under the pressure of two rooks and two bishops. The situation calls for an investigation of all direct attacks employing the most forceful moves that White has at his command. Well, let us try them", Lasker.

White has two ideas:

B1) 16 ∥ae1+ ∥e6 17 ∥xe6+ ("A further fine combination of the attack. In the bare analysis, we can blame the lack of the dark-squared bishop for the defence, and the desertion of Black’s queen from defensive duties", Wells) 17...∥xe6 18 ∥e1+ ∥e5! (18...∥d7 loses due to 19 ∥f5+ ∥d8 20 ∥g7 ∥e8 21 ∥xf6+ ∥e7 22 ∥f8) 19 f4 ∥ag8 20 ∥h3+ ∥d5! (Mat.Müller-Schiffer, German Bundesliga 1997/98, continued 20...∥fg4? 21 fxe5 dxe5 22 ∥e4 ∥xe4 23 ∥xe4 f5 24 ∥d3 ∥xh6 25 ∥c4+ ∥f6 26 ∥xg8 ∥xg8 27 ∥h4+ ∥f7 28 ∥d8, when "White’s formal material advantage is small, but the black forces still experience difficulties finding the scene of the action", Wells) 21 c4+ (or 21 fxe5 ∥g4) 21...∥xc4 22 ∥f5+ ∥c6 23 ∥xf6 ∥b4 allows Black to consolidate, keeping a decisive material advantage, Mat. Müller.

"A fine attacking game which pinpoints everything that is wrong with 4...∥h4?!", Wells. Is it indeed?;

B2) However, White has a much superior continuation of the attack in 16 ∥g7! ∥e6 17 ∥g5 ∥he8 18 ∥xf6+ ∥d7 19 ∥xh7 with a clear plus, Mat. Müller.

10 bxc3
10 ∥xg7+ ∥f8 11 ∥h6 is less convincing since 11...∥g8 (not 11...∥xb2 12 ∥e1 ∥xa1 13 ∥xa1! ∥xa1 14 ∥h5+ ∥g8 15 ∥xf6+ ∥xf6 16 ∥e8 mate) 12 ∥e6+ ∥e7 13 ∥g7 dxe6! 14 ∥xe5 ∥xe5 15 c3 ∥f6 leaves Black with three minor pieces for the queen, Gutman.

10...0-0
10...∥f8 fails miserably in view of 11 ∥b1 d6 (11...∥a6 12 ∥e1 ∥c5 13 ∥f3) 12 ∥b5 ∥e6 (12...∥xc3 13 ∥xg7 ∥xg7 14 ∥b2) 13 ∥e1 ∥xa2 14 ∥xg7, Gutman.

11 ∥e1

![Chess Diagram]
11...\textbf{wa5}  
11...\textbf{wx}c3 12 \textbf{xb}1 d6 (or 12...\textbf{xe}8 13 \textbf{exe}8+ \textbf{exe}8 14 \textbf{b}2 \textbf{wc}5 15 \textbf{we}2 \textbf{wf}8 16 \textbf{xe}1) 13 \textbf{b}2 \textbf{wa}5 14 \textbf{xf}6 \textbf{xf}5 15 \textbf{xb}5 \textbf{xb}5 16 \textbf{x}b5 \textbf{gxf}6 17 \textbf{xc}6 \textbf{bxc}6 18 \textbf{e}7 favours White, Miettinen.  
12 \textbf{xb}1 d5 13 \textbf{xb}5!  
An improvement on 13 \textbf{d}xg7?! \textbf{xg}7 14 \textbf{h}6+ \textbf{xh}6 15 \textbf{d}2+ \textbf{h}5 16 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{w}a3 17 h3 \textbf{wd}6 18 \textbf{e}3 (18 g4+ can be met by 18...\textbf{d}xg4 19 hxg4+ \textbf{d}xg4 20 \textbf{d}x5+ \textbf{d}x5 21 \textbf{g}6+ \textbf{d}xg6 22 \textbf{d}x5 f5, Miettinen) 18...\textbf{d}f4 19 g3 \textbf{d}g8 20 \textbf{d}h2 \textbf{wd}6 21 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{d}e5 22 \textbf{d}f4 \textbf{d}xd3 23 \textbf{d}h4+ \textbf{d}g6 24 \textbf{w}h6+ \textbf{f}5 25 \textbf{c}xd3 \textbf{e}6 0-1, Moore-Miettinen, corr. 1994.  
13...\textbf{wa}2 14 \textbf{d}xg7 \textbf{d}xg7 15 \textbf{h}6+ \textbf{xh}6 16 \textbf{d}2+ \textbf{h}5 17 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{e}8 18...\textbf{d}g4 is no better due to 18 h3 \textbf{d}xf2 19 g4+ \textbf{d}xg4 20 hxg4+ \textbf{d}xg4 21 \textbf{f}2, Gutman.  
18 \textbf{xe}8 \textbf{wa}1+ 19 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{xe}8 20 \textbf{xf}7+ \textbf{h}6 21 \textbf{xd}5  

Black is helpless, Gutman.

Section 3  
(1 e4 e5 2 \textbf{d}f3 \textbf{c}6 3 d4 exd4 4 \textbf{d}xd4 \textbf{w}h4 5 \textbf{c}3 \textbf{b}4 6 \textbf{e}2)  
6...\textbf{xc}3+ 7 \textbf{bxc}3  

The immediate exchange on c3 is by far the most popular way of dealing with White's system, but this doesn't mean it is sufficient for equality.  
7...\textbf{d}f6  
7...\textbf{w}xe4 is rather an artificial attempt to win the pawn.  
After 8 0-0 (8 \textbf{b}5 will transpose into the variation after 6 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{w}xe4+ 7 \textbf{e}2 \textbf{xc}3+ 8 \textbf{bxc}3 — Part 4, Chapter 4, Section 4, Sequels 5-15) 8...\textbf{xd}4 (8...\textbf{d}d8?! 9 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{g}6 10 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{f}6 11 \textbf{d}2 h6 12 \textbf{f}e1 \textbf{d}e7 13 \textbf{b}5 d6 14 \textbf{d}ad1 left Black with a grim position in Kind-Hager, Germany 1998) 9 exd4 \textbf{d}e7 10 \textbf{xe}1 \textbf{wh}4 11 \textbf{d}d3 \textbf{w}f6 12 \textbf{wh}5 h6 13 h4 g6 14 \textbf{w}e2 d6 15 d5 \textbf{h}7 16 \textbf{b}2! (16 g3 \textbf{w}e5, Reefat-Vladimirov, Calcutta 2000, 17 \textbf{w}xe5?! dxe5 18 \textbf{xe}5 \textbf{d}d8 19 h5 would have also been excellent for White) 16...\textbf{wh}4 17 \textbf{w}e3 f5 18 g3
$a4\ 19\ \text{xf6}\ \text{wd7}\ 20\ \text{xe7}\ \text{xe7}\ 21\ \text{xh6}\ \text{f7}\ 22\ \text{wh7+}\ \text{f6}\ 23\ \text{wh8+}\ \text{f7}\ 24\ \text{b5}\ \text{black's position collapses, Gutman.}$

8 $\text{xf3}!$?

This is the most critical response, though White has several alternatives here:

I) 8 0-0 $\text{xd4!}$ will transpose into the variation 6 $\text{xe2}\ \text{f6}\ 7\ 0-0\ \text{xc3}\ 8\ \text{bxc3}\ \text{xd4} — \text{Part 4, Chapter 5, Section 2, Sequel 2; } 2.7$

II) 8 $\text{b5}\ 0-0\ 9\ 0-0$ does not provide White with a real initiative.

9...$\text{xe4}!?$ (however, too passive is 9...$\text{e8}\ 10\ \text{f4}\ \text{d6},\ \text{lillo-julian, Spain 1994, after 11\ c4?! a6}\ 12\ \text{c3}\ \text{f6}\ 13\ \text{e1}\ \text{e8}\ 14\ \text{f3}\ \text{black's position is under pressure}) 10\ \text{xc7} (10\ \text{f3}\ \text{xb8}\ 11\ \text{g3}\ \text{we7}\ 12\ \text{e1}\ \text{f5}\ 13\ \text{xc7}\ \text{d6}\ 14\ \text{d5}\ \text{f7}\ 15\ \text{c4}\ \text{e6}$ is certainly not worse for Black, Gutman) 10...$\text{xc3}\ 11\ \text{we1}\ \text{xe2+2}\ 12\ \text{xe2}\ \text{xb8}\ 13\ \text{a3}\ \text{d6}\ 14\ \text{xqd6}\ \text{d8}\ 15\ \text{f1}\ \text{h6}\ 16\ \text{g3}\ \text{a4}\ 17\ \text{b5}\ \text{a8}\ 18\ \text{c7}\ \text{b8}\ 19\ \text{c4}\ (19\ \text{b5}\ \text{a8}$ forces a draw) 19...$\text{d4}\ 20\ \text{we7}\ \text{d7}\ 21\ \text{d5}\ \text{f5}\ 22\ \text{we5}\ \text{b8c2}\ 23\ \text{c5}\ \text{e8}\ 24\ \text{wc3}\ \text{wc6}\ 25\ \text{xe8+}\ \text{xe8}\ 26\ \text{md1}\ \text{e6}\ 27\ \text{c7}\ \text{xc8}\ 28\ \text{xc6}\ \text{wc6}$ was slightly better for Black in Nadeev-Mitkov, French League 1993;}

III) 8 $\text{xc6}\ \text{dxc6}\ 9\ 0-0$ was tried in some games.

A) 9...$\text{xe4}!?$ 10 $\text{wd4}\ \text{we7}\ 11\ \text{xdg7}\ \text{f6}\ 12\ \text{xf6}\ \text{xc3}\ (13\ \text{a3}\ \text{d5}\ 14\ \text{f3}\ \text{e6}\ 15\ \text{c4}, \text{berger-kubala, rimavska sobota 1992, causes no problems for Black in view of} 15...\text{b6}\ 16\ \text{b2}\ \text{g8}\ 17\ \text{c5}\ \text{c4}\) 13...0-0 14 $\text{b1}$ yields White a clear plus, Gutman;

B) 9...$\text{xe4}!$ is the correct antidote to White's plan.

10 $\text{f3}$ (more effective than 10 $\text{d3}\ \text{g4}\ 11\ \text{f3}\ \text{h5}\ 12\ \text{e1+}\ \text{e6}\ 13\ \text{e3}\ 0-0\ 14\ \text{d4}\ \text{d7}\ 15\ \text{c2}\ 16\ \text{f2}\ \text{c8d8}\ 17\ \text{e4}, \text{berger-kubala, rimavska sobota 1992, when 17...\text{wd5}\ 18\ \text{c4}\ \text{wc6}\ 19\ \text{b1}$ \text{f8}$\text{f8}$ would have secured an edge for Black) 10...$\text{wc4}\ 11\ \text{e1+}$ (Oral-Mitkov, Capelle la Grande 1994, continued 11 $\text{b1}\ 0-0\ 12\ \text{xd5}\ 13\ \text{xc5}\ \text{xd5}\ 14\ \text{d3}\ \text{xa2}\ 15\ \text{b4}\ \text{a6}\ 16\ \text{xa6}\ \text{bxa6}\ 17\ \text{f4}\ \text{c5}$ with advantage for Black) 11...$\text{e6}\ 12\ \text{a3}\ \text{wa4}\ 13\ \text{c5}\ (13\ \text{wc1}\ 0-0-0) 13...$\text{d7}\ 14\ \text{e4}\ \text{wb5}$ favours Black, Gutman.

IV) 8 $\text{f5}!?$ $\text{xe4}\ 9\ \text{xcg7+}\ \text{d8}\ (9...$\text{f8}?!$ is met by the annoying 10 $\text{h6}\ 10\ 0-0$ (more ambitious than 10 $\text{g5}\ \text{g6}\ 11\ \text{wd2}\ \text{xcg7}\ 12\ \text{f4}\ \text{e7}\ 13\ \text{we3+}\ \text{d8}$ with a draw.
Leisebein-Grott, corr. 1999) seems more testing.

After 10...\textit{\textbar}g6, (Drysdale-Roe, e-mail game 1999, went 10...d6 11 \textit{\textbullet}d3 \textit{\textbar}d5 12 \textit{\textbullet}b1 a6 13 c4 \textit{\textbar}d4 14 \textit{\textbullet}b2 \textit{\textbar}h4 15 \textit{\textbar}f3 \textit{\textbullet}g4 16 \textit{\textbar}f4 \textit{\textbullet}d5 17 h3 \textit{\textbar}h6 18 \textit{\textbullet}xe5 dxe5 19 \textit{\textbar}xf7 e4 20 \textit{\textbullet}xe4 \textit{\textbullet}e5 21 \textit{\textbullet}f1+ \textit{\textbullet}d7 22 \textit{\textbar}xd7+ 1-0) 11 \textit{\textbullet}h5 \textit{\textbullet}g8 12 \textit{\textbullet}f4 \textit{\textbar}f5 13 \textit{\textbullet}d3 \textit{\textbullet}xa5 14 c4, White retains the pressure, \textit{\textbullet}Gutman. 8...\textit{\textbullet}xe4

8...\textit{\textbullet}xd4 9 \textit{\textbullet}xd4 0-0 10 0-0 d6 11 e5 \textit{\textbullet}xd4 (11...\textit{\textbullet}g4? 12 h3) 12 cxd4 dxe5 13 dxe5 gives White an excellent endgame, \textit{\textbullet}Gutman.

9 0-0

9...\textit{\textbullet}c5

9...d5 10 \textit{\textbullet}b5 0-0 hardly makes sense in view of 11 \textit{\textbullet}xc7 \textit{\textbullet}b8 12

\textit{\textbullet}d8 13 \textit{\textbullet}xd5 \textit{\textbullet}g5 14 \textit{\textbullet}g2 \textit{\textbullet}h3+ 15 \textit{\textbullet}h1 \textit{\textbullet}e6 16 \textit{\textbullet}e3 with a clear advantage for White, Coffield-Eimes, e-mail game 1997. 10 \textit{\textbullet}e1+ \textit{\textbullet}e6 11 \textit{\textbullet}a3 a6

\textit{\textbullet}Gutman-Leisebein, corr. 1999, continued 11...\textit{\textbullet}g5 12 \textit{\textbullet}b1 \textit{\textbullet}a5 13 \textit{\textbullet}c1 h6 (13...a6 14 \textit{\textbullet}g4) 14 \textit{\textbullet}b5 \textit{\textbullet}a6 14...\textit{\textbullet}a4 15 \textit{\textbullet}b2 15 \textit{\textbullet}e2 \textit{\textbullet}a4 16 \textit{\textbullet}f5 \textit{\textbullet}d8 (16...g6 17 \textit{\textbullet}e3 a6 18 \textit{\textbullet}b3 d6 19 \textit{\textbullet}d5) 17 \textit{\textbullet}d5 a6 (17...\textit{\textbullet}f4 would have been answered by 18 \textit{\textbullet}b5 \textit{\textbullet}a5 19 \textit{\textbullet}xg7 \textit{\textbullet}xd5 20 \textit{\textbullet}xh6) 18 \textit{\textbullet}d3 b5 (18...\textit{\textbullet}f4 19 \textit{\textbullet}e3 g6 20 \textit{\textbullet}g3 \textit{\textbullet}e8 21 \textit{\textbullet}e4 h5 22 \textit{\textbullet}g5 d6 23 g3 \textit{\textbullet}f6 24 \textit{\textbullet}f3 and Black is helpless) 19 \textit{\textbullet}e8 (or 19...\textit{\textbullet}xc4 20 \textit{\textbullet}e4 \textit{\textbullet}b8 21 \textit{\textbullet}xc4 \textit{\textbullet}d4 22 \textit{\textbullet}xg7 \textit{\textbullet}xg7 23 \textit{\textbullet}f4) 20 \textit{\textbullet}b2 d6 (20...\textit{\textbullet}xc4 21 \textit{\textbullet}xg7 \textit{\textbullet}xd3 22 \textit{\textbullet}f6+ \textit{\textbullet}e7 23 \textit{\textbullet}xe6) 21 \textit{\textbullet}e4 \textit{\textbullet}d7 22 \textit{\textbullet}xg7 \textit{\textbullet}c8 23 cxb5 axb5 24 \textit{\textbullet}xh6 \textit{\textbullet}ac5 25 \textit{\textbullet}f3 \textit{\textbullet}xe1+ 26 \textit{\textbullet}xe1 \textit{\textbullet}a6 27 \textit{\textbullet}e7+ \textit{\textbullet}xe7 28 \textit{\textbullet}xe7 \textit{\textbullet}c6 29 \textit{\textbullet}f5 \textit{\textbullet}xa2 (29...\textit{\textbullet}xc2 is no improvement due to 30 \textit{\textbullet}xf5 31 \textit{\textbullet}g4) 30 h4 \textit{\textbullet}we6 31 \textit{\textbullet}xe6+ \textit{\textbullet}xe6 32 \textit{\textbullet}f8+ \textit{\textbullet}b7 33 \textit{\textbullet}g7 e5 34 \textit{\textbullet}xc6+ \textit{\textbullet}xc6 35 h5 1-0.

12 \textit{\textbullet}b1 \textit{\textbullet}f6 13 \textit{\textbullet}d5

Black has serious difficulties in developing his pieces, \textit{\textbullet}Gutman.
'Part Five: 
The Fraser Variation

(1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4
 dxe4 Wh4)
5 d3!?

“Introduced in 1870 by the Scottish player George Brunton Fraser. For him it was the result of much striving to find a convincing reply against 4...Wh4, — one which would be better than 5 b5”, Glasgow Herald, 1873.

“Dear Mr. Fraser, I have much pleasure in hearing you once more. The games, you depend upon me, shall have early attention. Why did you not annotate them more copiously? I always like to have the player’s notes in games; especially when they have the faculty of analysis you have”, Howard Staunton, 1874. (Howard Staunton, D.N.L. Levy).

“This is the second-best choice. In most variations White gets good attacking chances for the pawn sacrificed, but we believe that his gallant play will founder on the adamantine rocks of the most accurate defence”, Botterill/Harding.

“White’s 5 d3 is not as good as the more usual lines with 5 b5 or 5 c3 Black can take the e-pawn and retain excellent chances...White will gain a few tempi and enjoy rapid development — a method we believe to be the best of the rest — but Black’s king finds safety in castling”, Hall.

Perhaps it is just a question of taste, to me this knight retreat looks like a very sensible move — the attack is directed against the black queen on h4.

The idea of Fraser is a very sound one, White obtains domination over the kingside and gains the initiative. However, according to present-day theory, 5 d3 favours Black and has been neglected.

5...Wh4+

“Anyway, the new move 5...Wh5, declining the gambit, appears to be Black’s best continuation, which leads to equality”, Siegbert Tarrasch, Kagans Neueste Schachnachrichten, 1925.

“5...Wh5 was suggested here, but it cannot be so good. For one thing it looks like the prelude to further loss of time with the queen. For another thing, simple faith must be placed in material superiority provided that the risks insured are not too great”, Botterill/Harding.

“5...Wh5 is equal, according to Tartakower (500 Master Games of Chess), and the move has also been associated with Tarrasch”, Hall.
White has two main lines:
A) 6 c3 b4 7 d2 f6 is the only one which was analysed by Tarrasch.
And here:
A1) 8 d3 0-0!? (8...d5 9 exd5 cxd5, suggested by Tarrasch, is less convincing in view of 10 w2+ c7 11 cxd5 cxd2+ 12 xd2 xd5 13 c3!) 9 0-0 d6 when Black is at least no worse since 10 b5 can be met by 10...g4, Gutman;
A2) 8 b5 xd2+ with two examples:
A2a) 9 xd2 e5!? (9...xd1+ 10 xd1 d8 11 f3 a6 12 c3 d6 is also possible) 10 c4 w4+ 11 e2 0-0 12 xc7 b8 13 0-0 d5 14 e3 d4 leads nowhere for White;
A2b) 9 wxd2 0-0 10 0-0-0 (10 xc7 xe4 11 w3 w5+ 12 c3 f6 13 x8 e8 favours Black) 10...w5!? 11 xc7 x4 (11...b4 seems wrong due to 12 d5! xf5 d5 e2+ 14 b1 b4 15 c3, Gutman) 12 w3 xe3+ 13 xe3 b8 (more precise than 13...f2??! 14 xa8 xh1 15 d2) 14 g1 f2 with equality, Tarrasch.
B) “In fact, after the simple 6 e2! Black is already in trouble”, Hall.
6...f6 (or 6...w5+ 7 d2 w6 8 c3 with good attacking chances for White) 7 0-0 (7 g5 g6 8 f4, indicated by Hall, is less clear on account of 8...xe4!? 9 h5 f5 10 xf7+ d8 11 e6 w6 12 e8+ e8 13 xh8 wxe6) 7...d6 (7...xe4? 8 g5) 8 c3 e7 9 d5 xd5 10 exd5 e5 11 xe5 wxe5 12 b5+ is clearly in White favour, Gutman.

“Safe is the narrow way of duty”, Friedrich Schiller.

We divide the material into two chapters:
Chapter 1: 6 e3
Chapter 2: 6 e2

Chapter 1
(1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 xd4 w4 5 f3 wxe4+)
6 e3

“Naturally, one may also play 6 e3, but it doesn’t offer so many chances”, Botterill/Harding.
“Doubtful, according to Steinitz”, Hall.
6...b4?!
The most logical continuation.

Alternatives are:
I) 6...b4+ ("Black has not tried this move, but it seems quite strong", Hall) 7 bd2 (7 c3 wb2 8 d2 b4 9 b1 a3 10 d5 d6 11 c3 f6 12 c4 a7 13 e2 d8 doesn’t give White full compensation for the two pawns) 7 wb2 8 b1 xa2 (8...w3 9 b5 a5 10 c4! w7 11 0-0 12 e1 e7 13 c5 d6 14 a5 and Black’s overloaded position falls apart) 9 c4 a4 10 w2 e7 11 d4 xd4 12 xd4 a5 13 0-0 and White has a dangerous initiative, Gutman;

II) "Alternatively, Black could equally well adopt Evans (it was nevertheless, Fraser himself) recipe of 6...w7 followed by...f6, ...wb8 and ...e7", Botterill/Harding.

7...wb8 (10...wxe3+ 11 h1 c5 12 e2+) 11 d5 wd8 12 d4 xd4 13 exd4 e6 14 e2 is quite promising for White, Gutman;

III) 6...c5, another suggestion from Botterill/Harding, seems more testing, when 7 d3 e7 (7...b4+ is shown to be baseless by 8 c3! wb2 9 xc5 xa1 10 e2+ d8 11 0-0 d6 12 a3 e6 13 c4 xc4 14 wc4, Gutman) 8 0-0 leads to the critical position.

Black has a choice:
A) 8...xe3 9 e1 d6 10 xe3 e6 11 c3 (11 f5 d7 was indicated by Hall) 11...f6 (11...0-0-0 12 d5) 12 f5 0-0 (12...d7?! 13 f5 d8 14 f3) 13 d4 xd4 (13...d8 14 g4!? wd7 15 g5 xf5 16 xf6) 14 xd4 wd7 15 d3 c5 16 w4 puts Black under severe pressure, Gutman;

B) 8...f6 is more logical, with a further split:
B1) 9 e1 0-0 10 c3 xe3!? (10...g4?! 11 d5 d6 12 xc5 xc5 13 w2 "makes the defence more difficult, offering as it does the temptation of 13...xf2 14 b4! and White wins a piece", Botterill/Harding) 11 xe3 c5 12 e4 xe4 13 xe4 d6 14 d3 h6 causes Black no problems, Gutman;

Black needs development as soon as possible, but obviously not at the cost of allowing White a big spatial advantage.

In my opinion, 7 c3 f6 (or 7...wd8 8 c4 f6 9 g5 e5 10 b3 h6 11 f4) 8 c4 (8 we2 can be met by 8...d5 9 0-0-0 e6) 8...g4 9 0-0! xe3 10 fxe3 d6
B2) 9 \( \text{\textit{dxc5 \textit{wxc5}}\)} 10 \( \text{\textit{dxe1+ \textit{gxf8 \textit{d1}}}}\) a3!? (11 \( \text{\textit{c3 d6}}\) 12 \( \text{\textit{wxd2 h6}}\) “and the inconveniences Black has to suffer for the sake of the pawn are rather minor”, Botterill/Harding) 11...d6 12 h3 \( \text{\textit{g6}}\) (12...\( \text{\textit{wh5}}\) 13 \( \text{\textit{d.bd2 f5}}\) would have been answered by 14 \( \text{\textit{d.e2 e8}}\) 15 \( \text{\textit{d.f1}}\) 13 \( \text{\textit{b4 w.h5}}\) 14 \( \text{\textit{d.bd2 e8}}\) 15 c4 and Black still has difficulties, Gutman. 7 \( \text{\textit{d.d3?!}}\)

I) 7 \( \text{\textit{d.d4}}\) is of dubious value in view of 7...c5 8 \( \text{\textit{c3 g6}}\) Freeborough/Ranken;

II) 7 \( \text{\textit{a.a3}}\) seems more prudent.

Black has three options:

A) 7...

B) 7...

C) 7...

D) This is the position, which Freeborough/Ranken had judged in Black’s favour.

11 \( \text{\textit{b3 cxc3}}\) 12 bxc3 0-0

Safer than 12...

13 \( \text{\textit{f1 b6}}\) 14 \( \text{\textit{bxb6 axb6}}\) 15 \( \text{\textit{e7 b7}}\)

Black is fine, Gutman.
Chapter 2
(1 e4 e5 2 ♜f3 ♛c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ♣xd4 ♜h4 5 ♜f3 ♤xe4+
6 ♤e2!?)

"After this, White's superiority in development should secure him the advantage", Paul Keres.

We divide the material in five sections:
Section 1: 6...d5
(6...♗b4, 6...♖c5)
Section 2: 6...♗b4+
Section 3: 6...♗f6
Section 4: 6...d6
Section 5: 6...♖e7

"6...♖e7 is the move, suggested by Larry Evans (once again, this line of play was already analysed by George Fraser himself); that spoils White's fun. Against other continuations, White gets a very menacing initiative in return for the pawn", Botterill/Harding.

Section 1
6...d5
"This advance in the centre was suggested by Oscar Cordel in his Führer durch die Schachtheorie, 1888, as sufficient for equality", Bilguer.

We mention here two more moves:
I) 6...♗b4 7 ♘a3 ♗c5 (7...♗f6 8 0-0 ♘e7 9 c3 ♘c6 runs into the disruptive 10 ♘b5 ♘d8 11 ♘d3 ♘g4 12 ♘e1+) 8 0-0 ♘e7 (or 8...♗f6 9 c3 ♘c6 10 b4 ♘b6 11 ♘d3 ♘g4 12 h3 ♘h5 13 ♘e1+ ♘d8 14 b5) 9 ♘e1 ♘g6 10 c3 ♘bc6 11 b4 ♘b6 12 ♘d3 with good attacking chances for White, Fraser;
II) 6...♗c5 7 0-0 ♘ge7 (Seefort Club-Collingwood Club, corr. 1876, went 7...♗f6 8 ♘e1 0-0 9 ♘c3 ♘f5 10 ♘d3 ♘h5 11 ♘e4 ♘g4 12 h3 ♘ge5 13 ♘xe5 ♘xe5 14 ♘g5 ♘h8 15 ♘h5 h6 16 ♘h4 ♘e7 when 17 ♘xe7! ♘xe7 18 ♘xe7 ♘xe7 19 ♘d6! ♘d5 20 ♘xf7+ ♘g8 21 ♘d6 ♘b4 22 ♘c4+ ♘h8 23 c3 ♘c2 24 ♘f7+ would have given White a clear advantage, Gutman) 8 ♘c3 ♘g6 9 ♘e1 0-0 (obviously more prudent than 9...d6 10 ♘d5 ♘d8 11 ♘d3 ♘h5 12 ♘f4 ♘g4 13 h3, Fraser) 10 ♘d3.

"With a lot of pressure since the black queen is short of good squares", Botterill/Harding.

Black has a choice:
A) 10...f5 11 ♘e2 (11 ♘b5!? ♘b6 12 ♘e3 ♘a5 13 c3 a6 14 a4!? looks quite promising, Gutman) 11...d6
(11...d5 can be well met by 12 £f4
£d6 13 c3 a5 14 £c2, Gutman) 12
£f4 £e8 13 £c4+ £h8 14 £d5
and White retains the initiative,
Fraser;
B) 10...£h5 was suggested by
Alexei Sokolsky, however, 11 £e4
(11 £b5 £b6 12 £e3 £a5 13 c3 a6
14 a4 £d5 15 £d2 d6 16 £a3 £g4
17 £e2 £b6 18 h3 £e6) 11...d6 12
h3 £b6 13 £g3 £a5 14 c3 still
causes some problems for Black,
Gutman.
7 0-0 £e6 8 £c3

8...£f5
8...£g6 was also tried, and now:
A) 9 £b5 0-0-0 10 £f4 £d7 11 c4
a6!? (after 11...£e4 12 £e3 dxc4
13 £xa7+ £xa7 14 £a4 £d6 15
£xa7 £a6 16 £d4 £xd4 17 £xd4
£d5 18 b3 £g6 19 £f3 cxb3 20
axb3 b6 21 £fd1 £b7, Sieranoja-
Kilti, Jamsae 1996, 22 £e5! £xg2+
23 £f1 £h6 24 £xh6 gxh6 25
£xf7 £c5 26 £xh8 £xf2+ 27 £e1
would have given White a decisive
advantage) 12 £c3 dxc4 13 £a4
£d6 is very reliable for Black,
Gutman;
B) 9 £b5!? £ge7 10 £e1 0-0-0 11
£g5 £d6 (or 11...£b4 12 £xe7
£xe7 13 a3) 12 £d3 £h5 13 £b5
£d7 14 £d2 and Black has some
difficulties in confronting White’s
threats, Gutman.
9 £b5 £ge7 10 £g5!
10 £d4 £g6 11 f4 has emerged as a
less promising option.

Black has two possibilities:
A) 11...£f5?! 12 £e1 £d7 13 £xc6!
(13 £xd5?! 0-0 0 14 £xc6,
Gunsberg-NN, London 1879, is less
impressive in view of 14...£xc6! 15
£xc6 £xc6, indicated by
Stein) 13...bxc6 14 £d3 and
White has pressure, Gutman;
B) 11...£d7?! 12 £xc6 bxc6 13
£e1 £d8 14 £e3 £c8 keeps
Black’s game alive, according to
Cordel.
10...£a6
There is no point in playing 10...£e6?,
as White wins quickly after 11 £d4
£xg5 12 £xe6 £e5 13 £el,
Bilguer.
11 £xe7 axb5 12 £xf8
We have reached a position that
Bilguer had judged as better for
White.
12...£xf8 13 £d4!? £xd4 14 £xd4
0-0-0 15 a4 b4 16 £xb4

Black will suffer due to his
exposed king, Gutman.
Section 2
(1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 exd4 4 ∆xd4 w4h4 5 ∆f3 wxe4+ 6 ∆e2)
6...b4+

"With this move Black loses an important tempo as the black queen on e4 still appears not to be in its element. Contrary to Steinitz, Blackburne and Rosenthal, I believe that Black would have done better with returning his queen home", George Fraser, Glasgow Herald, 1873.

"A finesseful check, to induce the self-blocking move 7 c3, or force White into an unfavourable interposition of the queen's knight", Hall.

We now consider four lines:
Sequel 1: 7 ∆c3
(7 ∆d2, 7 ∆bd2)
Sequel 2: 7 c3 ∆e7
Sequel 3: 7 c3 ∆c5 8 0-0 ∆f6
(8...w7e7)
Sequel 4: 7 c3 ∆c5 8 0-0 ∆ge7

Sequel 1
7 ∆c3
White has also tried:
I) 7 ∆d2 ∆f6 8 0-0 ∆xd2 9 w4x2d2 0-0 10 ∆c3 w7e7 11 ∆fe1 d6 12 c4 w8d8 13 h3 ∆f5 14 a3 w7d7 15 b4 wae8 was fine for Black in Kunert-Gelfenboim, Germany 1999; II) 7 ∆bd2 ∆xd2+ 8 ∆xd2 w8f6 9 0-0 0-0 10 ∆c3 (or 10 ∆d3 w4g4 11 h3 w8h5 12 c3 d6, Botterill/ Harding) 10...w8d5 11 w3d3 wxc3 12 bxc3 w7f4 13 wxe1 d5 with advantage for Black, Anischnenko-Vaisman, USSR 1963.
7...wxc3+ 8 bxc3

White hopes that the bishop-pair fully compensates for the material and for his scattered pawns: with the knight on f3, this seems like quite a risky plan.

However, this continuation is not to be underestimated: new files create new threats, and Black must react precisely.
8...w8d6!
I don't like 8...w8ge7, because the knight controls less space here.
9 0-0 d6 (9...0-0 is premature in view of 10 ∆d3 w8a4 11 w5g5) 10 wxe1 with a further split:
A) 10...w6g6 11 w5g5!? (11 w4d4 0-0 12 w8b5 leads nowhere on account of 12...w8h3 13 w8f3 w8e5!? 14 w8xc7 w8ac8 15 w8b5 a6 16 w8xd6 w8xf3+ 17 w8xf3 w8xc3) 11...0-0 (or 11...h6 12 w8h5 w8f6 13 w8e4 w8h4 14 f4 0-0
15 c4 b6 16 Ab1 a6 17 Ab3) 12 Ab1 b6 13 Ah5 Wf6 14 c4 and Black has some problems finding a safe place for his queen, Gutman;
B) 10...h6!? 11 Ad4!? (Zhitenev-I.Zakharov, Moscow 1971, went 11 Ab1 0-0 12 c4 b6 13 h3 Wh7 14 Ad4 Axd4 15 Wxd4 Af5 16 Ab2 Ac6 17 Wc3 and now 17...Aae8!? 18 f4 Ahd8 19 Afx6 f6 could obtain a plus for Black) 11...0-0 12 Axb5 Afx5 13 Axc7 Acd8 14 Ab1 b6 15 Ab2!? Axd7 16 Axb5 d5 17 Axd4 Axd4 18 cxd4 still gives White some edge thanks to the bishop pair, Gutman.
9 0-0 0-0

10 Ad3
Other possibilities are:
I) 10 Ag5 We5 11 Ad3 d6 12 f4 Wd5 13 f5 Ad7 14 Ae4 Wxe4 15 Wd4 Aae8 18 f5 Af5 17 Wxf5 Wxf5 18 Wxf5 Wxe2 and Black won easily, Hadjito-ff-Levy, Siemen Olympiade 1970;
II) 10 Ae1 d6 (after 10...h6 11 Ad3 Wd5 12 c4 Wa5 13 Ad2 Wb6 14 Ac3 Ag4 15 We2 d6, Manrique-Ancheyta, Merida 1997, 16 h3!? Ae5 17 Aex5 dxe5 18 Aex5 Aex5 19 Wxe5 should promise White an excellent game) 11 Ag5 Wg6!? (11...We7 12 Ad3 Ae6, Alridge-Gibbons, New Zealand 1990, is less convincing due to 13 Ad4!? h6 14 Ah4, when Black has to be a little careful of the pins) 12 Ad3 Af5 13 Ab1 b6 with advantage for Black, Gutman;
III) 10 Ag5 d6 11 Ab1 Ae5 12 Ab4 Wg6 13 Ah4 Ab8 14 Ag3 Axf3+ 15 Afx3 Af5 16 Ab7 Axc2 17 Wf3 a5 18 Ad4 We8 19 c4 Ae4 20 Aex4 Wxe4 21 Wxe4 Wxe4 22 Wc3 Ab1 23 Ac1 Ad7 24 f3 Ac1+ 25 Wxc1 Ae2 gave Black a clear plus in Fieandt-Ketonen, team championship, Finland 1997.
10...Wg4 11 h3 Wh5 12 Ab1 a6 13 Ag5 d6 14 Ae1 Ae5 15 Axf6 gxf6

White has no compensation for his minus pawn.

Em.Lasker-Manson, simultaneous game, San Francisco 1902, continued 16 Ae2 Wh6 17 Ab4 Ah8 18 Wc1 Wxc1 19 Wxc1 Ag8 20 Wf1 b5 21 Afx4 Ag7 22 Afx4 Ae6 with a winning endgame for Black.
Sequel 2
(1 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 2 \text{\textdagger}f3 \text{\textdagger}c6 3 \text{d}4 \text{exd}4 4 \text{\textdagger}xd4 \text{\textw}h4 5 \text{\textdagger}f3 \text{\textw}xe4+ 6 \text{\textdagger}e2 \text{\textdagger}b4+)
7 \text{c}3!
The most logical continuation.
7...\text{\textdagger}e7

It may well be a wonderful square for the bishop (with the queen on d8), while here White has good chances to exploit the insecure position of Black's queen on e4.

8 0-0
8 \text{\textdagger}bd2 \text{\textw}g6 9 0-0 allows Black to consolidate with 9...d5!, when 10 \text{\textdagger}e1 \text{\textdagger}h3 11 \text{\textdagger}h4 \text{\textw}d6 12 \text{\textdagger}df3 \text{\textdagger}e6 13 \text{\textdagger}d3 0-0-0 14 \text{\textdagger}f5 \text{\textdagger}xf5 15 \text{\textdagger}xf5+ \text{\textdagger}b8 16 \text{\textw}c2 \text{\textdagger}f6 17 \text{\textdagger}g5 \text{\textdagger}hf8 18 \text{\textdagger}xh7 \text{\textdagger}h8 turned out quite badly for White in Adam-Müller, e-mail game 1998.

8...\text{\textdagger}f6
Black has several alternatives here:
I) 8...\text{\textb}6? 9 \text{\textdagger}e1 \text{\textdagger}b7 10 \text{\textdagger}g5! (improving on 10 \text{\textdagger}a6, Judd-Roberts, Philadelphia 1876, when 10...\text{\textw}xe1+ 11 \text{\textw}xe1 \text{\textdagger}xa6 was a must; however, 12 a4 \text{\textdagger}f6 13 \text{\textb}4 still favours White) 10...\text{\textw}f5 (or 10...\text{\textw}e5 11 \text{\textdagger}xf7!) 11 \text{\textdagger}g4 \text{\textw}f6 12 \text{\textw}xd7+ \text{\textdagger}f8 13 \text{\textw}xc7 and Black is overwhelmed, Gutman;

II) 8...d6 9 \text{\textdagger}e1 \text{\textw}g6 with two examples:
A) 10 \text{\textdagger}bd2 \text{\textdagger}d7 (after 10...\text{\textdagger}f8?! 11 \text{\textdagger}f1 h5 12 \text{\textdagger}e3 h4 13 \text{\textdagger}d5 \text{\textdagger}f6 14 \text{\textdagger}d3 \text{\textw}h5 15 \text{\textdagger}f4 \text{\textdagger}g4 16 \text{\textdagger}w}d7 17 \text{\textdagger}g5 \text{\textdagger}e5 18 \text{\textw}b3 \text{\textdagger}d8, Vavpetić-Truta, Ptuj 1990, 19 \text{\textdagger}xe5! \text{\textw}xe5 20 \text{\textdagger}xf7 \text{\textw}f7 21 \text{\textdagger}g6+ \text{\textdagger}e8 22 \text{\textw}f7+ \text{\textdagger}xf7 23 \text{\textdagger}xh8+ \text{\textdagger}g8 24 \text{\textdagger}g6 would have secured a clear advantage for White) 11 a4 0-0-0 12 a5 \text{\textdagger}e5 gives a little something for White, Gutman;
B) 10 \text{\textdagger}a3 \text{\textdagger}d7 11 \text{\textdagger}b5 (11 \text{\textdagger}g5?! \text{\textdagger}f6 12 \text{\textdagger}b5 \text{\textdagger}c8 13 \text{\textdagger}c4 0-0 0-14 \text{\textdagger}xa7 \text{\textdagger}xe8 15 \text{\textdagger}xc6 bxc6 16 \text{\textdagger}w}f3 \text{\textdagger}f5 17 \text{\textw}xc6 d5 18 \text{\textdagger}f1 \text{\textdagger}d6 19 \text{\textdagger}xe8 \text{\textdagger}xe8 20 \text{\textdagger}f3 \text{\textdagger}e4 21 \text{\textdagger}g5 d4 22 \text{\textw}a4 \text{\textdagger}xf3 23 \text{\textdagger}xf6 \text{\textdagger}a8 24 \text{\textw}xd4 \text{\textdagger}f6 was winning for Black in Cuartas-Pekarek, Prague 1982)
11...\text{\textdagger}c8 12 \text{\textdagger}f4 \text{\textdagger}f6 13 \text{\textdagger}b3 14 \text{\textdagger}xd4 c6 15 \text{\textdagger}f4 \text{\textdagger}f8 16 \text{\textw}b3 b6 17 \text{\textw}a4 c5 18 \text{\textdagger}c6 \text{\textdagger}xc6 19 \text{\textdagger}xc6 \text{\textdagger}c7 20 \text{\textdagger}c1 and White has a decisive pressure, Gutman.

III) Steinitz tried in some games 8...\text{\textdagger}h6, a rather awkward-looking move.

After 9 \text{\textdagger}e1 (Wihay/Wurm-Steinitz, consultation game, New Orleans 1883, went 9 \text{\textdagger}c3 \text{\textw}g6 10 \text{\textdagger}d4 0-0
11 \( \text{A}h5 \) \( \text{W}f6 \) 12 \( \text{A}d2 \) \( d5 \) 13 \( \text{A}2f3 \) \( \text{A}x\text{d}4 \) 14 \( \text{c}x\text{d}4 \) \( \text{A}5f5 \) 15 \( \text{A}g5 \) \( \text{W}b6 \) 16 \( \text{A}xe7 \) \( \text{A}xe7 \) 17 \( \text{A}e1 \) \( \text{A}c6 \) 18 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( \text{A}f5 \) 19 \( \text{A}ad1 \) \( \text{A}ae8 \) 20 \( \text{W}g5 \) \( \text{A}e4 \) with advantage for Black) 9...\( \text{W}g6 \) 10 \( \text{A}g5 \) \( \text{A}d8 \) (a sad decision, but 10...0-0? can be refuted by 11 \( \text{A}x\text{d}4 \) \( \text{W}d6 \) 12 \( \text{A}xf6 \) \( \text{A}x\text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{A}x\text{h}7+ \) \( \text{A}x\text{h}7 \) 14 \( \text{W}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{c}x\text{d}6 \) 15 \( \text{A}x\text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{A}f4 \) 12 \( \text{A}d2 \) \( \text{A}e8 \) 13 \( b4! \) \( \text{W}f6 \) 14 \( \text{A}g3 \) \( \text{W}x\text{c}3 \) 15 \( b5 \) \( \text{A}d4 \) 16 \( \text{A}e4 \) \( \text{A}x\text{e}2+ \) White has a choice:

A) 17 \( \text{W}x\text{e}2 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 18 \( \text{A}d1 \) \( \text{A}d7 \) 19 \( \text{A}d4 \) a6 20 \( \text{A}c5 \) \( \text{A}b8 \) (this is a better defence than 20...\( \text{d}x\text{c}5 \) 21 \( \text{A}e6+ \) \( \text{f}x\text{e}6 \) 22 \( \text{A}x\text{d}7+ \) \( \text{A}x\text{d}7?! \) 23 \( \text{W}x\text{e}6+ \) \( \text{A}d8 \) 24 \( \text{A}d1+ \) \( \text{A}d6 \) 25 \( \text{A}h4+ \) 1-0, Merian-Steinitz, New York 1884) 21 \( \text{A}x\text{d}7 \) \( \text{A}x\text{d}7 \) 22 \( \text{A}e6 \) \( \text{f}x\text{e}6 \) 23 \( \text{W}x\text{e}6+ \) \( \text{A}d8 \) 24 \( \text{A}h4 \) \( \text{A}f5 \) 25 \( \text{A}x\text{e}7+ \) \( \text{A}x\text{e}7 \) 26 \( \text{W}x\text{d}6+ \) \( \text{c}x\text{d}6 \) 27 \( \text{W}x\text{d}6+ \) \( \text{c}8 \) 28 \( \text{W}e6+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 29 \( \text{W}e5+ \) \( \text{b}6 \) 30 \( \text{W}d4+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 31 \( \text{W}f4+ \) \( \text{c}8 \) 32 \( \text{W}g4+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) could lead to a draw by repetition, Gutman;

B) 17 \( \text{A}x\text{e}2! \) is more forceful, 17...\( \text{W}a3 \) (or 17...\( \text{W}a5 \) 18 \( \text{A}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{c}x\text{d}6 \) 19 \( \text{A}x\text{d}6 \) 18 \( \text{A}e3 \) \( \text{W}b4 \) 19 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 20 \( \text{A}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{c}x\text{d}6 \) 21 \( \text{A}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{A}x\text{d}6 \) 22 \( \text{W}x\text{d}6+ \) \( \text{A}d7 \) 23 \( \text{A}d1 \) and Black is helpless, Gutman.

I) 9 \( \text{A}b5 \) \( \text{W}d5 \) 10 \( \text{W}e2 \) \( \text{A}d8 \) (a fine suggestion by Freeborough/Ranken, while 10...\( \text{W}e6 \) 11 \( \text{A}c2 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{A}e1 \) \( \text{W}d6 \) 13 \( \text{A}g5 \) \( \text{A}d8 \) 14 \( \text{A}d3 \) h6 15 \( \text{A}h4 \) \( \text{W}e6 \) 16 \( \text{A}b2 \) \( \text{A}e8 \) 17 \( \text{A}ad1 \) leaves Black under pressure) 11 \( \text{A}e1 \) (or 11 \( \text{A}d1 \) \( \text{W}h5 \) 12 \( \text{A}b2 \) \( \text{A}e6 \) 13 \( \text{A}f1 \) c6 14 \( \text{A}d3 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 15 \( \text{A}g3 \) 0-0 16 \( \text{A}f5 \) \( \text{A}d8 \) 11...\( \text{A}e6 \) 12 \( \text{A}e5 \) 0-0 13 \( \text{A}c4 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 14 b4 (14 \( \text{A}d2 \) d5) 14...\( \text{W}b6 \) 15 \( \text{A}e3 \) \( \text{W}d6 \) 16 \( \text{A}f3 \) \( \text{A}e8 \) 17 \( \text{A}d2 \) c6 18 \( \text{A}d1 \) \( \text{W}c7 \) and White has already lost the initiative, Gutman;

II) 9 \( \text{A}b2 \) \( \text{W}f5 \) (9...\( \text{W}d5 \)?) 10 \( \text{A}c4 \) \( \text{W}h5 \) 11 \( \text{A}e1 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{A}f1 \) d6 13 h3 causes some problems as 13...\( \text{A}e5 \) loses due to 14 \( \text{A}x\text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}x\text{e}5 \) 15 \( \text{A}g3 \) 10 \( \text{A}e1 \) (Vivo-Gori, Milan 1992, went 10 \( \text{A}h4 \) \( \text{W}e6 \) 11 \( \text{A}e1 \) d5 12 \( \text{A}d3 \) \( \text{W}d6 \) 13 \( b4 \) a6 14 \( \text{A}d3 \) 0-0 15 \( a4 \) g6 16 \( \text{A}a3 \) \( \text{W}d8 \) 17 \( \text{A}d2 \) a5 18 \( b5 \) \( \text{A}x\text{a}3 \) 19 \( \text{A}x\text{a}3 \) \( \text{W}d6 \) 20 \( \text{A}a1 \) \( \text{A}d8 \) 21 h3 when 21...\( \text{A}e6 \) would have given a plus for Black) 10...0-0 11 \( \text{A}f1 \) d5 12 \( \text{A}g5 \) (12 \( \text{A}d3 \) \( \text{W}d7 \) 12...\( \text{A}e4 \) 13 \( \text{A}e3 \) \( \text{W}d7 \) 14 \( \text{A}x\text{e}7 \) (14 \( \text{A}f4 \) \( \text{A}c5 \)?) 14...\( \text{A}x\text{e}7 \) does not offer White quite enough for the sacrificed pawn, Gutman.

9 \( \text{A}e1 \)
There are two more possibilities:

9...0-0
Other ideas are worth exploring:
I) 9...\textit{w}d5? 10 \textit{c}d4! \textit{d}xd4 11 cxd4 \textit{d}8 (11...0-0?! 12 \textit{f}3 \textit{w}d6 13 b3! \textit{d}8 14 \textit{a}3 \textit{w}b6 15 \textit{c}5 \textit{w}a6 16 \textit{xf}8 \textit{xf}8 17 \textit{c}3 left Black without compensation for the exchange, Golmayo-Steinitz, seventh match game, Havana 1883) 12 \textit{c}3 \textit{w}a5 (or 12...\textit{w}e6 13 \textit{f}4) 13 \textit{w}b3 \textit{f}8 14 \textit{f}4 is clearly in White’s favour, Gutman;

II) 9...\textit{w}f5 10 \textit{c}h4 (less worrying for Black is 10 \textit{c}d4 \textit{d}xd4 11 cxd4 d5, Freeborough/Ranken) 10...\textit{w}d5 appears more often though, with a further split:

A) 11 \textit{d}2 0-0 12 \textit{f}3 was given by Fraser, when Freeborough/Ranken recommended 12...\textit{w}b5 13 b3 d5 14 c4 \textit{w}b6 15 cxd5 (or 15 \textit{e}3 d4) 15...\textit{d}xd5 as being fine for Black;

B) 11 \textit{d}xd5!? \textit{d}xd5 12 \textit{f}3 is a possible improvement, after 12...\textit{f}8 13 \textit{f}5 d6 14 \textit{g}xg7 \textit{g}xg7 15 \textit{c}xd5 \textit{e}8 (15...\textit{e}5 16 f4 \textit{h}4?! is shown to be careless by 17 g3 \textit{d}3 18 \textit{c}3 \textit{x}c1 19 \textit{g}xh4 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{c}4 b5 21 \textit{f}1 \textit{e}6 22 b3 a5 23 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}xa2 24 \textit{x}a2) 16 \textit{a}3 a6 17 \textit{f}4 \textit{f}5 18 \textit{c}4 \textit{f}6 19 \textit{e}3 the ending is slightly better for White, Gutman.

10 \textit{b}5!?
The most straightforward move.

Less effective are:

I) 10 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}xd4 11 cxd4 \textit{d}8 12 \textit{c}3 \textit{w}g6 13 \textit{d}3 \textit{w}g4 and Black is at least no worse, Gutman;

II) 10 \textit{d}3 \textit{w}g4 11 h3 \textit{w}h5 12 \textit{bd}2 d5!? (is more reliable than 12...d6, suggested by Steinitz, since after 13 \textit{f}1 Black cannot play 13...\textit{e}5? in view of 14 \textit{x}e5! dxe5 15 \textit{g}3, Gutman) 13 \textit{f}1 \textit{d}6 14 \textit{g}3 \textit{x}g3 15 \textit{fx}g3 d4!? deserves more attention.

And here:

A) Hunter/Jenkins-Zukertort, consultation game, Glasgow 1873, continued 16 \textit{g}5 (“White wins a piece, but exposes his game to great danger”, Steinitz) 16...dxc3 17 bxc3 (17 g4 \textit{x}xg4 18 hxg4 \textit{x}xg4 19 \textit{c}1 \textit{d}ad8 20 bxc3 \textit{x}f3 21 \textit{g}xf3 \textit{e}5 22 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}xd3 23 \textit{d}xd3 \textit{w}g6+ and wins, Steinitz) 17...\textit{h}6 18 g4 \textit{x}xg4 19 hxg4 \textit{x}xg4 20 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}ad8 21 \textit{w}c2 \textit{c}ce5 22 \textit{f}5 \textit{xf}3+ 23 \textit{g}xf3 \textit{xe}3 24 \textit{xe}3 \textit{w}g5+ 25 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}5 26 \textit{d}3 \textit{h}4+ 27 \textit{e}2 \textit{h}2+ 28 \textit{e}1 (or 28 \textit{d}1 \textit{h}1+ 29 \textit{e}1 \textit{w}xf3+ 30 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}d8 31 \textit{e}3 \textit{w}f2+ 32 \textit{e}2 \textit{w}f4+ 33 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}5 34 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}e8) 28...\textit{w}g1+ 0-1.

“Johann Hermann Zukertort, from about 1871 to 1886 second player in the world after Steinitz. Like Anderssen, his teacher, Zukertort had a direct and straightforward style, and in combinative situations he could calculate far ahead. As an annotator and analyst Zukertort was outstanding in his time, and much of his work in these fields appeared in the Chess Monthly which he and Hoffer edited from 1879 to 1888”, Hooper/Whyld, The Oxford Companion to Chess.
B) 16 cxd4!? \(\text{W}a5 17 \text{g5} \text{Qxd4} 18 \text{xf6} \text{Qxf3}+ 19 \text{xf3} \text{b6}+ 20 \text{h2} \text{xf6} 21 \text{xf6} \text{gxf6} 22 \text{e7} \text{c6} 23 \text{c4} \text{e6} \text{could have led to an approximately equal ending, Gutman.}

10...\text{Wd5}

11 \text{Wa4}

11 \text{Wxd5} \text{Qxd5} 12 \text{a3} (12 \text{xc6} \text{dxc6} 13 \text{c4} \text{fails to 13...Qb4} 14 \text{xe7} \text{Qc2} \text{since after} 15 \text{a3} \text{Qxa1} 16 \text{e1} \text{f5} 17 \text{d4} \text{d3} 18 \text{c5} \text{b6} \text{White has no compensation for the exchange}) 12...\text{d8} 13 \text{c4} \text{Qf6} 14 \text{Qc3} \text{d6} \text{favourites Black, Gutman.}

11...\text{e8} 12 \text{g5} \text{f5} 13 \text{a3} \text{xa3}

13...a6? is a serious loss of time in view of 14 \text{ad1} \text{b8} (or 14...\text{a3} 15 \text{xe8}+ \text{xe8} 16 \text{d3} \text{c5} 17 \text{e4}) 15 \text{d3}, Gutman.

14 \text{xe8}+!

14 \text{xf6} is thought to be inaccurate due to 14...\text{e6}! 15 \text{ad1}?! \text{xf6} (after 15...\text{xb2} 16 \text{d4} \text{White has decisive pressure, the black bishop on b2 is rather misplaced}) 16 \text{xa3} \text{d6} 17 \text{xc6} \text{bxc6} 18 \text{d4} \text{exe1}+ 19 \text{exe1} \text{d7} 20 \text{a6} (20 \text{a5} \text{d8}) 20...\text{c5} 21 \text{b7} \text{d8} 22 \text{c6} \text{xc6} 23 \text{xc6} \text{b8} 1/2-1/2, Gutman-Leisebein, corr. 1999.

14...\text{exe8} 15 \text{e1} \text{f8} 16 \text{exe8} \text{Wb1}+ 17 \text{e1} \text{xb2} 18 \text{d3} \text{d5} 19 \text{Wh4} \text{h6} 20 \text{e7}

White wins easily, Gutman.

Sequel 3
(1 \text{e4} \text{e5} 2 \text{Qf3} \text{Qc6} 3 \text{d4} \text{exd4} 4 \text{Qxd4} \text{Wh4} 5 \text{Qf3} \text{exe4}+ 6 \text{e2} \text{Qb4}+ 7 \text{c3})

7...\text{c5}

Black prefers to generate some counterplay with his dark-squared bishop bearing down on the a7-g1 diagonal.

8 0-0 \text{f6}

8...\text{e7} is too slow since 9 \text{e1} \text{d6} (9...\text{d8}? 10 \text{c4}+ \text{ge7} 11 \text{d5}) 10 \text{b4} \text{b6} 11 \text{a4}! \text{a5} 12 \text{bxa5} \text{xa5}
(or 12...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{x}a5} 13 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c}4} 14 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b}3} 15 \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 16 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} 17 \texttt{\textit{d}f6} 18 \texttt{\textit{f}3}, Gutman) 19 \texttt{\textit{b}5} 20 \texttt{\textit{e}6} 21 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} 22 \texttt{\textit{f}6} 23 \texttt{\textit{a}8} 24 \texttt{\textit{c}4} \texttt{\textit{c}5} 25 \texttt{\textit{d}d4} 26 \texttt{\textit{x}d4} 27 \texttt{\textit{c}x} 28 \texttt{\textit{a}3} is crushing for White, Fraser. 29 \texttt{\textit{d}3}!

A most natural reply, temporarily holding up Black’s casting, although it seems that Black faces problems everywhere:

I) 9 \texttt{\textit{e}1 0-0 10 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{\textit{b}6} 11 \texttt{\textit{d}3} \texttt{g}4 12 \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 13 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{g}3 (Fraser’s analysis ran 13...\texttt{\textit{h}5} 14 \texttt{\textit{e}5} 15 \texttt{\textit{d}d4} \texttt{\textit{h}4} 16 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{\textit{c}x} 17 \texttt{\textit{a}6} wins the black queen) 18 \texttt{\textit{c}x} 19 \texttt{\textit{b}1} wins the black queen) 16 \texttt{\textit{f}3} \texttt{\textit{f}4} 20 \texttt{\textit{e}5}, and White retains strong pressure, Gutman;

II) 9 \texttt{\textit{b}4} \texttt{\textit{e}7} (9...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b}b}6? loses to 10 \texttt{\textit{d}d3} \texttt{g}4 11 \texttt{\textit{b}5} \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 12 \texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{h}5} 13 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e}1}+ 14 \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 15 \texttt{\textit{b}5}, Fraser) 10 \texttt{\textit{d}d2}! (10 \texttt{\textit{d}d3} \texttt{g}4 11 \texttt{\textit{b}5} \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 12 \texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{h}5} 13 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e}1} d6 14 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} 15 \texttt{\textit{f}1} \texttt{c}5 should hold for Black) also looks like a promising alternative.

A) 10...\texttt{\textit{d}5} gives White two possibilities:

A1) 11 \texttt{\textit{c}4} \texttt{\textit{h}5} 12 \texttt{\textit{e}1} \texttt{d}6 13 \texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{e}6}! (while 13...\texttt{\textit{d}d8} 14 \texttt{\textit{f}1} favours White, Steinitz) 14 \texttt{\textit{e}6} \texttt{f}x\texttt{e} 15 \texttt{\textit{e}6} 0-0-0 is approximately equal, Gutman;

A2) 11 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e}1}+ 0-0 12 \texttt{\textit{c}4} appears much stronger; 12...\texttt{\textit{d}6} 13 \texttt{\textit{a}4} \texttt{a}6 14 \texttt{\textit{a}2}! is without hope for Black, Gutman.

B) 10...\texttt{\textit{g}6}! is preferable, reaching a position after 9 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{\textit{g}6} 10 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{\textit{e}7} — III.

III) 9 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{\textit{g}6} (9...\texttt{\textit{e}7 10 \texttt{\textit{d}3} \texttt{d}6 11 \texttt{\textit{b}4} \texttt{\textit{b}6} 12 \texttt{\textit{a}4} \texttt{a}6 13 \texttt{\textit{c}4} \texttt{\textit{a}7} 14 \texttt{\textit{a}3} 0-0 15 \texttt{\textit{b}5}) when White has a choice:

A) 10 \texttt{\textit{h}4} \texttt{\textit{g}5} 11 \texttt{\textit{d}f} \texttt{\textit{d}5} 12 \texttt{\textit{c}2} 0-0 13 \texttt{\textit{b}4} \texttt{\textit{b}6} 14 \texttt{\textit{d}3} (14 \texttt{\textit{c}x} \texttt{b}4 15 \texttt{\textit{b}2} \texttt{\textit{e}4}) 14...\texttt{\textit{h}5}! (less advisable is 14...\texttt{\textit{e}5} 15 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{x}e}5} \texttt{\textit{w}x} 16 \texttt{\textit{f}3} \texttt{\textit{h}5} 17 \texttt{\textit{c}4} \texttt{d}6 18 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b}2} \texttt{\textit{g}4} 19 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{\textit{e}2} 20 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e}2} \texttt{c}5} \texttt{\textit{d}5} \texttt{22 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e}1} \texttt{w}5} 23 \texttt{\textit{\textit{a}x} \texttt{\textit{f}6} \texttt{g}x\texttt{f} 24 \texttt{\textit{d}4}) 15 \texttt{\textit{g}5} \texttt{d}6 causes no problems for Black, Gutman;

B) 10 \texttt{\textit{b}4}! \texttt{\textit{e}7} (or 10...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b}b}6} 11 \texttt{\textit{a}4} \texttt{a}6 12 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c}4} 0-0 13 \texttt{\textit{d}3} 11 \texttt{\textit{e}1} \texttt{d}6 11...0-0 12 \texttt{\textit{b}5} \texttt{\textit{d}8} 13 \texttt{\textit{e}5}) 12 \texttt{\textit{f}1} 0-0 (12...\texttt{\textit{d}4}! 13 \texttt{\textit{d}d3} \texttt{\textit{f}5} is well met by 14 \texttt{\textit{b}5! \texttt{\textit{c}c} \texttt{\textit{e}5} 15 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{x}f}5} \texttt{\textit{d}2} \texttt{\textit{x}b} 17 \texttt{\textit{a}4}, picking up the black knight) 13 \texttt{\textit{d}3} \texttt{\textit{g}4} 14 \texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{d}7} 15 \texttt{\textit{g}3} with good attacking chances for White, Gutman.

9...\texttt{\textit{g}4} 10 \texttt{\textit{e}1+} \texttt{\textit{e}7} 11 \texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{h}5} \texttt{12 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{d}5}

12...\texttt{\textit{d}6} fails tactically due to 13 \texttt{\textit{f}1} 0-0 (or 13...\texttt{\textit{e}5} 14 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{x}e}5! dxe} 15 \texttt{\textit{g}3}) 14 \texttt{\textit{g}5} threatening 15 \texttt{\textit{g}3}, Gutman.

13 \texttt{\textit{f}1} \texttt{\textit{e}4}

And now:
14 c4!
This key move keeps more tension as 14...dxe4 dxe4 15...e4 e6 16...g3 w6 17...f4! (17...a4 0-0 18...h4?!...xh4 19...xh4 wad8 20...f4...d7 21...e1 a6 22...e5?!...e8 was level in Jenkins-Zukertort, Glasgow 1873) 17...d8 18...a4...d7 19...e1 (19...e5?!...xe5 20...xe5 0-0 21...xa7 is worth consideration, Gutman) 19...0-0 20...e5...xe5 21...xe5...fd8 22...f5...xf5 23...xe7 with a clear plus for White, Fraser.
14...b4 15...cxd5...xd3 16...e4 c5
16...xcl 17...xc1 is no better.
17...xe7+!...xe7 18...d4

This is a safer line for Black according to Anatoly Karpov: at least the vital e-file is now more or less blocked.
9...e1
The direct 9...d3!?...g4 10...b4 seems to offer White reasonable prospects, perhaps even better than the main line.
We examine:
A) 10...b6 11...bd2...d5 (11...0-0 can be met by 12...e4...d5 13...h3...d7 14...eg5) 12...e1...f5 (12...a6 13...a4 0-0 14...a3) 13...xf5...xf5 14...a4...5 15...d8 16...a3...e6 17...b3...d8 18...bd4...xd4 19...xd4...f6 20...g4 with advantage for White, Gutman;
B) 10...d6 is a more lively continuation, which appears to be Black’s only chance to survive. 11...h3 (Sahu-Ravisekhar, New Delhi 1987, went 11...a3...e5 12...b5...xf3+ 13...xf3...xf3 14...xf3...g6 15...xd6+...xd6 16...e1+...d8 17...xg6 1/2-1/2) 11...h5 12...e1 leads to a crucial position where Black has a choice:

White has a devastating attack, Gutman.
Alternatives are less trustworthy:

I) 9...0-0? 10 ♘d3 ♙d5 11 b4 ♘d6
12 b5 ♘e5 13 ♘xe5 ♘xe5 14 ♘xh7+ ♘xh7 15 ♙h5+ ♘g8 16 ♘xe5 is without any hope for Black, Gutman;

II) The oldest defence 9...d6 10 b4! ♘b6 was mostly analysed.

"Wilhelm Steinitz cultivated also the assault by a chain of pawns on the queen’s side which has the effect of cramping the opponent and of threatening him, thus going beyond Philidor who directed such attacks mainly against the king", Lasker.

There are two options:

A) 11 a4 a5 (11...a6 12 a5 ♘a7 13 ♘xa6 ♙g4 14 ♘d3 0-0 15 ♙h3 ♙h5 16 b5 ♘e5 17 ♘xe5 ♙xd1 18 ♙xd1 with a clear advantage for White) 12 ♘bd2!? (12 bxa5 ♘xa5 13 ♘b5 ♙g6 14 ♘a3 ♘e6 15 ♘d2, "an interesting but inconclusive analysis by Fraser", according to Botterill/Harding, was overturned by Grigory Levenfish's suggestion, 15...♗d5!, when 16 g3 ♙f6 17 ♙e2 ♘a8 18 ♘ac4 ♘c5 favours Black) 12...♗f5 13 ♘c4 axb4 14 ♘xb6 cxb6 15 cxb4 d5 16 ♘d3 ♙g4 17 b5 ♘d8 18 ♙h3 ♙d7 19 ♘g5 and

9...d5?!

"With this advance Black should get more control in the centre, some space and the d6-square for his bishop", Karpov.
Black’s position collapses, Nadtochi-Shadanov, corr. 1983;
B) 11 ąbd2 ąg6 12 ąc4, “as given
by Bruno Parma, is some improve-
ment”, Botterill/Harding. After
12...ąe6 13 a4 ąxc4 (or 13...d5 14
ąxb6 axb6 15 b5 ąd8 16 ąd3
ąh5 17 ąe5) 14 ąxc4 a5 15 b5
ąe5 16 ąxe5 dxe5 17 ąxe5!
āxf2+ 18 ąh1 ąh4 19 ąa3 Black
has no defence, Gutman.

10 b4!
10 ąb5 ąf5 11 b4 is less
promising.

Black has to try:
A) 11...ąb6 12 ąd3! ąg4 13 a4 a5
(13...a6 14 a5 ąa7 15 b5 axb5 16
ąxb5 ąe6 17 a6 0-0 18 ąa4 ąg6
19 ąd3) 14 b5 ąd8 15 ąa3 ąe6
16 c4 dxc4 17 ąe4 ąg6 18 ąxc4
ąf6 19 ąc3 and White has the
initiative, Gutman;
B) 11...ąd6! 12 ąd4 ąd7 13 ąg5
f6 (13...h6, indicated by Hall, is
feeble in view of 14 ąxe7 ąxe7 15
ąa4) 14 ąh4 0-0 looks fine for
Black, Gutman.
10...ąd6

10...ąb6 11 ąd3 ąg4 12 ąbd2
reaches a position after 9 ąd3 ąg4
10 b4 ąb6 11 ąbd2 d5 12 ąe1. ąf5
11 ąa3 0-0 12 ąb5
It remains to be seen whether Black
can find a satisfactory method of
counterplay.
12...ąg6

12...ąe6 13 ąd3 ąd7 14 a4 ąe8 15
ąxd6 ąxd6 16 b5 ąd8 17 ąa3
ąf6 18 ąc2 h6 19 c4 dxc4 20
ąxc4 ąe6 21 ąa2 ąg6 22 ąb2
ąf4 23 ąc3 with the “terrible”
threat of 24 ąxe6.

13 ąxd6

More precise than 13 ąd3, when
13...ąf5 14 ąh4 ąf6 15 ąxf5
ąxf5 16 ąf3 ąfe8 17 ąd2 ące7
18 ąxf5 ąxf5 19 ąxd6 ąxd6 20
ąxd5 leads to equality.

13...ąxd6

13...cxd6 can be powerfully an-
swered by 14 ąf4.
14 a4 ąe8 15 b5 ąd8 16 ąa3 ąf6
17 ąxe7 ąxe7 18 ąxd5 ąe6 19
ąd4 ąxd4 20 ąxd4

The ending is clearly in White’s
favour, Gutman.
Section 3
(1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Qxd4 Wh4 5 Qf3 Wxe4+ 6 Qe2)
6...Qf6

The natural developing move, which keeps Black's position more fluid.

7 0-0

The less common 7 Qc3 is most simply met by 7...Qb4 8 0-0 Qxc3
9 bxc3 0-0, transposing into the variation after 6...Qb4+ 7 Qc3
Qxc3+ 8 bxc3 Qf6 9 0-0 0-0 — Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 2, Sequel 1.

7...Qe7

7...Wc7 transposes into the variation 6...Wc7 7 0-0 Qf6 — Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 5, Sequels 2 and 3. In 8 Qc3!

Alternatives are:
I) 8 Qb5 0-0 9 Qe1 (Prada-Sorin, rapid game, Oviedo 1992, went 9
Qc3 Wg6 10 Qd3 Wh5 11 Qb5 Qd8 12 Qg5 a6 13 Qxf6 axb5 14
Qxd8 Qxd8 15 Qe1 d6 16 Wc2 Qg4 17 Qxb5? Qxf3 0-1) 9...Wb4 leads
nowhere for White;
II) 8 Qe1 0-0 9 Qc3 (9 Qbd2 Wh5 10 Qe4 Qxe4 12
Qxe4 d6 13 Qe1 Qf6 14 c3 Qe5 15 Qxe5 Wxd1 16 Qxd1 Qxe5 gave
Black a clear advantage in Lapkova-

Vecerkova, Chrudim 1993) 9...Wb4
10 Qd2 Wc5 11 Qe3 Wf5 (instead Schmid-NN, Dresden 1873, con-
tined 11...Wd6!!) 12 Qd3 a6 13 Wc2 Qe5? 14 Qf4 and White won
easily) 12 Qb5 Qd8 13 Qfd4 (or 13
Qg5 d5 14 Qd3 Wd7) 13...Qxd4 14
Qxd4 (14 Qxd4 a6 15 Qd3 Wg4!) 14...Wc5 leaves White with some,
but possibly not enough compensation
for the pawn, Gutman.

8...Wf5

Another idea is 8...Wb4, however 9
Qb5! (after 9 a3 Wd6 10 Qd3 a6 11
g3 Qd4 12 Qxd4 Wxd4 13 Qe1
Qd8 14 Qe3 Wd6 15 Wc2 Qe8 16
Qad1 Wc6 17 Qc4 d6 18 Qxf7 Qg4
19 Qxe8, Haimi-Harju, Lahti 1997,
19...Qxe8!? 20 Wd3 Qxd1 21 Qxd1
Qf3 22 Qc4 Qd7 23 Qe1 Qe8
would have been satisfactory for
Black) 9 Qd8 (9...Qd8 10 c3 Wc7
11 Qe1 0-0 is insufficient due to 12
Qd3 Wc5 13 Qg5 with the threat of
14 b4) 10 c3!? (10 Qd2 Wc5 11
Qe3 Wd5 12 Qe1 h6 13 Qc3 Qe6
14 Qd3 d6 15 Qe1 Wd7 16 h3 g5
was played in Deese-Stockholm,
Germany 1991, when 17 Qd4
would have kept matters unclear)
10...Wc5 11 Wb3 a6 12 Qe3 Wd5
13 c4 Wf5 (13...Wh5? is cunningly
refuted by 14 Qxc7!!) 14 Qbd4
\[ d4 \, 15 \, dxe4 \, d6 \, 16 \, f5 \, b6 \, 17 \, e3 \, puts \, Black \, under \, pressure, \, Gutman. \]
\[ 9 \, b5 \, d8 \, 10 \, d3 \]
\[ 10 \, g5 \, f8 \, 11 \, d3 \, g4 \, 12 \, f3, \, suggested \, by \, Fraser, \, is \, less \, impressive \, in \, view \, of \, 12...\text{Wh}5! \, (12...\text{Wh}b4 \, 13 \, e1 \, a6 \, 14 \, c3 \, h6 \, 15 \, g4) \, 13 \, f4 \, d6 \, (13...\text{d5}?!) \, allows \, White \, to \, obtain \, a \, crushing \, attack \, with \, 14 \, g6! \, fxg6 \, 15 \, xdx5 \, d6 \, 16 \, g4 \, Wh4 \, 17 \, f7+ \, Wh7 \, 18 \, g5 \, xg5 \, 19 \, e1) \, 14 \, c3 \, b4 \, 15 \, e2 \, Wh6, \, Gutman. \]
\[ 10...\text{Wh}5 \, 11 \, f4 \, d6 \, 12 \, d2 \]

12...\text{g4} 

Sinabov-Mitrev, Teteven 1991, went 12...f5 13 e2 g4 14 c3!? d7 15 fe1 a8 16 a4 h6 17 b4! xfx3 18 xf3 Wh5 19 b5 d8 20 e5 Wh7, and now 21 xex7+! xex7 22 xd6 would be decisive.  
\[ 13 \, df4 \, d4 \, 14 \, d4 \, d7 \, 15 \, c4 \, f5 \, 16 \, xac1 \, d6 \, 17 \, f6 \, c8 \, 18 \, c5 \]

An ideal position for White.  
\[ 18...dx5 \, 19 \, b5 \, c6 \, 20 \, a5 \, d5 \, 21 \, xex6 \, xf4 \, 22 \, xd7+ \, xdx7 \, 23 \, e2+ \, e8 \, 24 \, xf4 \, Wh6 \, 25 \, d3 \]

In spite of being a pawn down, White has a winning game, Gutman.

Section 4 

(1 e4 e5 2 d4 f3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 dxe4 Wh4 5 f3 xxe4+ 6 e2) 

6...d6 7 0-0 Wh7 

"This move order makes it more difficult for Black to create enough counterplay", Fraser.

8 e1! 

There have been no recent prospects for White after 8 e1 c3 8 c6 9 b5 Wh7 10 e1 (10 d5 a6 11 a4 can be met by 11...xd5?! 12 xd5 f6 13 e1+ e7 14 Whd5 b5 15 b3 0-0) 10...a6 11 a4 d6 12 g5 xg5 13 d4 0-0 with a further split:  

A) 14 xxc6 bxc6 15 e2 h6! (more precise than 15...xaba 16 xcd c6 17 Wh2) 16 xh4 d5 17 c7 (or 17 xcd xh4 18 cxc6 Wh8) 17...c7 18 c4 a4 looks fine for Black, Gutman;  

B) 14 xxc6 bxc6 15 Wh2 d5 16 xcd c8 17 Wh2 Wh7 18 xcc6 Whg5 19 Whc3 xfe8 20 xe3 21 xac1 xex3 22 xex3 e8 23 xex8+ xe8 was equal in Nunez-San Claudio, Spain 1991. 

8...e6 9 b5 Wh7 10 d4 xge7 

Not too much attention has been given to 10...f6 11 c4!? (the ending resulting from 11 Wh2 e7
12 \( \text{Qxe6 fxe6} \) 13 \( \text{Wxe6} \) 14 \( \text{Wxe6 a6} \) is level) 11...\( \text{e7} \) 12 \( \text{Wa4} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{Cc3} \) a6 14 \( \text{Bxc6} \) bxc6 15 \( \text{Bxc6} \) with an edge for White, Gutman.

11 \( \text{Ag5} \)!

After 11 \( \text{We2 h6!?} \) (Fraser analyses 11...0-0 12 \( \text{Ag5} \) \( \text{Bb8} \) 13 \( \text{Bxe7} \) \( \text{Bxe7} \) 14 \( \text{Bxc6} \) bxc6 15 \( \text{Wd5} \) 16 \( \text{Cc3} \) \( \text{Bf6} \) 17 \( \text{Bxd5} \) \( \text{Xxd4} \) 18 \( \text{Bb4} \) \( \text{Bb6} \) 19 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{Bc8} \) 20 \( \text{Bxc6} \) and Black's position collapses) 12 \( \text{Bxe6} \) \( \text{Bxe6} \) 13 \( \text{Bxe6} \) fxe6 14 \( \text{Bxe6} \) 0-0-0 15 c3 the structure is slightly favourable for White because of two bishops, Salvioli.

11...a6 12 \( \text{Bd4} \) b5 13 \( \text{Bxe6} \) fxe6 14 \( \text{Bb3} \) d5 15 a4 b4 16 a5

Section 5
(1 \( e4 \) e5 2 \( \text{Sf3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 3 d4 exd4 4 \( \text{Xxd4} \) \( \text{Hh4} \) 5 \( \text{Sf3} \) \( \text{Wxe4}+ \) 6 \( \text{Be2} \)) 6...\( \text{We7} \)!

The black queen has done a splendid job in winning the e4-pawn, and now returns home. The variation is just about playable for Black, but is highly complex and requires a good understanding of the position.

We consider two lines in this section:
Sequel 1: 7 \( \text{Ag5} \)
Sequel 2: 7 0-0

Sequel 1
7 \( \text{Ag5} \) \( \text{Af6} \)
The modest move, which has largely replaced other possibilities:
1) \( 7...f6?! \) 8 \( \text{Be3} \) \( \text{Wf7} \) 9 0-0 d6 (Fraser's analysis ran 9...\( \text{Sg6} \) 10 \( \text{Cc3} \) a6 11 \( \text{Bd4} \) \( \text{Xxd4} \) 12 \( \text{Bxd4} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 13 \( \text{Bh5} \) g6 14 \( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{Xxd4} \) 15 \( \text{Xxd4} \) with a clear advantage for White. Levenfish gives some more moves: 15...\( \text{Be7} \) 16 \( \text{Bf1} \) c6 17 \( \text{Bd5} \) \( \text{Wg7} \) 18 \( \text{Bd2} \) and Black is helpless) 10 \( \text{Cc3} \) \( \text{Bc6} \) 11 \( \text{Bb5} \) a6 12 \( \text{Bbd4} \) \( \text{Hg7} \) 13 \( \text{Xxd4} \) \( \text{Bd7} \) 14 c4 \( \text{Be7} \) 15 \( \text{Bb3} \) yields White strong pressure, Gutman;

White has the superior game, Steinitz.
II) 7...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}b4+?! , an attempt to win the second pawn, is hazardous in view of 8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}xb2 (8...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 9 a3) 9 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}b5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b4+ 10 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}f1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d6 (10...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}a5 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b1) 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c4, Gutman;
III) 7...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}c5 8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 9 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}a5 was indicated by Lelsebein, after 10 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d2?! (instead of 10 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d2 a6 11 a3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}f5 12 0-0 d6 13 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d7 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f6, Lelsebein) 10...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f6 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}f5 12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}b5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d8 (12...0-0 13 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xc7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b8 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d3 favours White) 13 a4 a6 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}xd4 15 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xd4 White still has good attacking chances, Gutman.
8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d8 9 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d5?!
White should retain the tension.

Alternatives are:
I) 9 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xf6 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}xf6 10 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d8 is regarded as not being a very promising way to play for White.

There are two options:
A) 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 12 0-0 (12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}e2 a6 was indicated by Steinitz, when 13 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}a4 0-0 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xc6 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e8 15 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe7+ \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe7 retains a clear plus for Black) 12...0-0 13 c3 a6 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}c5 15 b4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}a7 16 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e1 d6 leaves White with no compensation for the pawn, Gutman;
B) 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d4 is more controversial, with three examples:

B1) 11...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}xd4?! 12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}xd4 d6 and Black is better according to Steinitz; in my opinion 13 0-0 c6 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}fe1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}c6 15 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}h5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d7 16 c4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}g5 17 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}f4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 18 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ad1 is fine for White, Gutman;
B2) 11...a6 12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d3 (12 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}c5) 12...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 13 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}g3 0-0!? (Fraser analyses 13...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}xd4?! 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}xg7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xc2+ 15 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f8 16 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xc2 d6 17 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ae1 as preferable for White) 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}f5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f6 15 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xc7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xb2 16 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}xd8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xd8 17 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}a3 18 0-0 when White has some compensation for the pawn, but hardly enough for more than draw, Gutman;
B3) 11...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}c5?! was suggested by Chaplinsky, after 12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}b6 13 0-0 0-0 14 a4 d6 15 b4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e6! 16 a5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}d4 17 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xd5 18 a6 bxa6 19 c3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}f6 Black keeps a clear plus, Gutman.
II) 9 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e7 10 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e1 0-0 looks like a more sensible choice.

White has two ideas at his disposal:
A) 11 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Q}}c4 d6 12 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d2 (Delarge-Lembeye, corr. 1992, went 12 h3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f5 13 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{W}}d7 14 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ad1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ae8 15 a3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d8 16 b4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e4 17 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe4 18 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe4 19 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}d3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ee8 20 g4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}e5 21 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}xe5 22 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}f4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}ee8 and Black won easily) 12...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{A}}g4 13
\[ \text{\textit{Wf4} \textit{xf3} 14 \textit{xf3} \textit{e5} 15 \textit{e2} h6 16 \textit{f4} \textit{xc4} 17 \textit{xc4} \textit{d7} 18 \textit{ad1} \textit{f8} 19 \textit{wd4} \textit{f5} 20 \textit{wd2} \textit{f8} \text{ was clearly better for Black in Sears-Yeo, Havana 1994; B) 11} \textit{d3} \text{ is the traditional reply, 11...d6 (11...h6?! may be even better according to Steinitz, when 12 \textit{f4} d6 13 \textit{wd2} can be answered by the annoying 13...\textit{b4} 12 \textit{wd2} (12 h3 h6 13 \textit{f4} \textit{e8} 14 \textit{wd2} \textit{f8}) 12...\textit{g4} with a further split: B1) 13 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 14 \textit{xf6} gxf6 15 \textit{wh6} \textit{g6} 16 \textit{h4} f5 17 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 18 \textit{xf5} \textit{wh4} is clearly in Black’s favour; B2) 13 \textit{h4} (intending to play 14 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 15 \textit{xf6} gxf6 16 \textit{wh6} \textit{g6} 17 \textit{f5}, Steinitz) runs into the disruptive 13...\textit{d5}! 14 \textit{xe7} (or 14 \textit{e4} \textit{g5} 15 \textit{xd5} h6) 14...\textit{xe7} 15 h3 (15 \textit{e4} \textit{c6}) 15...\textit{e6} 16 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 17 \textit{f3} h6, Gutman; B3) 13 \textit{w4?!} \textit{xf3} 14 \textit{xb7} (14 gxf3?! \textit{e5} 15 \textit{h1} \textit{xd3} 16 cxd3 \textit{h5} 17 \textit{xe7} \textit{e4} 18 \textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 19 \textit{e7} \textit{e6} 20 \textit{e1} \textit{f8} 21 \textit{e8}+ \textit{e8} gave Black a decisive endgame advantage, Golmayo-Steinitz, first match game, Havana 1888) 14...\textit{h6} (14 \textit{e6} 15 \textit{xb7} \textit{xb8} 16 \textit{wa7} \textit{xb2} 17 a4 turns out quite well for White) 15 \textit{f4} (15 \textit{xe6} gxe6 16 \textit{g3}+ \textit{f8} 17 \textit{w4} \textit{h7} 18 \textit{f5} \textit{g5} 19 \textit{h4} \textit{d4} 20 \textit{wd5} \textit{ge6} 21 \textit{wh5} \textit{g5} 22 hgx5 \textit{wg5} maintains a clear plus for Black) 15...\textit{wd7} (15...\textit{e8} 16 \textit{e3} 16 h3 (16 \textit{h6} is still premature due to 16...\textit{g6} 17 \textit{f5} \textit{wd8} 18 \textit{w4} \textit{g7} 19 \textit{e3} \textit{e5}) 16...\textit{e8} 17 a3!? (17 \textit{e3} is innocuous on account of 17...\textit{b4} 18 \textit{xb7} \textit{ab8} 19 \textit{wa7} \textit{e6} 20 \textit{a3} d5) 17...\textit{ab8} 18 \textit{ad1} a6, and White will be hard pressed to justify his material deficit, Gutman. 9...\textit{e7} “Evans’ claim that White does not have sufficient compensation for the pawn seems to be entirely correct”, Botterill/Harding.

“Black is slightly better, according to Evans”, Lane. 10 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 11 0-0 0-0 12 \textit{e1} d6 12...d5 is another method, intending to break the pin along the h4-d8 diagonal, as quickly as possible.

White has a range of possibilities:
A) 13 \textit{wd2} \textit{e6} 14 \textit{d3} \textit{f8} 15 \textit{w4} is the most straightforward way to play, when Black has a choice of: A1) 15...\textit{b4} 16 \textit{d4} \textit{xd3} 17 cxd3 \textit{h8} (17...c5 18 \textit{f5} \textit{d8} can be met by 19 \textit{d6} \textit{f8} 20 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 21 \textit{xf6} \textit{gxf6} 22 \textit{xb7}) 18 \textit{f5} \textit{h5} 19 \textit{wh4} \textit{d7} was suggested by Lelsbein, however, 20 \textit{e3} g6 21 g4 \textit{d7} 22 \textit{f6} is quite annoying for Black; A2) 15...h6! is more accurate since the ending after 16 \textit{xf6} (16 \textit{xe6} gxe6 17 \textit{wh6} fails in view of 17...\textit{e4} 18 \textit{xe4} dxe4 19 \textit{xe4} \textit{f8} 20 \textit{wh5} \textit{g7}) 16...\textit{xf6} 17...
\(\text{\textit{xf6}} (17 \text{\textit{wc7 xe7}} 18 \text{\textit{wd6 xb2}}) 17...\text{gxf6} \) should be a disaster for White, Gutman.

B) 13 c3 \(\text{\textit{wd6}}!?\) (more precise than 13...\text{e6} 14 \text{\textit{d3 h6}} 15 \text{\textit{h4 fe8}} 16 b4!?) 14 \text{\textit{xf6}} with two examples:

B1) 14...\text{gxf6} 15 \text{\textit{wd2 e5}}!? (after 15...\text{e8} 16 \text{\textit{d3 e7}} 17 \text{\textit{c2 g7}}, indicated by 
\textbf{Leisebein}, 18 \text{\textit{e3 g4}} 19 \text{\textit{d4}} offers White some chances) 16 \text{\textit{ad1 c6}} 17 c4 \text{\textit{e8}} and Black keeps the balance, 
\textbf{Gutman};

B2) 14...\text{\textit{xf6}} 15 \text{\textit{xd5 d8}} 16 \text{\textit{b3}} (or 16 \text{\textit{d3 e6}} 17 \text{\textit{e4 g6}} 18 \text{\textit{e3 d6}} 19 \text{\textit{e4 d5}}, 
\textbf{Leisebein}) 16...b6 17 \text{\textit{ad1 b7}} 18 \text{\textit{c4 h6}} 19 b4 a6 was quite satisfactory for Black in Gutman-Leisebein, corr. 1999.

C) 13 c4 is a more interesting idea.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{13...}\text{\textit{d8}}
\end{array}\]

Two other moves leave the initiative in White’s hands:

I) 13...\text{\textit{e6}} 14 \text{\textit{wd2 fe8}} and then:

A) 15 \text{\textit{f4 wd8}}! (15...h6?! is premature in view of 16 \text{\textit{hxh6 gxh6}} 17 \text{\textit{wh6 d8}} 18 \text{\textit{g5 e5}} 19 \text{\textit{h7+ xh7}} 20 \text{\textit{wh7+ f8}} 21 \text{\textit{h6+ g8}} 22 \text{\textit{e3}} and Black is overwhelmed) 16 \text{\textit{wh4}} (16 c3 h6 17 \text{\textit{hxh6 gxh6}} 18 \text{\textit{wh6 g4}} 19 \text{\textit{wh7+ f8}} 20 \text{\textit{f5 w6}} 21 \text{\textit{exe6 xe6}} 22 \text{\textit{xe4 xe2}} with an edge for Black) 16...h6 17 \text{\textit{hxh6 gxh6}} 18 \text{\textit{wh6 b4}} 19 \text{\textit{g5+ f8}} 20 \text{\textit{h6+ e7}} 21 \text{\textit{xe6+ xe6}} 22 \text{\textit{h3+ e7}} 23 \text{\textit{e1+ f8}} 24 \text{\textit{wh6+ g8}} 25 \text{\textit{g5+ leads to a draw, Gutman;}}\]
B) 15 \( \text{e2}! \) is more consequent, 15...\( \text{wd8} \) 16 \( \text{eae1} \) h6 17 \( \text{exe6 gxh6} \) 18 \( \text{whx6} \) \( \text{b4} \) 19 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 20 \( \text{xe6! wd7} \) 21 \( \text{h1e3 fxe6} \) 22 \( \text{g3} \) with a crushing attack for White, Gutman.

II) 13...\( \text{de5} \) 14 \( \text{dd2}? \) (14 \( \text{exe5 dxe5} \) 15 \( \text{xf6 wxf6} \) 16 \( \text{wh5} \) g6 17 \( \text{exe5} \) \( \text{exe5} \) 18 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{e6} \) is a draw) 14...\( \text{wd8} \) (14...h6 15 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e6} \) can be met by 16 \( \text{f4 xd3} \) 17 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{wd8} \) 18 \( \text{exe4} \) 15 \( \text{exe4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 16 \( \text{wc1 d7} \) 17 \( \text{wf4 h5}?! \) (17...\( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) is shown to be careless by 19 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 20 \( \text{wh4} \) h6 21 \( \text{exe6 gxe6} \) 22 \( \text{hxh6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 23 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 24 \( \text{exg4} \) \( \text{fxg4} \) 25 \( \text{h7} \) 26 \( \text{g6} \)?) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 19 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 20 \( \text{whxf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 21 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 22 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 23 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{g6} \) 24 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{xe1} \) 25 \( \text{f8} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 26 \( \text{xc1} \) gives White an endgame advantage, Gutman.

14 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 15 \( \text{wxf4 xf3} \) 16 \( \text{wxh6} \) 17 \( \text{xf6} \) 18 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{b8} \)\?, threatening 18...\( \text{e5} \).

17...\( \text{xf6} \) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 20 \( \text{g3+} \) \( \text{f8} \) 21 \( \text{h3} \)

A more conservative continuation.

7...\( \text{ff6} \) 7...\( \text{wd8} \) 8 \( \text{c3} \) is also possible, and here:

A) 8...\( \text{d6}?! \) seems premature in view of 9 \( \text{d5} \) (another way of contesting the vital e-file is 9 \( \text{e1}?! \) \( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 11 \( \text{e2} \) 6 12 \( \text{a4} \) 9...\( \text{exe7} \) 9...\( \text{exe7} \) 10 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d6} \) is bad because of 11 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{exe7} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) 10 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e6} \) 11 \( \text{b5} \) (Dragović-Pujek, Pula 1990, continued 11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 12 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 13 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{fxe3} \) 14 \( \text{xf3} \) 0-0-0 15 \( \text{e3} \) 16 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 17 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) 19 \( \text{ed1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 20 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 0-1) 11...\( \text{d7} \) (or 11...\( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{a4} \) 13 \( \text{b3} \) 12 \( \text{c4} \) yields White strong pressure, Gutman; 

B) 8...\( \text{ff6} \) returns to the main line.

8 \( \text{c3} \)

8 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 9 \( \text{b5+} \) (9 \( \text{c3} \) appears best, transposing back into the main line) 9...\( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{e2} \), temporarily holding up Black’s castling, was indicated by Steinitz. However,
10...a6 11 ¤xc6 (11 ¤a4 b5 12 ¤b3 0-0) 11...¤xc6 12 ¤c3 ¤e6 13 ¤g5 (or 13 ¤f4 ¤d5 14 ¤xd5 ¤xd5 15 ¤xc7 0-0) 13...¤g4 14 f3 ¤f5 15 ¤f4 (15 ¤h1 h6 16 ¤ge4 0-0) 15...¤d4+ 16 ¤h1 (16 ¤e3 ¤e5) 16...0-0 17 ¤e5 ¤xe5 18 ¤xe5 ¤h5 19 ¤xe7 ¤xf4 should lead to equality, Gutman.

8...¤d8

8...d6 gives White two possibilities:

A) 9 ¤g5 ¤d8 (9...¤e6 10 ¤e1 0-0-0 can be a little uncomfortable for Black due to 11 ¤d4 ¤xd4 12 ¤xd4) 10 ¤d5 ¤e7 11 ¤xe7 ¤xe7 12 ¤e1 0-0 reaches a position, covered after 6...¤e7 7 ¤g5 ¤f6 8 ¤c3 ¤d8 9 ¤d5 ¤e7 10 ¤xe7 ¤xe7 11 0-0 0-0 12 ¤e1 d6 --- Sequel 1;

B) 9 ¤e1!? ¤d8 10 ¤b5+ ¤e7 seems more testing.

White has two options:

B1) 11 ¤d5 with a further split:

B1a) 11...¤e6 12 ¤xe7 ¤xe7 (12...¤xe7 13 ¤xc6 bxc6 14 ¤d4 ¤d7 15 c4) 13 ¤d4 clearly favours White;

B1b) 11...¤xd5! 12 ¤xd5 0-0 13 ¤d3 (13 ¤xc6 bxc6 14 ¤xc6 ¤b8) 13...¤b4 (more effective than 13...¤c6 14 ¤g5 ¤e7 15 ¤c4 d5 16 ¤h4 ¤g6 17 ¤h5 c6 18 c3 h6 19 ¤d2) 14 ¤h7+ ¤h7 15 ¤e4+ ¤g8 16 ¤xb4 (or 16 ¤xe7 ¤xc2 17 ¤e4 ¤xe1 18 ¤g5 ¤e8 19 ¤h7+ ¤f8 20 ¤h8+ ¤e7 21 ¤xg7 ¤d7 22 ¤h7 ¤e5 23 ¤e3 ¤d3 24 ¤d1 ¤e7 25 ¤xd3 b6 26 ¤f6+ ¤c6 and Black’s king lives happily ever after) 16...¤f6 17 c3 b6 18 ¤e4 ¤b8 19 ¤f4 ¤b7 20 ¤d3 ¤e8 offers Black at least equal chances, Gutman;

B2) 11 ¤e2!? is the key move, which keeps Black’s king in the centre and gives White an excellent game, Gutman.

9 ¤d5

9 ¤e1 ¤e7 10 ¤d5 ¤xd5 (10...0-0!? 11 ¤xe7+ ¤xe7 12 ¤g5 will transpose into Sequel 1) 11 ¤xd5 is an interesting attempt.

Black has a choice:

A) 11...d6 12 ¤h5 (12 ¤b5 0-0 reaches a position after 8...d6 9 ¤e1 ¤d8 10 ¤b5 ¤e7 11 ¤d5 ¤xd5 12 ¤xd5 0-0) 12...¤e6 13 ¤b5 (13 ¤g5 ¤xg5 14 ¤xg5 ¤d7 15 ¤d3 ¤e5 16 ¤e4 ¤g4 17 ¤w4 f6 18 ¤xf6 gxf6 19 ¤f4 0-0-0 leads nowhere for White) 13...g6 14 ¤h6 ¤d7!? (14...¤d7 fail miserably on account of 15 ¤xc6 bxc6 16 ¤g5) 15 ¤d4 ¤f6 16 ¤e3 a6 17 ¤a4 b5 18 ¤xe6 fxe6 19 ¤b3 ¤e7 20 c3
when White has enough pressure for the pawn;
B) 11...0-0 12 c3 (12 Wh5!? is preferable, transposing back into the main line) 12...d6 13 Wh5 (or 13 Ad3 Ae6 14 Wh5 g6 15 Wh6 Ae5) 13...Af6 (13...g6 14 Wh6) 14 Ag5 Af5 15 Exf7 Wd7 16 Ag5 Ae5 is fine for Black, Gutman.
9...Ad5 9...Ae7 10 Axe7 We7 11 Ae1 0-0 seems to be less precise, though, White can play 12 Ad3!? (12 Ag5 will transpose into sequel 1) 12...Wd8 13 c3 d6 (or 13...d5 14 h3 h6 15 Af4) 14 h3 h6 (14...Ae6 15 Ag5) 15 Af4 Ae6 16 Wd2 with good attacking chances, Gutman.
10 Wxd5 Ae7

This certainly represents the critical position.
11 Wh5
A very lively continuation is 11 Ag5 0-0 12 Ac4 (12 Ad3 g6 13 c3 d6 is in Black’s favour) 12...Ab4 when White can force a perpetual check by 13 Wxf7+! Wxf7 14 Wxf7 Wh6+ Wh8 16 Qf7+.
11...0-0
Alternatives are:
I) 11...d6 12 Ac4 (12 Ae1 Ae6)
12...0-0 13 Ag5 Akg5 14 Akg5 Wf8 15 Wae1 Wc6 16 Af6! Ae7 17 Ae3 Ag6 18 f4 Wc6 19 Ad3 and White has the initiative;
II) 11...d5 when White has to try:
A) 12 Ad3 Ab4!? (the endgame resulting from 12...Ae6 13 Ag5 g6 14 Axe6 gxe6 15 Wxd8 Axd8 16 Ae1 0-0 is approximately equal) 13 Ae5 Ae6 14 Af5 Ac8 (14...g6? loses immediately due to 15 Axe6!) 15 Ae1 g6 16 Akg6 fxg6 17 Akg6 hxg6 18 Wxh8+ Ae7 19 We5 Wg8 20Af4 Ac8 21 We2 a6 22 c3 Ad6 and I prefer Black;
B) 12 Ad1!? Ae6 13 Ae3 0-0 14 c4 Wc8 15 Ad3 g6 16 Wh6 dxc4 17 Ae4 Ad8 18 Ag5 Akg5 19 Akg5 Ad1+ 20 Ad1 Whf8 21 Wh4 gives White sufficient compensation as the dark squares around Black’s king are obviously weak;
C) 12 Ae1 0-0 13 c3!? (or 13 Ad3 g6 14 Wh6) 13...g6 14 Wh6 will transpose into the main line.

12 Ae1!? Three other moves come into consideration, without any one of them being particularly effective:
I) 12 Ac4 g6 13 Wh6 d5 14 Ag5 Akg5 15 Akg5 f6 16 Ad1 Ae7 17 Ae3 c6 is good for Black;
II) 12 Ag5 h6 (not 12...Akg5!? 13 Akg5 f6 14 Ad3 g6 15 Akg6 We7 16 Ah6) 13 Ae4 (13 Af3 d5 14
13...d5
13...d6 seems wrong because of 14 $\text{c}4$, threatening 15 $\text{g}5$.

14 $\text{c}3$?
14 $\text{d}3$ 15 $\text{g}4$ 15 $\text{g}5$ 16 $\text{x}g5$ f6 17 $\text{f}4$. (17 $\text{g}6$ $\text{w}d7$ 18 $\text{x}f6$ $\text{x}f6$ 19 $\text{h}7+$ $\text{f}7$) 17...$\text{w}d7$ 18 c3 $\text{f}7$ leaves White with some, but possibly not enough compensation for the pawn.

14...$\text{e}8$ 15 $\text{g}5$ $\text{x}g5$ 16 $\text{x}g5$ f6 17 $\text{d}3$ $\text{f}5$
17...$\text{x}g5$ 18 $\text{x}g5$ $\text{w}e7$ 19 $\text{x}h7$ $\text{w}g7$ 20 $\text{x}g7+$ $\text{x}g7$ 21 $\text{x}e5$ $\text{f}xe5$ 22 $\text{x}e5$ $\text{d}7$ leads to equality;

B) 13...d6!? causes more problems for White, 14 $\text{e}1$ (14 $\text{g}5$ $\text{x}g5$ 15 $\text{x}g5$ f6 16 $\text{x}g5$ is insufficient due to 16...$\text{w}e7$ 17 $\text{x}f6$ $\text{x}f6$ 18 $\text{x}h7+$ $\text{f}7$ 19 $\text{w}h5+$ $\text{g}7$ 20 $\text{d}3$ $\text{e}6$ 21 $\text{w}h7+$ $\text{f}8$ 22 $\text{w}h8+$ $\text{g}8$) 14...$\text{g}4$ 15 $\text{g}5$ $\text{x}g5$ 16 $\text{x}g5$ f6 17 $\text{f}4$ $\text{w}d7$ 18 $\text{e}3$ $\text{e}5$ with a plus for Black.

12...g6 13 $\text{h}6$

White's powerful bishops provide sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, analysis by Gutman.

* * *

"Enough, there are still problems to be solved; the whole truth in Chess is not by any means all known yet—fortunately": Emanuel Lasker, Manual of Chess.
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