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Introduction

It is now over 100 years since the death of Johannes Hermann Zukertort, one of the great players of chess history, who paradoxically is remembered today more for talents he did not possess than for his truly remarkable chess gifts.

After his defeat in the first official world championship match to Steinitz in 1886 and his untimely death two years later, the chess world failed to preserve the memory of Zukertort by publishing a collection of his chess masterpieces. A Swedish book, virtually unobtainable today, did appear in 1912 — but this did not do full justice to Zukertort’s illustrious chess career.

Apart from that publication, only a handful of Zukertort’s games have found their way into chess books and magazines since his death, while even fewer writers have drawn attention to his contributions to the art and science of chess.

The present volume is an attempt to bring to the notice of today’s chess world these chess masterpieces and re-establish Zukertort to his rightful place in chess history as an important link between the old combinational style and modern positional tendencies. At heart, Zukertort remained an artist of the chessboard, following in the Romantic traditions of his teacher Adolf Anderssen and the legendary Paul Morphy. However, because of the increase in chess knowledge and refinement of technique, Zukertort was obliged to ally his enormous tactical ability to modern methods.

Zukertort was a most diligent, profound and accurate analyst, with a tremendous amount of opening theory stored in his astonishing memory. His dash and brilliance, combined with soundness in building up an attack and precision in calculating variations, made him a very dangerous opponent and resulted in the production of a great many elegant games. He was also an excellent endgame player.

Unfortunately Zukertort’s breakdown in health and premature death not only prevented him from challenging Steinitz to a return match but also did not allow him to further develop several innovative closed and queen’s pawn openings, with which he had engaged himself in the latter part of his career. Like Steinitz, he was a pioneer, and in the path of discovery at times he made errors of judgement or undertook mistaken plans; but once on the right track he would push an advantage home in the most forceful, direct and clear-cut fashion.

Personally, a very likeable and sociable man, he gave up the editorship of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung in 1872 and left his home in Germany, in a state of poverty, to make a living as a chess professional in England. Here, he rapidly became accepted as an integral part of the London chess scene and was attached to the prestigious St. George’s Chess Club. He also was elected an honorary member of the City of London Club, played chess for side-stakes at the famous Simpson’s Divan, travelled far and wide giving blindfold and simultaneous displays, and of course competed in matches and tournaments. In addition he was very active as a chess journalist,
firstly as games editor for the Westminster Papers, then as a contributor to the City of London Chess Magazine and finally as co-editor of the Chess Monthly — which he founded in 1879 with Hoffer.

The present book contains a selection of Zukertort’s best casual, odds, simultaneous, blindfold, consultation, match and tournament games. The notes are mainly by Zukertort himself from the above-mentioned periodicals, and his arch-rival Steinitz, who ran a magnificent chess column in The Field. Other commentators are indicated at the end of each game.

In the first part of the book have been assembled a collection of the best articles and extracts about Zukertort, most of which were written by his contemporaries, people who actually knew him. These give biographical details and pen-portraits of Zukertort, the man and his work.

The introductory comments under ‘Zukertort’ are taken from Harry Golombek’s ‘Chess: A History’ and Fred Reinfeld’s ‘The Human Side of Chess.’ The ‘Zukertort in Germany’ essay has been adapted from a long narrative in Deutsches Wochenschach 1913. The eye-witness account of Zukertort and Anderssen has been translated from Von Gottschall’s German book on Anderssen. The warm tribute ‘The Chess Apostle’ comes from the Westminster Papers, while the Rev. G.A. MacDonnell’s witty, but wonderfully human portrait of Zukertort is in fact a chapter from his Knights and Kings of Chess. Hoffer gives us a first-hand report of his friend and co-worker’s last hours in an obituary taken from Chess Monthly. The German appreciation by Von Gottschall, giving personal details not found elsewhere, is a contribution from the Deutsche Schachzeitung, while the English appreciation by Cunningham, and the assessment by Steinitz, are extracted from the International Chess Magazine. A modern evaluation of Zukertort, particularly in relation to Steinitz, is provided by the eminent Soviet chess historian, Neishtadt, from his Russian book The First World Champion. Furthermore, Mieses’ reliable and objective ‘Commemoration of J.H. Zukertort’ which appeared in the British Chess Magazine in 1942 as a centenary memorial article of Zukertort’s birth, is reproduced courtesy of former editor Bernard Cafferty. Finally, I wish to thank Brian Reilly and Ken Whyld for providing me with further reference material used in this book.

As a postscript, it gives me great pleasure to express my appreciation of the spirited English grandmaster Stuart Conquest, who in 2011 took the initiative to rediscover and unearth Zukertort’s sunken and overgrown grave at Brompton cemetery, West London. His subsequent cooperation with Dr Marek Stella-Sawicki, Chairman of the Polish Heritage Society, then led to the erection of an elegant new headstone, which was rededicated with full religious rites at a well-attended ceremony held on 26 June 2012. You can see a picture of the high point of this ceremony on page 529.

Jimmy Adams
London 2014
Part One
The Articles
Zukertort

Despite a career that stopped as it were halfway, Zukertort is clearly one of the chess immortals and there is about his best games a sort of resilient and shining splendour that no other player possesses. He was a very fine combinationalist, and he had more experience and command of close positions than, say, Blackburne. His weakness was a variability that was due to a highly-strung nervous system. He was a great player who might well have become a most worthy world champion had his life-span not more or less coincided with that of a still greater figure, Wilhelm Steinitz. One of the most talented players of all time, one of those who carry with them the aura of certain genius, indeed it is arguable that in skill and ability he was the equal of Steinitz, but that he was handicapped by being physically weaker. It is unfortunate, but nevertheless one of the hard facts of life among chess masters, that physical matters played an all-important role in something which ideally speaking, should concern and depend upon the mind only.

Harry Golombek
Zukertort

Zukertort's victory in the London International Tournament had been so overwhelming that in the eyes of many people he was the rightful World Champion. Naturally, it was a view with which Steinitz disagreed. He pressed Zukertort hard for a match to decide the issue, but much time was wasted in swapping insults. More time was wasted in a punctilious wrangle about who was to be regarded as the present World Champion, and, who, consequently, was supposed to be the challenger!

When the dramatic struggle began in 1886, it was in fact the first official match for the World Championship.

Here it is necessary to discard the Zukertort legend. The accepted version is that Zukertort was a superficial player whom Steinitz crushed because of his superior planning ability. I cannot see that Steinitz gains much credit when his adversary is condemned so sweepingly; the fact is that Zukertort was a great player, but Steinitz was even greater!

Steinitz won the contest because he was the better player, but the reason for his victory has been obscured. As can be seen from the progress of the match, it was the old Steinitzian tenacity that once more brought him victory. Steinitz later admitted that Zukertort 'was the strongest player we ever came across'. But he immediately qualified this by questioning Zukertort's originality. The reason for this is interesting: unlike Chigorin, Zukertort heartily believed in the theory elaborated by Steinitz. But Zukertort disputed Steinitz's claim to exclusive authorship of that theory! Zukertort viewed his own style as the ideal blend of the old combinatorial school with the modern positional trend. (His annotations constantly invoke the principles of positional play. Later writers have ignored these annotations, and are consequently unaware of Zukertort's comprehension of the positional style.)

Zukertort had two big points in his favour. While he loved the Evans Gambit, he actually specialized in close openings with 1.d4. It is of course impossible to play these openings and achieve satisfactory results without a thorough understanding of position play. The other point in his favour was that he never indulged in the wild eccentricities favoured by Steinitz. He could therefore say with justice that he not only understood position play, but actually applied it in his own games; whereas Steinitz, so the argument would run, recommended the positional style but often went counter to it in his games.

The result was a running argument between Steinitz and Zukertort which went on for years, in the course of which each master shouted: 'My Modern School is better than your Modern School!'

Unfortunately, Zukertort finished the match in a state of collapse, and went back to London a shattered man. The match literally killed him: he never regained his skill or his health and after several shocking failures he was stricken with a cerebral
hemorrhage on 19th June 1888, while playing a game. He never recovered consciousness, and died the next day.

This great artist, who could have prospered in any one of twenty professions, lived and died for chess, yet his legacy to the chess world – his beautiful games – has vanished into obscurity.

Fred Reinfeld
Zukertort in Germany

Many people have counted J.H. Zukertort amongst the Russian-Jewish section of the population, from whom he probably gained his knowledge of Russian people's life and his ability to speak the Jewish people's dialect. In fact he had spent his youth in a region where the Jewry played a great role, since he was born in Lublin (Russian-Poland) and grew up in Warsaw and Petrikau. However, there was a basis for this in that his father was an evangelist, who carried out missionary work amongst the Jews, to convert them to Christianity. Also the first name of our chess master points to the fact that he was born a Christian.

Zukertort was born on 7 September 1842. He attended the Gymnasium at Petrikau for about a year, then received a complete classical education at the Maria Magdalena Gymnasium at Breslau, in which town his father had taken up residence in 1855. In 1858 he made his first acquaintance with chess, which he learned from a fellow-student and very soon looked upon as being more interesting than draughts. However, his first real education in chess came when he enrolled as a medical student at the University and Anderssen recognised him as an up and coming talent. After Anderssen had for a while given the young student a knight, he soon went over to playing without odds, and many games were exchanged between the two of them. Many of these Von Gottschall collected in his book on Anderssen, whereas their original publication can only be found by carefully and laboriously going through copies of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung.

Also in this magazine Zukertort talked about chess life in Posen, where his family had now moved to. This is all the more valuable in that, apart from a correspondence game against the Berlin club, nothing else had been written about chess in this town. Zukertort himself wrote that he visited Posen for the first time in 1861 and did not find much in the way of encouragement. Things were better in 1862, when Von Gottschall moved there and founded a new chess club, which admittedly was not very active after his departure. Nevertheless interest was not lost and later on Zukertort was able to report favourably, although a number of games played by Zukertort and given in the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung show that nobody in Posen could put up a successful resistance against the future master. For the historically minded it is enough to state that these games from the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung are the oldest examples of Zukertort's praxis that we have. If the knight odds games against the opponent 'Z', published in the book on Anderssen, should hint at Zukertort, then we would have before us the earliest examples of Zukertort's play.

Up to 1867 Zukertort's name had not been seen in magazines devoted to chess. In this year, for the first time, games by Zukertort were published – in the Deutsche Schachzeitung; these were from a series of 20 games which he had played with Victor Knorre. Also we find his name for the first time in the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung, from the point when he took on the editorship of this magazine. As is well-known, it was founded by Gustav Neumann, who slaved away in Berlin on a
periodical in which he could advance his own ideas and mostly publish his games against Anderssen. Thus the editorial chair of the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung* had become vacant and the publisher, J. Springer, substituted Zukertort for Neumann. From August 1867 the numbers were filled with articles, analyses and games by Zukertort. In particular, a great deal of analysis was published by him in these issues, which he then brought together in a book *Theory of the Openings of the 807 games of the first six years of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*. We also mention further publications from his hand. With Dufresne, he brought out a *Guide to the Game of Chess* (C. Schweigger), with 42 illustrative games. Earlier, starting in 1862, had appeared in 13 supplements, *Complete and easy to understand chess instruction in 48 lessons*, a major work by Dufresne, which was later re-published under the title *The Great Chess Handbook*, with 318 illustrative games, and with Zukertort as co-author.

Meanwhile in 1868 Zukertort played his teacher Anderssen a so-called match, which in fact turned out to be only a series of casual games, which did not attract public interest. Anderssen was the winner with +11 =1 -4. Also 24 offhand games were played with Zukertort coming out ahead +11 =3 -10. It should also be mentioned that the match Zukertort won against Anderssen +5 =0 -2 in Berlin 1871, cannot be regarded as such, since it was only a number of serious games on which, win or lose, not very much depended. Nevertheless it is surprising that, when Zukertort talked of this as a match in the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*, Anderssen, who was then still titled as first editor, did not object to this at the time; either the report did not bother him that he should edit it, or he was then of another opinion. Also here Zukertort won the round of casual games +18 =5 -14.

Zukertort was also distinguishing himself as a blindfold player. After branching out from the Anderssen school he began to give blindfold displays in Berlin, which were reported by a friend of his in the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*. Admittedly, there were no well-known names amongst his opponents, but that is not what mattered; the main thing was that Zukertort, as reported by all the eye-witnesses, made his moves very quickly and constantly showed his class. Thus, for example, we mention these early blindfold exhibitions in Berlin: 21 January 1868 at Arnim’s Hotel +4 -2 =1 after 5 hours play; 3 February 1868 at Cafe Weiland +6 -1 =0 after 6 hours play; 16 March 1868 at Cafe de Baviere +4 -4 =1; 2 March 1869 +8 -1 =2 after 4½ hours; and 26 July 1869 in Hamburg +7 =1 -1 after 4½ hours.

In 1869 was published (again by J. Springer) *A Collection of Selected Chess Problems, Studies and Game Positions*, with in fact 176 problems 2-14 moves deep, including two composed by Zukertort himself, 10 conditional mates, 28 self-mates, 28 studies and 40 game positions, with 282 diagrams in all. This book became the cause of a highly unpleasant quarrel which undoubtedly made Zukertort very bitter and also provided unwelcome material for the readers. In the *Leipziger Schachzeitung* (later the *Deutsche Schachzeitung*) came forth a critic, in fact Minckwitz, who did not give the book a very decent review, particularly with regard to the introduction and the two Zukertort problems. It seems that Zukertort’s pride was sorely hurt and the ensuing personal conflict overflowed into the pages of their respective magazines.
The Franco-Prussian War interrupted the dispute. But it broke out again on the occasion of the publication of the Baden tournament games of 1870. An apparently harmless remark by Zukertort that he had published more games from Baden than any other magazine aroused Minckwitz’s hellish anger and in the first number of 1871 he turned against Zukertort and sought to provoke him. Naturally Zukertort was not found wanting and replied in an equally massive fashion. Whether the readers were happy with the way the editors unleashed their resentment against each other and spoke their mind, was not asked.

I consider that this literary feud probably had even further consequences. As is well known, a special book was published on the Congress of the West German Chess Federation, held at Krefeld 1871, but this did not appear for a number of years. The games played there thus first became known through this book. Equally, in the Deutsche Schachzeitung, a book was announced for the further congresses of 1871 in Wiesbaden, Ems and Leipzig. However this did not see the light of day and so only a very few games became known from these congresses. There is an obvious suspicion that Minckwitz, who took part in all these congresses, had forcibly obtained the sole rights for publication of the games, and Zukertort wanted the opportunity of presenting the games in his rival magazine. As a matter of fact, games are hard to find from these events and, apart from one odd example, only games by Stern in Wiesbaden and Ems were published—in the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung—and it is presumed that Stern himself sent these to Zukertort.

One can well imagine that these trifles and petty goings-on, together with other problems, had a bad effect on Zukertort’s editorship, so that at the end of 1871 the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung ceased publication. And this happened rather abruptly. There was no announcement that the magazine would stop; also there were no solutions to the chess problems of the final month; all the signs are that the cessation of publication was sudden and not anticipated. In addition to this, Zukertort had decided to leave Germany and go to London where he hoped to find more favourable ground for a chess master, and in this he proved to be right...

O. Koch
Zukertort and Anderssen

In 1868, when I came to Berlin as a young student, there was a lively chess scene in certain confectioners' shops, but the club nights of the 'Schachgesellschaft' were sometimes very poorly attended. To stimulate the chess enthusiasts, once a year the 'Schachgesellschaft' invited the German grandmaster Anderssen to play chess in the holiday period, and then the picture changed tremendously. Interest was aroused in the noble game, which amounted to real enthusiasm, but which soon waned again after the departure of the chess colossus Professor from Breslau.

The leaders of the Berlin chess world at that time were Jean Dufresne, an old chess-friend of Anderssen, and Hermann Zukertort, a young chess-pupil of the master, then editor of the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*. Dufresne, an easy-going dark-complexioned man, who had to give up his journalistic career because of defective hearing, found a modest, but adequate living through his literary activities that were not solely related to chess. Zukertort, a reddish-blond slightly built young man, a genius in chess, lived in constant financial difficulties, since Berlin at that time was no ground for a professional chess player, just like today.

Being a young chess amateur, I naturally endeavoured to get in touch with the Berlin chess circle, and I had the good fortune not only to become acquainted with the two above-mentioned chess stars, but also gradually to become friends with them. The name of Anderssen at that time dominated the whole German chess world. Morphy had already disappeared from the scene. Despite his victory over Anderssen, Steinitz was still not regarded as his equal, and L.Paulsen's cautious play was not classed in the same league as the combinatorially rich and deeply thought out attacking style of the 'old master' from Breslau.

Dufresne confided in me that earlier Anderssen had toyed with the idea of becoming a professional chess player. When Anderssen made a trip to the London tournament of 1851, he had a serious conversation with Dufresne on this matter. Rumour had it that in London a talented chess player could receive fame, honour and money in abundance, and, whilst he was present in the British capital, Anderssen wanted to explore the grounds for this and try to find out whether this rumour was true. Dufresne promised to follow on afterwards if it was so.

Well, Anderssen indeed returned home from the London tournament with a purse full of money, but his investigations into the aforementioned course of action had disillusioned him completely, and so there was no longer any question of this.

Anderssen’s trip to London had only been made possible because the Berlin friends had clubbed together and advanced the cost of it. After his return, Anderssen immediately paid off these debts and a goodly sum was left over for himself. In addition, he had suddenly acquired a world-wide reputation.

Above all, Anderssen's stay in Berlin during the Easter fair of 1871 remains in my memory, since at that time I was introduced by Zukertort to the 'old master' and had the honour of playing a few games with him. Play took place in the club.
Zukertort and Anderssen

premises of the ‘Schachgesellschaft’ (there is no longer any trace of it today). Anderssen appeared every morning at about 10 o’clock and he would then play all day long, sometimes until midnight. Upon his arrival in Berlin, Anderssen was taken from the railway station to his hotel by Zukertort and some close friends, and these turned up the same evening with him at the chess club where immediately the fight began.

First of all, Zukertort asked: ‘Herr Professor, have you brought along anything new?’ Yes the old master had something new. At that time the Compromised Defence to the Evans Gambit was very much in favour, since the counter-gambit ...b5 was seen as a completely winning refutation of White’s attack. Against ...b5 was matched Anderssen’s new move ßb3-b2, after ßc4-d3. At first Anderssen won a few games against Zukertort with this new move, but this had less to do with the move than with the dashing play of the ‘old master’ and the novelty of the thing.

Zukertort had confided in me that he was thinking about playing a match with Anderssen, and as we plodded our way homewards, he returned to this idea, which was foremost in his mind. I drew his attention to his total failure in the first evening’s play, but he replied excitedly that he expected to beat Anderssen without fail. His confidence was based, he told me, on his detailed knowledge of Anderssen’s peculiarities. As White, so he explained to me, Anderssen would without doubt play his new move in his favourite Evans Gambit. ‘I am no longer afraid of this move at all. Black’s game is still superior. At worst it would turn out to be a drawn game. But when playing White, I would win every time with the Vienna Game, since Anderssen’s defence with ...ßc5 followed by ...c6, b5, a5, ßa6, is inferior, even though he has already won so many games with it.’ And now he explained to me that he had analysed this method of play in detail and found that Black will be lost in every case. Anderssen, however, would not give up his defensive system.

Well, on the following day, when Zukertort came out with his proposal for a match, Anderssen was totally against it. Upon Zukertort’s pleading and urging he then asked: ‘What are we playing for?’ Since, as already mentioned, Zukertort was not endowed with riches, he replied — ‘For nothing!’ Now, more than ever, Anderssen did not want to know, but, being of good nature, he eventually withdrew the refusal, and Zukertort got his match, which then turned out exactly as he had predicted to me. Anderssen harboured no suspicions about his defensive system in the Vienna Game, while he did not handle his Evans Gambit ideally every time, and so Zukertort triumphed. The games were played separately, if no new opponent was available for Anderssen, and even in the style of casual games, since both opponents were quick players.

Anderssen himself complained bitterly over the slow play of Steinitz in their 1866 match. This drawn out sort of play, even on obvious moves, had made him nervous; he often jumped to his feet and went to an adjoining room with the request to a spectator to call him when it was his turn to move. Zukertort had another opponent ‘sitting like death’, L.Paulsen, who once took 15 minutes over his first move. In those times when clocks were still not used, with the more robust characters ‘sitting like death’ was a favourite means of ‘mating’ an opponent.
When the match with Zukertort was at an end, Anderssen felt decidedly embarrassed at his defeat against his 'pupil' and he flew into a rage: a match without a stake could not be regarded as a proper match. If Zukertort wanted to play really serious games with him, then he must place a stake, he, Anderssen, would put down double. Now a Berlin chess-friend, W., came up with a purse for Zukertort, and then three games were played between the opponents with a stake, of which Anderssen won all three. With that the matter was closed. Anderssen had taken a small revenge. Zukertort, however, had achieved his fondest wish - a 'great success', which he could carry with him to the other side of the Channel to establish a new chess livelihood. Already then Zukertort was very seriously thinking about emigrating there. Unfortunately he could not make a living in Berlin and thus saw his salvation only in a change of residence to London. The same Berlin chess-friend who had backed him against Anderssen, later also gave him the means to travel to London and gain a foothold there, where he expected better days.

When Anderssen and Zukertort again met each other in 1877 at the Leipzig Chess Congress, Zukertort, as White, naturally again played the Vienna Game against the 'old master', but in the meantime Anderssen had been able to detect the weakness of his defence; he did not play the move ...c6 and won the game.

C. Sander
The Chess Crichton

[One of the best and most respected foreign chess players who has ever made this country his home was Johannes Hermann Zukertort. His ashes remain in our keeping, as he died in London on 20th June, 1888, and was buried in Brompton Cemetery, to the west of the Chapel, and about half-way between it and the Chelsea Football Ground. The ground is officially known as A.F. 107 X 18. A memorial slab, known as a marble 'ledger', is laid on the grave, and bears the following inscription:

'In Memory of J.H.Zukertort, the Chess Master, Born September 7th, 1842. Died June 20th, 1888.'

The slab is in good condition and the lettering still clear, but it has sunk into the ground considerably and wants restoration in that respect.

One of the earliest friends Zukertort made in England was the late Mr.I.O.Howard Taylor, of Norwich. He went to Norwich and stayed with Mr.Taylor for a week in September, 1872, taking part in many public chess events in that city. Mr. Taylor thought, in view of the interest excited in Norwich by this marvellous chess player, that local people would appreciate some account of his career. He therefore learned from Zukertort the history of his life and published an extensive report in the Eastern Daily Press, 28 September 1872. I do not think this account was ever made known elsewhere. I therefore quote it in full. It will serve to show how important was the man whose ashes the London chess players have now in their keeping.-J.Keeble, 1927, with corrections]

J.H.Zukertort was born at Lublin, in Russian Poland, on September 7th 1842. He is of mixed Prussian and Polish descent, his mother being Baroness Krzyanowska. One sister is married to Baron Marczewski, now in the Russian but formerly in the French service, who saved the life of the Earl of Cardigan at Balaclava with his Chasseurs d’Afrique. The Baron now holds a watch, which the gallant Earl presented to him as an acknowledgement. Herr Zukertort's family have not his chess gifts. His father only plays draughts, his mother is only a rook player, and the subject of this notice can render his sisters the odds of the Queen. This is noteworthy, because the family of Louis Paulsen (his father, brother and sister) all played finely, and Morphy's uncle and father were also accomplished amateurs.

Herr Zukertort is a good linguist, being well acquainted with English, Italian, French, Spanish, Greek, Latin, Hebrew and Russian, and having also some knowledge of Turkish, Arabic, Sanskrit, etc. In his youth he was an unwearyed reader, constantly devoting whole nights to the acquirement of literary information. He is familiar with English history and with the best English classics — especially with Shakespeare. Such is the energy of his character that he learnt one language to read Dante, another to read Cervantes, and a third, Sanskrit, to trace the origin of chess.
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In theology and kindred subjects his reading would put many ecclesiastics to the blush. He is thoroughly up (to use an expressive word for which there is no exact equivalent) in Dr. Bateman’s obscure subject ‘Asphasia’, from hospital experience and from discussion with the first German authority, but contends that ‘Alogonmeia’, not ‘Asphasia’, is the true scientific term.

Upon philology and the derivation of words and phrases he has contributed extensively. He takes a deep interest in all questions of social science, and has written on prison discipline. He is also an original thinker on some of the problems that perplex humanity. Herr Zukertort is, besides, an accomplished swordsman, the best domino player in Berlin, and one of the best whist players living, and so good a pistol shot that at fifteen paces he is morally certain to hit the ace of hearts. A man, said the profound Bacon, may be young in years but old in hours.

Amid a catalogue of such varied accomplishments Herr Zukertort has found time to play 6,000 games of chess with Anderssen alone, and to rise from a Rook player to a first-rate in a few years.

Besides, he was a pupil of Moscheles, and in 1862-6 musical critic of the first journal in Silesia.

One would suppose there at least his intellectual labours were continuous. Not so. Herr Zukertort at the age of 30 is also a military veteran. His studies at Heidelberg and Breslau were interrupted by the war in which Prussia and Austria engaged with Denmark, and he served in the Danish, in the Austrian and in the French campaign. His rank when in service in the Prussian forces is that of Lieutenant, and he was present at the following engagements, viz, in Denmark, Missunde, Duppel and Alsen; in Austria, Trautenau, Konignhof, Konignatz (Sadowa) and Blumenau; in France, Spicheeren, Pange (Vionville), Gravelotte, Noiseville, and all other affairs before Metz. Twice dangerously wounded, and once left for dead upon the field, he is entitled to wear seven medals, besides the orders of the Red Eagle and the Iron Cross. At Gravelotte, every officer in his regiment was either killed or wounded, and the regiment was exposed from five to six hours to the enemy’s fire without being able to return a shot. They went into action 1,800 strong, and came out under 400.

He obtained the degree of M.D. at Breslau in 1865, having chiefly devoted his attention to chemistry under Professor Bunsen at Heidelberg, and to physiology at Berlin under Professor Virchow.

Herr Zukertort is now on the staff of Prince Bismarck’s private organ, the Allgemeine Zeitung, and is chief editor of a political journal which receives ‘officios’ from the Government at Berlin; besides this he is the first theorist of the modern school of chess, and author of The Grosses Schach Handbuch and a Leitfaden, and, further, he was for several years the editor of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung.

In blindfold chess Herr Zukertort is able to summon at will a perfect and distinct mental photograph of any game in which he is engaged, with the sixty-four squares of the board and every piece and pawn in its place, and he can dismiss that mind-picture for any other when he pleases. In 1864, at the age of 22 years, he began to afford sure indicae of this exceptional talent, playing three games at
Beeley’s Garden at Posen on May 21st, 1864. Any one who has enjoyed the pleasure of witnessing his blindfold play will be assured of the truth of his own expression, ‘The games are iron-printed in my head’. Zukertort believes that from the concentration of ideas and complete abstraction, it is possible for a player to conduct a single contest with higher skill minus than plus his eyes! Morphy was the knight-errant of Caissa; Zukertort is the chess Crichton.

J.O. Howard Taylor
The Zukertort Legend

The foregoing article represents the source of the 'Zukertort legend' which has lived on in chess lore right up to the present day.

However, a painstaking investigation by the German chess historian, Ulrich Grammel, into the truth of Zukertort's extraordinary claims, was published in an article 'Chessmasters are not gods' in the Rochade magazine. We summarise here the results of this important piece of research.

Zukertort entered Breslau University, Faculty of Medicine, on 29 April 1861. However, the University registration book shows that he did not obtain a passing certificate and in fact was struck from the list of students on 9 February 1867 for failing to present himself for his studies.

The universities of Heidelberg and East Berlin confirm that a Johannes Zukertort did not matriculate there at any time from 1850 to 1880.

Thus Zukertort obtained no degree, or doctorate in medicine. Previous to his arrival in England in 1872, Zukertort had not been credited with the title of doctor, but curiously enough, when he later returned to Germany for chess events, he was given this distinction there also.

The rank-lists of the Prussian Army between 1862 and 1878 do not record Zukertort as serving in the military. He almost certainly took part as a volunteer medical orderly in the short war against Austria in 1866. That he could not have won seven medals is obvious. Moreover non-officers were not eligible for the Red Eagle and the Iron Cross – and the latter was not awarded at all for this particular campaign.

It is doubtful whether he took part in the Franco-Prussian War and if he did it would probably have again been in a medical capacity. Our only hint about this comes from Zukertort's report on the Baden tournament of 1870 in the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung: 'Herr Stern in fact played only four games... since he soon had to hurry to the colours as a Royal Bavarian Reserve. We allow ourselves to mention that J.H.Zukertort, who for various reasons had been unable to give a definite acceptance to play, at the last moment was prevented from taking part in the tournament through similar circumstances.' The War began on 19 July 1870 and ended with the peace agreement of 10 May 1871. The return of the troops followed from about the end of May to the middle of July 1871. But there are a number of Zukertort games played in Berlin during this period, including those of his second match with Anderssen. In addition, Zukertort continued uninterrupted to bring out his magazine throughout the duration of the War.

There is absolutely no trace of any journalistic work outside of chess by Johannes Zukertort. Enquiries from such authoritative bodies as the Institute for Magazine Research in Dortmund, Bremen University – German Press Research, or the State Archives in Berlin, failed to come up with anything to support Zukertort's editorial
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claims, nor does the extensive work *Magazine-City Berlin* by Peter de Mendelsohn mention Zukertort.

Detailed records of Bismark's *North German General Magazine* prove conclusively that Zukertort was not on the editorial board, nor did he work as a regular or freelance journalist for that periodical.

Zukertort's claim to have studied music under Moscheles can also be discounted. The Leipzig Conservatoire, to which Moscheles was professor, has no record of Zukertort in its registration book. Moscheles was in the last part of his life — he died in 1870. His wife's memoirs make no mention of Zukertort as a private pupil, nor is it conceivable that Zukertort, in his poor financial state, could have afforded such lessons.

In the *British Chess Magazine*’s obituary it is said that Zukertort was naturalised British in 1878, but the Home Office, Nationality Department, has no record of this.

As mentioned in the 'Zukertort in Germany' article, Zukertort's father was a Christian missionary, spreading the gospel amongst the Jewish community. The names of his sons, Johannes and Adolf Christian, indicate that they were also born into the Christian faith. The *Chess Players Chronicle*’s comment of 1883, given later, also bears witness to the fact that Zukertort did not follow the Jewish faith, whatever his ancestry may have been.

With his intelligence, education and outstanding memory, it would come as no surprise to hear that Zukertort spoke several languages. How many is the question. Certainly he had an excellent command of English as well as his native German.

Mr. J. Howard Taylor was an honourable English gentleman and there is no doubt that Zukertort actually made the claims to him — but whether these came out of the wine, a habit of bragging, a sense of humour, or the need of an insecure man to boost his reputation in a foreign land, we shall never know...

J. Adams
The Chess Apostle

Doctor J.H.Zukertort, whose portrait graces our gallery this month, was born on the 7th September 1842, and made his first move on the Chess-board in the Spring of 1861. In that year he entered a handicap tourney, started at the Breslau University Chess Club, receiving the odds of a queen, and signalised himself by losing every game he played. But he was not of such stuff as Jephtha's progeny, to weep over his loss in the mountains — perhaps there were none available; he betook him unto the plains of Breslau, and purchased a copy of Bilguer's Handbuch. This little incident is the key to the character of the man, and it is pleasant to note that his practical good sense was rewarded by promotion to the Knight class before the first year of his noviciate had expired. Like most masters of the game, Herr Zukertort has known but two stages in his progress to excellence — the tyro and the student. In 1862 he encountered Anderssen at the odds of a Knight, winning nearly every game, and thereafter met the first players of the day on even terms. His daily intercourse with Anderssen at Breslau, which continued for four years, tended to develop his latent powers, and although he was then desirous of avoiding publicity in Chess matters, he was, in 1867, widely known as one of the first players in North Germany. In the summer of 1867 he assumed the post of editor of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung, and held it until the collapse of that journal, in December 1871. In the course of these four years he published, in conjunction with Dufresne, the Great Chess Handbook, and of his own works the Brief Guide to Chess, a Collection of Problems, Studies and Endings, and a Short Synopsis of the Openings. In 1871 he defeated Anderssen in a set match, by five games to two, and it is worth recording, that of twelve correspondence matches in which he has been engaged, he has never lost one. No reader of the Westminster Papers can be ignorant of his career in England. He came hither in 1872, and took part in the tourney of that year, gaining the third prize. In the City of London handicap he gained the second prize, and in 1875 he was the winner in a match against Mr.Potter, with a score of four to two, and eight draws. In the Divan tourney, just concluded, he was second to Mr.Blackburne, but he made even games in his play with the winner. Of his blindfold powers it may be said that he is, at least, the equal of
Mr. Blackburne. His greatest performance in that way was at Hamburg, in 1869, when he was pitted against one of the best teams ever opposed to a blindfold player, on which occasion he won eight games, drew one, and lost none. It would require a special number of the Westminster Papers to set forth half our hero's exploits as they deserve, but we prefer to use the space at our disposal with a characterisation of the man, rather than of the Chess player. The judgement of a journal to which he has always lent his countenance, though he has never shown his face in it before, may be considered partial. But at the risk of such an imputation, we must pay our tribute of admiration to the gentleman and scholar who has, within the last few years, become 'one of us'. No one who looks upon the face which illustrates our gallery this month will deny to it, even under the guise of caricature, the graces of intellectuality and sensibility. It is as the face of an Apostle by an old master, and an Apostle in trouble to boot, but hear the original converse, good reader, and then wonder at the transformation in every line of that apparently resigned, and pain-stricken face. In every society which he frequents our hero is a welcome guest, and his popularity is due, not to his profound analytical powers, but to his practical humour and vivacity. These qualities he is more apt to display in a small, than in a large circle, but in either his gaiety is never found wanting, and in all, the genuine qualities of the man predominate over the superficial attributes of the mere Chess player.
Death of Dr. Zukertort

How the leaves are falling! In recording the unprecedented number of deaths of so many Chess-players and valued friends in the May and June numbers of the Chess Monthly, we hardly thought that it would be our painful duty to add to the mournful list that of Dr. J. H. Zukertort. But such is the case; and the present number contains the last of the work so eminently and conscientiously done for so many years by our departed friend and collaborator. The circumstances of the last hours were given by The Field as follows:

"On Monday, the 18th inst., he played one of the handicap games at the British Chess Club. On Tuesday he seemed in better health and spirits than usual of late. He passed the afternoon at the British Chess Club, either conversing freely or looking at positions on the several boards. He left a few minutes after seven o'clock, appeared at Simpson's about two hours later, and whilst playing a game of Chess with Mr. Sylvain Meyer was seized with an attack of faintness, which seemed to be of a serious nature. As usual in cases of emergency, everybody being eager to help, none hit upon the right means. Instead of calling medical aid, he was taken to the British Chess Club in an unconscious state. There a doctor was soon in attendance, but the anxiety of the numerous friends present increased with the prolonged comatose state of the patient, and Dr. Cassidy, a member of the club, was sent for, when it was thought advisable to remove the patient to Charing Cross Hospital. At about four o'clock a.m. the Rev. J. Verschoyle, and Messrs. Frank Harris, Gunsberg, and Hoffer made inquiries there, and it was ascertained from Dr. Jeeves that he was still in a state of unconsciousness, and that the symptoms of a cerebral attack (Dr. Cassidy's diagnosis) had increased. He never regained consciousness, but expired about ten o'clock on Wednesday morning, the cause of death being cerebral hemorrhage. When the friends called at the hospital in the forenoon he was no more."

Dr. Zukertort, of German extraction, was born in Lublin (Russian Poland) in 1842. Studying medicine in Germany at the beginning of the sixties, he obtained in the school of Professor Anderssen the right grasp of both theory and practice, acquiring in a comparatively short time a local reputation as the most talented pupil of the immortal German master. In 1867 he made himself known to wider circles as Editor of the New Berlin Schachzeitung, founded by Neumann and Suhle after the retirement of Ph. Hirschfield from the Editorship of the Leipzig Schachzeitung. In his new capacity he had ample opportunities; he published his own brilliant masterpieces, as well as numerous valuable treatises on the openings, especially about the Muzio, Kieseritzky, Evans, etc. He collected the discoveries of the new Berlin school, at the head of which were Hirschfield, Neumann, and Suhle, in the same manner as Baron Heydebrand u.d. Lasa did in the German Handbook with the researches of the old school, which was led by Bledow, Hanstein, Harrwitz, and
Mayer Jean Dufresne, Dr. Max Lange, and Emil Schallopp formed the connecting link between the old and the new school. The latter received a further development by Steinitz when he succeeded De Vere on The Field, and in the volumes of the Chess Monthly. Staunton in England, Morphy in America, and Kolisch in Paris, belonged still to the old school.

In addition to his usual editorial duties he published various valuable Chess works in Germany, and the editorship of the Schachzeitung he held till 1872, interrupted only by the Franco-German war, where he served in his medical capacity; as, in fact, he had done in the Schleswig-Holstein campaign, and in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. His career as a representative of English Chess commenced in 1872.

Zukertort combined, with Anderssen’s extraordinary brilliancy and fertility of imagination, great analytical power, whilst his marvellous memory made him one of the first blindfold players of the day. He was only deficient in English steadiness and tenacity, as a match player, hence his defeat by Steinitz in the first encounter, 1872; but these qualities he acquired in the subsequent matches with Potter, Blackburne, and Rosenthal. To this must be added what, perhaps, is only known to the initiated few, that Zukertort was indebted, in a great measure, to Mr. Ph. Hirschfeld, for many of the innovations which he introduced in his match and tournament play, as well as in the analytical notes in this Paper. For over ten years Mr. Hirschfeld was a constant and valuable opponent of the late master. Valuable is used advisably, for even Steinitz offered to play a series of match games with Hirschfeld, without stakes, but for the sole advantage of first-class practice. The theory of the Lopez, the latest development in the Evans and the Hamppe-Allgaier, were worked out and practically tested over the board with Hirschfeld.

The exhaustive analysis of the Morphy-Anderssen match games published in our early volumes; the Blackburne-Zukertort match; the Rosenthal-Zukertort match; the various tournaments which have taken place during the last ten years; notably, the notes to the tournament games 1883, treasured up in the nine volumes of the Chess Monthly, would, if systematically arranged, form a complete new theory of the game. After 1883 he intended to undertake this work himself; but the American tour and subsequent ill-health made him postpone it, and now it is too late. The Field says:

'An accomplished gentleman and scholar, a rival of the famous Anderssen, with whom he competed successfully, a profound analyst, a celebrated blindfold player, his intimation of making England his home was received with general welcome. The balance of success in his chess career up to 1883 was greatly in his favour. He defeated Rosenthal and Blackburne in single combat, and won the first prize in the international chess tournament, Paris, 1878, after a tie-match with Winawer. But all the victories he achieved were overshadowed by his splendid performance in the memorable International Chess Tournament, London, 1883. He secured the first prize with only one lost game to Steinitz, and in that, too, he had the better position. First honours being certain, he relaxed somewhat the tension of his energies,
and lost three more games, in all of which, however, he had an absolute winning advantage. There is little or no doubt that, had it been necessary to add these games to his score, he would have won them. The final score was, nevertheless, three games ahead of Steinitz, who took second prize. His game in the first round with Blackburne is the finest that had been played in the present generation of chess masters, and the others give evidence of his then supremacy over all the competitors in the contest, without exception. This concludes the record of his successes. Now begins a page of history which every chess player would prefer to tear out, were it possible, so as to remember only the Zukertort of 1883. Contrary to the advice of his friends and the verdict of medical men [we may be permitted to mention a mutual friend, Dr. Charles Elam - Ed.] that absolute repose was required after the supreme effort of many weeks' duration, he persisted in accepting Steinitz's challenge to a match, the conditions of which were unfavourable to him; but we commented upon the match at the time of its conclusion, and have no desire to allude to them again. The fact remains that he returned from the States a broken-down man. His nerves seemed over-strained; an impediment in his speech was noticeable, which was more accentuated of late; he had no energy left to rouse himself from a kind of mental torpor. He lost a short match with Blackburne, and played in several tournaments since, more as a matter of duty and habit than with any prospects of success. In the present handicap at the British Chess Club he headed the list, which gave rise to a hope of an ultimate recovery. At one time it was doubtful whether he would venture to compete, but, as he assured us, he considered it a sort of test case whether he would play in the forthcoming International Congress of the B.C.A. at Bradford, or abandon practical chess, for a time anyhow. But it proved only the last glimmer of the light before it was extinguished. It is doubtful whether he could ever have recovered. Those who have had the privilege of a close intimacy with the departed will be unanimous in the testimony to his many superior qualities. A late contemporary, ten years ago, in publishing a portrait of Dr. Zukertort, remarked: "In every society which he frequents our hero is a welcome guest, and his popularity is due, not to his profound analytical powers, but to his practical humour and vivacity. The genuine qualities of the man predominate over the superficial attributes of the mere chess player." We have confined our remarks to the simplest, duty of the biographer, and conclude, fearing that feelings of the sincerest friendship, and also a chess player's admiration, might cause us to overstep the line of strict impartiality. From the moment the sad news became known, telegrams and letters from distant admirers poured in to the hon. secretary of the British Chess Club, inquiring the day of the funeral, and wishing to pay the last tribute of respect to the departed.

And now we shall only add that he died in harness, fighting, if ever a man did. By the board he had lived, and by the board did he perish.

A noble ending for a chess player!

The funeral took place on Tuesday, the 26th ult., at 10.30, at the Brompton Cemetery. Present were: Mr. F. Anger, President of the City of London;
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Capt. A. S. Beaumont, Herbert Baldwin, H. E. Bird, W. H. Cubison, Jas. Eccles, Robt. Forster, W. M. Gattie, I. Gunsberg, A. Guest, Thos. Hewitt, Ph. Hirschfield, L. Hoffer, F. W. Lord, W. Manning, Sylvain Mayer (who played the last game with the deceased on the fatal evening), James Innes Minchin, Dr. Mrazsek, Sebastian B. Schlesinger, President of the Manhattan Chess Club, New York; Jas. Wade, Publisher of the Chess Monthly; Rev. W. Wayte, and a Paris amateur. Wreaths were sent by the British, the City of London, and the Brighton Chess Clubs, and by Mr. Eccles.

L. Hoffer
Steinitz on Zukertort

With the most sincere and profound sorrow we learn from a cablegram to the New York papers that Mr. Zukertort died in London on the 20th June 1888. No particulars of the sad event are likely to reach this country before our present issue goes to press, but it is generally assumed that the cause of death was disease of the heart, of which Mr. Zukertort had suffered for many years.

J.H. Zukertort was born September 7th, 1842, in the Russian city Riga, on the Baltic Sea. His parents were, however, Germans, and returned to their native country when Zukertort was about 7 years of age. He received his early education at the Gymnasium (College) of Breslau, of which institution the immortal Chess master, the late Professor Anderssen, was tutor of mathematics and the German language. As already stated on a previous occasion, the great Professor was in the habit, after his match with Morphy, of selecting among his pupils such as showed some talent for Chess, for the purpose of playing with them, and in order to keep up some kind of practice for which he had otherwise hardly any opportunity in Breslau. Zukertort was one of those fortunate students who were favoured with a most excellent training in the game from the great master, and after he had for some time received large odds he rapidly rose to be a worthy opponent of his teacher on even terms. Having completed his preliminary education in Breslau, Zukertort took up his residence in Berlin, where for several years he was devoted to the study of medicine and to literary work, chiefly in connection with our pastime. He became editor of the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung* after the retirement of Herr Neumann, and he published a book on the game in conjunction with Herr Dufresne. Though he participated in some of the tournaments of the German Chess Association without making his mark among the prize-winners, he nevertheless succeeded in 1871 in defeating Anderssen in a series of seven games by the majority of 5 to 2.

His real public Chess career may, however, be considered to have dated from next year, when he entered the London Tournament of 1872. Though he only came out third prize-winner behind Steinitz and Blackburne, his score against the first named including the games played in the handicap, was equal, namely: 1 and 1, and 5 draws. A match was thereupon arranged between the two rivals, which ended in favour of Steinitz, with the score of 7 to 1 and 4 draws. He did not enter the Vienna Tournament of 1873, and he confined himself to blindfold exhibitions and to literary work as a game annotator of the *Westminster Papers* until 1875, when he met Mr. Potter in a match, in which he came out as victor with a score of 4 to 2 and 8 draws. In the early part of 1876 he, however, distinguished himself with a blindfold performance which alone in itself would commemorate his name as one of the greatest Chess artists up to our time. For he accomplished the extraordinary task of conducting simultaneously, without sight of board or men, 16 games against a strong team which included such first-class amateurs as Dr. Ballard and Messrs. Minchin and Wayte. In the final score he won 12, lost 1 and drew 3, and his
performance on that occasion as a blindfold player has never been equalled before or since. In 1877 he competed in the Anderssen Jubilee Tournament at Leipzig, and came out third behind Paulsen and Anderssen, after tying with the latter. In the same year he won the first prize in a tournament at Cologne.

In the Paris Grand International Tournament of 1878, which was one of the best double-round contests ever held, he made his first great record as a successful tournament champion by coming out first victor after a tie with Winawer. Two great matches followed that event, namely, one against Rosenthal in 1880 and the other against Blackburne in 1881. Zukertort won both matches with excellent scores, namely, with 7 to 1 and 11 draws against Rosenthal, and with 7 to 2 and 5 draws against Blackburne. In the Tournament of Berlin in 1881, he came out second behind Blackburne, and next year at the Grand International Double-round Tournament of Vienna, he tied for fourth and fifth places behind Steinitz and Winawer (tie) and Mason. But he had made an excellent run for chief prize up to the last two rounds, and he was awarded the special prize for the best individual score against the chief prize-holders.

1883 was, however, the year of his greatest glory. We have often expressed our opinion, to which we still firmly adhere, that the results of tournaments, however well such contests may be arranged, require confirmation by the match-test, for the former only furnish a sort of cross-play proof in small individual contests which cannot be relied upon. But there can be no doubt that the London Grand International Tournament of 1883 was the best of the kind up to the present, as far as the regulations of play and the number and value of prizes were concerned, and the stipulation alone, which restricted the counting of draws, made it a fairer test of skill than any tournament held before. Zukertort won this tournament in magnificent style, coming out 3 games ahead over his next rival, Steinitz, and one of his games against Blackburne belong for combination-play to the very finest on record.

The accounts of Zukertort's subsequent tour in America, his match with the Editor, and the results thereof, need no repetition. In the London Tourney of 1886 he came out behind the 6 prize winners and Mr. Lipschütz, tying for 7th place with Captain Mackenzie. In the next tournament at Nottingham, he took 4th prize. Since then, he lost a short match of 5 games up against Blackburne by 5 to 1 and 8 draws, and in the Frankfurt Tournament, he tied for 13th place with Burn. Only once he gained the first prize in the handicap of the British Chess Club, but he failed to win any prize in Simpson's Divan Tournament. His death is more than sufficient apology for his last failures, and there can be no doubt that he had altogether broken down in health.

We think that in view of Zukertort's remarkable Chess career, which gave proofs of his powers in matches against several first-class players, and in two of the best tournaments that have ever been organised, we are justified in saying that he was the strongest player we ever came across. But in the interest of truth and justice, we feel bound to record our opinion, that in point of genius he never was the equal of Anderssen, nor perhaps the superior of some living players whom he defeated. He
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had, no doubt, an excellent position judgement, but this was more the outcome of routine than of intuitive perception. His powerful memory enabled him to recollect the weakness of different opponents, and he was, therefore, a dangerous rival in tournaments. He had an extraordinary book-knowledge, and when he came across some novelty in friendly analytical trials with strong players, he would retain it for years and then apply it in a match or tournament. But though he had a remarkable faculty of assimilating and perhaps correcting other people's ideas, we feel sure that he was very deficient in originality. We noticed this defect especially in his analysis as well as in his attempted practical application of the principles of 'the modern school'. He knew of course as much as had been published about them, but when he had to take the initiative of developing a new idea, or else of applying an old one in a novel situation, he mostly went astray in a manner which showed that though he had acquired some good knowledge of position according to the new maxims, he had not fully entered into the spirit of the modern theories. His lack of appreciation was shown for instance when in his matches against Rosenthal and Blackburne, he would persist in playing and theoretically advocating the advance of both the QRP and QNP to their third squares in the Queen's Pawn Opening (turned into a Queen's Fianchetto). Though we repeatedly pointed out the strategical weakness of such a disposition of Pawns, Zukertort as long as he was victorious, owing to his superior tactics, would not become convinced until, at last, Blackburne successfully adopted our advice in his game against Zukertort at Berlin, as regards the treatment of that form of opening, and from that moment, Zukertort dropped at any rate the advance of P-QR3 which he had so stoutly supported in practice and in his writings previously.

During his first visit to America he was reported to have said about his own play that he amalgamated in his practice the principles of the old and of the modern school, and as far as we could judge from the games of his last match against Steinitz, his chief failures were due to such an attempt, which also bears out our criticism that he did not fully comprehend the spirit of the reform which has taken place in the conduct of the game. To give a practical illustration we may point out that after the novel defence which Steinitz adopted against Zukertort's favourite Queen's Gambit in the 7th game of the match, the latter might have been pardoned for once in trying to press a king's side attack instead of endeavouring to dissolve his isolated centre pawn, as the former course
was evidently in accordance with the views of Labourdonnais, Morphy, Harrwitz, etc. But after seeing the progress and result of that one game we feel sure that for instance a player like Herr Englisch, though he is not quite as strong yet as Zukertort was, would, however, hardly have pardoned himself for making such an experiment twice. Yet Zukertort persisted with the same policy all through the match in the same opening. Another instance of his shortcoming in analytical judgement may be found in his remark to Black’s 10th move in the second game between himself and Steinitz, in the London International Tournament of 1883. We have no doubt that in a correspondence game the weakness of Black’s position on the Queen’s side would make his game untenable. Yet Zukertort seemed to be more than satisfied with his position all through, after winning the game by some weak moves on the part of the opponent. We could recite numerous more instances, but we think the above will be sufficient to show that we have taken some pains in arriving at our judgement about his general style, which in fact had not been much separated from the maxims of the old masters from whom he had received his early training. We have only to add on this subject that our remarks are made in the interest of general instruction to students of the game who might otherwise be misled as regards the tendencies of modern improvements. Zukertort was, however, a profound and generally accurate analyst, who rarely made a mistake when he had once reduced his position to a combination point, either in his practice over the board or in his theoretical researches and annotations of games.

About Zukertort personally we shall say no more than he had many excellent qualities that more than overbalanced some defects of his character, which, however, we believe to have been more due to his time and surroundings than natural to himself. His death will be universally regretted among lovers of the game, and will leave a void in the Chess world which cannot be easily filled up.

Wilhelm Steinitz
A Portrait of Dr. Zukertort

Shortly before the opening of the tournament of the British Chess Association in 1872, four conspirators met one evening in the Strand at a restaurant which was that time the hebdomadal rendezvous of certain well-known chess-players.

“Well” said one of them, “I think I have found a man who can beat Steinitz. Who is he?” asked Löwenthal. “Zukertort,” said the discoverer. “He has just won a match of Anderssen.”

The matter was talked over, and the conspirators—all committee-men of the British Chess Association—resolved to invite Zukertort to this country, and offer him twenty guineas towards his expenses.

About a fortnight afterwards, the young Prussian arrived in London and appeared one evening at the Caledonian Hotel, then the headquarters of the Westminster Chess Club. There he played his first game in this country, and was beaten by Wisker, the stakes being a guinea a-side.

The same year he took part in the London Grand Tourney, and also played a match with Steinitz. His style was brilliant, but his success meagre.

Once in England he resolved to make it his permanent home. He liked the rich beef and port wine and the patronage accorded to professional chess-players. And so, from 1872 to the time of his decease, 1888, he was a citizen of London, occasionally visiting the Continent to play in tourneys, and never failing to carry off a good prize. In 1878 he won the first prize in Paris, defeating the leading champions of the day; and in 1883 he achieved the great object of his ambition by triumphing over Steinitz and winning the first prize in the London Tournament. On that occasion he distanced all his opponents by no less than three games, and secured the first prize a fortnight before the termination of the contest. From the very first he headed the poll, played with remarkable ease, unfolded a new style combining uncommon boldness with perfect soundness, never had to thank luck for a victory, conducted every part of the game with unsurpassed skill, and never once failed to be brilliant when an opportunity presented itself for being so. It was no wonder, when he defeated Blackburne, and thereby secured the championship, that loud applause from a large body of spectators greeted his victory. That applause was the involuntary homage due to successful genius, not the triumphant exultation over a brave but defeated competitor. Most, if not all, Englishmen desired to see the laurel crown once more decorating Blackburne’s brow; but no Englishman, and scarcely even one foreigner, grudged the Prussian his well-won honours.

The triple defeat sustained by Zukertort towards the close of the tourney excited no small surprise amongst the multitude, and grievously troubled his numerous friends; and now comes the question, what was the cause of this catastrophe? It certainly was not a desire on his part to subserve the interests of the opponents to whom he succumbed, inasmuch as Zukertort was incapable of any unfair conduct. It was not carelessness—all who know Zukertort will feel assured that his ambition
was not merely to win the first prize, but to win it with unexampled glory. Moreover, he was not at all likely to be careless, seeing that one of his ardent admirers had backed him for a considerable sum to score twenty-four games, that is, two more than the number he actually won. I think that his ultimate breakdown may be easily accounted for. The natural cause is the right one. It was the result of a rebound from the nervous tension under which he had been playing during the previous seven weeks. Having during that period excluded from his thoughts every subject external to the game, lived, as it were, in an atmosphere of chess, and then, having achieved the object of his ambition, his mind naturally wandered out into the world beyond chess; his thoughts became dissipated, and refused to be concentrated upon the further efforts which he was called upon to make. I have little or no doubt that, if twenty-four had been the minimum number required for victory, Zukertort would have reached it. But, though I, in common with all true lovers of our game, rejoice to do justice, and render honour to Zukertort's powers, yet I hold it by no means fair to depreciate the skill, or sneer at the success, of any of the players (Mackenzie, Sellman, and Mortimer) who prevailed over him in the last three games. This, I regret to say, has been done by some critics. Referring to Mackenzie's victory, they call it 'a surprising event'. But why should there be any surprise, seeing that the result of former encounters between these two champions was an equal score? More than twenty years ago Mackenzie won the championship of America, and never since then has it been once wrested from him. Besides his Transatlantic triumphs, Mackenzie has, on several occasions, played in European tournaments, and, by winning high prizes in each of them, vindicated his right to a place amongst the veritable masters of the game. To speak therefore of his victory over Zukertort, or rather, his making equal games with that gentleman as a 'surprising event', is to place him outside the list of first-class champions. To speak of him thus, argues in truth an ignorance of history, or an incapacity to appreciate the force of facts.

Zukertort was a great 'blindfold' player. He could, as such, conduct fifteen or sixteen games, but he never, I believe, finished such a large number at one sitting, and seldom produced games such as Blackburne's, replete with interest and sparkling with beauty. Still, as a blindfold seancist, he is entitled to a place in the first class.

Zukertort was an encyclopaedist; a sort of Lord Chancellor Brougham, 'only more so'. For he not merely knew a little of everything, but also a great deal of his own profession — chess. He was, indeed, a master of chess lore. He had all the best book-moves at his fingers' ends, and had only to spread out his hands over the board, and the best book-moves dropped from them upon it. His memory was prodigious, which, perhaps, was one reason why he loved to show his games and record his victories. But he never was a bore, and in this way was he saved from degenerating into one.

One day he was playing with a jocose youth, who was also a strong player. Well, Zed won the No.1 game. 'Now that game,' said he, 'reminds me of an Allgaier which I won of Anderssen in my seventeenth match with him. And he said — you
know Anderssen? - that it was the finest specimen of the Allgaier he had ever seen. I will show it to you if you like.' Then he showed it. Well, Zukertort played and won No.2 game.

'Now that game reminds me of one I played with Schumoff at St.Petersburg about twenty years ago. It never was recorded, but the club presented me with a gold medal, on which was inscribed the position where I made the great sacrifice that won the game. (Read this cum grano salis.) I have lost the medal, but I will show you the game if you like.' Then he showed it also.

Then they began No.3, and lo! the jocose one got the best of it, and, just as he was delivering the crushing stroke, he jocularly observed:

'Now this position, Doctor, is identical with that which occurred in the forty-fifth game of the one hundred and ninety-seventh match I played with Labourdonnais's grandmother's uncle's aunt, and it may save you trouble to know that I won the game at the two-hundredth move.' Thereupon Zukertort smiled a satirical smile, and looked reproaches at his opponent; but never from that day forth did he show his games or recount his victories.

And here, in justice to this good fellow's memory, I must say that, in showing his games, he did not desire so much to magnify himself as to please others. He delighted in diffusing a knowledge of chess, and, unlike most masters, if he discovered a 'new' move, he would not hesitate to impart his knowledge even to a rival. His talk about himself and his victories never bored me, but, on the contrary, afforded me considerable amusement. He was so pleased with himself that he seemed to think (and rightly) that he was diffusing pleasure by making others pleased with him. To talk about oneself does not always argue egotism or pretentiousness. A good deal depends upon the sort of person 'self' is, and whether the talk is to gratify listeners or only to glorify the talker.

Socially, Zukertort was a very pleasant man, merry as a cricket and chirpy as a bird. He never frowned except when playing 'blindfold', and never looked sad but when walking by himself. His popularity, which was great and deserved, was evident in many ways, especially in the entertainments given to him by the three leading London clubs - the St.George's, British, and City - previous to his departure for America to play his last match with Steinitz. 'Well', said a would-be wit at the City banquet given in his honour, 'Well, after all, I believe Zukertort is feted to win.'

Prior to his match with Steinitz the following amusing incident occurred at a dinner given by the Manhattan Club at Philadelphia to Messrs. Steinitz and Zukertort. After several toasts, Mr. Eugene Delmar rose and cried out, 'Here's to the champion chess player of the world. Let him respond.' Immediately the company waxed hilarious. Zukertort got red in the face, and Steinitz husky in the throat; but the boldest held his breath; whereupon someone rose and said, 'Gentlemen, I think I see a way out of this difficulty; let Messrs. Steinitz and Zukertort sing a duet in response.' The champions would not sing; but some horrid creature now calls it the due-yet song! As the company were leaving the room, Steinitz was whispering lugubriously to a neighbour, 'You see how I am treated, and receive no
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Recogni———; whilst Zukertort was gaily twittering forth: 'Yes, sir, even when I was a boy I was a great mathematical genius' he would have said; but ere the word was out the guests were fled.

Upon his return from America after the match, Zukertort was again entertained by the City of London Chess Club, when he made a very dignified as well as humorous speech, offering no excuse for losing the match, except what may be found in the following portion of his speech. 'I was not pleased', said he, 'with the changes of climate I had to undergo. In New York I enjoyed good health, but not so at St. Louis nor at New Orleans. I could neither eat, drink, nor sleep in a manner that satisfied my desires or augured well for my success in the match. "What do you object to in New Orleans?" asked a citizen thereof. "Why, to the drains", I replied. "The drains, there is nothing the matter with them." "Nothing the matter! Where is your nose?" "My nose is all right." "How, then, can you say there is nothing the matter with the drains?" "Because, my dear friend, there are no drains!"

As I have frequently in this notice called Zukertort 'Doctor', I may mention that he was a member of the medical profession, and, as such, served with the German Army before Metz. Steinitz used to amuse himself and others by deriding this doctoral prefix. 'He is no doctor', would shout the Bohemian champion. - 'He is', would reply an eminent F.L.C.P., 'I've seen his diplomas.' - 'How is it, then, he never uses that title in Germany?'. - 'Because in that highly educated country', retorted the eminent one, 'Doctor is the vulgar title of every man, woman, and child.' Very modest indeed, say I, was it on Zukertort's part to content himself with the title of Doctor, seeing that a great authority, Edward Lowe, divided all chess players into two classes, calling ordinary ones 'Doctors', and extraordinary ones 'Professors'; and truly, professor, aye Regius professor, of chess was Dr. J.H. Zukertort.

Always weak in body and delicate in health, Zukertort found it a work of great labour to engage in hard matches or long tournaments. Still, whenever circumstances and his health admitted of it, he was one of the foremost to enter the arena and unsheathe his sword. He never shrank from the battle if by any means he could take part in it. No doubt the many arduous contests in which he engaged seriously affected his health. But the Brobdingnagian match with Mr. Steinitz permanently shattered his constitution, and even dissipated his good spirits. Since that time I never knew him give a hearty laugh, or enjoy a humorous story. The bravery and
chivalry of the man in consenting to 'meet' the Austrian champion were worthy of all praise, but his acceptance of his adversary's one-sided conditions was foolhardy and even suicidal. Having won, in the grandest style, the first prize in the International tournament of 1883, he was entitled to rest upon his laurels, and enjoy the fruits of his labour. But Mr. Steinitz, thinking otherwise, tempted him with challenges, and ultimately induced him to make a match. I did my best, at the time, to dissuade the champion from meeting Steinitz in single combat, pointing out that his health was bad, and the conditions against him. But the generous and courageous spirit of the man was deaf to my counsels, and longed to give his adversary 'revenge'. Accordingly he accepted the defiance, fought splendidly as long as his health held good, and at last succumbed to weariness and malaria. And here I may mention that my most worthy friend, the late Dr. Charles Elam, strongly advised Zukertort, after his great victory in '83, never again to engage in any serious match. 'If you do', said he, 'it will kill you.' – 'I know that', said Zukertort, turning to me, 'but, play or not play, I must be, and am, prepared to be taken away at any time without a moment's warning.' And so it came to pass, for on Tuesday, June 19, after playing a game in the handicap at the British Club, he adjourned to the Divan, where, whilst playing an off-hand game, he was seized with a fit, which terminated fatally at ten o'clock the next morning. Zukertort was born at Riga in September 1842, and died at the Charing Cross Hospital on June 20th, 1888, aged not quite forty six. Of all the foreign chess-players who have, within the last thirty years, visited or resided in this country, not one of them was more admired and liked than J.H. Zukertort, the 'Chess Apostle'.

Rev. G.A. MacDonnel
J.H. Zukertort: An English Appreciation

It has been commonly believed that the late Johann Hermann Zukertort was born in the town of Riga on the 7th September, 1842, but it is now stated on the authority of Herr E. Schallopp, who gets his information from Herr Adolf Zukertort, a stenographer in Berlin and a brother of J.H. Zukertort, that the real birthplace of the great Chess player was Lublin, a small town in Russian Poland. The year of his birth is undoubtedly 1842, but whether the 7th of September was his actual natal day is not quite so certain, but probabilities point that it was. At the time therefore of his untimely death he was in the forty-sixth year of his age, there being but three months difference in age between him and the renowned English player Mr. J.H. Blackburne.

Mr. Zukertort’s father was a German merchant, but his mother was a Pole. In 1855 the Zukertort family returned to Germany. In 1860 we have the first recorded event of his life which couples him with Chess, for it was in that year, he then being eighteen years old, that he joined the University Chess Club at Breslau. In 1862, in the cold month of February, Anderssen and Zukertort first met, and from that date commences his real Chess career. At first the great German professor gave him the odds of the Knight with comparative ease, and it was by slow steps that Zukertort attained to his great skill, but the steps if slow were sure, for he was possessed of a memory of a most tenacious character, and analysis once studied were never forgotten even down to their most minute detail. Slowly then, as I have said, did he make progress, until Anderssen could no longer give him the slightest odds, and the younger player began in some degree to be looked upon as the rising hope of Germany. By 1864 he had firmly established himself as a player, although the laurels of no great victory had as yet encircled his brow, yet those who knew felt that there was a Chess career before him. Three years later, in June, 1867, he became associated with Anderssen in the editorship of the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*, on the retirement on Herr G.R. Neumann, who in that year went to Paris to take part in the contest for the Emperor’s prize. From that moment Zukertort’s history is indissolubly united with the history of our noble game, and alike as an analyst, match player, tournament player and blindfold player, he has stood in the first rank of the masters. I propose briefly to glance at his performances in these respects, but meanwhile I shall here complete my short account of the facts of his life. In 1872 he came over to England to take part in the tournament play of that year, and this country became his home from that time. In the first years of his residence here he naturally became one of the great galaxy of Chess lights which then adorned our northern firmament: Bird, Blackburne, Boden, Burn, De Vere, Horwitz, J. Lord, Löwenthal, MacDonnell, Potter, Wisker and Steinitz were the chief of these, and in Zukertort they found no unworthy colleague. With Staunton, who for long was the king of English Chess, Zukertort had but slight acquaintance, as the ‘great lion’ died on 22nd of June, 1874, when Zukertort had been but two years here, and during all this time Staunton had had no direct connection with the active Chess world. It is worthy of note that Staunton like
Zukertort passed away suddenly, and that in both cases the death stroke came when they still had their harness on. In Staunton's case he died sitting at his desk with his pen in his hand; to Zukertort, death came as he was sitting playing in Simpson's, and the last object that he beheld as unconsciousness overcame him was the pieces in battle array on the board. 1883 was the culminating point of Zukertort's Chess career for the great London International Tournament of that year was his very apotheosis. In the Autumn of that year he visited the United States where he had a very flattering reception. During his visit he made a tour of the States giving exhibitions of his skill as a simultaneous and blindfold player. This visit extended over part of 1884, and in 1885 he made a tour on the continent with like success whilst he also paid a professional visit to several English provincial towns. In December 1885 he again crossed the Atlantic, this time to play his great match with Steinitz, which however ended disastrously for him. When he returned to England his friends noticed a falling off in his health, and I have had from time to time to chronicle the fact that he was far from well. But all his friends hoped this would pass off, and when he roused himself in the pending handicap at the British, making once more a fine score in fine style, it was believed that he had once more regained his health. These hopes, however, were all too soon to be doomed to be extinguished by his untimely death.

**Analyst and Writer**

Zukertort's pen has long been active in the cause of his favourite game, and his wonderful power as an analyst is to be first discovered in his contribution almost to every opening. He is not the inventor of any daring innovation, such as the Steinitz Gambit; his power indeed rather lay in the marvellous accuracy with which he pushed his researches into the details of openings. With the Evans Gambit, his name will ever be linked along with that of his master, Anderssen, as having almost completely exhausted the scientific resources of that brilliant opening. In the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung* for 1870 there appears his great analysis of that opening and of others throughout the year. I have already mentioned his connection with the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung* which, however, ceased at the end of 1871 when the magazine died. Soon after he made his home here he became associated with the late *Westminster Papers* of which for some time he was Game Editor. He was also on the staff of *The City of London Chess Magazine* and throughout the pages of both magazines will be found abundant proofs of his skill and accuracy as analyst and annotator. In 1879 in conjunction with Herr L.Hoffer he commenced the *Chess Monthly* which has regularly appeared up to the present time, and it is in its pages that for the last eight years he has displayed his analytical powers.

Both as a blindfold and a simultaneous player, Herr Zukertort won great renown. His first recorded exhibition of blindfold play was in 1868, he being then 26 years old when he encountered 7 of the Berlin players with great success. He gradually increased the number that he was willing to play till they reached 12. But even this did not satisfy him and in 1876 he played in London 16 blindfold games simultaneously with the result that he won 12, drew 3 and lost 1 only. On the 23rd April,
1881, I had first the honour of making Herr Zukertort's personal acquaintance, although I had before met him at the Divan. In that and the following day the West Yorkshire Chess Association held its twenty-sixth annual meeting, and as an attraction Mr.Watkinson engaged the services of Herr Zukertort. On Friday 22nd April, Herr Zukertort engaged blindfold against 6 of the strongest Yorkshire players, winning all the games. On the following day he played 20 games simultaneously, losing one, with two or three left unfinished through want of time; the remainder he won. I dwell upon these facts as it was not only the first time I had seen Mr. Zukertort play blindfold Chess but the first time I had seen that species of Chess played at all. Since then I have seen Mr. Blackburne in his wonderful performances in that line and the novelty has worn off, but at the time I was much struck with Herr Zukertort's performance.

**Tournament Play**

Zukertort has a splendid record in Tournament play even if we include these latter years when his powers to some extent seemed to have failed him. Whilst residing in Germany he took part in no important tournament, and the 1872 London was the first serious encounter of that kind that he made. He, however, brought with him a great reputation as a proficient in the game, as the laurels of victory were still fresh round his brow from his series of games with Anderssen. Still public curiosity was on tip toe, to see how he would bear himself in a fray amongst more experienced players. In the end he came out third close after Blackburne who was second, Steinitz being first. This was a good beginning, better indeed than that made either by Steinitz or Blackburne, for the former only came in sixth at his first International Tournament whilst the latter failed to get a prize at all in his first trial at Dundee — the only time, however, that he has missed a prize in all the tournaments in which he has engaged; for though Mr. Blackburne entered for the Tournament of 1862 he resigned after playing a few games. In 1876, Zukertort took part in the Divan Tournament coming out a good second after Blackburne, Potter being third. In 1877, the Leipzig Tournament was held in connection with the Anderssen Jubilee and this was attended by Zukertort as representative of the St.George's Club. In the end, he tied with Anderssen for second and third place, Louis Paulsen being first. In the same year he took part in the Cologne Tournament taking first prize. In 1878 came the Paris International Tournament when Zukertort's star was again in the ascendant, for he tied with Winawer for first and second place and in the play-off, beat his wily opponent and took first prize. Blackburne being third and Capt. Mackenzie fourth. This was by far the most important encounter of the kind in which he had engaged as the number of masters he met therein was great. It was true that Steinitz did not take part in the fight, but most of the other great masters were there, and this victory certainly gives Zukertort a front rank amongst the very foremost masters of the day. In Berlin in 1881, he was not so successful, however, though he went thither flushed with his recent victory over Blackburne. But the 'old lion' of British Chess losing no heart by his defeat showed magnificent form during the whole Tournament for losing a game to Mason to start with, he went on accumu-
lating win after win and ultimately came out winner 'hands down' with Zukertort: second, whilst Winawer and Chigorin tied for third and fourth. In 1882 came the Vienna Tournament in which for the first time Zukertort met Steinitz in an important Tournament, but he only tied with Steinitz for 4th and 5th, Winawer tying for first and second and Jas. Mason taking third.

The London International Tournament of 1883 was the scene of his most famous exploits and the area of his grandest victory. In the first round every player except Steinitz went down before his victorious arm. In the second round too, he added victory after victory to his score until he had made sure of the first prize some time before play was completed. This was on Monday, 11th June, when he conquered Blackburne and his score was then made up to 21, a number which no other competitor could possibly reach. Zukertort, however, won one more game after this and lost three, but his score was 22 and his nearest rival was Steinitz with 19 games. Third came Blackburne with 16\frac{1}{2} and one unplayed game and fourth, Chigorin with 16. This Tournament may be described as 'a battle of giants', and the position he won there will stamp him forever as being then a 'master among masters'. I witnessed many of his games and perhaps I may for once be allowed to quote from myself. Writing of the first day's play, I said, 'at one board is Zukertort with clean-cut features and an intellectual looking face but with marks upon it of considerable nervous tension; opposite to him is Chigorin comely and smiling.' His game with Blackburne in the first round will ever remain a 'gem of purest ray serene'. I was present when it was played and since then I have seen Blackburne play it over several times and it lives in my memory forever as 'a thing of beauty'. Zukertort allowed Blackburne to exactly carry out his ideas, he let him have the open file and the doubled Rooks thereon and the seemingly strong attack, and then came the 'clap of thunder!', the Queen was put en prise and the advanced Rook had to retire, but to no avail, for the ground was torn from under the Englishman's feet as by a series of earthquake shocks. 'Ah!' says Blackburne as his recollections linger upon it, 'it was marvellous, but I made him do it, I actually forced the good moves upon him!' Quite true in a sense, but none but a master brain could have seen that Blackburne's impetuous attack opened out such a royal road to victory. Commenting at the time upon Zukertort's play during the Tournament, I wrote then in the Leeds Mercury: 'There can be no doubt whatever that in this Tournament, Zukertort's Chess powers have come to their greatest perfection for during the entire progress of the play he has shown every good quality that goes to make up a fine player. He has not won by 'flukes' for as it happened, Fortune gave him fewer chances than the other players, but all along his play has been steady, accurate, yet daring, alike in the opening, the mid-game, and the end-struggle, he has shown himself a master, and one knows not which to admire the more, his happy strokes of brilliant play, when the opportunity offered, or the masterly strategy wherewith he nursed some little pawn to victory in some fine endgame.' Looking back I have little to alter; it is true that after analysis has discovered here and there little flaws in one or two of his games, but that being granted they still remain a wonderful specimen of his Chess skill at its best.
With 1883, let me close the account of his tournament play, for after that comes but disaster and defeat. In 1886 British Chess Association, in 1886 Nottingham; in 1887 Frankfurt and in 1887 British Chess Association did he take part, but in none did he shine, neither did he in the Tournament so lately concluded at the Divan. In the pending handicap at the British Club he seemed to wake up with new life, and at the time of his death, he had won 7 out of a possible 8.

**Match Play**

The deceased master has proved himself an excellent match player, though it must be admitted that in this department, he falls much below the level attained by his great rival, Steinitz, and as I have always believed that match-play and match-play alone is the real test of individual strength, there can be no doubt as to which of the two players is the stronger. Zukertort's first important contest was fought in a series of games in 1871 against his old master, the great Anderssen, and victory smiled upon the younger man, for he won the majority by the final score, Zukertort 5, Anderssen 2. A different result, however, was to follow his next venture. Smar king under his partial defeat in the London 1872 Tournament, he challenged Steinitz to a match and this ended in a victory for the Austrian, who scored 7 to Zukertort's 1 and 4 draws.

In 1875 occurred his match with W.N. Potter which he won, but only after a prolonged struggle, the score being Zukertort 4, Potter 2, drawn 8. It was not till 5 years after, in 1880, that he played his next match. This time his opponent was Mons. Rosenthal, the French champion. Victory was again with Zukertort, who won the match with a score of 7 to Rosenthal's 1 and 11 draws. Like his match with Potter, it was noticeable for the number of draws and it was further of note for the number of times the Ruy Lopez was adopted. The next year, he played his first match with Blackburne, whom he defeated with a score of 7 to Blackburne's 2 and 5 draws. This match is of interest, because it was immediately after it had been played that Blackburne made such a glorious fight at Berlin, where he altogether outstripped Zukertort. This, however, was to be the last of his great victories in match-play. For years before the conclusion of the 1883 Tournament there had been talk of a match between Zukertort and Steinitz, the friends of each player claiming that their man held the championship of the world. The friends of Steinitz justified their claim on his behalf by putting forth his unbroken record as a match player, whilst Zukertort's friends based their claim on the magnificent run he had made in the just completed Tournament where he had come out ahead of Steinitz by 3 games. It was not, however, till 1886, that the match actually was played, and at one time it was greatly feared that it would never come off at all. It was played for the championship of the world and a stake of £800. The match was divided in three sections; the first was played in New York, the second in St. Louis, and the last in New Orleans, but the facts are so recent that I need only now state, that at the end, victory was with Steinitz, who scored the match with 10 wins against Zukertort's 5 and 5 draws. Steinitz thus still kept his unbroken record in match-play and retained the championship, while Zukertort experienced his second defeat at his hands. In 1887, he played a short match with Blackburne and though he made a good stand, he was unable to hold his own and the match ended Zukertort 1, Blackburne 5, drawn 8.
The ‘Last Scene of All’

A few words as to the personality of the man. In stature he was short, and indeed, he might be described as a ‘dapper little man’. His features were clear-cut, his complexion when in health, ruddy and pleasant, his manner somewhat reserved and retiring to strangers, but he could unfold when with his friends. It has been told to me by one who knew him, that ‘if he bore no deep enmities, he evinced no strong attachments’. He was a well-mannered, intellectual man and possessed considerable scholarship. He was not without humour, but it was humour that cannot be put on paper, for much of its effectiveness depended both upon the time and manner of its being said.

I remember in the 1883 Tournament when one of the players in the Vizayanagaram Tourney, rushed up to him and said excitedly, ‘Oh! Mr. Zukertort, I have just lost a game by such a blunder.’ ‘My good friend’, replied Zukertort with provoking coolness, ‘that is really nobody’s fault but your own!’ In telling this, I know it has not much point, but at the time it was awfully funny, and as the disappointed player turned away, Zukertort’s face with its suppressed mirth, was a study, not mirth be it understood at the player’s defeat, but at his eagerness to put forth his excuse of a blunder. Again, when Gunsberg and Burn were playing off one of their tie games in the British Chess Association Congress, an excited by-stander said in a soft voice to Zukertort: ‘Do you think Burn will win?’ ‘My friend’, replied Zukertort, ‘I am not Mr. Burn’s brain.’

The end came suddenly indeed. He left the British Chess Club in the afternoon of Tuesday, 19th June, seemingly in good health and certainly in good spirits. In the evening, he entered the Divan and soon after commenced playing a game. After a little, he complained of feeling faint and a little brandy was offered to him, but unconsciousness quickly supervened and he was taken to the British Club for quietness. Here, however, the state of coma deepened, and despite medical aid, his case seemed desperate. He was then removed to the Charing Cross Hospital where, however, he never recovered consciousness in the least, and he died on Wednesday, 20th June, at 10 a.m. At the inquest held on his body, the cause of death was given as cerebral haemorrhage. He was buried on Tuesday, 26th June at Brompton Cemetery, a large attendance of Chess friends being present. Amongst these were – the Rev. W. Wayte and Jas. I. Minchin, representing the St. George’s Chess Club. Mr. F. Anger, Mr. J. Manning and Mr. F. W. Lord, representing the City of London Chess Club. Mr. L. Hoffer (chief mourner) and Mr. R. Foster, representing the British Chess Club. Mr. S. B. Schlessinger, President of the Manhattan Chess Club. Messrs. H. E. Bird and I. Gunsberg, representing the Master-players. Mr. Jas. Wade, (publisher of ‘Chess Monthly’), Capt. Beaumont and Messrs. Baldwin, Cubison, Eccles, Gattie, Guest, Hirschfield, Meyer and M. Studer from Paris. Wreaths were sent by the Brighton Chess Club, the City of London Chess Club and by Mr. Eccles.

La Bourdonnais sleeps in Kensal Green Cemetery. Zukertort now lies in Brompton, and towards the latest made grave, the Chess players of the whole civilised world cast a pitying glance as they think of him who passed away from their midst in the very prime of life. His work for his beloved game is done, and the Chess world can but mourn his untimely loss.

J. G. Cunningham
J.H. Zukertort: A German Appreciation

Many heavy blows to the chess world have already been reported this year but the painful announcement of the death of the great chess master J.H. Zukertort struck all sincere chess-friends more severely than all the others. There was a sober sound to the telegraphic announcement which made its round through the newspapers: London. The famous chess player Zukertort has died. The writer of these grave words had no idea what the chess community must feel by the announcement of this item of news. The loss is irreplaceable. With Zukertort, a piece of modern chess history has been carried to the grave, a star of rare magnificence has gone out for ever. Only he who has stood in the centre of chess life of the modern era is able to appreciate the significance of this chess hero in full measure. For a decade, Zukertort’s name was praised as one of the most excellent and brilliant; he was the centre of general interest; the victor of two world-class tournaments no longer dwells amongst the living!

Johannes Hermann Zukertort was born on 7 September 1842 in Lublin (Russian Poland). His father was a missionary. Apart from Lublin, Zukertort spent his early youth also in Warsaw and Petrikau. Already as a boy, besides other extraordinary talents, he displayed a rare memory. He was given his first instruction in the parental home, then attended the Gymnasium in Petrikau for a year, and after moving with his parents to Breslau at the beginning of 1855, the Maria Magdalen Gymnasium of that town. He remained there for the duration of the German school-leaving examination, until 1861. His parents in the meantime had moved to Posen. He made his first acquaintance with chess in his gymnasium days. One day in 1858 he came home from the fair and, beaming with joy, showed his brother a little carved wooden chess set that he had bought there for about 30 pfennig. He enthusiastically explained to his attentive listener that he had learned, from a schoolmate, a game which was much more beautiful than draughts. For good or bad, his brother was initiated into the mysteries of the new art. However, if we ignore this modest beginning, Zukertort’s chess dates first from 1861. At this time he was a student of medicine and frequented the Academic Chess Club of Breslau. His acquaintance with Professor Anderssen, who was then working as a school-teacher in Breslau, gave his life a special direction. Anderssen soon recognised his enthusiastic student as an up and coming talent; his gifted pupil made particular progress; he had a preference for playing with the young Zukertort, at first with odds of a knight, though already after a short time on equal terms. Already in 1862, Zukertort was reckoned as the second best chess player in Breslau. In the same year, Zukertort, on a visit to his parents, co-founded the Posen Chess Club. In 1864 he played 7 games with G.R. Neumann, of which each won 2 games, 3 were drawn. Thus equal play was reflected by an equal score. His later opponent, Mieses, could no longer put up energetic resistance against the increasingly more powerful chess talent. He was utterly defeated by his younger partner.
In the campaign of 1866, Zukertort took part as a voluntary doctor. Soon after his return in 1867 he moved to Berlin to work in chess literature, taking over G.R. Neumann's position as editor of the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung*. Already in 1868, he excited people with his extraordinary talent for blindfold play, in which he later became an undisputed master, a remarkable sensation. As is well known he first competed in great tournaments in the years 1868 and 1869, when he appeared for the first time as a contender in the West German tournaments at Aachen 1868 and Hamburg and Barmen 1869. In 1868 he also lost a short match against Anderssen, but he defeated his teacher under similar conditions in 1871.

In June 1872, he travelled to England, first of all with the intention to fight out his first match with Steinitz, but then taking up permanent residence. In the London tournament of 1872, Steinitz was 1st, Blackburne 2nd, Zukertort 3rd. His first hard duel with his great rival Steinitz ended with an utter defeat for Zukertort, his opponent won 7 games, he only 1, with 4 draws. A short match with Cecil de Vere ended 2 to 1 in his favour; in 1875 he defeated Potter by 4-2 with 8 draws. In the Leipzig tournament of 1877 he won 3rd prize, in Cologne, during the same year, the 1st. But not until 1878 did he compete in a real world-class tournament, at Paris. There, he also saw his chess teacher Anderssen for the last time. His success was surprising, Zukertort arrived at a play-off for the 1st and 2nd prizes with Winawer, and won. In 1880 he defeated Rosenthal in a match by 7-1, with 11 draws, in 1881, Blackburne by 7-2 and 5 draws. In the international tournament at Vienna 1882, Zukertort tied for 4th-5th prize with Mackenzie; in addition he won a special prize for the one who had had the greatest success against the first three prizewinners.

The high-point of his chess career, however, was the international master tournament in London 1883; Zukertort achieved a victory there, as few in the chess world could emulate. Of the first 23 decisive games, he won 22, so that he secured first prize, four points ahead of Steinitz. But not only this extra-brilliant success was generally admired; people also admired the victorious weapons with which Zukertort rose to this height. In this tournament, Zukertort had bestowed his most marvellous gifts to the chess world. Here, his splendid game with Blackburne was enough to prove what depth and beauty of combination Zukertort was capable of. Since that unparalleled victory, Zukertort's star was in decline. The well known defeat against Steinitz in 1886, in a great match which for a long time was in doubt but then did take place in a great extravagance of publicity, upset his reputation and undermined completely Zukertort's anyway not very sound health. The encouraging start to this last of his great chess battles justified the bold expectations; but it was deceptive, and the way this great dispute of the two stars turned out caused general disappointment. After his earlier successes, one should not mention Zukertort's further participation in great tournaments, as at Frankfurt on Main and London 1887. Zukertort's strength had been waning for a long time; the great chess master, in the last period, spoke of his play in a melancholy way with a sort of bitter irony. This short survey on the exceptional career of a highly gifted man who, in his last years, was very wrongly much maligned and criticised, will hopefully
once again demonstrate to our readers his importance. Instead of poking fun at him, as unfortunately happened many times, people should have pitied him and not just felt that he was no longer the Zukertort of 1883. A fallen great needs genteel consideration and the most loving respect.

Zukertort was also busy as a writer: thus he edited the *Neue Berliner Schachzeitung* with Anderssen from August 1867 to December 1871 (Berlin, Julius Springer). In 1868 came out in the same edition his *Collection of Selected Problems, Studies and Endgames*. In the same place he brought out his book *Brief Guide to Chess*. A further guide, as well as a *Handbook of Chess*, both works written jointly with J.Dufresne, came out in 1870, published by Von Schweigger in Berlin. All other material, for example *Zukertort's Blindfold Play* or other published books under Zukertort's name, are by his own admission absolute fakes. Zukertort did not contribute a stroke of the pen in their collaboration. His chess journalist work in England began already in 1872. However not until 1873 was he an editor of the *Westminster Papers*. He remained with this magazine until the end of 1876. During this time he was also for two years the main collaborator with the *City of London Magazine*. In September 1879 he founded his own magazine, the *Chess Monthly*. The editorship was carried out jointly with his loyal friend L.Hoffer, who did not desert him for the rest of his life. *Chess Monthly* alone had more subscribers than all other magazines combined, that were published in the English language. This says enough for the quality of its contents.

Zukertort was in his time also a popular personality in Germany. His extensive tours, on which he visited countless small chess clubs, brought him into personal contact with a great contingent of chess friends. On these tours, he acquired a well-grounded profession as an excellent blindfold and simultaneous player. Zukertort played, with the greatest ease, 8-10 games at the same time from memory. During these displays, he joked, he drank, took free and easy rest breaks in which he talked about politics, indeed about anything except chess. Also during the games he delighted the players and others present with humourous remarks. Everyone was convinced that Zukertort carried out his difficult task without great strain. He would often be extremely disparaging towards simultaneous play: 'if I were a sportsman and could ride a bicycle so as not to be tired through walking about, I would play against 200 opponents at the same time.' These are approximately his words – Zukertort was not equipped with that soundness of health that chess, above all the participation in great tournaments, absolutely demands, and therefore all the more admirable are his success and his stamina. He was afflicted by a heart defect from his youth, during the '80s he suffered from this deep-rooted weakness even more as a very severe rheumatism set in which made his pain even worse. Also his tournament results were very often influenced by his state of health. Thus he came to the Vienna tournament severely affected, lost in the beginning against weaker opponents; not until the second half of the tournament, after an intervening pause, did he play at full strength and he lost only one more game, through which he secured a special prize. Also in the London tournament 1883, though to all appearances well-disposed, he found it difficult to compete because of his...
suffering. He had to take digitalis and other strong measures. Nobody doubted that the result of his match with Steinitz was attributable, at least partly, to his weakened state of health. In New York still fresh, already in St. Louis he began to suffer from insomnia, he was ill in New Orleans with a fever, which in fact planted the germ of death in his chest and, through frequent recurrence during his last years, weakened him more and more. Whilst visiting his brother in Berlin 1887, he suffered a severe heart spasm, which he however overcame. At that time he already predicted that he would die a sudden death, which in fact did occur: on Tuesday 19 June 1888 he collapsed from a cardiac arrest during a chess game in Simpson’s Divan, the well-known meeting-place of London chess players. He was taken, unconscious, first of all to the nearby British Chess Club and from there to the Charing Cross Hospital, where he died the following morning at 10.15.

Zukertort was a bachelor. He had the great misfortune that the girl, Emma Kurz, whom he deeply loved and had chosen for his bride, became dangerously ill whilst a student of medicine, and passed away in the prime of life. Zukertort’s death is mourned by his 73 year old sick mother and his four brothers and sisters. His father died before him on 2 December 1887.

Zukertort was a charming companion, always stimulating and lively. He knew how to place himself in the centre of society without being obtrusive. He shared his rich store of experience, which he liked to make use of in conversation, was familiar with science and literature and displayed an often sarcastic humour with pertinent and keen remarks. He bubbled over with a wealth of anecdotes, which he delivered constantly with the best humour.

The question as to whether Zukertort should be counted among German or English chess players would often be raised. He called himself a German in a letter in December 1886 to this writer, when he complained of the fact that a section of the German press seemed to gloat over his defeat against Steinitz. In any event he is of German origin, enjoyed German schooling, first of all edited a German chess magazine, and was a pupil of the most famous German master.
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The 7th September, 1842, saw the birth of J.H. Zukertort, one of the greatest chess masters of the last century.

His birthplace was Lublin, which, at that time, was part of Russian Poland. He moved to Breslau in 1855, where he became a pupil at the high school. He then studied medicine at the University of that town.

As far as I know he never practised, although he is said to have taken part in the war of 1866 as a volunteer surgeon in the Prussian Army. Even if true, this would amount to very little, as we all know that this campaign lasted hardly more than a week. The fact is that his sole occupation, from 1867 in Berlin, and from 1872 onwards in London, was exclusively that of a chess master and chess author.

He died in London in 1888 from heart disease, an ailment from which he suffered already in his younger days.

Before discussing Zukertort’s chess career, I would like first to refer to a point of historical and biological interest which applies also to chess. In an article which appeared some time ago in the Contemporary Review, and which was reproduced in several English chess publications, I have discussed the interesting and pertinent question: at what age does man reach the zenith of his mental powers? In this article I have pointed out that the experience gained in the field of chess contests provides valuable data for this controversy. Chess statistics show that, although nearly all great chess masters have had remarkable achievements to their credit when still in their teens, they have developed their gifts slowly and gradually — one might even say the greater their talent, the slower their development — until, at approximately 40, they have reached the summit of their powers.

Zukertort’s chess career drastically supports this theory of mine. When I made his acquaintance in 1881, he told me: ‘It is now twenty years ago since your uncle was giving me odds of the Queen.’

My uncle, Dr. S. Mieses, who lived in Breslau, was one of the strongest masters in Germany. Through frequent encounters with him and particularly with Anderssen, young Zukertort made rapid progress and, after a few years, he reached full master-strength. He stepped into the international arena for the first time in Hamburg in 1869, when he won the third prize. He obtained the same result in London, 1872, and Leipzig, 1877, here behind L. Paulsen and Anderssen. In 1871 he won a match from Anderssen, who, be it said, was not a good match player, but he was beaten decisively by Steinitz in 1872. All this tends to show that Zukertort did not belong to those meteoric beings of which Morphy, Pillsbury, Capablanca are shining examples. Up to 1877 his development shows nothing sudden, nothing sensational. It is rather a slow and steady maturing of his powers.

At that time he ranked as a strong, but not a front rank master, and it must be counted as a remarkable and psychologically exceptional case that Zukertort, at the
age of 36, should suddenly, in the space of one year, arise as one of the world's leading matadors. His victory in Paris, where he won the first prize after a tie match with Winawer, very naturally created a sensation in the chess world. 'This is not the Zukertort of last year', remarked Anderssen on his return from Paris.

In Berlin, 1881, he came in second, behind Blackburne; in Vienna, 1882, he was equal fourth with Mackenzie. He won matches from Rosenthal (1880, by 7-1 and 11 draws), and Blackburne (1881, by 7-2 and 5 draws).

Zukertort's greatest success was achieved in the London Tournament of 1883, a brilliant and unprecedented achievement. This was a double-round fixture with fourteen participants, among which were nearly all the strongest players in the world. With three rounds only to go, Zukertort was leading with five points, ahead of Steinitz and unassailable. His opponents in the last three rounds were Mackenzie and the two weakest players in the tournament, Mortimer and Sellman. Surprisingly, Zukertort lost all three games, but he was still three points ahead at the finish. The loss of these three games was severely criticised at the time, Zukertort being accused of not giving of his best because there was no need for it. This criticism was entirely unjust, for Zukertort was a player of unbounded enthusiasm and ambition. I once mentioned the subject to him, and he said: 'After I had secured the first place in so overwhelming a manner, a physical reaction set in. I was totally unable to marshal the energy necessary to win a game.' After his enormous expenditure of nervous energy, this is psychologically quite understandable.

Apart from the actual result, Zukertort's achievement was artistically outstanding. Nearly all his games in this tournament were of the highest class, and some of them - e.g., his brilliancy against Blackburne - belong to the immortals of chess literature.

For two years after the London Tournament Zukertort stood at the height of his fame. During 1884 and 1885 he was on tour throughout the United States and Canada, and his performances in simultaneous and blindfold play deservedly roused the unbounded admiration of American chess circles. It may be mentioned here that Zukertort was undoubtedly the finest blindfold player of his time. He played sixteen games blindfold, a record which was broken only in 1902 by Pillsbury.

This brilliant period of Zukertort's life was unfortunately followed by an unexpectedly sudden and tragic collapse. As matters stood in the chess world, a match between him and Steinitz had become a matter of course. After his victory over Anderssen in 1866 and, especially, after his sensational success in tournaments and matches in the period from 1873 to 1882, Steinitz was recognised as beyond doubt the strongest player in the world. No master would have dared to pit himself against him. But now there had arisen, in everybody's opinion, a most dangerous rival. Steinitz himself shared the general belief and challenged Zukertort to a match.

This match, which was played in 1886 in the U.S.A., partly in New York, partly in St. Louis, and finally in New Orleans, is a landmark in the history of the game. For the first time the match carried with it the Championship of the World. Steinitz can claim the credit of introducing this sporting term into our game. 'Zukertort and I', he argued, 'are undoubtedly the most successful masters of our time. The
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winner in the forthcoming match can therefore rightly claim the title of 'Champion of the World.'

The match was to be for ten wins, draws not counting. It is no wonder that this contest was followed with the keenest interest throughout the chess world, and its unusual course produced at first a feverish tension and then—disappointment.

Of the first five games which were played in New York, Zukertort won four and lost one. After this unexpectedly brilliant start, he seemed almost certain to win, and it would have been a very popular victory, for it cannot be denied that the sympathy of the chess world was overwhelmingly on the side of Zukertort. The reason for this was not only Zukertort's much-admired combinative style of play; it was also a question of personal preference. Only two people, in spite of a score of 4 to 1 in Zukertort's favour, believed that Steinitz would be the ultimate winner. One was Steinitz himself; the other—Zukertort. I mean this quite seriously, for, as the American master Max Judd told me, Zukertort arrived in St. Louis for the second part of the match in a far from confident mood. When Max Judd congratulated him on his success up to date, Zukertort replied: 'You will be surprised to hear what I am about to tell you: I am going to lose this match!' It is a noteworthy fact that Zukertort never met Steinitz in an entirely unconstrained state of mind. Steinitz had a curious psychic influence on him and, be it said by the way, not in chess only.

Of the games played in St. Louis and New Orleans, Zukertort lost nine and won only one. Five games were drawn. The latter games in the match show unmistakable signs of a moral collapse on the part of Zukertort, whose poor state of health obviously was not equal to the strain and excitement of a fight which lasted several months.

Counting draws, the result of the match was 12½ to 7½, which is far from disgracing the loser, but Zukertort's ambitious temperament never could get over his disappointment. His life's aim was the World Championship, and to have been so near to realising his ambition and then to have failed was a death-blow to his morale. From that time he considered his chess career as ended. In so depressing a state of mind, and in addition physically a very sick man, Zukertort was no longer capable of high achievement in chess. It would be a biographical injustice even to mention his failures in 1887 and 1888. Zukertort died of his match against Steinitz.

In his type of play Zukertort belonged to the most brilliant combinative players of all time; he was equally outstanding as a strategist and a tactician. His style was perfectly finished, and he treated all parts of the game with complete mastery. As a chess artist he was Steinitz's equal in every respect. As a fighter Steinitz was his superior on account of his better health and his tremendous power of moral resistance.

As a writer also, Zukertort was uninterruptedly active. In addition to numerous and valuable theoretical essays he wrote several handbooks, and from 1879 to 1888 he was co-editor with L. Hofer of the Chess Monthly, which appeared in London.

Zukertort was a man of comprehensive culture and literary talent. In his social intercourse he was lively and entertaining, and, on account of his kindly and jovial disposition, he was generally liked. The number of his personal friends, especially in England, was very great.

J. Mieses
Zukertort’s Breakdown

‘In the London International Tournament of 1883, Zukertort performed the amazing and unparalleled feat of winning 22 games to one defeat, receiving the first prize from the committee no less than two weeks before the close of the tournament. The account of this magnificent struggle will still be fresh in the minds of most Chess-players. Zukertort’s play throughout was characterised not only by extreme daring, but by soundness and brilliancy, these qualities culminating in his game in the first round with Blackburne, “one of the most brilliant”, says Steinitz, “on record”. His score against Steinitz was even, each player winning one game.

So severe a contest was not as may be supposed, without its effect upon the winner. Zukertort, who from an early stage had been compelled to sustain himself by terrible doses ofaconite, almost broke down at last, and his health, never robust, began to give his friends grave anxiety.’

Indeed, as the above extract from the British Chess Magazine makes clear, Zukertort was at the peak of his powers and had achieved a tournament result which, even today, ranks as one of the greatest of all time. Thus the fact that he lost his last three games, two of which against players at the foot of the tournament table, must surely be attributed to his physical collapse. It is known that Zukertort not only partook of ‘virulent poison’ to overcome pain, but was also partial to opium.

Nevertheless, up to a point, Zukertort played just as splendidly in these last three games as in the rest of the tournament. Only lapses of mental application at critical moments spoiled what was otherwise an almost perfect performance in London.

Spanish Game
Mackenzie
Zukertort
London tournament, 13 June 1883
Notes by Zukertort

11...d7

If 11...c5, White would reply 12.c4! dxc4 13.Bxh7 cxb3 14.axb3 Wc8 (best) 15.Wxc8+ Bxc8 16.Bxa6 etc.
12. d2
If now 12.c4, then 12...bxc4 13.bxc4 c5 – 12.d3 would be, however, better, I think, than the text move.

12...h6 13.d4 f5 14.w3

A mental aberration; Black had an easily won game: 25...d1+ 26.e1 (or 26.xf1 xf2+! 27.xf2 (27.h1 xf3+ 28.e2 d5+ etc.) 27...xf3+ 28.g1 xf1+ 29.xf1 xf1+ 30.xf1 b1b+ etc.) 26...d2 27.e4 (if 27.e6, then 27...d5) 27...d4 28.g6 xf2+ 29.h1 xe4 30. xe4 (if 30.xe4, then 30...c1+) 30...xe1 31.xe1 (if 31.xxe1 xf3 32.e6 h3 and wins) 31...xe1+ 32.e1 xf3 and 33...xe3.

21...xf3

21...xf7 would probably lead to a draw by the following line of play:
22.e6 xf3 23.exd7 xc3 24.e7 (best) 24...xc2+ 25.f1 xh2 26.e8+ h7 27.e2 (if 27.xa8, Black draws at least with 27...h1+ 28.e2 xh1 29.h+ (29.d8? xe1+ 30.xd2 (or 30.xe1 b1b+) 30...d1+ 31.xd1 b1b+ 32.e2 (32.d2) xa8 33.xa8 xa2+ and wins) 29...g6 30.d8xe1+ 31.xxe1 (best) 31...b1b+ etc. – If 27.xb2, Black wins with 27...xf3 28.e1 h1+ 29.d2 d1+ and 30...xd7 27...c6 28.xa8 xd7 29.xa6 h4 30.xb2 etc. The text move leads to bishops of different colour, but it enabled me to defend the far-advanced b-pawn.

22.gxf3 d4 23.g6 h4

24.g2 add8 25.e4

25...d2?

A mental aberration; Black had an easily won game: 25...d1+ 26.e1 (or 26.xf1 xf2+! 27.xf2 (27.h1 xf3+ 28.e2 d5+ etc.) 27...xf3+ 28.g1 xf1+ 29.xf1 xf1+ 30.xf1 b1b+ etc.) 26...d2 27.e4 (if 27.e6, then 27...d5) 27...d4 28.g6 xf2+ 29.h1 xe4 30. xe4 (if 30.xe4, then 30...c1+) 30...xe1 31.xe1 (if 31.xxe1 xf3 32.e6 h3 and wins) 31...xe1+ 32.e1 xf3 and 33...xe3.

26.xh4 c1+ 27.f1 d1

Black resigns.

Sicilian Defence

Sellman

Zukertort

London tournament, 14 June 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 c5 2.d3 a6 3.d4

If 3.d3, which is considered to be the best continuation, I intended to reply
3...\(\text{Qf6}\), a move played in the late Vienna tournament by L. Paulsen.

3...\(\text{cxd4}\) 4.\(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{d6}\)

Better, I think, than 5...\(\text{e6}\), which gives to the first player the opportunity to continue with 6.\(\text{Qdb5}\) or 6.\(\text{Qxc6}\) bxc6 7.e5.

6.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{e6}\) 7.0-0 \(\text{Qe7}\) 8.\(\text{Qe3}\) 0-0

9.\(\text{We2}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 10.\(\text{Qad1}\) \(\text{Qc7}\)

Provoking the attack of the hostile knights, which, I thought, would finally result in White losing time and position.

11.\(\text{Qdb5}\) \(\text{Wb8}\) 12.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{e5}\)

13.\(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{a6}\) 14.\(\text{xg6}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\)

15.\(\text{Qxd6}\)

White has no choice: if 15.\(\text{Qa3}\), then 15...\(\text{b5}\) winning a piece.

15...\(\text{Qxd6}\)

16.\(\text{d1}\) 16.\(\text{d3}\)

Mr. Steinitz gives here in his annotations to this game the following continuation: 16.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 17.\(\text{wh6}\) \(\text{d8}\)

18.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{e7}\) 19.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 20.\(\text{f4}\) 'with a fine attack'. I think, however, that Black has a satisfactory defence, viz:

20...\(\text{Qg8}\) 21.\(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 22.\(\text{wh4}\) \(\text{Qc5}\)

23.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{fxe5}\), and although White's attack is not exhausted yet, it is certainly no equivalent for the lost piece.

16...\(\text{Qd4}\) 17.\(\text{Qd5}\)

17...\(\text{Qe6}\)?

A blunder which leads to the loss of the exchange and of the game. Black should come out with a decisive superiority of forces after 17...\(\text{Qd8}\) 18.\(\text{c3}\) (or 18.\(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 19.\(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) and 20...\(\text{exd4}\)) 18...\(\text{Qb5}\) 19.\(\text{Qxd4}\) (or 19.\(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 20.\(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) etc.) 19...\(\text{bxc4}\) 20.\(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 21.\(\text{Qh4}\) \(\text{Qg8}\)

22.\(\text{Qxf6}\) (22.\(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 23.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 24.\(\text{Qd7}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\)) 22...\(\text{Qxf6}\)

23.\(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{Qb5}\) 24.\(\text{Qxg8}\) \(\text{Qxg8}\) and Black's two bishops ought to win.

18.\(\text{Qf6}\) \(\text{Qh8}\)?

I might have still drawn with 18...\(\text{Qg7}\)

19.\(\text{Qg3}\) (if 19.\(\text{Qxe6}\), then 19...\(\text{Qxf6}\) 20.\(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 21.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) with a winning superiority of material) 19...\(\text{Qxf6}\) 20.\(\text{Wh4}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 21.\(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qh8}\)

22.\(\text{Qf6}\) etc.

19.\(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{fxe6}\) 20.\(\text{Qd7}\) \(\text{Qc7}\)

21.\(\text{Qxf8}\) \(\text{Qxf8}\)

Of course, if 21...\(\text{Qxf8}\), then 22.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{Qb5}\)

23.\(\text{a4}\), winning a piece.

22.\(\text{c3}\)

22...\(\text{Qb5}\)

This and Black's next move were played to avoid the exchange of queens, which must have proved ruinous to Black, whose scattered pawns would be then indefensible. But by letting White's queen undisturbed in my ranks, I gave Mr. Sellman an opportunity to display his powers of combination, of which he availed himself with rare vigour and brilliancy of the highest order.
23.\textit{W}d7 \textit{W}b6 24.\textit{A}d3 \textit{A}g7
25.\textit{A}g3 \textit{A}g8 26.\textit{A}d1 \textit{A}a7 27.\textit{W}f7
\textit{A}c6
If 27...\textit{W}xb2, White mates in three
moves, beginning with 28.\textit{W}xg7+ -
27...h6 would be equally ineffective as
the text move, for White wins then
with 28.h3 and 29.\textit{A}d7.
28.\textit{A}xg7! \textit{A}xg7 29.\textit{W}f8+ \textit{A}g8
30.\textit{W}f6+ \textit{A}g7 31.\textit{A}d7
Black resigns.

Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Mortimer
London tournament, 15 June 1883

Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{A}f3 \textit{A}c6 3.\textit{A}c4 \textit{A}c5
4.b4 \textit{A}xb4 5.c3 \textit{A}a5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 dxc3 8.\textit{W}b3 \textit{W}f6 9.e5 \textit{W}g6
10.\textit{A}xc3 \textit{A}ge 7 11.\textit{A}a3 \textit{A}b8
The \textit{Handbuch} gives it as Anderssen’s
defence: I would rather call it one of the
many experiments of the late Master – I
do not consider it satisfactory: the vari­
ation 11.\textit{A}a3 represents, in my opin­
on, the most lasting form of attack in the
‘Compromised’, and its defence
stands and falls with 11...0-0.

12.\textit{A}xd5
Black had to guard against the loss of
the king’s bishop, threatened after the
exchange of the two pieces with \textit{W}a3+.
Besides the text move he has the contin­
uation: 12.b5 13.\textit{A}xe7 \textit{A}xe7
(13...bxc4 14.\textit{A}xg6 etc., loses at least
the exchange) 14.\textit{A}xe7 \textit{A}xe7
15.\textit{W}a3+ \textit{A}e8 (15...\textit{W}d8 16.\textit{A}d3
\textit{W}b6 17.\textit{A}g5 etc.) 16.\textit{W}xa5 bxc4
17.\textit{W}xc7 \textit{W}b6 18.\textit{W}d6 (my own con­
tinuation; after 18.\textit{W}xc4 \textit{A}a6,
White cannot get any equivalent for the
lost exchange) 18...\textit{W}xd6 19.exd6 \textit{A}a6
20.\textit{A}f6+ \textit{A}f8 (if 20...\textit{W}d8, then
21.\textit{A}g5) 21.\textit{A}e7, with a fine attack.

13.\textit{A}xd5

If 13...b5, White gets a winning attack
– originally played by JDufresne of
Berlin – with 14.e6! fxe6 15.\textit{A}xc6
dxc6 16.\textit{A}e5 \textit{W}e4 17.\textit{W}g3 g6 (if
17...\textit{W}g8, then 18.\textit{W}g5 b4 19.\textit{A}ad1
\textit{W}a moves 20.\textit{A}d7) 18.\textit{W}g5 b4
19.\textit{W}f6 (if 19.\textit{A}ad1, Black escapes by
19...0-0) 19...\textit{W}f8 20.\textit{W}g7 bxa3
21.\textit{A}ad1! (threatening mate in two
moves) 21...\textit{A}h4 22.\textit{A}xc6, and White
comes out at least with the exchange
ahead.
14.\textit{A}ad1 b5 15.\textit{A}d4 b4 16.\textit{A}h4
\textit{W}b6 17.\textit{A}b2 \textit{A}e6 18.\textit{A}f5! \textit{g}6
If 18...\( \text{Qxd4} \), White gets an overwhelming attack with 19.\( \text{Qxf7} \) and 20.\( \text{Qxd4} \).

19.\( \text{Qxe6} \) fxe6
If 19...dx e6, then 20.\( \text{Qg7} \)+ \( \text{Qf8} \) (best) 21.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) (21...\( \text{a6} \) 22.\( \text{Qd7} \) 22.\( \text{Qf6} \) (threatening 23.\( \text{Qxe6} \)) 22...\( \text{Qg8} \) 23.\( \text{Qfd1} \).

20.\( \text{Qg7} \)+ \( \text{Qd8} \)
If 20...\( \text{Qf7} \) or \( \text{f8} \), White forces the game with 21.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) (21...\( \text{xg7} \) 22.\( \text{f6} \)+ \( \text{Qg8} \) 23.\( \text{f4} \) 22.\( \text{Qf6} \), followed by 23.\( \text{Qe8} \) or 23.\( \text{f4} \) accordingly— if 20...\( \text{Qe7} \), then 21.\( \text{Qg3} \).

21.\( \text{Qxe6} \)+ \( \text{Qe7} \) 22.\( \text{f4} \)
Going in for brilliancy and neglecting the simple win with 22.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 23.\( \text{Qxh7} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 24.\( \text{Qh3} \) etc., or 24.\( \text{Qg5} \) and 25.\( \text{Qh4} \).

22...\( \text{Qb7} \) 23.\( \text{Qxd7} \)+
The sacrifice of the rook is not absolutely unsound—cf. note to White's 26th move—but I had a forced win with 23.\( \text{Qfd1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 24.\( \text{Qh3} \).

23...\( \text{Qxd7} \) 24.\( \text{Qf7} \)+ \( \text{Qc8} \) 25.\( \text{e6} \) \( \text{Qa6} \)
Mr. Mortimer conducts the game from this point in unexceptionable style. The text move provides Black with fair prospects to save the day.

26.\( \text{Qc1} \)?
Weak: I could still come out with the exchange by continuing with: 26.\( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 27.\( \text{Qxh8} \) \( \text{Qxh8} \) 28.e7 \( \text{Qb5} \) (if 28...\( \text{b5} \), then 29.\( \text{Qf8} \) 29.\( \text{h3} \)

\( \text{Qe8} \) 30.\( \text{Qf6} \) c6 31.\( \text{Qe6} \) and 32.\( \text{Qd8} \)

26...\( \text{Qd8} \) 27.e7 \( \text{b7} \) 28.exd8\( \text{Q} \)

29.\( \text{Qe6} \)?
I overlooked Black's crushing reply: the game would be about even after: 29.\( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 30.\( \text{Qe3} \) etc.

29...\( \text{Qd5} \)
Absolutely decisive, for, of course, with three pawns against one on the queen's side and the attack, Black must win.

30.\( \text{Qf6} \)
There were better moves, but none could save the game against best play. I:

30...\( \text{Qxc7} \), Black wins at once with:

30...\( \text{Qf5} \)

30...\( \text{Qc6} \) 31.\( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 32.\( \text{Qe7} \)
\( \text{Qd6} \) 33.\( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 34.\( \text{Qc5} \)+
\( \text{Qc6} \) 35.\( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 36.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b6} \)+
37.\( \text{Qh1} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 38.\( \text{Qc1} \)+ \( \text{Qb5} \)
39.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 40.\( \text{fxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \)
41.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 42.\( \text{Qd8} \) c5

White resigns.

'After the tournament, the doctors were unanimous in insisting upon the necessity of a thorough rest, and could Zukertort have been induced to take this, there is reason to believe he might have recovered. Rest however, he did not, and much against general advice, started almost immediately for a playing tour through the United States and Canada. This was so successful that he followed it in 1885 by a similar journey on the continent, visiting in the interim and afterwards, some of the more important English provincial chess centres.' (British Chess Magazine)
Zukertort and Steinitz

In 1871-1872 Steinitz was achieving considerable success in London. In the autumn of 1871 he took first prize in a handicap tournament, by winning all 12 games! Admittedly, handicap tournaments have nothing to do with serious competitions, but in the following year 1872, at the international tournament in London, he took first prize in a far stronger line-up, again winning every game! Second place was taken by J. Blackburne, and third by J. Zukertort, after tie-break games with MacDonnell and De Vere.

Johannes Hermann Zukertort. This name was then heard for the first time outside Germany. A year before the London tournament, Zukertort had defeated his teacher, Anderssen, with the score +5 -2.

Immediately after the London international tournament, Zukertort, together with Steinitz, took part in a rather insignificant handicap tournament. At this time, each defeat of Steinitz was considered a sensation. And here, after starting with two draws, he suffered a defeat to Zukertort. This defeat against a younger opponent, who not long before had crushed Anderssen, was a challenge to Steinitz and he felt obliged to match his strength with him.

The match took place in London in August-September 1872. It ended, as expected, in a rout for Zukertort: +7 -1 =4.

Steinitz conducted the battle against Anderssen's pupil, as he did against Anderssen himself, with weapons of the combinational school. The opening repertoire of the match consisted of the King's Gambit, Evans Gambit and Italian Game. Nevertheless, Steinitz did employ closed openings on two occasions.

King's Gambit
Steinitz
Zukertort

6th Match Game, London 1872
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3..f3 g5
4..c4 g4 5.\f3 h4+ 6..f1
\h6 7.d4

This variation was met in the 1866 match between Steinitz and Anderssen. And not just once. There Black four times repeated one and the same mistake—he played 7...d6.

7...f3!
The strongest continuation.

8..c3

The prospect of repeating Silberschmidt's analysis did not appeal to Steinitz. In refraining from the move 8.g3 (8..h3+ 9..f2 \xg2+ 10..e3 f5!), he allows his partner to expose his king. The reader is given the chance to compare this match with the contest between the same rivals in 1886. The change which Steinitz's style went through is immediately striking. But in this match the future champion appears as a representative of the combinational style... Incidentally, it is not so simple to attack the king. For example, an immediate 8..fxg2+ 9..xg2 \h3+ 10..g1 does not promise anything good. On 10...g3 follows 11..f1! gxh2+ 12..xh2 with an obvious advantage for White.
8...d6 9.\textcircled{d}d3 \textcircled{g}g7
But here 9...fxg2+ was now better, if only, on 10.\textcircled{w}xg2, to reply 10...\textcircled{g}g7. After, for example, 11.\textcircled{f}f4 \textcircled{c}c6 12.\textcircled{e}e3 0-0 13.\textcircled{w}d2 \textcircled{h}h8, Black has a good game.
Not long before the match, Zukertort gave a detailed analysis of the Salvio Gambit in the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung, the magazine which he edited. In this position, the German master examined two continuations - 10.\textcircled{e}e3 and 10.\textcircled{f}f4. But there is also a third...

10.g3
The white knight, now already on d3, plays an important role. White's chances lie in the exploitation of his superiority in the centre. In this position, his king is comparatively safe.

10...\textcircled{w}d8
Not 10...\textcircled{h}h3+? 11.\textcircled{e}e1, and both 11...\textcircled{x}xd4 12.\textcircled{f}f4! f2+ 13.\textcircled{d}d2 and 11...\textcircled{g}g2 12.\textcircled{f}f2 followed by \textcircled{f}f1 are more than unpleasant for Black.

11.\textcircled{f}f4 0-0

12.h3
Steinitz wants to loosen the far advanced enemy pawns, thereby opening the h-file. But this natural plan allows Zukertort an original means of obtaining counterplay. Another possibility was 12.\textcircled{h}h5 with the threat to win a piece by 13.\textcircled{w}d2. There might follow 12...\textcircled{h}h8 13.\textcircled{e}e3 \textcircled{c}c6 14.\textcircled{w}d2 \textcircled{g}g5; White's position looks threatening, but Black has counterplay with ...f5.

12...\textcircled{c}c6 13.\textcircled{h}h5
White defends the d4-pawn indirectly.

13...gxh3 14.\textcircled{d}d5 \textcircled{g}g4 15.c3 \textcircled{e}e7 16.\textcircled{d}f4
On 16.\textcircled{w}xf3, Zukertort would have probably continued 16...\textcircled{e}xd5 17.\textcircled{x}xd5 c6 and then 18...h2. Steinitz decides to first 'deal with' the h-pawn and open a file.

16.\textcircled{g}g6 17.\textcircled{e}h3 \textcircled{c}e6 18.\textcircled{x}e6
Steinitz considered this obligatory exchange (otherwise Black plays ...f5), with the following knight thrust favourable for himself.

18...fxe6 19.\textcircled{g}g5 \textcircled{h}h6!

A witty idea! On 20.\textcircled{e}xe6 Zukertort intended 20...\textcircled{x}c1! If now 21.\textcircled{x}xd8, then 21...\textcircled{e}e3+. On 21.\textcircled{w}xc1 follows 21...\textcircled{e}e7! 22.\textcircled{f}xf8 \textcircled{x}e4 23.\textcircled{w}d2 f2 24.\textcircled{h}h3 \textcircled{x}f8 and Black wins.

20.\textcircled{b}b3! \textcircled{x}xg5 21.\textcircled{x}xe6+ \textcircled{f}f7 22.\textcircled{w}xg4 \textcircled{x}xc1 23.\textcircled{x}xc1 \textcircled{w}e8 24.c4
A check on b5 was threatened.

24...d5?
Of course, the pawn cannot be taken, but now Steinitz obtains a passed pawn in the centre and, most importantly, the f6 square.
Black had a choice between two continuations – the sharp 24...b5 and perhaps the positionally more well-grounded 24...\textcolor{red}{\textit{c}7}, allowing the connection of the rooks and, possibly, the maintenance of the f3-pawn.

25.e5! dxc4 26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e}xc4 \textit{b}5} 27.b3 \textit{wa6} 28.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c}f6+}

The consequence of the 24th move – Black has to give up the exchange.

28...\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf6}} 29.\textit{exf6} \textit{xf6} 30.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc7}}

White’s position is winning, though it requires him to be accurate – his king is exposed.

31.\textit{wd7} \textit{wa6+} 32.\textit{wc4} \textit{we7} 33.\textit{wd5+} \textit{wg7} 34.\textit{wh2} b5 35.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc6 \textit{wb7}}}

Despite the convincing result of the match, Steinitz knew very well that he would have to deal with this swashbuckling fellow again in the future. The talent of Zukertort was obvious: the new rising star was distinguished by sharp tactical sight and unusual ease in the calculation of complicated variations. The match with Steinitz awakened in Zukertort the desire to become a professional master. He gave up the practice of medicine and stayed in London...

As correspondent for The Field, Steinitz visited several important international contests: in 1878 – the Paris tournament, in 1880 – the congress in Wiesbaden, and in 1881 – the congress of the German Chess Federation in Berlin. The most interesting games of these competitions appeared shortly afterwards in The Field. Steinitz subjected these to a thorough anatomy. He set out to prove that the play of the winners (the main criticism was directed against Blackburne and Zukertort, the winners of the Berlin tournament), based on the romantic traditions of the combinational school, was principally incorrect.

Steinitz’s commentaries were subsequently valued highly by Lasker. But what about his contemporaries? How did they take to Steinitz’s precepts? The wide circle of his chess readers benefited from his analyses. Continuous elucidations of games, pointing out turning points in the struggle, helped them to understand what was going on at the chessboard, or what could happen.

As regards the theoretical reasoning of Steinitz, this was obscure, and not only to the ordinary reader. There was either agreement or dispute with Steinitz’s variations. General opinion considered him to be an eccentric, but talented, great master. Those who were capable of evaluating his ideas – his immediate rivals – did not receive any pleasure from his lessons, which were expressed, moreover, in a sharp, categorical form. That move you made, sir, – said Steinitz – is a mistake. Your
victory is no more than the result of the terrible, anti-positional play of your opponent. But it is necessary to play so and so, for such and such an indication of the position requires namely this and not that action. Accustomed to an enthusiastic response, winners of high prizes were shocked. It is easy to see how their regard towards Steinitz became at best reserved.

In 1881 took place a match between Zukertort and Blackburne, which was won by Zukertort with the score +7 -2 =5. Steinitz’s commentaries to the games gave rise to sharp polemics between him and the editors of Chess Monthly, Zukertort and Hoffer — a second-rate master but a distinguished chess worker and journalist. At first the dispute bore a principal character, but then it ‘became personal’. In plain language, Steinitz declared to his opponents that they really did not understand chess very well and he was ready to prove this to them in a match. Steinitz offered to play against Zukertort and Hoffer in consultation, with a time-control of 15 moves per hour, to eleven wins, at a stake of 100 to 250 pounds sterling. And he added that he could give the consultants odds of two points or... receive such odds from them!

Zukertort took such a proposal as an insult and replied that he was ready to play Steinitz under any reasonable conditions, but first Steinitz had to apologise to him. Zukertort rightly pointed out that the identical time-control placed the consultants in a disadvantageous position — clearly, consultation required an additional expenditure of time. Zukertort’s reasons convinced Steinitz. He admitted that he had been hasty and agreed to play under conditions set by Zukertort. However, further negotiations then led to nothing.

All these polemics, of course, bore no relevance to the matter in hand. Steinitz simply annoyed his colleagues. In the theoretical arguments which he started, he turned out to be one against the rest, and there was nothing left for him but to prove the correctness of his ideas in practice over the chessboard.

From the time of his match with Blackburne in 1876, Steinitz did not take part in competitions. Exhibition tours, as is well known, do not maintain sporting form. Meanwhile his chess practice over the six year period 1876-1882 amounted only to casual games; in fact exhibitions of simultaneous play — actual and blindfold. Steinitz did not like to play blindfold, but he was a professional and the public liked such performances. At times, prestige had to be taken into account — brilliant blindfold play by all great masters has astonished the world.

While Steinitz was instructing ordinary amateurs and lecturing masters, four important tournaments were held: in Paris (1878), Leipzig (1879), Wiesbaden (1880) and Berlin (1881), and also several interesting matches. The greatest successes were achieved by Zukertort, Blackburne, Winawer and the Austrian master Englisch. Zukertort gained first prize in Paris. Second was Winawer, who lost a play-off match with him, while Blackburne came third. In Wiesbaden, Blackburne shared 1st-3rd prizes with Englisch and Schwarz (Zukertort did not play). In Berlin, Blackburne brilliantly won first prize. By scoring 14 points out of 16, he outstripped the second prize-winner Zukertort by three points! 3rd-4th prizes fell to Winawer and Chigorin, who were playing abroad for the first time.
In Leipzig, first was Englisch and second L.Paulsen (Zukertort and Blackburne did not take part in the tournament).

Out of the most important matches should first of all be mentioned the previously referred to victory of Zukertort over Blackburne. A year earlier, in 1880, Zukertort had demolished Rosenthal (+7 -1 =11). Blackburne had won two matches – in 1879 against Bird (+5 -2 =1) and in 1881 – against Gunsberg, a future rival of Steinitz in the struggle for the world championship (+7 -4 =3). In 1879 Blackburne lost a short match to the rapidly advancing American master, J.Mason (+1 -2).

And so, on the eve of the great tournament at Vienna (1882) in which Steinitz decided to take part, his main rival was considered to be Zukertort. Relations between Steinitz and Zukertort were tense, neither could forget the unpleasant polemics. Vienna was a 'neutral' city where they had the chance to continue their dispute over the chessboard.

The tournament was held to mark the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Vienna Chess Club. It was not only great in the class of the participants, but also in their number: 18 masters played two games against each other. For the first time in the history of chess, encounters with one and the same opponent were played not in order, as previously, but by circuits, that is two tournaments taking place after the other, and this time amongst the principal organisers was to be found Kolisch – a wealthy patron and an outstanding master.

The story goes that, before the start of the competition, Steinitz was asked who, in his opinion, had the best chances of first prize. 'Undoubtedly myself' replied Steinitz, 'You see, I have easier opponents than my rivals' – 'But why is that?' – 'They have to play against Steinitz, but I do not...'

The tournament began in May 1882. The favourites, apart from Steinitz and Zukertort, were considered to be Blackburne, Winawer, Englisch and L.Paulsen. Also Bird and Chigorin were playing. After his success in Berlin, the performance of the Russian master was awaited with great interest. The New World was represented by the American champion, George Henry Mackenzie, James Mason and the less strong player Preston Ware. Besides these, Wittek, Schwarz, Fleissig, Noa and Meitner took part. The time control was 15 moves per hour.

Steinitz began the contest with two victories, including one over Blackburne, but then scored only ½ point out of 4, leaving him with 2½ out of 6. More unpleasantly, he lost to his main rival – Zukertort. Nevertheless, after 9 rounds, Steinitz emerged with 50 per cent. A break in his play had had its effect: he was made to pay for his 'training'.

But with his 'training' over, Steinitz found his old form and finished the tournament with the overall result of 24 out of 34. Only Winawer managed to score as many points.

The American masters performed excellently. Mason obtained third prize – 23 points, while 4th-5th was shared by Mackenzie and Zukertort – 22½ each. 6th (last) prize fell to Blackburne – 21½. 7th place was occupied by English – 19¼. 8th, L.Paulsen – 18½. This time Chigorin played badly – he shared 12th-13th place with the Austrian master Schwarz.
Johannes Zukertort

Steinitz could be satisfied – he came above his main rival. Zukertort could console himself with the fact that he had taken 1½ points out of 2 from Steinitz. In fact, however, Zukertort did not play as was expected of him, nor as he expected of himself: he took only ½ point out of 2 from each of Winawer, Blackburne and Engliston, while against Weiss he lost both games. Despite the comparatively small differences in their scores (Steinitz = 24; Zukertort 22½), Steinitz conducted the contest far more evenly.

There remained only to decide the fate of first prize. The tie was broken, as was customary, by two games. The first, Steinitz played in the style of Anderssen, but fate proved unkind. The second game Steinitz played already in the style of Steinitz. He gained victory in a delicate bishop ending and, by equalising the score, shared the 1st-2nd prize with Winawer.

A correspondent present at the Vienna tournament noted that the outward appearance of Steinitz was in total contrast to Zukertort. The German master had a clear-cut, intellectual face. On the other hand, Steinitz’s face was rugged. He seemed more a man of the business world than of intellectual work. A massive, stocky figure, determined bearing, large round face, flat nose, uncombed hair, dishevelled beard – this is how the great master looked in 1882.

The London tournament of 1883 was the fourth official international contest in England. It was held in the aristocratic St. George’s Chess Club [actually the ‘Criterion’ restaurant in Piccadilly Circus – ed.]. Parallel with the main event was played the lower class Vizayanagaram tournament (the young German master Kurt von Bardeleben gained victory in it). 4th place was taken by Steinitz’s future opponent in a world championship match, Isidor Gunsberg), named so in honour of a certain Indian maharajah, a patron and chess enthusiast, who had donated quite a large sum of money.

14 masters took part in the main event: Steinitz, Zukertort, Blackburne, Mason, Mackenzie, Chigorin, Bird, Sellman, Noa and also the lesser known James Mortimer and Arthur Skipworth. The tournament began at the end of April 1883 and lasted two months. Play was in two circuits, with the usual control for this time of 15 moves per hour. For the first time, modern double clocks were used.

In the table of results there were hardly any draws. Aggression by the rivals was ensured by the rules: games ending with a drawn result were replayed. If this did not help, and they were also concluded peacefully, the partners had another encounter in prospect. 'The right to draw' was given by three draws in a row!

The struggle between Steinitz and Zukertort was a duel between a thinker and an artist.

The first circuit was prolonged until the end of May, because of the great number of draws which had to be replayed and also because of banquets, other festivities and picnics. After the first circuit, Zukertort, scoring 12 points, was at the head of the tournament table, 2½ points above his nearest rival Mason. In the second circuit, beginning on 28 May, Zukertort increased his lead and only after losing three games (including two against the weakest participants of the tournament) in the final rounds, when first prize was already secured for him, did he give his rivals...
Zukertort and Steinitz

In the chance to draw a little closer to him. When Zukertort played his second game against Steinitz on 7 June, the influx of the public was quite extraordinary. Good seats were taken literally by force, and the spectators, with unparalleled staying-power, did not leave them until the end of the game. But there was even greater interest in the tournament on 11 June, when Zukertort was due to play a game against Blackburne, the win of which would guarantee him first prize. When, at the last move, Blackburne, after laying down his king in a sign of surrender, got up, solemnly shook hands with Zukertort and congratulated him on his victory in the tournament, the spectators broke their hitherto strained silence and loudly applauded the brilliant winner.

Zukertort finished the tournament with 22 points out of 26 (he replayed 7 draws). Steinitz obtained second prize – 19 points (he also had 7 draws). Third fell to Blackburne – 16½ points (and 13 replayed draws!), 4th Chigorin – 16 points, 5th-7th prizes were shared by English, Mackenzie and Mason – 15½ points each. Rosenthal, occupying 8th place, received a special prize for the most beautiful game of the tournament against Steinitz. He also set an original record by replaying 7 draws!

The result of the tournament was a heavy blow for Steinitz: his main rival had stripped him by 3 points! Their personal encounters, admittedly, finished with a score of 1:1, but the fact remained that Zukertort had conducted the contest obviously better. Who else could score 10 wins in a row, which he did in the second circuit – including one against Steinitz! Moreover Steinitz suffered four defeats, against such romantics as Chigorin and Rosenthal.

In London, Steinitz played many good games, but... Zukertort scored 3 points more. The result of the contest clearly convinced Steinitz that there was only one way to restore his dented reputation – a duel with Zukertort. And immediately after the tournament, Steinitz challenged him to a match. Zukertort wanted to play without fail in London, Steinitz anywhere, but not in London. It is not surprising that the negotiations were protracted. The historical match eventually took place in another country and only after three more years.

Negotiations on the Steinitz-Zukertort match dragged on for three years. 'The greatest match of our time', in the words of one of the leaders of the British Chess Association, Minchin, required if not the greatest, then certainly the longest negotiations – thus wrote Chigorin in Shakhmatny Vestnik in 1885. The mediating sides, Minchin and Frere, exchanged wordy letters in the pages of Chess Monthly – the organ of Zukertort, and International Chess Magazine – the organ of Steinitz. At first, Zukertort insisted on playing in London, where he had already lived for 13 years and gained many friends and admirers, but later he gave way. It is interesting that discussions about the conditions of the match were conducted openly in the press and the chess public was fully informed about all the details. The dialogue between the two sides was at times interrupted, then resumed. Sometimes the discussions involved quite insignificant matters. At the beginning of 1885, Chess Monthly gave notice that Zukertort had agreed to Steinitz's proposal to play to ten wins. The final regulations had still to be settled and this also required time.
Finally the conditions of the match were decided.

The venues for the contest were three cities of the United States: New York, St. Louis and New Orleans. At the first stage, in New York, play was to go on until one of the opponents had scored four wins. After a break, the match would pass on to St. Louis. The second stage would continue until one of the rivals had won three games. Then, after a pause, would follow the final battle in New Orleans, where the struggle would go on to the victorious (or drawn) end.

As already mentioned, the match was to be played to 10 wins, draws not counting. Upon a score of 9:9, the match was to be declared drawn. This condition, repeated later in subsequent duels for the world championship, is explained by an unwillingness of the rivals to stake the result of such a crucial match on one decisive game.

The rate of play - 3 games per week. Time control - 2 hours for 30 moves, and then one hour per 15 moves.

The stake - 2,000 dollars from each side. In this way, the winner would receive 1,000 dollars, the other half went to the sponsor. In addition to this, the Chess Clubs of New York, St. Louis and New Orleans bore Zukertort's travelling expenses to America. The expenses were estimated in accordance with the result of the match - 500 dollars upon the win of the match, and 750 dollars on losing. The 'consolatory increase' called for was compensation for bitter defeat and loss of stake.

In the course of the match, several of these conditions were changed. Thus, in St. Louis, the rivals decided that upon the score 9:9 they would continue the contest to another eight wins. However then there would be increased playing-time and the beginning of the session would be moved back an hour.

While Steinitz was touring America and busy with his magazine, competitions were going on in Europe. The most important of these were the congresses of the German Chess Federation.

The 3rd Congress in Nurnberg (1883) brought victory to Winawer. Second was Blackburne, third - Mason. The next, 4th congress took place in Hamburg in 1885. Here, first was Gunsberg - whom we recall in connection with the result of the subsidiary tournament in London (1883). A group of masters shared 2nd-6th places: the familiar to us Blackburne, Mason, English, Weiss, and also Siegbert Tarrasch - in the future one of the strongest chess players in the world, a rival of Chigorin and Lasker.

A less representative tournament took place in Hereford (England) in 1885. The omnipresent Blackburne took the first prize.

Zukertort did not take part in these competitions. Following Steinitz's example, he took a trip to America in 1884. Zukertort won several matches there, including a couple against the partners of Steinitz - Sellman and Martinez, admittedly with rather worse results than Steinitz.

The long-awaited match between Steinitz and Zukertort was regarded by the chess world as an event the like of which had not been seen since the duel between Morphy and Anderssen.
Contests between 'masters among masters' have gone on for a long time. The first chess players of the world, its 'uncrowned champions', are considered to be Philidor, Labourdonnais, Staunton, the winner of the first international tournament — Anderssen, and Morphy. Some people are inclined to extend this notion also to more distant times, naming the Spanish champion Lopez (16th century) and the Italians Leonardo and Greco (17th century). However the official title of world champion did not exist before the Steinitz-Zukertort match. Their match was the first in the history of chess competition, in which the winner was to be honoured with the title of 'Champion of the World'.

The reader is already familiar with the main achievements of Zukertort. Johannes Hermann Zukertort was born in Lublin in 1842. His father was a German missionary, his mother came from a Polish aristocratic family. Zukertort became acquainted with chess at 13 years of age in Breslau. Here he met his future teacher and then rival, Anderssen. After receiving a medical education, Zukertort moved to Berlin. In 1870 he took part in the Franco-Prussian war as a doctor. The London tournament 1872 marked the beginning of the professional chess career of Zukertort, who from this time settled in England. Steinitz became a chess professional without finishing high school. Zukertort gave up the practice of medicine for the sake of chess.

Zukertort's contributions to chess literature were considerable. In Berlin 1867-71 he was joint editor with Anderssen of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung. After moving to England, Zukertort co-founded the magazine Chess Monthly in 1879. The world-famous Great Chess Handbook by Zukertort and the German master Dufresne, went through three Russian editions — in 1872, 1884 and 1896.

Zukertort was an excellent blindfold chess player. In this art he had no equal. Before him, nobody had conducted more than twelve games in this way. In 1876, Zukertort gave an exhibition on 16 boards (+12 −1 =3).

Zukertort was an exceptionally gifted man. His unusual memory contained hundreds of games of the old masters — from the first move to the last. He had knowledge of twelve languages, including Russian, Greek, Latin, Sanskrit. Hebrew and Arabic.

The sharp polemics mentioned previously, the competing standpoints of Steinitz and Zukertort both in England and the world chess arena, the dispute about the conditions of the match, still did not undermine their relations. After the London tournament 1883, the result of which Steinitz took to heart, he had the courage to estimate at true worth the mastery of his rival. Annotating the game, Zukertort-Blackburne, played in this contest, Steinitz wrote: 'In conjunction with White's previous play, this forms one of the most noble combinations, perhaps even the most beautiful of any that has been created on the chessboard. No words are sufficient to express our admiration for the mastery with which Zukertort has conducted this game.'

The combination made by Zukertort was indeed a masterpiece; nevertheless, it was necessary for Steinitz to give his due. Nowadays, it is not customary to spoil a rival with an enthusiastic appreciation.

However an overall result is determined not by an individual brilliant combination, remarkable though it was. According to L. Bachmann — his future biographer —
Steinitz wrote: 'With genuine strength is assumed also a strength of character, and in this respect I therefore have doubts about the genius of Zukertort.'

And so, on 11 January, the long-awaited match between Steinitz and Zukertort began in New York. Unusually for a chess contest, it was preceded by wide, American-style publicity. Nowadays this would perhaps not surprise anybody, but then was the first time it happened in the area of chess. Besides the match conditions, the programme included brief information about the history of chess, biographies of the contestants and even recollections of Morphy.

Before the match, Steinitz wrote in the International Chess Magazine - 'Of course, I hope to demonstrate the best I am capable of. Since my change of residence, my health has considerably improved. I want - he added - by making such a declaration, to burn my bridges, which I might have need of in order to explain defeat.'

But now we go over to the hall of Cartier's Academy on Fifth Avenue in New York. A specially erected stage was set aside for the contestants and seconds. On the wall hung a demonstration board with movable pieces, just as in modern times.

At two o'clock such a crowd of spectators gathered in the hall, that there were not enough places for everybody. Not only were more or less all the well-known New York players here, but also a great number of visitors, several coming specially from a long way away to be present at the match. Here were the presidents of the chess clubs of Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco and other towns. There were also quite a few ladies.

Steinitz and Zukertort, accompanied by their seconds, presented themselves at two o'clock precisely. The seconds set up the chess pieces on the historical table on which Morphy had gained so many victories, and cast lots for who was to start. The first move fell to the lot of Zukertort. The opponents sat down at the table. A deadly silence ensued and Zukertort advanced the queen's pawn. The game lasted until six in the evening. There followed a two-hour dinner break, after which the game continued for another hour and a quarter. Captain Mackenzie repeated the moves on the demonstration board (which was quite a big 'democratic detail': the moves were demonstrated not by an ordinary amateur, but by a famous master, a prize-winner of an international tournament, winner of a match for the title of champion of the USA). The moves themselves were immediately transmitted by telegraph, not only to various American clubs, but even to London.

The match attracted enormous attention. Newspapers published not only the games. Here is how one of the New York papers described the contestants of the match.

Steinitz: 'With a half-bald head, great cinnamon-brown side whiskers looking like a mane, and lively, piercing eyes.'

Zukertort: 'Lean, with a short beard, setting off his face in a frame. While he is thinking about the position, his eyes are fiery... Suddenly he makes a move like a flash of lightning.'

'Steinitz looks more calm, not saying much... From time to time, while the opponent is thinking, he walks up and down with a blank look, insensitive to all that is going on around.'
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Zukertort is more active, he fidgets in his armchair, rubs his hands, readily talks to people nearby... Zukertort plays quickly, Steinitz more slowly, more surely.'

The first game ended in an impressive victory for Steinitz. In reply to his opponent's advance on the queen's flank, he carried out a counter-blow in the centre and achieved a space advantage. Then, by regrouping his forces, Steinitz created threats on the king's flank. A knight sacrifice demolished the Pawn cover of Zukertort's king and his position became hopeless. In an interview after the game, Zukertort acknowledged that his defeat was due to his opponent's excellent play.

Steinitz played the second game with the white pieces. In the so-called Scotch Four Knights Opening, he acted indecisively and Zukertort succeeded in seizing the initiative. Shortly afterwards, Zukertort went over to an attack on the king's flank. Admittedly, on the 23rd move he made a serious mistake, but Steinitz did not exploit it and, by increasing the pressure, Zukertort led the game to victory. The score stood at 1:1.

Looking at the games, one is convinced that it was not only Steinitz who conducted the struggle in a manner unusual for a representative of the combinative school. Zukertort did not go headlong into the dashing attacks which were expected of him. With white, he chose solid, closed openings, and endeavoured to advance not on the king's, but on the queen's flank. In the second encounter, Zukertort strived to cramp his opponent and conduct the struggle with an exploitation of the two bishops and an advantage in space.

Steinitz had finally broken with the 'old school'. The match with Zukertort was for him not only a duel for the title of champion of the world, but also a creative laboratory in which he could carry out experiments which he had conceived long before.

There is no better illustration of Steinitz's methodical play, fully in accordance with his teachings, than the third game of the match (New York, 15 January 1886), which was won...by Zukertort!

Steinitz (Black) played here 12...f6b8, intending to open the b-file, on which Zukertort replied 13.0-0. In the event of 13.\[d1, Black would continue 13...b5! 14.c3 e5 with the initiative.

13...b6 14.cxb6 \[xb6 15.\[xb6 \[xb6 16.\[c3 \[b7 17.\[a2

It would be better to defend the b2-pawn by 17.\[c1.

17...\[d7 18.\[d1 c5

The possibility of winning a pawn by 18...\[b1 19.\[a1 \[xb2 has presented itself. Steinitz did not like Black's position after 20.\[a4 \[b8 21.\[c1 \[a6. Therefore, without being distracted from his intended plan, he decides to
continue operations on the queen's flank. In Chigorin's opinion, the manoeuvre ... \( \text{b}1-a2-c4 \) allows Black to free his knight and rook from the defence of the c6-pawn, and thus the b2-pawn was worth taking.

All the same, one would think that Steinitz was right: it is not easy to unravel the tangle of black pieces. Thus, after 22.\( \text{d}1 \), 22...\( \text{a}2 \) is not possible in view of 23.\( \text{c}1 \).

19.\( \text{a}4 \)

On 19.b3, which would prevent the advance ...\( \text{c}4 \), 19...\( \text{c}6 \) is good. From now on, Black develops strong pressure on the queen's flank.

19...\( \text{c}4 \) 20.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 21.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)

White has defended the weak points on the queen's flank, and Steinitz regroups his forces for action on the other flank.

22.\( \text{f}3 \)

Giving Black a new object of attack. However, on other continuations, Steinitz would have been able to develop an attack by means of ...\( \text{h}5 \) followed by ...\( \text{h}4 \) (as the reader will see, it is dangerous for White to play \( \text{h}4 \)). After driving back the g3-knight, Black installs a knight on \( \text{e}4 \) whereupon an exchange on \( \text{c}3 \) and an invasion on the b-file is threatened.

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

How can the g3-square be defended? 23.\( \text{e}1 \) will not do in view of 23...\( \text{d}3 \). On 23.\( \text{f}2 \) follows 23...\( \text{x}3+ \) 24.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 25.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}3 \) 26.\( \text{h}5 \) with an attack, while 25.\( \text{f}4 \) (in place of 25.\( \text{g}4 \)) 25...\( \text{f}6! \) catastrophically weakens the g4- and e4-squares. The weakness of these squares turns out to be very considerable also after Zukertort's move.

23.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 24.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}5! \)

An important attacking resource.

25.\( \text{h}4 \)

The further advance of the \( \text{h}5 \)-pawn threatened serious trouble. But now the \( \text{h}4 \)-pawn is in danger. It was therefore worth resigning himself to a cramped position and temporarily ceding control over the e4-square, by withdrawing the knight to \( \text{f}1 \) and intending \( \text{f}1-\text{d}2 \). For example, 25.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 26.\( \text{d}2 \). Nevertheless White's position remains difficult. Steinitz had at his disposal the choice between two plans: 26...\( \text{c}3 \), with a further exploitation of the b-file, or the undermining of the f4-point by ...\( \text{g}5 \).

Even worse is the manoeuvre \( \text{g}3-\text{h}1-\text{f}2 \), recommended by some commentators. After 25.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 26.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 27.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) there does not seem to be any defence for White against the transfer of the rook − ...\( \text{a}8-\text{a}7-\text{b}7 \) with an invasion on the first rank.

25...\( \text{d}8! \) 26.\( \text{d}1 \)

The \( \text{h}4 \)-pawn can only be defended by 26.\( \text{h}1 \) followed by \( \text{g}3 \). However after 26...\( \text{e}4 \) 27.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6! \) White can do nothing about Black's increasing pressure on both flanks.

26...\( \text{g}6 \)

The capture of the pawn still does not come. On the straightforward 26...\( \text{g}4 \) 27.\( \text{x}5 \) \( \text{x}4 \) would follow 28.\( \text{x}4 \) \( \text{x}4 \) 29.\( \text{d}1 \).

27.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}8 \)
Black needs the b-file in the future for an attack on the queen's flank. Worth considering is 27...\(\text{h}b5\), with the possibility of doubling rooks.

28.\(\text{Wf}2\) \(\text{Ee}7\) 29.\(\text{Ef}3\) \(\text{Ee}4\)

Another plan is 29...\(\text{Ee}8\), also winning the \(b4\) pawn and preserving the knight, which could then be transferred to \(d6\) and \(b5\).

30.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 31.\(\text{Eh}1\) \(\text{Exh}4\)

Black wins a pawn. At the same time he retains a more active position.

32.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{Ee}7\) 33.\(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Wd}5\) 34.\(\text{Ef}2\) 35...\(\text{a}4\)

Steinitz later conceded that the plan linked to the aggressive move 34...\(g5\) was stronger. For example, 35.\(\text{g}2\) (quite bad for White is 35.fxg5 \(\text{Wxg}5\)

36.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{Ee}6\) 35...\(\text{xf}4\) 36.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{h}7\) with a dangerous attack for Black.

Steinitz pursues another aim - to exchange the bishop on \(c3\), defending the \(b2\)-square, for which he intends the manoeuvre ...\(\text{Ee}7\)-d8-a5. This plan is good on one condition: it includes the necessary prophylactic move ...\(f5\), suppressing any attempt by White to organise play on the king's flank.

35.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{Eb}3\) 36.\(\text{Eh}1\) \(\text{Ef}7\)

As already mentioned, now or even on the following move, he should play ...\(f5\), depriving the opponent of hopes connected with the break \(g4\).

37.\(\text{aa}1\) \(\text{d}8\)? 38.\(\text{g}4\)

Exploiting the fact that Black's pieces have deserted the king's flank, Zukertort goes over to a counterattack.

38...\(\text{hx}g4\)

Steinitz indicated later that, by continuing 38...\(\text{a}5\), he would have achieved his aim on the queen's flank and repulse the opponent's attack on the king's side. Here is his variation: 38...\(\text{a}5\) 39.\(\text{gx}h5\) \(\text{xc}3\) 40.\(\text{bxc}3\) \(\text{ab}8\) 41.\(\text{hx}g6\) \(\text{fxg}6\)

42.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{w}f5\) with the threats \(43...\text{xc}3\) and \(43...\text{bb}2\). But, of course, 38...\(f5\) would be much more reliable.

Continuing Steinitz's variation, Chigorin added that, on 43.\(\text{h}4\), Black has to somewhat disengage himself from the siege of the queen's flank and play 43...\(\text{h}8\), and in the event of \(44.\text{h}1\) - 44...\(\text{bb}8\). I also add: on \(45.\text{a}2\) or \(45.\text{h}2\) (with the threat of \(46.\text{h}1\)) Black must play 45...\(\text{h}5\)!

39.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{a}5\)?

A move which concludes an accurate positional manoeuvre, and at the same time - a serious tactical mistake. The retribution for it will, as a rule, be more severe than for the failure of a strategic plan. Steinitz is at once deprived of all the fruits of his strenuous work and suffers defeat.

The commentators suggested here 39...\(\text{f}8\), followed by ...\(\text{w}8\)-e7 or
39...\textit{e}7. However, in the first case might follow 40.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}8 41.\textit{e}5 \textit{f}6 42.\textit{g}3 with the threat 43.\textit{h}2, in the second — 40.\textit{b}4!. By exchanging bishops, White is left with the strongest threats. His knight will be a great deal stronger than the enemy bishop.

On 42...\textit{xc}3 follows 43.\textit{xc}3. Therefore Steinitz has to step back with \textit{e}king. But this does not save him from a ruinous attack.

\textbf{40.\textit{f}8 41.\textit{h}8+ \textit{g}7}
This is also forced, since on 41...\textit{f}7 follows 42.\textit{xa}8 and the bishop a5 is still under threat. On 42...\textit{xc}3, decisive is 43.\textit{a}7+.

\textbf{42.\textit{h}7+ \textit{f}8 43.\textit{f}2! \textit{d}8}
44.\textit{h}4 was threatened. True, 43...\textit{xc}3, this move does not work because of 44...\textit{xb}2+ 45.\textit{g}3 \textit{g}5 but simply 44.\textit{xc}3 finishes the game. The manoeuvre \textit{f}2-h4 could also be forestalled with the advance 43...\textit{g}5 but then 44.\textit{e}5! is decisive.

\textbf{44.\textit{e}5 \textit{g}8}
Black's position is already defenceless.

\textbf{45.\textit{ah}1 \textit{f}6 46.\textit{xf}7 \textit{f}8 47.\textit{rf}6}
On 47...\textit{xf}6 follows 48.\textit{h}4 with unavoidable mate.
Black resigns.

As is well known, nobody is immune from a mistake. Both the genius of combinations and the great strategist. The latter always distinguishes himself by the development of a feeling of danger — the ability to avert in good time a tactical turn of events by the enemy. But it is precisely the great chess strategist who at times makes tactical blunders, which it would seem in no way correspond to his understanding of chess. Surprisingly he loses his immunity against the opponent's tactical tricks and perishes under an attack which might easily have been repulsed.

As distinct from a tournament, a loss in a match game means not just one point, but as it were, straight away two. The unfortunate outcome of the third encounter greatly unsettled Steinitz and in the following, fourth game, he made a gross blunder in a somewhat better position. Steinitz carelessly captured an enemy pawn and was at once left a piece down. Two moves later, he laid down his arms.

The fifth game was, perhaps, Zukertort's best creative achievement in the match.

Depressed with setbacks, Steinitz played indifferently and allowed his rival to demonstrate in all brilliance his active, attacking style. The first, New York stage of the match was concluded with a convincing victory for Zukertort. The score stood uncomfortably for Steinitz at +1 -4.
Not even the most ardent supporters of Zukertort could have expected such a start. In an interview in one of the New York newspapers, Steinitz acknowledged that he was playing worse this time than usual. However, the poor start for him did not decide the outcome of the match. As evidence, he gave examples from his own practice.

In Baden-Baden 1870, I had half a point out of four at the start, but finished by taking second prize. In Vienna 1873 – continued Steinitz – in the second round I lost twice to Blackburne, then made several draws, but, by winning 16 games in a row, I gained first prize.

Steinitz also played indifferently in the Vienna tournament 1882. After nine rounds he only had 50 per cent of the total points and shared 11th-13th place with Englisch and Witteck. But also there, success at the finish allowed him to share 1st-2nd place with Winawer. Steinitz’s play also did not get going at all at the start of the following London tournament 1883. Nevertheless he took second prize, allowing only Zukertort ahead of him. This unhurried man, in the chess struggle, was like a powerful locomotive slowly gathering speed. It required time to do so, but then later it would already be impossible to stop him.

However this time even the most optimistic admirers of Steinitz were in low spirits. Few people pointed to analogies from chess history, such as Morphy’s losses in the first two match games against Harrwitz and likewise Steinitz’s explanation: history by no means always repeats itself.

But nevertheless history did repeat itself! Now, taking in at a glance the whole chess career of Steinitz, one can observe the characteristic pattern of his results: an indifferent start and a stormy finish, sweeping away all obstacles. Events developed in such a way, not only in this, but also in the following matches with Chigorin.

After a short break, play was resumed in St. Louis. The match conditions here were similar to New York.

The struggle in St. Louis took quite a different turn. Buried by the ill-wishers and mourned by his supporters, Steinitz startled both.

**Spanish Game**

**Steinitz**

**Zukertort**

6th Match Game, St. Louis, 3 February 1886

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{d}f3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 3.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{f}6\)

A popular defence in those years. Ten years later, a severe blow was delivered to the main, so-called ‘Brazil’ variation 4.0-0 \(\text{x}e4\) 5.d4 \(\text{e}7\) 6.\(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{d}6\) 7.\(\text{x}c6\) bxc6 8.\(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{b}7\) 9.\(\text{c}3\) 0-0 by 10.\(\text{a}1\), and the defence came to be met more rarely, giving way to systems with the move 3...a6.

**4.0-0**

Later on, Steinitz came to give preference to closed systems and played 4.d3 here.

4...\(\text{d}e4\) 5.\(\text{e}1\)

The 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 12th and 14th games of the match also developed in this way! Now it has been proved that the solid continuation 5.d4 is stronger.

5...\(\text{d}6!\)

5...\(\text{f}6\) is worse. After 6.\(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{e}7\) 7.d4 0-0 8.\(\text{c}3\) Black has difficulties.

6.\(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{x}e5\)
In later games, 6...\(\text{\texttt{e7}}\) was met. This move leaves White less choice of continuations, and therefore it is more accurate.

A) 7.\(\text{\texttt{x}}\)c6 dxc6 8.\(\text{\texttt{e2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) 9.d3 \(\text{\texttt{f5}}\) 10.\(\text{\texttt{d2}}\) 0-0 11.c3 \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{e4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d5}}\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{f4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{ad8}}\) 14.d4 \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) (12th game).

B) 7.\(\text{\texttt{d3}}\) 0-0 8.\(\text{\texttt{c3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{exe5}}\) (8...\(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) is also not bad) 9.\(\text{\texttt{exe5}}\) c6 (a move which prevents the manoeuvre \(\text{\texttt{d5}}\)) 10.b3 \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 11.\(\text{\texttt{b2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d5}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{f3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f6}}\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{e2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c7}}\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{a3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 15 \(\text{\texttt{ae1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) (14th game).

In both cases the chances are about even.

7.\(\text{\texttt{exe5+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e7}}\) 8.\(\text{\texttt{c3}}\)

In the 4th game Steinitz continued 8.\(\text{\texttt{f1}}\). There followed 8...0-0 9.d4 \(\text{\texttt{f6}}\) 10.\(\text{\texttt{e1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 11.c3 \(\text{\texttt{xe1}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{xe1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f5}}\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{f4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{d2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) with an equal game. With the move 8.\(\text{\texttt{c3}}\) he sets his partner an interesting trap.

8...0-0

Why did Steinitz not take the bishop? Because on this could follow the amusing mating finale: 8...\(\text{\texttt{xb5}}\) 9.\(\text{\texttt{d5}}\) 0-0 10.\(\text{\texttt{exe7+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\) 11.\(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{h6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) (or 12...\(\text{\texttt{e8}}\)?) 13.\(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{gxh5}}\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{f6}}\) mate. If Black were to continue 6...\(\text{\texttt{e7}}\) (in place of 6...\(\text{\texttt{exe5}}\)), this variation already cannot be obtained: 6...\(\text{\texttt{e7}}\) 7.\(\text{\texttt{c3}}\)? \(\text{\texttt{xb5}}\) 8.\(\text{\texttt{d5}}\) 0-0 9.\(\text{\texttt{xc6}}\) dxc6 10.\(\text{\texttt{exe7+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\) 11.\(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe8}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{xf7}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\), and it is not White, but Black who wins!

9.\(\text{\texttt{d3}}\)

An original position. The bishop on d3 and knight on d6 prevent the development of their own forces. But if Black was forced into the move ...\(\text{\texttt{d6}}\), then White played \(\text{\texttt{d3}}\) voluntarily. The position of the bishop on d3 has a quite definite point: Steinitz intends to attack the king's flank.

9...\(\text{\texttt{f6}}\)

After 9...\(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) is obtained a position from the 14th game (see note to the 6th move).

10.\(\text{\texttt{e3}}\)

Threatening 11.\(\text{\texttt{xe7+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe7}}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{h5+}}\) and 13.\(\text{\texttt{h3}}\).

10...\(\text{\texttt{g6}}\)

Another continuation was 10...\(\text{\texttt{e8}}\), which would also parry the bishop sacrifice, but without compromising the position of the king. Steinitz called the move 10...\(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) a 'challenge'. He thought it was necessary to accept it and prove to the opponent that the weakening of the king's flank is fraught with serious consequences.

11.b3 \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\)

Chigorin recommended 11...\(\text{\texttt{e8}}\), which opens the way for the d-pawn and at the same time the bishop on c8.
The knight could be transferred via g7 to f5 or e6.

12...\textit{d}f5 \textit{g}5?  
An move of dubious value. It is possible that Zukertort's intention was to detain the bishop on c1. Steinitz considered that 12...\textit{d}d4 was correct. For example:

13...\textit{d}xe8+ \textit{x}xe8 14\textit{b}b2 \textit{d}5 15\textit{e}e1 \textit{e}e6 and Black has a solid position.

13...\textit{d}xe8+  
An interesting attempt to exploit the weakness of the long diagonal was suggested by Emanuel Lasker. It lies in the exchange sacrifice 13...\textit{b}b2! . Accepting the gift is risky: 13...\textit{d}xe3 14\textit{f}xe3, and the threat of \textit{d}d5 is very real. On 14...c6, strong is 15\textit{f}f1 with the threat of \textit{e}e4. If now 15...\textit{e}e7, then 16\textit{a}a3. In the event of 14...\textit{f}5 (in place of 14...c6), White would continue the attack by means of 15...\textit{d}d4, while after 14...\textit{e}e6 – 15\textit{f}f1 with the threat of 16...\textit{d}c4 (analysis by Emanuel Lasker).

13...\textit{d}xe8 14\textit{b}b2!  

14...c6  
Zukertort's decision to refrain from the capture of the d2-pawn is quite right. E. Schallopp, the author of a book on the Steinitz-Zukertort match, published soon after the ending of the contest, censured Zukertort. In his opinion, after 14...\textit{d}xd2 15\textit{e}e4 \textit{g}5 16...\textit{e}xg5 \textit{w}xg5 17...\textit{e}e1 \textit{g}7, 'Black is subjected to a strong attack, but in the end he will be able to exploit his material advantage.' Other commentators also reckoned the same thing. Undoubtedly, White must find some strong means due to the powerful bishops. Many years later, Emanuel Lasker pointed out the simple move 16...\textit{c}c4! (in place of 16...\textit{d}g5), after which Black's position is hopeless. If 16...\textit{d}d5, then 17...\textit{w}xg5 \textit{w}xg5 18\textit{ax}d5, and he might as well resign.

We now look into the retreat of the bishop to h6 (instead of 15...\textit{g}5). After 15...\textit{h}h6, also very strong is 16...\textit{c}c4. For example, 16...\textit{d}d5 (if 16...\textit{w}e7, then 17...\textit{e}e1 \textit{f}f8 18\textit{e}e2 with the threat 19...\textit{d}f6) 17...\textit{x}d5 \textit{w}xh5 18...\textit{f}f6+ \textit{h}h8 19...\textit{w}f6 \textit{f}f8 20...\textit{e}e1 and, in order to save himself from mate, Black has to part with the rook (20...\textit{e}e6 21...\textit{h}h8+).

In general, the primary idea of the move 12...\textit{g}5 – to prevent the development of the white bishop on b2 – turns out to be impracticable.

15...\textit{d}e4 \textit{e}e7 16...\textit{w}e3  
The idea of the queen manoeuvre is to provoke the move ...f6, and then the advance of the h-pawn loosens the weakened pawn cover of the black king.

16...\textit{d}d5 17...\textit{d}d4 \textit{f}e6 18...\textit{g}3 \textit{e}e6  
Also after 18...\textit{c}c5 19...\textit{f}f4, Black is subjected to strong pressure.

19...\textit{e}e1 \textit{g}7 20...\textit{h}h4 \textit{w}d7 21...\textit{h}h5 \textit{g}7  
If 21...\textit{g}xh5, then 22...\textit{w}f4 \textit{f}f8 23...\textit{w}h6.

22...\textit{h}xg6 \textit{x}g6  
On 22...\textit{h}xg6, very strong is 23...\textit{h}h4.

23...\textit{e}e3 \textit{f}f7 24...\textit{w}f4 \textit{e}e8  
Zukertort probably rejected the preliminary exchange – 24...\textit{xd}3 25...\textit{cxd}3 with 25...\textit{e}e8 to follow, because of 26...\textit{w}h6 \textit{g}7 27...\textit{e}e5 \textit{h}h5 28...\textit{w}xh5 29...\textit{w}xh5
with the threat to transfer the rook to the king's flank.

25.\texttt{e}3

White has the initiative, but all points in the immediate vicinity of the black king are defended. With the following move Zukertort is left without sufficient cover for the f5- and h5-squares, which eases White's task.

25...\texttt{e}6

Considered the decisive mistake. Instead of this, commentators recommended 25...c5. However, then 26.\texttt{h}6 with the threat \texttt{f}4 is strong. Black does not have the move 26...\texttt{f}5 because of 27.\texttt{x}f5 \texttt{x}f5 28.\texttt{h}5.

26.\texttt{g}4 \texttt{f}8 27.\texttt{f}5 \texttt{c}5 28.\texttt{h}6+

On 28.\texttt{h}4, Black has a sufficient defence in 28...\texttt{e}6. Now, however, Steinitz wins a pawn.

28...\texttt{g}7 29.\texttt{f}5+ \texttt{f}7 30.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}7 31.\texttt{f}5+ \texttt{f}7 32.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}7 33.\texttt{f}5+ \texttt{f}7 34.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}7

The rule about the threelfold repetition of moves (or position) was not then in force, and, before forcing a transfer to a favourable ending, Steinitz gains time.

35.\texttt{x}g6 \texttt{x}g6 36.\texttt{x}g4 \texttt{xe}3 37.fx\texttt{e}3

Stronger is 37.dxe3!, which promises chances of creating a passed pawn on the king's flank.

37...\texttt{x}g6 38.\texttt{x}f6

White has an extra pawn, but it is difficult to realise it.

38...\texttt{b}4 39.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}6

Correct is an immediate 39...\texttt{h}5, preventing 40.\texttt{g}4, but Steinitz, in his turn, overlooks this possibility.

40.\texttt{f}2 \texttt{h}5 41.\texttt{g}4

41...\texttt{h}4

A mistake. After the exchange on g4, Black retains great chances of a draw. It would be extremely difficult to win the minor pieces endgame with five pawns against four on one flank. Now, however, Steinitz easily copes with the task—the h4-pawn causes Black only worry.

42.\texttt{h}5 \texttt{d}6

If 42...\texttt{g}5, then 43.\texttt{f}3 with the threat of 44.\texttt{f}6+.

43.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{c}5 44.\texttt{f}6 \texttt{g}5 45.\texttt{x}x\texttt{g}5 \texttt{x}g5 46.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{e}5 47.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{d}4 48.\texttt{e}6+ \texttt{f}6 49.ex\texttt{d}4 \texttt{c}xd4 50.\texttt{c}5 \texttt{g}5 51.\texttt{x}b7 \texttt{f}4 52.\texttt{a}5 \texttt{f}6 53.\texttt{c}6 \texttt{e}3 54.\texttt{x}a7 \texttt{d}2 55.\texttt{c}6 \texttt{xc}2 56.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{xd}3 57.\texttt{b}4+ \texttt{e}2 58.\texttt{a}5 \texttt{e}7 59.\texttt{d}5 \texttt{f}3

Or 59...\texttt{c}5 60.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{d}3 61.\texttt{f}4+ \texttt{e}3 62.\texttt{xd}3 \texttt{xd}3 63.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{d}4 64.\texttt{a}6 and the bishop cannot be everywhere at once—one of the white pawns queens.

60.\texttt{xe}7 \texttt{d}3 61.\texttt{d}5 and Zukertort resigned.
Queen's Gambit
Zukertort
Steinitz
7th Match Game, St. Louis, 7 February 1886
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.Nf3 Nf6 4.e3 c5 5.Nc3 Nc6
The symmetrical variation of the
Tarrasch Defence was met even when its
author had only just begun his chess
career...
6.a3
White wants to play dxc5, b4 and Bb2.
The opportunity is presented to Steinitz
to express his attitude towards the centre.
6...dxc4
leading to a position from the Queen's
Gambit Accepted. Nowadays (this vari­
ation is also employed today, over 100
years later!) 6...cxd4 7.exd4 Qe7 is pre­
tered here, so as to play ...dxc4 only af­
after White has developed the f1-bishop.
Some masters choose waiting tactics
and play 6...a6. A third possibility is
6...Qe4. Steinitz has a different plan. He
immediately exploits the d4-pawn and
begins to systematically besiege it. He
also employed this strategy with success
in the 9th game, which will give us a
more convenient opportunity to dwell
at length on the treatment of such posi­
tions in both the past and present.
7.Nxc4 cxd4 8.exd4 Qe7 9.0-0
0-0
10.Qe3
On the basis of a great deal of practical
material, theoreticians advise White to
continue here 10.Qd3 followed by
Ng5. The position of the pawn on a3
offers him the possibility of the man­
oeuvre Qc4-a2-b1. Zukertort plays
Qd3 on the next move, but he develops
the queen's bishop, not on g5, but on
e3. Such a plan is also met in the mod­
ern Queen’s Gambit Accepted, but, as a
rule, White links this to the move Qe5
and a future advance of the f-pawn.
10...Qd7 11.Qd3
If he wishes, White could rid himself
of the isolated pawn, by playing 11.d5. Af­
ter 11...exd5 12.Qxd5 Qxd5 13.Qxd5,
a symmetrical pawn formation is ob­
tained with a probable drawn outcome.
But Zukertort does not want to take
'time-out'.
11.Qc8 12.Qac1
In the present position, it is more advis­
able to develop the queen's rook on d1,
intending Qe5.
12...Wa5
13.Qa2
A manoeuvre in accord with his 11th
move. Zukertort transfers the bishop to
b1, so as to take aim at the enemy king.
White has available good possibilities of
piece play. However, if these prove un­
successful, the weakness of the isolated
pawn could tell later on. For the time being, Steinitz's plan is limited to the blockade of the d4-pawn, 'observing' it on the d-file, and also to prophylactic measures on the king's flank.

13...\(\text{f}d8\) 14.\(\text{fe}1\)

As White has brought out his bishop to e3, it is not worth posting the rook on the e-file. 14 \(\text{fd}1\) was better. The reader has probably already noticed that Zukertort's detached developing moves are not linked to a united plan.

14...\(\text{e}8\)

Falling back to an apparently passive position, the bishop defends the f7-square from possible future attack, and allows the rook to take aim at the isolated pawn.

15.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{g}6\)

Black not only parries the threats on the b1-h7 diagonal, but also prepares the transfer of the bishop to g7, where it will take a more active part in the siege of the d4-pawn.

16.\(\text{we}2\) \(\text{f}8\) 17.\(\text{ed}1\) \(\text{g}7\)

18.\(\text{a}2\)

Steinitz easily realises his planned deployment of forces. Zukertort, however, loses the thread. In the present position he is not able to utilise his combinational talent. This is not the consequence of bad form, as asserted by his contemporaries, but the result of Steinitz's exceptional play.

18...\(\text{e}7\)

The knight heads for f5.

19.\(\text{d}2\)

A little trap; 20.\(\text{d}5\) is threatened.

19...\(\text{a}6\)

20.\(\text{g}5\)

Zukertort counts on somehow exploiting the pin of the knight on f6, but weakens the isolated pawn. In the opinion of Emanuel Lasker, it was worth trying to carry out the advance d5, by playing 20.\(\text{e}1\). This would make sense of the move 18.\(\text{a}2\).

The move 20.\(\text{e}1\), of course, is better than 20.\(\text{g}5\). We note, however, that in this case the advantage remains on Black's side. He can continue 20...\(\text{f}5\), and if 21.\(\text{d}5\), then 21...\(\text{xe}3\) 22.\(\text{xe}3\) edx5 23.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) and 24...\(\text{xb}2\).

20...\(\text{f}5\) 21.\(\text{g}4?\)

An anti-positional move, which meets with a tactical refutation. The weakening of the king's flank (g4-pawn, f3-square
and h1-a8 diagonal) plays a principal role. The relatively best choice was 21...\textit{dxf6} \textit{e}xf6 22.\textit{e}e4 \textit{g}g7 23.\textit{e}xc8 \textit{xc}8, though even then Black retains all the advantages of his position. On 24.d5 would follow 24...\textit{d}d8 25.d6 (if 25.g4, then 25...\textit{a}a4) 25...\textit{a}a4 26.b3 \textit{c}c6, and White stands badly.

By playing 21.g4, Zukertort reckons on replying to 21...\textit{d}d6 or 21...\textit{e}e7 with \textit{f}f4.

21...\textit{d}d4! 22.\textit{d}xd4 e5 23.\textit{d}d5
\nOn other replies, Black is left with an extra pawn.

23...\textit{xc}1 24.\textit{xc}1 \textit{exd}4
25.\textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}5 26.\textit{xd}5
\n26.\textit{xd}8 \textit{xd}4 27.\textit{xd}5, then 27...\textit{d}d6, attacking two pieces at once.

26...\textit{xd}5 27.\textit{xd}5 \textit{we}2!

The concluding move of the combination — a consequence of the weakening of White’s king’s flank. The simultaneous attack on the g4- and b2-squares leads to material advantage.

28.h3 h6?

White, of course, cannot take the h6-pawn (29.\textit{xe}6? \textit{xe}6 30.\textit{xd}6 \textit{d}d+), however Steinitz’s move misses a win. 28...\textit{xb}2 was correct. After

29.\textit{c}c5 \textit{d}d1+ 30.\textit{h}h2 \textit{e}e5+ 31.\textit{g}g2 \textit{xd}5+ 32.\textit{xd}5 \textit{c}c6, Black wins the endgame.

29.\textit{c}c4?

A blunder in reply. Both Steinitz and Zukertort do not take into account the simple retreat of the bishop to e3. By attacking the pawns on the queen’s flank, White maintains material equality. After missing this surprising opportunity, Zukertort loses by force.

29...\textit{f}f3 30.\textit{e}e3

If 30.\textit{f}f1 or 30.\textit{f}f1, then 30...\textit{c}c6.

30...\textit{d}d1+ 31.\textit{h}h2 \textit{c}c6 32.\textit{e}e7

On 32.\textit{xe}h6 decisive is 32...\textit{xe}h6 33.\textit{w}h6 \textit{h}1+ 34.\textit{g}g3 \textit{g}g1+. However a similar variation occurs in the game.

32...\textit{e}e5+1 33.\textit{f}4

The bishop cannot be taken: 33.\textit{xe}5 \textit{h}1+ 34.\textit{g}g3 \textit{g}g2+ 35.\textit{h}h4 (35.\textit{f}4 \textit{xf}2 mate) 35...\textit{xf}2+ 36.\textit{g}g3 \textit{g}5+.

33...\textit{xf}4+

Quite sufficient, but more beautiful would be 33...\textit{g}5!!, and on 34.\textit{xe}5 or 34.\textit{f}xe5 follows 34...\textit{h}1+ and 35...\textit{g}g2 mate.

34.\textit{xf}4 \textit{h}1+ 35.\textit{g}g3 \textit{g}1+

White resigned.

The score stood at 3:4. Tired from seven decisive games, the rivals at last took ‘time-out’. In the eighth encounter, after a quiet and not very interesting game, a
draw was already agreed on the 22nd move. To make up for it, the next game turned out to be one of the most interesting of the match.

Zukertort once again held a position with a central isolated pawn, and Steinitz carried out a siege of it.

Queen's Gambit
Zukertort
Steinitz
9th Match Game, St. Louis, 10 February 1886
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.\(\varepsilon_c3\) e5 \(\varepsilon_f6\)
4.\(\varepsilon_f3\) dxc4 5.e3

By a transposition of moves, the so-called classical position of the Queen's Gambit Accepted has been reached. However, instead of 5.e3, Zukertort had available the more energetic continuation 5.e4. On 5... c5, strong is 6.d5, and if 6... exd5 - 7.e5!.

But this is a conclusion of modern theory. The match between Steinitz and Zukertort took place in the 19th century.

5... c5
After giving up the centre, Black at once undermines it.
6.\(\varepsilon_xc4\) cxd4 7.exd4

It is interesting that contemporaries (including M. Chigorin in \textit{Shakhmatny Vestnik}, 1886) condemned this natural move, after which White is left with an isolated pawn in the centre, but with freer piece play. Running ahead half a century, we refer the reader to the creative work of Botvinnik, who repeatedly demonstrated the advantages of White's position. In contemporary practice, variations with the isolated d4-pawn with a locked-in black queen's bishop are met in three openings: the Queen's Gambit (Accepted and Declined), and the Nimzo-Indian and Caro-Kann Defences. This position is considered typical, and the plan of play now well-studied. But Zukertort and Steinitz were 'pioneers', they trod unknown paths. To Steinitz's credit goes the working out of a plan to besiege the isolated pawn. This credit is not diminished by the fact that the final evaluation of such positions has today changed.

7... e7 8.0-0 0-0

The d4-pawn is an excellent object for attack. Despite the fact that White's pieces are more actively placed, the chances are on Black's side — thus considered Steinitz. But already Tarrasch maintained that the excellent position of his pieces gives White the premise for an attack in the centre and on the king's flank.

We will see how Steinitz coped with all these problems.

9.\(\varepsilon_e2\)

A position which might well have stood on the board in another match for the world championship between Botvinnik and Petrosian and also in any game of our day. It is interesting that the move 9.\(\varepsilon_e2\), which is nowadays made
almost automatically, was condemned by Emanuel Lasker himself!

"Zukertort prepares to make combinations. Instead of this he ought to systematically build up his position, gradually accumulating small advantages, but it is precisely this which he does not know how to do." (Manual of Chess)

Lasker called the move 9.\texttt{W}e2, in all Zukertort's future games, a 'mistaken method'. But as the reader will see, up to a certain point Zukertort acted on a positional basis. It was only later on that he made a mistake.

\textbf{9...\texttt{B}d7}

In contemporary practice, the black queen's knight is more often developed on c6.

\textbf{10.\texttt{B}b3 \texttt{b}6}

Black's plan is to firmly blockade the d-pawn with the move ...\texttt{B}d5, then bring the queen out (to a5 or b6) and play ...\texttt{E}fd8. The queen's bishop, via d7, will be based at e8, where, in the event of an attack by White, it will defend the f7-pawn. The queen's rook will be placed on the c-file. After all this, it will be possible to think about exchanges, which will show up more boldly the weakness of the isolated pawn.

\textbf{11.\texttt{F}f4}

The commentators also raised objections to this move. 'The bishop is not particularly active on this square, and, in addition to this, the present move is attended by a loss of tempo' — wrote M.Euwe (Course of Chess Lessons, 1936). But nevertheless the 1930s Soviet master, N.Ryumin, achieved good results with the same system. Admittedly, he transferred the bishop later on not to g3, as Zukertort did, but to e5.

Perhaps the most unpleasant arrangement of forces for Black in the Steinitz Variation is 11.\texttt{B}d1 and, on 11...\texttt{B}d5, 12.\texttt{G}g5. The continuation 12...\texttt{W}a5 13.\texttt{Ba}c1 \texttt{D}d8 14.\texttt{E}e5 leaves White the better chances.

But, of course, the reason for Zukertort's defeat is not the fact that he did not play 11.\texttt{B}d1 or 11.\texttt{G}g5...

\textbf{11...\texttt{B}d5 12.\texttt{G}g3}

As already mentioned, 12.\texttt{E}e5 gives more prospects. But, all the same, Lasker's assessment of the move 12.\texttt{G}g3 is guilty of one-sidedness. "This loss of time with the bishop already shows clearly that Zukertort is playing without any plan. He is hoping for complications, which give opportunities for combinations, but until these occur he plays casually."

\textbf{12...\texttt{W}a5 13.\texttt{Ba}c1 \texttt{D}d7 14.\texttt{E}e5 \texttt{F}fd8}

Steinitz consistently carries out his plan. In Lasker's opinion, 'Black already has some positional advantage'.
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The reason for such an evaluation is Steinitz's purposeful play and the final result of the game. In fact there is still nothing bad about White's position.

15. \( \text{White} \)

Zukertort has his plan: he endeavours to force the opponent to exchange on c3, which would rid White of his isolated pawn.

Zukertort reasonably refrains from Steinitz' polite offer to exchange on d7. This offer, by the way, shows that the two bishops were not an end in themselves for Steinitz. After 15. \( \text{cxd7} \text{xd7} \), Black, by doubling rooks on the d-file, creates pressure on the isolated pawn.

Worth considering is the plan with the advance of the f-pawn, applied in a similar situation by Borisenko against Flohr in the 21st USSR Championship (1954). After 15. \( \text{f4} \), White threatens to loosen the opponent's king's flank. Besides this, he exerts influence over the d5-square, if the opportunity presents itself forcing Black to exchange on c3. If, as in the game, 15... \( \text{e8} \), then 16. \( \text{f5} \). On 15... \( \text{b6} \), possible is 16. \( \text{fd1} \text{xc3} 17. \text{bxc3} \). In the event of 15... \( \text{xc3} \text{bxc3} \text{b5} 17. \text{c4} \text{a6} 18. \text{fd1} \), the chances are also on White's side. A mechanical prevention of the advance f5 with the move 15... \( \text{g6} \) does not succeed because of the pawn sacrifice – 16. \( \text{f5} \text{xf5} 17. \text{h4} \). This interesting analysis is from V. Vukovic.

It appears that the evaluation of the move 15. \( \text{f4} \) depends on the consequences of the energetic reply 15... \( \text{b4} \). If now 16. \( \text{e4} \), then 16... \( \text{b5} \), while in the event of 16. \( \text{xd5} \) Black continues 16... \( \text{exd5} \). The pawn sacrifice 16. \( \text{h4} \text{xc3} 17. \text{bxc3} \text{xc3} 18. \text{d3} \text{ac8} \) leads to unclear complications.

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

With an open e-file and a knight on e5, a typical combinational move is the sacrifice on f7, and Steinitz, in good time, takes measures against it. In addition, on e8 the bishop does not hinder the manoeuvres of the other pieces.

16. \( \text{h4} \)!

Zukertort logically 'puts pressure' on the blocking square d5. The threat of 17. \( \text{xf6} \) forces Black to exchange on c3. Apart from 17. \( \text{xf6} \) there is also another threat – 17. \( \text{xd5} \). If 17... \( \text{xd5} \), then 18. \( \text{xe7} \text{xe7} 19. \text{xb7} \) with the win of a pawn. If 17... \( \text{exd5} \), then Black bids farewell to the open file and the whole plan of besieging the d4-pawn. His game, without doubt, is worse: with a symmetrical pawn formation, all three black minor pieces are passively placed, and White’s – ideally.

16... \( \text{xc3} 17. \text{bxc3} \text{c7} \)

The majority of commentators considered the present position undoubtedly favourable for Black. Obviously because later on Steinitz was totally successful in his planned counterplay. Meanwhile the chances of both sides are for the present equal. We note that direct play for the blockade by 17... \( \text{b5} \) was premature in view of 18. \( \text{g4} \). With the text move, Steinitz defends the bishop on e7 and thereby parries the threat of 19. \( \text{g4} \).
18.\texttt{\textsc{f}e1} \texttt{\textsc{ac}8}

Only this move of Zukertort is to a certain extent inaccurate. Logical seems \texttt{\textsc{g}3} \texttt{\textsc{d}6} and now \texttt{\textsc{c}4}, after which it would not be so easy for Steinitz to weaken the \textsc{c}- and \textsc{d}-pawns, or \texttt{\textsc{h}4}, inviting the partner to repeat moves. Also possible is \texttt{\textsc{c}2}.

19.\texttt{\textsc{d}3}

Another continuation was \texttt{\textsc{b}5}, on which White would probably have to go in for the isolation of the \textsc{d}-pawn with the move \texttt{\textsc{c}4}. In the event of \texttt{\textsc{c}2}, Black could boldly take the pawn: \texttt{\textsc{w}xc3} \texttt{\textsc{x}c3} \texttt{\textsc{xc}3} \texttt{\textsc{xh}7}+ (if \texttt{\textsc{xf}6} \texttt{\textsc{gxf}6} \texttt{\textsc{xh}7}] 24.\texttt{\textsc{xc}3}, then 24...\texttt{\textsc{xe}5} and Black has two minor pieces for the rook) \texttt{\textsc{d}4} \texttt{\textsc{xc}1} 24.\texttt{\textsc{xc}1} \texttt{\textsc{xd}4} with an extra pawn for Black.

20.\texttt{\textsc{xe}7}

On \texttt{\textsc{g}3}, Black would probably reply \texttt{\textsc{a}5}.

Before exchanging on e7, White could weaken the opponent’s king’s flank: \texttt{\textsc{c}2} \texttt{\textsc{g}6} \texttt{\textsc{xe}7} 21.\texttt{\textsc{xe}7} 22.\texttt{\textsc{b}3}, but even in this case, after \texttt{\textsc{b}5}, Black has a fully equal game.

20...\texttt{\textsc{w}xe7} 21.\texttt{\textsc{xd}5}?

Commentator-critics of Zukertort should begin with this exchange. It is quite wrong. 21.\texttt{\textsc{c}4} is correct. On 21...\texttt{\textsc{g}5}, indirectly defending the knight, possible is simply 22.\texttt{\textsc{g}3} and on 22...\texttt{\textsc{f}4} \texttt{\textsc{we}4}. Generally speaking, there is a complicated struggle ahead.

21...\texttt{\textsc{xd}5} 22.\texttt{\textsc{c}4} \texttt{\textsc{dd}8}

More reliable than 22...\texttt{\textsc{a}5}, since this move separates the rooks. Most likely, Steinitz rejected the move 22...\texttt{\textsc{a}5} not because of 23.\texttt{\textsc{d}5}, as supposed by the commentators (in this case 23...\texttt{\textsc{d}6} is possible), but in view of 23.\texttt{\textsc{c}5}.

If, in reply to the move made in the game, 22...\texttt{\textsc{dd}8}, Zukertort had played 23.\texttt{\textsc{d}5}, Steinitz intended to continue 23...\texttt{\textsc{b}5}. All the same, also then 23...\texttt{\textsc{d}6} or 23...\texttt{\textsc{wc}5} are probably simpler.

23.\texttt{\textsc{e}3}?

Zukertort wrongly contemplates an attack – it will be refuted. The weakness of his queen’s flank and the central pawns turns out to be very significant. The fact is that the move made by White, \textsc{c}4, is not in accord with active operations on the king’s flank, which requires the diversion of the heavy pieces from the defence of the central pawns.

The right plan lies in the modest move 23 \texttt{\textsc{ed}1}, intending \texttt{\textsc{wb}3} and then (if the opponent allows) \texttt{\textsc{c}5} and \texttt{\textsc{c}4-d6}. If
the opportunity presents itself; the break d5 could prove favourable. Black would have probably met this plan by the following regrouping of his forces: ...b6, ...Ec7 and ...Edc8. He would most likely drive away the hostile knight with the move ...f6, though this rather weakens the e6-pawn. Also possible would be the doubling of rooks on the d-file, with pressure on the d4-square. In both cases there is a complicated struggle ahead, and the outcome of the game would be far from clear.

23...\$d6 24.Ed1
On 24.Ed3, simplest is 24...h6, and if 25.Ed1 then 25...f6. Weaker is the 'courageous' 24...\$xd+ 25.EXh7+ Edf8 since the threats 26...Ed1+ and 26...\$xe5 are parried by the move 26.Ec3!

24...f6

25.Eh3
Played in the spirit of 'the good old days'. Zukertort sacrifices a knight.

In its commentary on the match, the magazine Deutsche Schachzeitung lectured Steinitz: 'Black could calmly take the knight—there would be nothing for it'. As evidence, this variation was given: 25...fxe5 26.EXh7+ Edf8 27.Eh8+ (or 27.Ed3+ 17f7 28.Eh8+ Ed7 29.EXg7 Edf8) 27...Ed7 28.EXg7+ 17f7 29.Ed3 Edf8 30.h4 e4 31.Ed6 \$xc4 32.h5 \$d5 33.h6 \$h5, and Black wins.

In the match book, published a few months later, E.Schallopp corrected the note by indicating that taking the knight 'is dubious in view of 27.Ed3 (instead of 27.Eh8+ or 27.Ed3+) 27...Ed7 28.EXg7 Ec7 29.Eh8+ Ed7 and White has at least a draw'. Half a century later, M.Euwe added his voice to this assessment, cutting short the variation on the moves 27.Ed3 or 27.Ed3+.

The attempt to strengthen White's play by means of 29.c5 (after which 29...\$xc5? is not possible in view of 30.Eh8+ Ed7 31.Ed8+ and 32.dxc5+) was considered unsuccessful because of the reply 29...\$d7. The conclusion was drawn that White all the same had to give perpetual check by 30.Ed8+ Ed7 31.Ed4+. However the curtain is lowered earlier; White could achieve more!

25...h6!
Instead of 30.\textit{Wh}h8+, G.Ravinsky suggested conducting the attack by 30.\textit{A}d3! If 30...e4 (on 30...\textit{ Axe}c5 follows 31.\textit{Wh}h8+ \textit{A}e7 32.\textit{A}xf7+), then 31.\textit{Ad}g3! \textit{Wh}d4 (also now 31...\textit{A}xc5 loses in view of 32.\textit{A}g8+ \textit{A}e7 33.\textit{Wh}h4+), 32.\textit{Wh}h8+ \textit{A}e7 33.\textit{A}xf7+ \textit{A}xf7 34.\textit{Wh}h7+, and White gives mate.

We return now to the variation which the \textit{Deutsche Schachzeitung} assesses in Black's favour — 27.\textit{Af}f3+ \textit{A}f7 28.\textit{Wh}h8+ \textit{A}e7 29.\textit{Af}xg7. In fact the chances here lie not with Black, but with White. After 30.\textit{Ab}1 b6 (30...\textit{exd}4 31.\textit{A}xb7+ \textit{A}c7 32.\textit{Ab}8!) 31.\textit{dxe}5 he has three pawns for the piece with a continuing attack. Generally speaking, contemporaries criticised Steinitz wrongly. He acts correctly in calmly refusing the gift. Black repels the attack, and later he comes down with his superior forces upon the weaknesses of the queen's flank and the centre.

26.\textit{Ag}4

In the hope of sacrificing the knight to demolish the pawn cover of the black king. On 26.\textit{Ag}6 would follow 26...\textit{Af}xg6 27.\textit{Wh}xg6 \textit{A}xc4!. If now 28.\textit{Ax}h6, then, exploiting the insufficiently defended first rank — 28...\textit{Wh}d4!, Black's centralised pieces decide the outcome of the struggle, since 29.\textit{Wh}7+ \textit{Af}8 30.\textit{Wh}h8+ \textit{Af}7 31.\textit{Wh}d8 does not work because of the simple reply 31...\textit{Wh}d8!.

26...\textit{Af}4!

Necessary prophylaxis.

27.\textit{Af}e3

In the event of 27.\textit{Ag}3, Black has the strong move 27...b5. Taking the pawn with 28.cxb5 is punished by the tactical blow 28...\textit{Wh}d4+. On 29.\textit{Ax}h6+ Black calmly replies 29...\textit{Ab}8 (30.\textit{Af}a3+ \textit{Af}d6).

27...\textit{A}a4!

In order not to lose a pawn, White's rook must abandon the first rank, which is very necessary for Steinitz.

28.\textit{Af}f3 \textit{Ab}6 29.\textit{Ad}2

On the 'desperate' 29.\textit{Af}x6, simplest is 29...\textit{Ax}d1.

29...\textit{Ac}6

The logical conclusion of the bishop manoeuvre, — driving off the rook from the first rank, was the tactical blow 29...b5! How will it turn out for White? 30...\textit{bxc}4 is threatened. In the event of 31.\textit{A}xc4, there follows 31...\textit{Ac}6 32.\textit{A}e3 \textit{Ab}1+ 33.\textit{Ad}1 \textit{Ab}5 34.\textit{We}3 \textit{Ac}2! and Black wins.

On 30.cxb5, sufficiently convincing is 30...\textit{Ac}1+ 31.\textit{A}f1 \textit{Ab}4 and White is defenceless (32.\textit{Af}6 \textit{Af}1+). If, however, 31.\textit{Ad}1, then 31...\textit{Wh}d4
32.\texttt{wx}d4  \texttt{xd}4  33.\texttt{d}xd4  \texttt{xd}1. and once again Black wins. All that remains for White is to leave the c4-pawn to its own fate and again try to attack the king’s flank: 30.\texttt{g}3  \texttt{bxc}4  31.\texttt{g}6. However, 31...\texttt{f}8 and, on 32.\texttt{g}4, the courageous reply 32...\texttt{h}8! repulses all the threats (33.\texttt{h}6 \texttt{e}8! 34.\texttt{f}7+ \texttt{xf}7). This interesting variation was found by V.Vukovic.

30.\texttt{g}3

In the event of 30.\texttt{xf}6, Black could boldly take the rook. Apart from two or three checks, White has nothing: 30...\texttt{xf}6  31.\texttt{g}6+ \texttt{f}8  32.\texttt{xf}6+ \texttt{e}8. On the ‘dashing’ 33.\texttt{f}5, ‘in the same style’ there follows 33...\texttt{f}5  34.\texttt{e}2+ \texttt{e}4!

White’s only chance to complicate the struggle lay in the break 30.d5!?. Steinitz was not afraid of this move and intended to refute it in the following way: 30...\texttt{ex}d5  31.\texttt{cxd}5 \texttt{xd}5  32.\texttt{cxd}5 \texttt{xd}5  33.\texttt{xd}5+ \texttt{xd}5.

However the main point of the pawn sacrifice is to obtain the f5-square for the knight. Instead of 31.\texttt{cxd}5, White has the very strong move 31.\texttt{f}5 with a dangerous attack. For example: 31...\texttt{f}8 (if 31...\texttt{e}5, then 32.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{a}1+ 33.\texttt{d}1) 32.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{d}7 (on 32...\texttt{xc}4, decisive is 33.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{h}8 34.\texttt{xf}8! \texttt{xd}8  35.\texttt{xd}8 \texttt{xd}8  36.\texttt{f}7+) 33.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{h}8 34.\texttt{g}4! will turn out badly for Black. Thus 34...\texttt{xc}4 loses in view of 35.\texttt{h}3+ \texttt{g}8 36.\texttt{h}7+ \texttt{f}7 37.\texttt{e}3! After the relatively best 34...\texttt{f}5 35.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{d}6 36.\texttt{g}5, White has an obvious superiority.

31...\texttt{d}7  32.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{xc}4  33.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{h}8 (33...\texttt{f}8 34.\texttt{h}7) 34.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{e}8 35.\texttt{h}4, and in view of the threats 36.\texttt{f}7+ and 37.\texttt{xf}7 mate, Black loses his queen.

These variations only signify that Black should not accept the pawn sacrifice. On 30.d5 he must reply not 30...\texttt{ex}d5, but 30...\texttt{ee}5!.

Black exploits the pin on the d-file. The first rank is insufficiently defended, and the knight is now only able to go to c2 and f1. Meanwhile 31...\texttt{ex}d5 is threatened. In the event of 31.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{ex}d5 32.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{c}7 followed by ...\texttt{c}6-e8, the game turns out to Black’s advantage. General conclusion: it was worth Zukertort trying his luck with the break 30.d5, though, on accurate defence, it would not have altered the result. And the main, positional continuation, 29...\texttt{c}6, chosen by Steinitz, did not let the advantage slip!

30...\texttt{f}5!

The black bishop now obtains the e4-square. For the time being, it is necessary for White to lose time on defence against the threat ...\texttt{f}4.

31.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{e}4  32.\texttt{b}3

Zukertort defends wittily against the threat 32...\texttt{f}4: he threatens 33.\texttt{c}5, winning the e6-pawn. On the simple-minded 32...\texttt{f}4 follows 33.c5 \texttt{fx}3 (if 33...\texttt{xc}5 then 34.\texttt{xe}6) 34.\texttt{xc}6 \texttt{ex}d2 35.\texttt{xe}6+ \texttt{h}8 36.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}xh6 37.\texttt{f}7+ \texttt{h}8 38.\texttt{f}6+ \texttt{g}8 39.\texttt{e}6+ \texttt{g}7 40.\texttt{e}7+ and Black cannot escape the perpetual check.

32...\texttt{h}7!
Steinitz does not leave his opponent any chances.

33. c5  bxc5  34. xex6

There is also no salvation in 34. xex6 xex6 35. xex6, in view of 35... c1+ e5 d1 d5 37. e1 xxa2 38. xxa2 xxd4.

34... c1+ 35. d1

35. d1, then, as in the game, 35... f4, threatening not only 36... xd2, but also 36... d5.

35... f4  36. wb2  b1  37. c3

xc8  38. xex4

The last hope. If he takes the rook with the pawn, White gives perpetual check: 38... fxe4  39. xxc8  xxd2  40. f5+. 38... xex4

White resigned.

An excellent, strategically whole-hearted game!

The score was equalised - 4:4. In accordance with the match conditions, there was now a break. Zukertort left St. Louis a little earlier than Steinitz, who was delayed due to his having to occupy himself with the March number of the International Chess Magazine!

Despite the equal score, Steinitz’s position before the concluding stage in New Orleans was psychologically more favourable; he was in an enthusiastic frame of mind. The negative emotions from his bad start over, the struggle began anew. Zukertort, however, was depressed; he had had a huge lead and lost it...

In New Orleans, play took place at the rooms of the club, which united enthusiasts of the king of games and games of cards. Its regulations were strict: only members of the club were allowed in the hall. No exception was made even for distinguished guests and reporters, who had to become members of the club. As a result there were only about 100 spectators present at the games of the third stage, which was held in a comparatively small hall.

The first encounter in New Orleans, and the tenth of the match, took a peaceful course. A draw was already agreed, at Steinitz’s proposal, on the 21st move. Steinitz’s clock showed 58 minutes, Zukertort’s - 23. But then the battle commenced.

In the 11th game, Zukertort, playing White, for the first time in the match began play with the move 1.e4. In the Four Knights Opening, he sacrificed a pawn and obtained an attacking position. After deciding to force events, Zukertort sacrificed a bishop on h7. White’s attack looked dangerous, but, with accurate defence, Steinitz repulsed the threats and for the first time since the start of the match was in front - 5:4.

He also won the next, 12th game. Now Steinitz was already threatening to tear away from his rival - the score stood at 6:4.

In the following, 13th game, Steinitz achieved an excellent position and seized the initiative. However Zukertort’s attempt to complicate the game with a knight sacrifice was surprisingly crowned with success. Steinitz made several mistakes, and finally play went into an ending in which Zukertort’s rook and two pawns proved to be stronger than Steinitz’s two minor pieces. On the 86th move,
Zukertort gained victory and narrowed the gap in the score, which now stood at 6:5. After this the match was adjourned for a week because of... the carnival.

Zukertort's victory in the 13th game turned out to be his last effort which was crowned with success. He did not manage to win one more game. After two 'bloody' draws, Steinitz conducted the 16th game confidently. He developed strong pressure by exploiting the power of the two bishops. The score changed to 7:5.

In the 17th game, Zukertort, playing White, achieved a favourable position with the Queen's Gambit. On the 21st move, he could have decided the encounter in his favour, but failed to find the winning continuation. Admittedly, his position remained better, but Steinitz defended ingeniously. After winning the exchange for a pawn, Zukertort then could not win the game.

The outcome of the match was decided by the following encounter, in which Zukertort's resistance was finally broken down.

The diagrammed position is from the 18th game of the match (New Orleans, 22 March 1886). Playing Black, it was Zukertort's turn to move. Striving for lively piece play, he continued

24...c6

However the opening of lines is to White's advantage. The position of White's king in the centre proves to be solid, and the two bishops plus pressure on the e5-pawn tilt the balance to Steinitz's side.

25.\text{c5 cxd5}  

White threatened, after 0-0 and $\text{cfc1}$, to increase the pressure on the c-file. Sooner or later Black will all the same have to exchange on d5.

26.\text{xd5 a4} 27.a3 b6 28.\text{c3 e8} 29.\text{e2}!

Steinitz forestalls the manoeuvre ...\text{b7-c5} (possible, for example, after 29.0-0).

29...\text{c8}

A pitiful position for the knight. But if he defends the pawn with the move 29...\text{ab8}, the knight equally could not go to b7.

30.\text{b5 e7} 31.\text{xd8+ xd8} 32.0-0

Despite the far-advanced g- and h-pawns, the white king is quite safe.

32...\text{a7}

On 32...\text{c7}, with the aim, after ...\text{d6}, of preparing ...f5, could follow 33.\text{c1 d6} 34.\text{d2 d8} 35.\text{c6 c8} 36.\text{e3} with an obvious advantage. In the event of 32...\text{e7}, strong is 33.f4.

33.\text{c4 c6}

A move which suggests itself, but which is bad. A more difficult task is set White with the continuation 33...\text{c8} 34.b3 (on 34.\text{d5} or 34.\text{a2} 34...\text{b5}) 34...\text{b5} 35.\text{b2 d4}. All
same, after 36.f4, undermining the f5-pawn and threatening the f7-square, the advantage is secured for White.

Now both White’s bishops are directed against the king’s flank, and Steinitz only has to open the f-file.

34...\textit{d5} \textit{e8}

\begin{center}
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\textbf{35.f4!}

Because of the threat to the f7-square, Black has to allow the terrible move f5, and this is tantamount to defeat.

\textbf{35...\textit{d7} 36.f5 \textit{e7}}

If 36...gxf5, then 37.\textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 38.\textit{xh7} \textit{e7} (38...d8 39.g6) 39.\textit{xf7+} and then 40.\textit{xf3}, also winning the h5-pawn.

\textbf{37.\textit{a2} gxf5}

Desperation. Both 38.f6 and 38.fxg6 were threatened.

\textbf{38.exf5 \textit{f8} 39.\textit{xf3}}

It goes without saying that 39.g6 was also possible.

\textbf{39...e4 40.\textit{xfh5}}

Black resigned.

The 8:5 score would seem to have still allowed the struggle to go on. However, it should not be forgotten that after the New York stage Zukertort had gained only one victory, suffering seven defeats. His nerves weakened, he was crushed, and all that remained for Steinitz was to complete the rout. Moreover, Zukertort was ill. In the 19th game he was completely outplayed. Steinitz’s pawns rushed forward. After a knight sacrifice, one of these reached the queening square and the score stood at match-point’ – 9:5.

With Steinitz needing to win only one more game, he decided to return to an old opening weapon and, for the first time, he chose his own gambit (1.e4 e5 2.\textit{d3} \textit{c6} 3.f4 \textit{xf4} 4.d4 d5 5.exd5 \textit{h4+} 6.\textit{e2}). Zukertort played the game very weakly. In a variation which he could well have expected, he made a decisive mistake and as early as the 19th move (also for the first time in the match!) the game was over. With the result +10 -5 =5, Steinitz gained victory, winning the official title of champion of the world.

Before discussing the results of the match, we will give a little data. The repertoire of the rivals consisted mainly of two openings – the Spanish Game and the Queen’s Gambit. As White, Steinitz opened the game only with the move 1.e4, on which Zukertort invariably replied 1...e5. With enviable constancy, the opponents played the Spanish Game, and to be more precise, the variation with the move 3...\textit{d6} (4.0-0 \textit{xe4} 5.\textit{e1} \textit{d6} 6.\textit{xe5} and 4.d3 d6 5.c3 g6 6.d4 \textit{d7}). There were only two exceptions. In the second match game, Steinitz unsuccessfully employed the Scotch Variation of the Four Knights Game (1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f3} \textit{c6} 3.d4 \textit{exd4} 4.\textit{xd4} \textit{f6} 5.\textit{c3} \textit{b4} 6.\textit{xc6} bxc6 7.\textit{d3} d5 8.exd5 cxd5 9.0-0 0-0 10.\textit{g5} c6 11.\textit{e2}), and in the last – his own gambit.
With white, Zukertort enthusiastically played his revived Queen’s Gambit. Zukertort began only one game with the move 1.e4 – the 11th game –, in which the opening was a Four Knights Game.

As is well known, in those days opening preparation did not play such a role as now. But the way Steinitz handled the Black side in the Queen’s Gambit showed that he was ahead of his time. The method of play in positions with a central isolated pawn, which he demonstrated, (see 7th and 9th games) signified far more than a successful opening experiment. Strategical planning, taking into account the interdependence of the stages of the chess game, where the outline of the middlegame is defined beforehand by the opening variation, has its beginning with Steinitz.

Zukertort played all his games very quickly. Thus, in the 5th, which he won, he spent a total of 55 minutes on 32 moves, while Steinitz took 2½ hours. In the 6th game (won by Steinitz), Zukertort needed only 1 hour 53 minutes for 60 moves, whereas Steinitz – 3 hours 33 minutes. There was approximately the same ratio in the 11th game (won by Steinitz) – 1 hour 25 minutes on 42 moves for Zukertort and 2 hours 40 minutes for Steinitz. In the peaceful 8th game, Zukertort made 22 moves in 20 minutes, while Steinitz pondered for 1 hour 15 minutes!

In contrast to Zukertort, whose nerves did not cope well with the match tension, Steinitz maintained enviable composure and self-control throughout the whole event. He did not seem to suffer from either fatigue or nervousness. On the other hand, Zukertort looked tired after the second stage. In the last few games it became noticeable that he was unwell. During the 19th game, Zukertort was very pale and somehow particularly nervous. The 20th game could not take place on the scheduled day: Zukertort presented a doctor’s certificate and the game was postponed for four days.

After the match, many commentators vied with each other in making statements hostile to Steinitz, endeavouring to belittle his victory. Steinitz’s opponent, they said, was nothing like the same Zukertort who three years previously had so brilliantly won the London tournament.

‘The match is over. Zukertort has been ignominiously defeated, Steinitz is the official champion of the world. But is the result of the match sufficient?’ – was the question posed by a New York newspaper.

‘The whole of the chess world, which intently followed the beginning of the match, later cooled towards it and in the end became disappointed and dissatisfied: they were expecting a battle of giants, but witnessed a cautious, not very talented, “trial of strength”. They saw that, in the majority of the games, victory was achieved due to a mistake by one of the opponents and that, towards the end, one of the “gladiators” was so weakened, both physically and mentally, that he was not able to put up any kind of resistance.’

To this company were added several chess authorities. In such a solid magazine as Deutsche Schachzeitung, the games of the match were accompanied by perfectly ironic commentaries. The American critics compared what was, in their opinion, dull play by Zukertort and Steinitz, full of flagrant errors, with the creativity of Morphy and his strongest opponents – Löwenthal, Harrwitz and Anderssen. The
play of Steinitz and Zukertort, they found 'dull', 'uninteresting', not bearing comparison with the 'dash' and 'brilliance' of the duels of the American champion.

In the pages of *Shakhmatny Vestnik*, Chigorin expressed the opinion that Zukertort 'was not his usual self, did not play as skillfully and did not even perform like a first-class chess-player'. And indeed, out of the last 15 games, Zukertort won only one. But perhaps this speaks not of the weakness of the loser, but of the strength of the winner?

In a less important contest, as a rule, the attacks would be bolder, more decisive, and the combinations more effective, particularly in games between players of different class. Now even a not very great specialist knows very well that the stronger the resistance, the more difficult it is to carry out intended plans, the more difficult it is to create whole games, logical from beginning to end. The stronger the resistance, the more stubborn the tense struggle, the more probability there is of frustration, mistakes, which, from the side, might seem perfectly incomprehensible.

In the creation of chess productions not partners take part, but 'artistic creation' struggles against 'artistic destruction'. So many interesting plans could be realised if the enemy's resistance were less strong! Then 'chess prose' — practical play, would be transformed into 'chess poetry' — compositions, where the 'evil opponent' is totally absent.

The wholeness of a game does not only depend on the strength of the resistance. An important role is played by the class of the competition, what is at stake in the chess struggle. An encounter between the same grandmasters in a 'sea-side' tournament and a Candidates match involves quite different levels of strain. In addition to this, fatigue from the previous day also varies. In a tournament, there are encounters not only with the leaders, but also with outsiders or less successful participants. In a match there is single combat with one and the same opponent.

In short, matches at the highest level of chess require colossal nervous energy. This energy, unmatched in tournaments, Zukertort could not sustain. His rich imagination proved to be powerless when confronted by the rational methods of Steinitz. This provoked a crisis which led to a slump. Running ahead of ourselves, we mention that, without exception, in all matches for the world championship there have been met, and will be met, mistakes which prompt quite a lot of sceptical observations. Nowadays, whether in the playing-hall or the press bureau, a grandmaster or even a master will sometimes discover serious errors in the play of champion and challenger, though he himself is inferior in playing strength to either of them.

It is psychologically more difficult to play for the world championship than in normal competitions, and this to a large extent explains the mistakes. The Steinitz-Zukertort match was the first contest of its kind, and contemporaries, amongst whom were included future participants of such matches, had a poor appreciation of what it meant to battle for the supreme title in the world. Later on, contemporaries were more than once mistaken in their assessment of world cham-
championship events. Time made amends. We recall how the chess world, 'with reservation', to put it mildly, received the next champion – Emanuel Lasker. Considering that it was not Lasker who won, but Steinitz who lost, then he would have not only lost to Lasker. Recognition of Lasker came later, when he came to defeat all of his rivals, one after the other. On the whole, the games of the Steinitz-Zukertort match are representative games of the leading chess players of that time.

Zukertort's creative failure can be explained first of all by Steinitz's unusual and, for him, highly unpleasant method of play. If Zukertort's opponent had not been Steinitz, but another master, then perhaps Zukertort would have remained the former Zukertort.

Contemporaries explained the defeat of Zukertort by the fact that he refrained from using his basic weapons and tried to conduct the struggle in his rival's style. In particular, Zukertort was reproached for the fact that he chose closed openings in which his tactical skill did not find sufficient scope. As another explanation for Zukertort's defeat was given his sickly condition.

Such a simple explanation does not shed light on what actually happened in St. Louis and New Orleans. As was also the case with Anderssen, the chess romantic of the 70s, Zukertort did not stand still. With time, his play became all the more versatile. The career of Zukertort in the creative history of chess is not at all 'the career of a virtuoso, star and performer'. He was an original and versatile chess master, whose weapons were not only combinational. As distinct from the romantics of the past, Zukertort was an '80s model, who, before rushing into an attack, carried out great preparatory work. In order to create a favourable positional premise for an offensive, he chose (and not only against Steinitz) closed openings. Often Zukertort directed his attack not against the king's flank, but against the queen's. Carried away by Zukertort's combinations, they did not pay attention to that side of his creativity.

The whole of the great master's trouble lay in the fact that his match opponent... played better! Above all this showed itself in the area of strategy. The plans which Steinitz carried out were based on a more healthy positional foundation. And though, in combinational play, Zukertort was superior to Steinitz, he was seldom given the opportunity to demonstrate his skill.

In the majority of games in the match – Emanuel Lasker wrote later – Zukertort was not able to utilise his strength, since Steinitz, it seems, had the gift of foreseeing combinations long before they appeared and preventing them from being carried out... The chess world did not understand what Steinitz's games heralded, just as it did not understand what Steinitz wrote about his 'modern school'.

In short, the fact is not at all that Zukertort was weaker in 1886 than in 1883. He was simply unlucky with his opponent.

The real strength of a chess master is made up of many factors. Inferior in the purely chess struggle, Zukertort also suffered defeat in the battle of wills. Illness weakened his resistance, increased the gap in the score, but it did not decide the result of the match.

A banquet was held on the occasion of Zukertort's return to London.
I went to America to enter upon a severe contest with a formidable opponent—
said Zukertort, addressing his friends. The result of that contest has not, perhaps,
come up to your expectation, but I do not wish to offer any apology or excuse for
myself. On the contrary, I wish here to say that I received from the American people
a most courteous and most hospitable reception. I wish also to say that my oppo­

Nevertheless, Zukertort gave an unusual explanation for his defeat.

I like the American people, and I was
satisfied with my opponent, but I cannot
say that I was delighted with the changes
of climate I had to go through. In New
York, among the breezes of the Atlantic, I
was, of course, all right, but in St. Louis,
in the interior of the continent, I was not
so comfortable, and at New Orleans, in
the Gulf of Mexico, I simply broke
down. At New York my score was 4 to 1,
at St. Louis the score was made equal,
and at New Orleans the score was turned
completely against me. The changes of
climate were, of course, as trying for my
opponent as for myself; the strain was
the same on both of us, and I willingly
give my opponent the credit of having
stood the ordeal better than myself. I
hope, however, that before long we shall
meet again, not for a trial of constitution,
but for a trial of chess skill; and I hope
that this trial will take place upon British ground, under circumstances which will
be equally pleasant and equally favourable to both of us.'

But alas, Zukertort and Steinitz did not meet again. After the match, Zukertort’s
play somehow immediately faded. In the same year, at the tournament of the
British Chess Association in London, he came 7th-8th, scoring only 50 per cent. In
1887 a new blow awaited Zukertort: he lost a match to Blackburne, with a terrible
result for a pretender to the chess crown: +1 -5 =8. It is worth mentioning that
Blackburne was not even the top player in England, in the same year he suffered
defeat to Gunsberg by virtually the same score (+2 -5 =6).

The great tournament in Frankfurt on Main (1887) proved to be the last in
Zukertort’s life. He was already seriously ill. The following year, Zukertort was no
more.
Zukertort Jottings

The visit of Herr Zukertort, the distinguished author and Chess player, to this country, will be one of the pleasantest remembrances associated with the Congress of 1872. Of his great skill as a Chess player, we have had before us satisfactory evidence, in the games of the two matches which he won of Anderssen, and his reputation as one of the masters of the famous Berlin school has long been firmly established in England; but only a personal acquaintance with the man could have brought home to our insular understandings his remarkable enthusiasm for the game, and his profound knowledge of its theory and history.

* * *

It is too soon to say anything about the play except this, that the games are all open; that nearly every game is suggestive, and the variations arising are infinite. It is play such as this that the lovers of Chess desire to see; and although hitherto, Herr Zukertort has not proved himself equal to Herr Steinitz (which perhaps we had no right to expect) he knows too well the strength of his adversary to feel that it is no disgrace to be beaten by the same master that beat his master Anderssen.

* * *

To our mind the Potter-Zukertort match should be memorable for the good feeling with which, from first to last, it has been conducted by the two players and their respective friends. The preponderance of draws in the score, although it detracts from the interest of the match, so far as the gallery is concerned, testifies to the caution of the players and the closeness of the contest, and, at all events, the student will find them lacking neither in interest nor instruction. Mr. Potter's style affords few opportunities for the dash which is the characteristic of Herr Zukertort, the combat has therefore been conducted by both players on the modern lines, a struggle for advantage of position in the endgame.

* * *

A comparison between the games of the Zukertort-Potter match and those in the contest between Dr. Zukertort and Herr Steinitz is only natural, and few we fancy, having done so, will be inclined to doubt that Mr. Steinitz would find the little Prussian a much more formidable antagonist now than he did when he met him immediately after his arrival in this country. The forthcoming match between Messrs. Blackburne and Steinitz may settle the respective merits of these two players, but certainly no satisfactory decision as to the world's championship can be arrived at until Mr. Z's claim to the title has first been disposed of.

* * *
Zukertort may congratulate himself on having lost one game only, in the Divan Tournament, and that against the first winner, Blackburne. He, moreover, has made at least even games in every one of the single encounters against any other competitor, and his chances for the first prize have only been affected by the number of games he drew.

Steinitz: The Field 1876

Dr. Zukertort lately achieved the extraordinary task of playing 16 games without seeing the board, against as many strong players of the West End Club. After a protracted struggle, he succeeded in winning every game except one, which was scored by Dr. Ballard. The effect of memory, clearness of perception, as well as depth and accuracy of combination needed to obtain such a result, can scarcely be imagined, especially since some of the games, like that with Mr. Minchin, bear comparison with any played by Dr. Zukertort over the board. We can only repeat that such a performance was indeed most extraordinary.

Chess Players Chronicle 1876

We are gratified to learn that the festivals in celebration of Professor Anderssen's chess jubilee, which are to be held at Leipzig during the coming week, will be attended by a distinguished delegate from this country. Herr Zukertort, who has been paying a flying visit to the Rotterdam Chess Club, has proceeded to Leipzig on a double Mission, viz., in order to compete in the tournament, and as a bearer of a letter from the St. George's Chess Club, conveying the congratulations of that society to Professor Anderssen, and announcing to the jubilar his election as an honorary member. This handsome attention on the part of the oldest and, from a social point of view, the highest chess club in the world, to one of the greatest players of our time, will no doubt be warmly approved of by every lover of the game throughout the country.

Steinitz: The Field 1877

Everyone who knows Herr Zukertort acknowledges his perfect honour, his contempt for cliques, and his readiness at all times to further the interests of chess without fee or reward.

Westminster Papers 1877

The result of the great International Chess Contest at Paris is highly gratifying to the English school of chess players. The London master, Herr Zukertort, whose natural chess genius has undoubtedly matured only since his arrival in England in 1872, has gained the chief prize offered by the French Republic, in a competition for which most of the greatest living chess masters had entered; and his triumph reflects great credit on the chess theory and practice of his adopted country.

In the tie-match with Winawer, amongst impartial connoisseurs Zukertort was the favourite for first honours, though the score of the two players showed intrinsic equality in an extraordinary manner. Though they had made even games
in their personal encounter, Zukertort’s powerful memory – proved in his marvellous blindfold performance against sixteen opponents at the late West End Chess Club, and at other numerous blindfold exhibitions – his far-sighted circumspection and judgement in the middle of the game, were considered qualities which would outweigh Winawer's collected coolness and self-possession, and his clear accuracy in details of the ending play. The fact that Zukertort, in spite of a bad start, had ultimately reached his rival, was also justly regarded as a proof that the former's faculties of endurance and staying power had been sufficiently wrought for the exciting final struggle in the hard contests of the last six weeks. Yet, in fairness, we must state that only in the latter part of the third game did Zukertort's superiority clearly assert itself, while there was an exciting combat, in which luck favoured the winner.

* * *

As the International Tournament of Paris was the event par excellence of the present year, we suppose we may say that the entertainment given to the winner was the chief occurrence of the past month. Exactly fifty gentlemen sat down to dinner on the 14th November at the Criterion Restaurant to greet and honour Dr. Zukertort. In a capital speech, the guest of the evening acknowledged the compliments rendered to him and said it would be false humility if he did not feel proud of the position he had obtained, especially after the somewhat bad start he made in the Tourney; and added some valuable observations on the importance of tenacity and courage in contests of this nature. He also stated that he should not refuse to stake his reputation in any serious encounter. Before sitting down Dr. Z paid a graceful compliment to his adopted country, in declaring that he owed to England the perfecting of his Chess education, and that whatever might be said to the contrary, in Germany or elsewhere, at Paris he had represented England and England alone.

* * *

I have always avoided personal chess disputes, and have confined myself to the fight over the Chess board, leaving the game under the board to those whose Chess capabilities can achieve a success only in the latter struggle.

Zukertort: Chess Players Chronicle 1879

Succeeding Wisker as games editor for the Westminster Papers was Dr. Zukertort, a man for whom, personally, I have a high regard and friendship, and whose industry and knowledge were placed at our disposal; and it should be remembered that the enormous work entailed in all of us was voluntary and without a fee or reward. I do not mean that Herr Zukertort never accepted an honorarium for his articles on the Chess Openings, but the fee that he accepted was so small that no one could call it payment for work done. The work was done by lovers of games for love alone and never for profit.

Duffy: Westminster Papers 1879
Openings are, like everything else, governed by the tyrannical law of fashion. Tried friends are neglected and superseded by upstarts of doubtful origin, whose only claim to favour is that some Chess swell patronised them on a more or less important occasion.

Zukertort: Chess Monthly 1879

The fine score of seven decided games against one, which Herr Zukertort accomplished in the match just concluded against Rosenthal, makes the fair mark of seven draws on the part of his opponent all the more conspicuous. The final score of the victor seemed to be out of reach of probability, when it is remembered that after the eleventh game of the match he counted only two games to one and eight draws. Yet M. Rosenthal’s deficiency in one important quality, which by no means belongs to the higher attributes of a chess master, will in the eyes of connoisseurs sufficiently account for the ultimate breakdown. It soon became evident that the Frenchman had no staying power, either for a long game or for a long match. His complete downfall dates, in our opinion, from the twelfth game, where he left a piece almost en prise at the end. He then lost heart and consequently was outplayed in three successive games, whence he only recovered sufficient moral force to delay the opponent’s final victory for four sittings. One of M. Rosenthal’s minor defects is, that he does not know how to economise his time. Thus we saw him waste nearly an hour over a move in the early part of the thirteenth game. He naturally became agitated and restless at the most important turning point, and not alone missed his best chance of gaining the superiority, but committed mistakes of reckoning under the pressure of time limit, while his opponent, who had moved in the opening with great rapidity, could remain cool and fresh, just in the most difficult part of the struggle. But, on the other hand, it stands to the credit of the French master that he did actually get out with the best of the opening and the early part of the middle in the majority of games played.

It is generally difficult to draw the line of demarcation between the loser’s faults and the winner’s merits; but apart from Herr Zukertort’s greater powers of endurance, there is a marked superiority in the conduct of the ending game on the part of the winner of the Paris tournament. Notably does the beautiful end play of the fifteenth game stand out as a masterpiece of Herr Zukertort’s genius for exact and clever calculation, not alone at the deciding point, but even more so in leading up to it from the complications of the middle part. Of his fertility of resources in difficult and sometimes inferior positions, the course of the match furnished several instances, and the finish of the third game is an example of brilliant tactics such as rarely occurs in hard match play.

Steinitz: The Field 1880

The twenty sixth annual meeting in connection with the West Yorkshire Chess Association was held on Saturday, April 23rd, at the Queen Hotel, Huddersfield. In order that the proceedings might be rendered more than ordinarily interesting, Herr Zukertort, the victor of the 1878 Paris Tournament, had been engaged to play
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against the strongest members of the Association; and further it had been arranged as an additional attraction that Herr Zukertort should, on the previous evening, play eight simultaneous games blindfold. The players were seated at a long table down the centre of the room, and Herr Zukertort occupied a seat with his back to the players. To the last four players he gave the move, and in the other games he had the move. Play commenced at half past seven, and progressed very steadily. When play ceased at eleven o'clock Herr Zukertort had won three games, and five games remained to be played out on the following day. On Saturday, the room was opened for play at 12 o'clock, and the first matter which had to be disposed of was the blindfold play; the final result being that Herr Zukertort won all the eight games in a masterly manner. It had been announced that twenty simultaneous games would also be played by Herr Zukertort. The play began in the course of the afternoon, but had to be broken off at six o'clock for tea, which was served in the commercial room. Here speeches were made and the proceedings of the annual general meeting carried out. Afterwards the players returned to the playing room, and the simultaneous was continued.

It may be interesting to Chess-players, as showing the power of memory, to state that the secretary, having misplaced the score of one of the blindfold games, applied to Herr Zukertort to supply him with it, and although some 14 or 15 hours had elapsed since the game was played, he immediately dictated the required moves - 20 on each side. Not the less wonderful was his remembrance on Saturday of the exact position in which each game was left on the Friday, and his power of taking up the thread of the play; indeed in two or three of the games, in order to save the players the trouble of going through the score, he placed the pieces in their proper positions on the boards, and the games then proceeded. Subsequently he entertained the members who were not playing, by relating a number of racy Chess and other anecdotes which were highly amusing.

British Chess Magazine 1881

For years past Zukertort and Blackburne have been universally regarded as rivals, between whom a meeting was looked upon as a certainty - near or remote as circumstances might determine - to which no true Chess player could be indifferent. Their respective achievements in the area of public Chess - in tournaments, matches, and blindfold play - were on one and the same plane; were commensurate and equal as might be, without absolutely coinciding, and pointing unmistakably to a similar equality in the men themselves, considered as public Chess players... It remains for us to add a few words as to the extremely satisfactory spirit in which the contest was carried out generally. From first to last the utmost good feeling was shown by both players. A considerate regard for each other's interests - a readiness to adapt themselves to each other's circumstances - to meet each other's wishes, in all but the actual manipulation of the pieces, was fully apparent from beginning to end, and was not lost upon the spectators.

Chess Players Chronicle 1881

* * *
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The winner of the Paris tournament has achieved another brilliant victory in carrying off the honours of the contest with Blackburne. Zukertort's victory remains deserved in every respect, and must be attributed to his mastery in the arrangement of his forces when conducting the close game, and his patent superiority in the endings.

Steinitz: The Field 1881

* * *

The fine day Blackburne and Zukertort arrived in Berlin for a chess tournament. First they made a tour of the city. Zukertort, who in his youth had lived and studied in Berlin, pointed out any sights worth seeing and told his worthy friend everything about them in the minutest detail. 'And what is that big building there?' asked Blackburne. 'That is a munitions depot' replied Zukertort. 'But no, dear friend — said Blackburne in a sweet tone — that is the University where you studied!'

With no desire to detract from the merits of Mr. Blackburne's great feat in winning the Berlin tournament, we, in examining into the causes of his success, in comparison with Mr. Zukertort's score, have come to the conclusion that Blackburne's strong constitution has favoured him in sustaining the hard task of three week's daily play with such masters. While Mr. Zukertort damaged his score through his more delicate organisation not being equal to the tremendous strain, especially coming as it did, so closely upon his late match. This we are convinced was an important balance in the scale of success, more so, perhaps, than the majority of amateurs will credit; at the same time, we are sure experienced players will endorse this opinion. It is our duty now, however, in further estimating the results of this great tournament to state our conclusion, that Zukertort's play suffered, and was weakened, by 'too much theory', which well-chosen expression, contemporary pertinently applies to all German Chess players, and therewith explains their inferior position in the final score.

Chess Players Chronicle 1881

* * *

Zukertort was indisposed during the Vienna tournament and suffered eight defeats. We must however not omit to refer to the many elements of chance, and other circumstances which influence the result of such a gigantic contest. We look round in vain for another sport where a contest entails such an excessive amount of labour as does this — hard play during thirty-four almost consecutive days, lasting for six, eight and even ten hours each day. The rooms at Vienna being inconveniently crowded and excessively hot, it becomes in a measure also a test of muscular strength and endurance.

Chess Players Chronicle 1882

* * *

Zukertort lost to Weiss in the 34th round at Vienna, this was a piece of good luck to Zukertort. Had he beaten Weiss, he would actually have been £12 out of pocket; as third prize winner he would only have obtained £48, but as fourth man he became entitled to the special prize of £32, which brought his winnings up to £60. Of
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course, had he had the misfortune (from a pecuniary point of view) of beating
Weiss his score would have been 23 1/2, and Mason would have then taken the fourth
and the special prize. We refer to this fact simply because it seems to exercise the
minds of some Chess players, as may be inferred from the following answer to a
 correspondent, which appears in the Leeds Mercury. 'S.S. He was certainly better
off, from a monetary point of view, in being fourth prize bearer rather than third.
You must form your own opinion upon the subject.'

Chess Players Chronicle 1882

On the opening day, Zukertort, by his brilliant victory over Chigorin, showed that
he was in form, and satisfied his friends that if his health, which had even rendered
doubtful his participation in the Tournament, were not to break down, he would
take his own part in the struggle for the championship.

The double defeat of his great rival Steinitz early in the contest, through his
venturesome adoption of his own opening (in which he had been successful on the
first day against Winawer), and refusal to accept the draw, which in that opening
can apparently be forced by the defence within ten moves, was the most notable
incident, and added greatly to Zukertort's chances of ultimate success.

At the close of the first round, Zukertort, who had lost only one game, and that
by a palpable blunder, to Steinitz, had taken so commanding a lead, amounting to
2 1/2 games, or five points, over Mason, who was then second, that except in the case
of an utter collapse, which in his state of health was always possible, the destination
of the first prize seemed almost certain.

As the second round went on it became clear that Zukertort would maintain his
supremacy of the first round, which became almost a certainty when, after eight
hours' play, he defeated his most formidable antagonist, Steinitz, on the 7th June, in
one of the most scientific games, as played by both parties, throughout the Tourna­
ment.

In the following week he defeated Winawer and Blackburne, when more than a
week before the termination of the Tournament it became impossible for any
other competitor to equal his score. He added one more achievement to his scroll
of victories by defeating Rosenthal, when the long-dreaded breakdown took
place. It was well known to his friends for the last ten days, while he had been
completing the roll of the successive victories with which his second round had
opened, that he had been compelled to drench himself nightly with a most
virulent poison to keep up his failing energies to the mark. But Nature would not
subsitute to any such dictation, and at last the long-threatened breakdown
occurred, fortunately when it was too late to deprive the champion of the Tourna­
ment of his well-merited honours. In his game with Captain Mackenzie, having
in a defence to the Ruy Lopez obtained an absolute winning position, Zukertort,
under the extraordinary hallucination that he had already doubled his Rooks on
the Queen's file, went in for what he believed to be an immediately winning
combination, which actually resulted in the loss of a Rook and Bishop, and neces­
sitated the instant abandonment of the game.
The following two days the champion was successively defeated by the two
keiest players in the Tournament, and while heartily congratulating them on the
satisfaction they must have felt at so unexpected an occurrence, it is impossible to
deny that on each occasion Zukertort performed most artistically the Japanese
rape despatch, and defeated himself with somewhat of the like pertinacity with
which he had previously defeated others. To his friends this was a mortifying
combination of an otherwise magnificent performance, from the merits of which it
extracts in no way, as with shattered nerves and temporary Chess-blindness it was
the shadow of Zukertort that encountered these defeats.

Until this breakdown Zukertort had achieved a record hitherto unattained in the
finals of Chess Tournaments by winning twenty-two games to one defeat, and had
shown in the performance that combination of brilliancy, energy, and accuracy
which, against such competitors, could alone have attained such a result. His game
against Blackburne in the first round is the finest that has been played in the time of
the present generation of Chess-players, and proves, if any such proof be wanting,
that magnificent combination is superior to that dull Chess strategy which risks no
Black and struggles pertinaciously to obtain an extra Pawn on the Queen's side
against the end-game. The stratagem is as sound as it is brilliant, and when
Zukertort played his R to K3 he had the whole combination, twelve moves deep,
neatly in his mind — a combination not to be surpassed in all the recorded games
of the brilliant masters of the Past, Morphy and Anderssen. Zukertort enrols himself
in the modern school of strategy versus combination, but genius will claim its
own and a brilliant Chess gem of this description will always rouse the enthusiasm
of the devotees of the game beyond the exhibition of the highest Chess strategy
ever witnessed.

There was no such perfect specimen in the second round, yet the game against
Englisch is singularly brilliant, though marred by a blot towards the finish, and
the most correct judgement could foresee the ultimate reward for the piece
apparently sacrificed in that game with so little immediate prospect of a return. The
second game with Steinitz is an almost perfect specimen of modern Chess, though
the transposition of two of Steinitz's moves would appear to have insured the draw.
The pertinacity with which Zukertort would be content with nothing short of
victory is especially shown in his second game with Noa, the deciding game with
Whinawer in the second round, and with Englisch in the first, where by his conduct
of the end-game Zukertort routed the critics, who in each case contended that a
draw only was possible. Throughout these games it may fairly be said that Zukertort
rarely indulged in unnecessary risks (his first game with Mason is certainly an
exception), and yet more rarely omitted the opportunity for a brilliant stroke when
offered. Above all, he played persistently to win, while most of his competitors
were content to play for a draw, and only go in for victory through their opponent's
shudder. It would have been a melancholy result if such tactics had secured the
highest prize.

Minchin: London International Chess Tournament 1883

* * *
Johannes Zukertort

At this stage, walking round to see how the other games were going, one player said to me, 'You've got the little man.' 'I don't know,' I replied; 'it's tremendously difficult.' On returning, Zukertort had not yet made his move, but it dawned on me that the sacrifice of the Rook was fatal and the only question was whether he would find it out. This did not long remain doubtful. Returning to the other I presently heard a crash as though a piece were being slapped down with an emphasis a man's muscles could give it, and presently there came a tap to my shoulder, 'Your clock is going, I have made my move,' he said, and from the expression of his face and the manner in which he drew himself up to his full height I felt I might remark as the writer did when the audience damned his play, 'he has it out, has he?'

** * * * **

The most nervous of the competitors appear to be Englisch and Zukertort. The latter, when contending with an equal, though perfectly quiet in outward demeanour, betrays by his compressed lips, and pale, dew-dropped brow the agitation that is going on within. Both these combatants have been very successful, but happens as a result of their skill, and in spite of their nervousness.

Chess Players Chronicle 1885

* * * *

We do not know why Zukertort desired to be considered other than he is, but we believe he never wished his Jewish extraction to be known.

Chess Players Chronicle 1885

* * * *

At the opening banquet of the Nuremberg Chess Congress 1883, Dr. Schmid, in his speech, expressed his regret, which he was sure the company shared at Dr. Zukertort's absence. Dr. Zukertort's unprecedented success at the London Tournament shed its lustre on German Chess, for he hoped England would not grudge Germany Zukertort, having Blackburne. Dr. Schmid concluded by proposing the representatives of the Press, coupled with the name of Mr. Hoffer. The latter replied, thanking his friend Dr. Schmid for his flattering remarks, and the company for the cordiality with which the toast was received. In concluding he reminded them that if they took the credit of Dr. Zukertort's success they must not forget that the German and the English Zukertort were two distinct persons. Zukertort had matured his style since his residence in England and had acquired from the English school that tenacity and perseverance which is best expressed in the proverb, 'An Englishman does not know when he is beaten.'

Chess Monthly 1885

* * * *

Despite his delicate health, Zukertort undertook one of the longest and most gruelling exhibition tours in chess history, when he visited North America from November 1883 to September 1884. Over a ten month period he travelled from coast to coast playing hundreds of games including 20 blindfold exhibitions in the U.S.A. and 4 in Canada, with an overall result of $+160 -36 =24$. 
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**Zukertort Jottings**


Discoursing at sundry times upon the Chess Openings, Mr. Zukertort expressed implied opinions with regard to a number of these. He condemns the King's Knight Gambit (1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3) in general and the King's Bishop Gambit (1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qc4) in particular. He despises the advance of the f-pawn as first move, and this equally for first or second player. He declares 3...f5 a lost game in the defence in Ruy Lopez, and has evidently a special affection for the Queen's Pawn Opening. 'After a few moves the books can do you no good, and each player must fight on his own resources.' He thinks the Evans Gambit sound in practice and that the Compromised Defence is the only one to give the second player a chance. He pronounces the Steinitz Gambit (1.e4 e5 2.Qc3 Qc6 3.f4 exf4 4.d4 Wh4+ fxe2) 'an abortion'.

---

Pittsburgh Chronicle Telegraph 1884

* * *

The San Francisco Chronicle 1884

* * *

Steinitz and Zukertort are both lions, only Steinitz roars the loudest.

Hartford Times 1884

* * *

During Zukertort's latest stay in Cincinatti, he accepted an invitation by Mr. Wilder his comfortable residence in St. Auburn, where he was made exceedingly welcome. A great company of ladies and gentlemen were present. Zukertort played with Mr. Charles Miller ten games on even terms, of which he won all save one in which he gave Mr. Miller the right to take two moves back. During the play, Zukertort remarked, 'I see that a namesake of yours in the Cincinatti Gazette has maintained that Morphy could have given me a Knight.' Mr. Miller did not open his lips, but remained clammed like an oyster, though he himself was the author of the questionable article. The spectators enjoyed the joke indescribably.

Mirror of American Sports 1884

* * *

When Zukertort started to play, he placed his hat on the window casing. I remarked that it was a big hat. Zukertort told me he had bought it from England, that it was a size 9½, and that it would be difficult to find one here large enough to fit him. Then and there I thought how absurd it was for me to try to win from a man with a head like that. I was right—he beat me.

Albert Hodges, Louisville 1884

* * *

Since the conclusion of the London Tournament, Mr. Steinitz has considered it his duty to pose as a martyr before the Chess World, persecuted and injured by myself and my friends. He generously reminds me, on every possible and impossible occasion, that I lost a match to him thirteen years ago, and asserts that I now carefully avoid another encounter. It is beyond the limits of decorum and parlia-
mentary language to enter into a discussion with an opponent who pricked on the scurrility of his speech and his writings. Past experience has taught any direct negotiations with Mr. Steinitz would exhaust human patience and prove barren. I am, however, ready to play Mr. Steinitz on either side of the and call on him to appoint a second with whom my second may discuss necessary preliminaries. These two gentlemen might elect a referee, and a committee, which would hardly find it difficult to arrange matters satisfactorily, there is a mortal whom Mr. Steinitz considers worthy of his confidence and appoint him.

Zukertort: Chess Monthly

* * *

Only six months after returning home from America, Zukertort commenced another tour of Europe. During April to July 1885 he visited Paris – Cologne – Berlin – Posen – Breslau – Weimar – Leipzig – Brunswick – Magdeburg – Chemnitz – Glashau – Dresden – Prague – Munich – Frankfurt again dazzling the chess clubs with his blindfold and simultaneous displays. We would like to relate a little event which fills us with wonder and proves the great skill and the perfect intellectual chess lucidity of the winner of two great tournaments of Paris and London. During one of the visits with M. Zukertort has honoured us at the office of La Strategie, he asked us, one day, he was accompanied by M. Rosenthal, for permission to correct the proofs of games of the May number of Chess Monthly which he wanted to send off the same evening. We hastened to place at his disposal a chessboard and a pen and ink only; with a chessboard I might make mistakes, but here (pointing to his forehead) I am sure of myself. Indeed, hour to an hour and a half, he had corrected his proofs, which he dispatched to England. The readers of Chess Monthly will be able to check blindfold correction of proofs has been well done; we have played over board some of the dozen games contained in this May number and have found no errors at all. Are there many of our colleagues who correct their proofs in a reliable and quick way?

La Strategie

* * *

The title of the Chess Championship of the World can be only acquired by a really international tournament, like Vienna '73 and '82, Paris '67 and London '83.

Zukertort, U.S.A.

* * *

Though Zukertort and Steinitz are the giants of the chess world, in the circle John L. Sullivan adorns they would be classed as feather-weights. They are considerably below medium weight. Their physical development all runs in the brain. Steinitz is the heavier of the two men. Indeed, for such a little man, burdened with a respectable quantity of avoirdupois. His face is full, his forehead high and bulging. He has a bushy beard and an abundance of dark hair. His
He bears an expression of imperturbable amiability. With the aid of a little stage dressing, Zukertort would make a first-rate Mephistopheles. His face is long and thin, his beard sharp and pointed. His nose long and sharp. His hair scant and revealing a bald patch. He has a shrewd, wide awake look at all times and has a habit of occasionally bunching his eyebrows, corrugating his brow and scanning his adversary as though he would read his innermost thoughts.

In their attitude and behaviour, while playing, the individuality of each player was seen. Mr. Steinitz scarcely quitted his chair. He leaned so far over the board that his nose almost touched the pieces. In contrast to this style, Mr. Zukertort jumped up from his chair after he had moved, lighted a cigarette and talked with his second and umpire.

Steinitz smokes a cigar and when he is tackling a peculiar knotty point puffs vigorously. Dr. Zukertort supplies him with a light for his second cigar. In the moves preceding the expiration of the first two hours of play, Steinitz is so pushed for time he can’t keep his record of the game, and Dr. Zukertort reads off the back moves to him. It is pleasant to see these little courtesies.

* * *

New York 1886

While waiting for the game to open, Mr. Zukertort was here, there and everywhere, sitting freely with those who were presented to him, and evidently feeling very serene as to the result of the afternoon. Mr. Steinitz came in with his rubbers on and his throat muffled up—a fat phlegmatic little man, with a fine forehead and mussed hair and clothes. His legs are very short, although his circumference around the equator is rather large, and it was a peculiar sight to watch the great Chess-player rested upon an ordinary chair and feeling unsuccessfully for the continent of North America with his feet. Both men are hirsute, but Zukertort is better groomed than Steinitz. Both have fine heads. Steinitz is all curves, Zukertort all angles. One of them gives the impression of large-mindedness, the other of acuteness. Steinitz is solidity and adipose tissue, Zukertort all brilliancy and nerves.

* * *

The Republican, St. Louis 1886

The moves up to this point had been made almost as rapidly as at the opening, but now the intervening pauses grew more protracted, and an opportunity was afforded to and indulged in by the spectators for a Physiognomical study of the two masters. Steinitz had his seat with its back to the light coming in from the Baronne street windows, and played with the white men. He sat on the edge of his chair, leaning forward, his hands on his knees, while Zukertort rested his head on hand, his elbow being supported by the arm of his chair.

Zukertort apparently took things easy, judging from his position when the game opened. He leaned back in his chair with his legs crossed his head a little inclined to one side. The movements of his hand were quicker and more nervous than those of Mr. Steinitz, whose actions appear to be more lethargic. The short compact figure of the latter, his ruddy face and ruddier whiskers, his slow respiration were in marked contrast with Dr. Zukertort’s slighter form, darker hair and whiskers, clear
Johannes Zukertort

white face and sanguine nervous temperament. The doctor looked as if ready for the ladies' saloon; Mr. Steinitz as better prepared for a walk with a male friend. The doctor's black coat fitted him neatly, his opponent's gray hung loosely in shoulders. Mr. Steinitz's constant companion, a rough knobby stick, was indicative of his tough, stubborn disposition as a Chess combatant. Dr. Zukertort scanned the board with quick, sharp glances, his gaze roving rapidly from one part to another. Mr. Steinitz kept his eyes glued to a particular section of the field, and after apparently satisfied with his inspection, slowly shifted them to another. Dr. Zukertort frequently rose from his chair, walked to the windows and gazed contemplatively at the moving panorama of Canal street; Mr. Steinitz never left his seat and only interrupted his cogitations to whisper to his second or sip the chocolate ice-cream at his side. One player seemed all nervous force and rapid perception; the other, all phlegm and deep-seeking meditation. The contrast was striking.

* * *

Not much surprise has been felt in London at the decisive victory achieved by Mr. Steinitz in the championship match, for it was generally believed that the game of the middle portion of the match showed that Mr. Zukertort was playing somewhat below his best form, and this was feared by his friends to be almost fatal to his chances in the latter part of the match. It cannot be doubted for a single moment that Steinitz, both physically and mentally, has more staying powers about him than are possessed by his opponent. In this connection I may just state that a well-known player said to me before the match had commenced, 'You'll see if Zukertort loses the first two or three games right off he will collapse altogether, but if Steinitz loses nine games clean off the reel he will play the tenth with just the same pertinacity with which he played the first. Steinitz never plays better than when fighting the uphill battle; Zukertort only shows at his best when fortune smiles.'

* * *

Steinitz won the match with the final score of Steinitz ten, Zukertort five, and five drawn games—a remarkable performance, deserving the highest credit, especially if it be considered that, after the first victory, he lost four games running. In St. Louis he equalised the score, and out of eleven games played in New Orleans, he lost only one. Comparing the temperament and physique of the two men, it must be admitted that Zukertort was badly handicapped by nature as well as by the conditions of the match. The latter, of course, he was ill-advised to accept—if Zukertort condescending to be advised by anybody can be imagined. The time limit was decidedly against him; he would have had more chance at a limit of twenty moves an hour. As a matter of fact, he rarely, if ever, used his allotted time; whereas Steinitz was over and over again pressed for time. The adjournments and displacements were against him. A man of delicate frame like Zukertort, endowed with such a large share of nervous irritability—a consequence of his health—and with such an active mind, cannot stand the mental strain and anxiety for months. The match commenced on January 11 and concluded on March 29. It may fairly be assumed
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had the match been played at a faster pace, and not interrupted, after he won
four games right off, the result would have been different. He could only come in
with a rush after the first élan. In the same ratio as Zukertort is impressionable,
Steinitz is phlegmatic, careful, and over-cautious, if anything. His physique is
trust, and his mistrust discernible in the game. He trusts nobody, not even
himself! If Zukertort sees a good move, he makes it; if Steinitz sees a good move, he
looks out for a better one.

The result of the match falls far below expectation, chiefly owing to the contro-
versy and rivalry of the two players, which has been carried on for years, and
reached its culminating point after the 1883 tournament. Steinitz started a
magazine in America, and enjoyed fully the new sensation of extolling the vast
superiority of 'the modern school', of which he claims to be the initiator and
pontiff. He attempted even to disparage Morphy. If it were possible that he could
have converted a single one of Morphy's admirers to his views, that one must be
nearly disappointed with the games produced in the present match. Where does 'the
modern school' come in? Two of the greatest living masters play a match after
months of negotiations, and shelter themselves, with their whole arsenal of
opposed new modes of treating the openings, behind the monotonous Ruy Lopez
and the Queen's Gambit. Zukertort finished by abandoning his theory of treating
close games, and returned to the old way of thirty years ago. Steinitz indulged
in a valueless novelty, and, if his opponent does not condescend to make a blunder,
poses a draw. Finally he reverts to the old way of playing the Ruy Lopez, and
these were the best games in the match. After the glaring unfairness of analysing
Morphy's games thirty years later, from a modern point of view, something more
was expected. We might just imagine a future founder of a modern school thirty
years hence analysing the games in the present match from the then modern point
of view! Morphy's games will compare well with any games played by any master
who ever lived. He who makes the fewest mistakes is the better player, and Morphy
was that one. To this must be added that Morphy was a genius, and a century rarely
touches more than one such remarkable intellect.

One advantage which the match has produced is, that both players have lost
prestige, and that the imaginary distance which was supposed to separate them
from the other eminent masters has dwindled down to imperceptible dimensions.

* * *

The question of stakes or money terms upon which Chess is played is a question of
the first importance in the interests of Chess, and a few notes of my experience
on the subject may not be inappropriate...

Before the year 1866, £10 or £20 a side was a convenient and common stake for
a match. Staunton and Harrwitz, Staunton and Horwitz, Morphy and Anderssen,
Steinitz and Blackburne, Steinitz and Zukertort, and Falkbeer and Bird were all
within these figures. The Championship match in 1843, England and France,
between Staunton and St. Amant was for £100 a side, but the English player had to
jet to Paris, and the match was a long one, and it was hoped even at that time that
future matches would be mainly for the honour of victory, and that money in the case would be a reasonable sum to liberally cover the player's expenses. Morphy reluctantly played for £100 a side in 1858, but his matches with Anderssen, Harrwitz and others were for merely nominal stakes. In 1858 an example was set in the case of Steinitz and Anderssen, when £100 a side was offered, and although Steinitz and Blackburne, and Zukertort and Black-ber, matches for £60 a side the stakes were only thus limited to the amount which could be conveniently obtained from backers at the time. So stakes progressively increased, and Steinitz and Zukertort actually played for £400 a side, a sum neither player could afford to lose, even though they could tax their Chess supporters for it. An adventure of a return-match which Zukertort so much desired, became impossible. Extra-ordinary depression of the great Chess victor in two of the most important Internationals ever held, viz., Paris in 1878, and Criterion, London, 1883.

There is too much reason to fear that the result of this match, and Zukertort's sensitiveness to supposed coolness towards him afterwards mainly contributed to cause his premature break up and untimely end. I always advised him before any match, in justice to himself, to stipulate for a time limit of 20 or 25 moves and not to play for more than £100 a side, the previous extreme maximum. In greatest matches, happy for him if he had observed this rule, as he himself acknowledged...

It has always seemed to me that as the stakes go up the play goes down. And certainly would be difficult to name a match in which so few interesting events took place as that between Steinitz and Zukertort...

Bird: Chess History and Records

* * *

Zukertort's play throughout the British Chess Association tourney has been disappointing, and altogether wanting in the precision that characterised him in 1883. Then it was almost perfect; sound alike in opening, mid-game, and the end. Rarely missing the absolutely best move, he generally made the most the position would give him. Now he was weak and irresolute; gaining advantages only to throw them away; initiating fine attacks but to let them slip through his fingers; attaining winning end-games, and then by a blunder throwing them away. There can be no question but that ill-health had much to do with this break down. A wayward body acting upon the mind, the unstrung nerves playing tricks with the throbbing brain. In his game with Pollock, however, there was to be seen the old skill; the patient building up of attack; the careful conservation of small advantages; the skillful and far-reaching plan of united action.

British Chess Magazine

* * *

Zukertort has not recovered yet from his recent illness, contracted during the latter part of his match with Steinitz, he is nervously impulsive, as in his game with Black-ber, where he captured a knight, losing his queen on the very next move, or in his game with Mackenzie, where he overlooked a mate in two moves, when he had a win game; then he also sacrificed a piece with Lipschutz, and lost the game; and w.
For Hanham he sacrificed about three pieces in a combination which was quite sound, or anyhow unnecessary to indulge in judging from the nature of the position. These incidents alone are indicative of his being entirely out of form, if it did not be perceived by his personal appearance.

Hoffer: Chess Monthly 1886

In the British Chess Club, Blackburne defeated Zukertort by 5-1, with 8 draws. It was said at the time that by this Blackburne vindicated his name as a match-player; but more importance would attach to the result had not Zukertort so obviously failed to be the player he was since his defeat by Steinitz the previous year. It was true that he had only just won the spring handicap at the British Chess Club, with a fine score of 13½ points in 15 games, but for more serious chess he no longer had the stamina. A welcome feature of the match was the friendly relations between the two players; a contrast to what had been the case in Zukertort’s last match.

Sergeant: A Century of British Chess

It is a fact that the unfortunate Zukertort was playing for a shilling when he was seized with the apoplectic stroke that led to his decease. It is however needless to recall this sad event. The chess player is, as a rule, endowed with the artistic temperament, thinking but little of to-morrow or yesterday, and enjoying himself in the present, amid the endless complications and delights that his chosen pastime never fails to afford.

In the British Chess Club the handicap is just about completed, yet the destination of the first prize is yet in some little doubt. Zukertort’s sad death placed the committee in a little difficulty, for whether they cancelled or retained his score, some injustice seemed to follow. After consideration, however, they came to the conclusion to retain his score and to reckon his unplayed games draws, and under the circumstances this seems a very equitable arrangement all round. This brought his score up to 10 which was sufficient to give the late Master a prize. I understand the amount of this prize will be handed over to defray part of his funeral expenses.

Cunningham: International Chess Magazine 1888

Zukertort lived in the Walworth Road just past my single eleven years lodging – 5 Regent Street, and he voluntarily confided many matters to me during the last twelve months of his life, which was for certain reasons fortunate. His two beautiful daughters, the sole care of his life, are now provided for, one nine years of age, and the other thirteen years of age, are being educated at or near Berlin by Zukertort’s mother and his married sister...

Bird: Chess History and Reminiscences
Part Two
The Games
### Zukertort's Tournament and Match Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>–</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Berlin. Match v Anderssen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Aachen tournament</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Hamburg tournament</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Barmen tournament</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Berlin. Match v Anderssen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>London. Grand tournament</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Handicap tournament</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v Steinitz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>London. Match v Steinitz</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>City of London Handicap tour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v Cohen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v Osborne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v De Vere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v Sother</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>London. Handicap matches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v De Soyres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>London. Match v Potter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>London. Divan tournament</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Match v Blackburne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Leipzig tournament</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Cologne tournament</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Paris tournament</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Paris. Play off match v Winawer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Chislehurst. Match v Owen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>London. Handicap match v Minchin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>London. Match v Rosenthal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>London. Match v Blackburne</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Berlin tournament</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Vienna tournament</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>London tournament</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Baltimore. Match v Sellman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>St Louis. Match v Judd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Philadelphia. Match v Martinez</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>New York/St.Louis/New Orleans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**World Championship Match v Steinitz**

1886 London. British Chess Association | 12 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7½ |
**Zukertort’s Tournament and Match Record**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tournament</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham tournament</td>
<td>9 5 2 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Chess Club Handicap tournament</td>
<td>15 13 1 1 13½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Match v Blackburne</td>
<td>14 1 8 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt tournament</td>
<td>20 6 5 9 8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Chess Association</td>
<td>9 5 2 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Simpson’s Divan Handicap tournament</td>
<td>17 9 3 5 10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Chess Club</td>
<td>8 7 6++ 1 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Handicap tournament**

- Draws replayed – did not count.
- 3 wins by forfeit.
- **If drawn, the first two games of each match did not count. A third game was replayed which counted.**
- Unplayed games classed as drawn due to Zukertort’s death.
**Tournament and Match Data**

1868 Berlin: Match v Anderssen
0 1 0 ½ 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0

1868 Aachen tournament
Anderssen 3; Lange, ZUKERTORT 2; WPaulsen 1; Schallopp 0.

1868 Hamburg tournament
Anderssen, L.Paulsen 4; Minckwitz, Schallopp, ZUKERTORT 2; Alexander 1

1869 Barmen tournament
Anderssen 5; Minckwitz, Schallopp, ZUKERTORT 3; WPaulsen 1; Hein 0.

1871 Berlin: Match with Anderssen
0 1 0 1 1 1 1

1872 London: Grand tournament
Steinitz 7; Blackburne 5; ZUKERTORT, MacDonnell, De Vere 4; Wisker 3; Gossip 1; Martin 0.
In a play-off for third place, Zukertort beat MacDonnell, and MacDonnell beat De Vere, who scratched to Zukertort.

1872 London: Handicap tournament
v Steinitz ½ ½ 1
v Wisker 0

1872 London: Match v Steinitz
0 0 ½ ½ 0 ½ 1 0 0 ½ 0

1874 City of London Handicap tournament
v Cohen 1
v Osborne 1
v De Vere 1 0 1
v Sother 1 0 0
First Match: 0 1 1 1, Second Match: 1 1 ½ 1

1874 London: Matches v De Soyres
First game played even, the second Zukertort gave pawn and move, third pawn and two moves, the fourth knight odds.

1875 London: Match v Potter
1 ½ ½ ½ ½ ½ 1 ½ ½ 0 ½ 1 1 1

1876 London: Divan tournament
Blackburne 8; ZUKERTORT 7; Potter 6; MacDonnell 4½; Janssens 2½; Minchin 1.

1877 London: Match v Blackburne
0 1 (Match unfinished due to dispute over stake money)
Leipzig tournament
L.Paulsen 9; Anderssen, ZUKERTORT 8½; Winawer 7½; Goring 6;
English, Leffmann, Schallopp 5; Metger 3½; Flechsig 3;
Franke, WPaulsen 2½.

Cologne tournament
ZUKERTORT 3½; Metger, Schallopp, Wemmers 3; Goring 2½; N.N. 0.

Paris tournament
ZUKERTORT, Winawer 16½; Blackburne 14½; Bird, Mackenzie 13;
Anderssen 12½; English, Rosenthal 11½; Clerc, Mason 8½; Gifford 3½;
Pitschel 2½.

Paris tournament play off match
v Winawer ½ ½ 1½

Chislehurst: Match with Owen
Won 8, Drew 3, Lost 0.

London: Match v Minchin
1 1 0 ½ 1
First two games Zukertort gave odds of pawn and two moves,
the second two games, odds of pawn and move, and the last even.

London: Match v Rosenthal
½ ½ 1 ½ ½ ½ ½ 1 ½ 0 ½ 1 1 1 1 ½ ¼ ½ 1

London: Match v Blackburne
½ ½ 1 1 1 0 ½ 1 ½ 1 0 ½ 1

Berlin tournament
Blackburne 14; ZUKERTORT 11; Chigorin, Winawer 10½;
Mason, Witek 9½; Minckwitz, Schwarz 8½; Berger, L.Paulsen 8;
WPaulsen 7½; Schallopp 7, Riemann, Wemmers 6½; Noa 5½;
Schmid 3½; Von Schutz 1½.

Vienna tournament
Steinitz, Winawer 24; Mason 23; Mackenzie, ZUKERTORT 22½;
Blackburne 21½; English 19½; L.Paulsen 18½; Witek 18;
Weiss 16½; Hrubby 16; Schwarz, Chigorin 14; Meitner 13; Bird 12;
Ware 11; Noa 9; Fleissig 7.

London tournament
ZUKERTORT 22; Steinitz 19; Blackburne 16½; Chigorin 16;
Englisch, Mackenzie, Mason 15½; Rosenthal 14; Winawer 13; Bird 12;
Noa 9½; Sellman 6½; Mortimer, Skipworth 3.

Baltimore: Match v Sellman
0 1 1

St. Louis: Match v Judd
Won 3, Drew 2, Lost 0.

Philadelphia: Match v Martinez
Won 9, Drew 1, Lost 3.
Johannes Zukertort

1886 New York – St. Louis – New Orleans:
   World Championship Match v Steinitz
   New York: 0 1 1 1 1
   St. Louis: 0 0 ½ 0
   New Orleans: ½ 0 0 1 ½ ½ 0 ½ 0 0 0
   Won 5, Drew 5, Lost 10.

1886 London: British Chess Association tournament
   Blackburne, Burn 8½; Gunsberg, Taubenhaus 8; Mason 7;
   Lipschutz 6½: Mackenzie, ZUKERTORT 6; Schallopp 5; Pollock 4½;
   Mortimer 4; Hanham 3½; Bird 2½.

1886 Nottingham tournament
   Burn 8, Schallopp 7; Gunsberg, ZUKERTORT 6; Bird 5½; Taubenhaus –
   Pollock 3; Hanham, Thorold 2; Rynd 1½.

1887 London: British Chess Club Handicap tournament
   ZUKERTORT 13½; Hoffer 11; Gunsberg, Mills 10½;
   Lowe, Wainwright 10; Trenchard 9; Mundell 7½;
   Hewitt; Ingoldsby 6½; Cathcart, Rabson 5½; Bennett, Redpath 4;
   Mackeson 3; Marett 2½.

1887 London: Match v Blackburne
   ½ 0 0 ½ 1 ½ 0 ½ 0 ½ ½ ½ 0

1887 Frankfurt tournament
   Mackenzie 15; Blackburne, Weiss 13½; Bardeleben 13;
   Berger, Tarrasch 12; Erlich 11½; L.Paulsen, Schallopp 11;
   Schiffs 10; Burn, Alapin ½; Noa 9; Gunsberg, Metger,
   ZUKERTORT 8½; Von Gottschall, Von Scheve 8; Taubenhaus 6½;
   Fritz 6; Harmonist 5½.

1887 London: British Chess Association tournament
   Burn, Gunsberg 8; Blackburne 6½; ZUKERTORT 6; Pollock 4;
   Lee 3½; Bird, Guest, Mason 3; Mortimer 0.

1888 London: Simpson's Divan Handicap tournament
   Gunsberg 16½; Mason 15½; Bird 13; Gibbons 11½; Pollock, Sellen 11;
   Mortimer, ZUKERTORT 10½; Hicks, Lee 9; Muller 8½; Kinderman 6½;
   Rolland 6; Purchase 5½; Gaitskill 4; Bull (retired), Evans (retired) 1;
   Jackson (retired) 0.

1888 London: British Chess Club Handicap tournament
   Blackburne, Gunsberg 11; Bird, Wainwright, ZUKERTORT 10;
   Gattie 8½; Pollock 7½; Mortimer 6½; Jetley, Michael 5½;
   Ingoldsby 4½; Sellen, Wyman 4; Alderson 2; A.Hirschfield 0.
   Zukertort died after scoring 7 wins and one loss.
   His remaining 6 games were classed as drawn.

***
Student Years in Breslau 1862-1867

1  Bishop’s Opening
A***
Zukertort
Rosen, April 1862
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.b4 c6 3.d3 b4 4.exd5 d5 5.a3 w5 6.0-0
White castles in the hope of winning the black knight on e4; how little this is the case is shown by the sequel.
6...wxe5 7.d3
If 7.a1 would follow 7...d6 8.g3
a8.d3 decisive is 8...w.xh2+ 9.w.f1
w.h1+ 10.w.e2 w.xg2) 8.w.f5 9.w.e2
d3 w.xf2+ 10.w.h1 w.h3) 9...0-0
and Black holds on to the won piece.

7...d6! 8.g3
In 8.f4, 8...w.d4+ wins.

8...w.g5! 9.w.e1? w.f3+ 10.w.f1
w.e3
Mate.

2  Sicilian Defence
Neumann
Zukertort
Breslau, 18 April 1864
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 c5 2.d3 e6 3.d4
It is better if White first develops his queen’s knight.

3...cx.d4 4.w.d4 f6 5.w.c3 w.c6
6.w.e3 d5 7.wxd5 exd5 8.w.e2
w.d6 9.0-0 0-0 10.w.g5 w.e6
11.w.e1 w.h8
This king move is absolutely necessary for the following combination, so that the e6-pawn cannot be taken with check.

12.w.e6 fxe6 13.w.g4

13...w.xg4! 14.w.xg4
On 14.w.xd8, Black wins two pawns by 14...w.xh2+ 15.w.h1 w.xf2+ 16.w.h2
w.d1.

14...w.b6 15.w.f1 w.a8
A loss of tempo; 15...w.f5 at once was best.

16.w.ae1 w.e5 17.w.h3 w.f5
18.w.h4 w.f8 19.w.d1 w.c4
20.w.d4 w.e5 21.w.g3 w.xb2
22.w.xb2 w.xb2 23.w.xe6 w.xa2
24.w.e2 w.c4! 25.w.xc4 w.xc4
26.w.h3 b5 27.w.h2 w.d4 28.f3 h6
29.w.d6 w.f7 30.w.d1 w.d5
31.w.g3 w.fd7 32.w.e6 a5 33.w.a6
b4 34.w.c6 c3 35.w.c8+ w.h7
36.w.a8 b3
White resigns.
3 Italian Game
Zukertort
Lowinsohn
Posen, 21 May 1864.
White played 2 games simultaneously blindfold
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.c4 c5
4.0-0 h6 5.c3 f6 6.d4 exd4
7.e5 g6 8.cxd4 e7 9.c3 0-0
10.d3 Wh5

11.xh7+! h8
On 11...xh7 follows 12.g5+ g6
13.d3+ f5 (on 13...f5 follows
14.exf6+ xf6 15.d5 mate) 14.f3
followed by 15.g4.
12.c2 f6 13.d3 g8 14.e4
b4 15.wc3

15.d5
It would be better for Black to take the white bishop.

16.b3 c6 17.g3 f7 18.d3
g5 19.exf6 xf6 20.h5 b4
21.e4 xc2 22.xc2 d6
23.ae1 e6 24.ae4 g7
25.h4! g6 26.h5+ f7

27.d2
Simplest here was to play for the win of a piece with 27.xg6+ since after
27...xg6 28.f4+ f7 (on 28...f5
White plays 29.g4+ e4 30.e1+
xf3 31.e3 mate) 29.h7+ g7
30.xg7+ xg7 31.xe6+.
27...e7 28.e1 d7 29.e61
Black resigns.

4 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, November 1864
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 c5
4.0-0 e7 5.d4 exd4 6.e5 e4
7.ae1 c5 8.xd4 xd4
9.xd4 0-0 10.c3 a6 11.c4
b5 12.d5 c6 13.f3 e6
14.d3 f5 15.exf6 xf6 16.e4
d5 17.xf6+ xf6 18.c3 a7!
19.a3 a7 20.ad1! g5
21.h5 g6 22.d4 f4?
Black must play 22...f5 here, after which White would have to go back with his bishop to e2.
23.\textit{\textbf{xg6}}!\textit{\textbf{g7}}

On 23...\textit{\textbf{h6}} White mates in three moves: on 23...\textit{\textbf{d7}} or 23...\textit{\textbf{c7}} follows
1+.\textit{\textbf{xh7+}}\textit{\textbf{xh7}} (or 24...\textit{\textbf{xh7}})
25.\textit{\textbf{g6+}}.

24.\textit{\textbf{xg7}} \textit{\textbf{xf2+}} 25.\textit{\textbf{wh1}} \textit{\textbf{xd4}}
26.\textit{\textbf{xf1}} \textit{\textbf{c5}}
27.\textit{\textbf{xf8}} \textit{\textbf{xf8}}
28.\textit{\textbf{h5}} \textit{\textbf{e4}}
29.\textit{\textbf{wd4+}} \textit{\textbf{h6}}
30.\textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{g5}}?

This accelerates the downfall of Black's game: Black must play 30...\textit{\textbf{f5}}.

31.\textit{\textbf{wh4+}} \textit{\textbf{g6}}
32.\textit{\textbf{h5+}} \textit{\textbf{f6}}
On 32...\textit{\textbf{h6}}, 33.\textit{\textbf{f7+}} \textit{\textbf{g7}}
34.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} is decisive.

33.\textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{f5}} 34.\textit{\textbf{g4}}
Black resigns.

---

5  Evans Gambit

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Anderssen}

\textbf{Breslau, January 1865}

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \textit{\textbf{e5}} 2.\textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{c6}} 3.\textit{\textbf{c4}} \textit{\textbf{c5}}
4.b4 \textit{\textbf{xb4}} 5.c3 \textit{\textbf{c5}} 6.d4 \textit{\textbf{exd4}}
7.0-0 \textit{\textbf{d6}} 8.cxd4 \textit{\textbf{b6}} 9.d5 \textit{\textbf{a5}}
10.\textit{\textbf{b2}} \textit{\textbf{e7}} 11.\textit{\textbf{d3}} 0-0 12.\textit{\textbf{c3}}
\textit{\textbf{g6}} 13.\textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{c5}} 14.\textit{\textbf{wd2}} \textit{\textbf{f6}}
15.\textit{\textbf{wh1}} \textit{\textbf{c7}} 16.\textit{\textbf{ac1}} \textit{\textbf{b8}}
17.\textit{\textbf{g3}} \textit{\textbf{f7}} 18.\textit{\textbf{f5}} \textit{\textbf{xf5}} 19.exf5
\textit{\textbf{xe5}} 20.\textit{\textbf{xe5}} \textit{\textbf{dxe5}} 21.\textit{\textbf{e4}} \textit{\textbf{wd6}}
22.\textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{h6}}

In this way Anderssen attempts to prevent a breakthrough on the g-file.

---

\textbf{Student Years in Breslau 1862-1867}

23.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{b5}} 24.\textit{\textbf{g3}} \textit{\textbf{c4}} 25.\textit{\textbf{cg1}}
\textit{\textbf{b6}}

On 25...\textit{\textbf{d8}}, White strengthens the attack by 26.h4.

26.\textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{fxg5}} 27.\textit{\textbf{g5}}

Analytical examination by Anderssen, Harrwitz and Zukertort confirmed the correctness of this sacrificial continuation with which Zukertort repeatedly had ill success against Anderssen.

27.\textit{\textbf{hxg5}} 28.\textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{h6}}
29.\textit{\textbf{g7+}}

Despite the previous sacrifice, White gives up two rooks for the queen, since he already had the following concluding combination in mind.

29...\textit{\textbf{g7}} 30.\textit{\textbf{g7+}}

30...\textit{\textbf{xg7}}

On 30...\textit{\textbf{xg7}} White wins with
31.\textit{\textbf{g5+}} \textit{\textbf{f8}} 32.\textit{\textbf{h6+}} \textit{\textbf{g8}}
(32...\textit{\textbf{e8}} 33.\textit{\textbf{e6+}} and wins a rook)
33.\textit{\textbf{g6+}} \textit{\textbf{g7}} 34.\textit{\textbf{e6+}} \textit{\textbf{f7}} 35.f6

119
1.e4 e5 2...d3 d6 3...b5 e7 4.c3 c5 5.b4 Axb4 6.c3 c5 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 d6 8.cxd4 cxd6 9.d5 c5 10.b2 e7 11.d3 0-0 12.c3 e6 13.e2 c5 14.d2 f6 15.h1 c7 16.fac b8 17.g3 f7 18.f5 xf5 19.exf5 e5 20.exe5 dxe5 21.e4 w6d6 22.e3 b5 23.w2c2 c4 24.zh3 h6 25.f4!

A fine move; if Black takes the pawn then his king gets caught between two fires by 26.wg4 w8f8 27.he1.

25...b4 26.ff3 c3 27.e1 b7 28.fxex5 fxe5 29.hg3 f8 30.g6 1f6

On 9...d5, White wins by 10 exd5 b8 (10...a5 11...d3 b6 12.wh5 w6f6 13.dxe5 11...h5 a6 12...d6 w6f6 13.dxe5 xe5 14.f4!.

10.wf5 w9f8

On 10...c5+ follows 11.wg5+ hxg5 12.wxg5+ w9d7 13.wf5+ w9e7 14.wg6 mate.

7 Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Anderssen

Breslau, May 1865

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2...d3 d6 3...b5 e7 38.xf7+ xf7 39.wf8+; or 34...h8

35.f6 g7 36.wxe5 g8 37...f5 and 38...e6

31.f6 g7

On 31...g4 follows 32.w6h6; on 31...d7 32...f5; on 31...c7 32.d6.

32.wg5+

So as to get to h6 with gain of tempo.

32...c8 33.wf6+ g8 34...f5!

w9e8 35...e6

Black resigns.

6 Spanish Game

Zukertort

Anderssen

Breslau, January 1865

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2...d3 d6 3...b5 e7 4.c3 c5 5.b4 Axb4 6.c3 c5 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 d6 8.cxd4 cxd6 9.d5 c5 10.b2 e7 11.d3 0-0 12.c3 e6 13.e2 c5 14.wd2 f6 15.h1 c7 16.fac b8 17.g3 f7 18.f5 xf5 19.exf5 e5 20.exe5 dxe5 21.e4 w6d6 22.e3 b5 23.w2c2 c4 24.zh3 h6 25.f4!

A fine move; if Black takes the pawn then his king gets caught between two fires by 26.wg4 w8f8 27.he1.

25...b4 26.ff3 c3 27.e1 b7 28.fxex5 fxe5 29.hg3 e8 30.wf5 1f6

On 9...d5, White wins by 10 exd5 b8 (10...a5 11...d3 b6 12.wh5 w6f6 13.dxe5 11...h5 a6 12...d6 w6f6 13.dxe5 xe5 14.f4!.

10.wf5 w9f8

On 10...c5+ follows 11.wg5+ hxg5 12.wxg5+ w9d7 13/wf5+ w9e7 14.wg6 mate.

11.wg5+ hxg5 12.wxg5

Mate.
8 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, 15 June 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.d4 g5 4.c4 g4 5.0-0 w.e7? 6.c3!!
wc5+ 7.d4 wxc4 8.d5 w.d6 9.d5 w.d8
In Game 12, 9...d6 was played – the
move is slightly better, but after
the mistake on the 5th move, even this
no longer avert the loss of Black's
game.
10.xf4 w.e8 11.d5 f6
12.xg4
If White plays 12.wxg4 then Black
must not take the knight at once, since
White then forces the game with
fxe5 13.xf8 wxf8 14.g5+ w.e8
5.w.h5+ w.f7 16.w.f1 w.xh5
17.e7 mate, but would reply with
12...g7 13.gxf6 xf6 14.g5
w.g6 15.h4 w.e4 16.w.h5 w.f8
17.ee1! wxd4+ 18.wh1 c6
19.wxf6+ cxd5
On 19...xf6 follows 20.xf6+ wxf6
20.xf6 21.w.e8 mates) 21.xf6
xf6 22.w.e8+ wc7 23.w.e5+ w.d6
..d1. On 19...xd5 follows
20.wxf8++ wc7 21.d8+ wd6
22.f5.
20.xf8++ wc7 21.g3+ d6
22.f2!
With this move, White, who has con-
tinued the attack logically and skillfully
up to now, carries out the final combi-
nation.
22.wc4
On 22.wxg4 White best plays
23.w.e7+ w.c6 24.wxg4 w.xg4
25.wxg7 etc.
23.xc8+! wxc8 24.w.e8+ wc7
25.w.e7+
Black resigns.
9 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, 17 June 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.d4 g5 4.c4 g4 5.0-0 w.e7? 6.c3
After the moves 1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4
3.d4 g5 4.c4 g4 5.0-0 gxf3 6.d4, as
is well known the attack falls on 6...d5
7.xd5 c6 8.b3 g4!. Here 7...d5 of
course must not be played because of
8.xxd5.
8.d5 w.d8 9.wxf3 wc6
10.wxh4 w.e6
On 10...w.h6 White wins by 11.wf6+
wd7 12.w.h4.
11.wxh8 w.f7+ w.xh8 12.w.h6
On 12...fxe6 of course follows
13.wxf8+ w.d7 14.w.h8; on
12...w.h6 13.w.h6 fxe6 14.w.h6
14.wxh8 was not good because of
14...w.b3 15.w.xb3 w.h6 15.w.h8+
etc.
13.w.h8+ w.f8
On 13...w.d8 White plays 14.wxg4!
14.wxe1 15.w.xg8 w.h6 16.w.f7 etc.
14.w.h4 w.xc1 15.w.xc1
Black could avert the immediate loss of the game by 15...\texttt{xf7}, after which would follow: 16.\texttt{xf7+} \texttt{f1+} \texttt{xe8} (on 17...\texttt{g6} White plays 18.\texttt{g4+} \texttt{h6} 19.\texttt{h4}) 18.\texttt{h5+} \texttt{d7} 19.\texttt{f7+} \texttt{ge7} 20.\texttt{d5} \texttt{e5} 21.\texttt{f5+} \texttt{e8} 22.\texttt{xe7+} \texttt{xe7} 23.\texttt{e6+} \texttt{d8} 24.\texttt{xd6+} \texttt{d7} 25.\texttt{e5} \texttt{e8} 26.\texttt{e6} \texttt{e7} 27.\texttt{exd7} and White wins.

16.\texttt{h5+} \texttt{g7} 17.\texttt{g5} Mate.

Through the sacrifice of the b-pawn White achieves a significant advantage in development, which he subsequently skillfully exploits.

9...\texttt{xc3} 10.\texttt{bxc3} \texttt{xc3} 11.\texttt{xc6} \texttt{bxc6} 12.\texttt{b1} 0-0 13.\texttt{b3!} \texttt{a5} 14.\texttt{c5!} \texttt{e8} 15.\texttt{xh7+} \texttt{xh7} 16.\texttt{h3+} \texttt{g8}

On 16...\texttt{g6} follows 17.\texttt{h5+} \texttt{f6} 18.\texttt{f3} mate.

17.\texttt{h5} \texttt{f5} 18.\texttt{d1!} \texttt{d7} 19.\texttt{h7+} \texttt{f7} 20.\texttt{g3!} \texttt{c3}

This is the only move that averts the immediate loss of the game, since 20...\texttt{g6} must not be played because of 21.\texttt{g6} mate and 20...\texttt{f6} because of 21.\texttt{exd7+}.

21.\texttt{g6+}

If White takes the bishop on c3 at once then he loses the queen by 21...\texttt{h8}.

21...\texttt{g8} 22.\texttt{xc3} \texttt{f4} 23.\texttt{h3} \texttt{e7}

Black sacrifices the exchange so as to defend himself against 24.\texttt{h7}, since then this defence comes too late because of 25.\texttt{h5}.

24.\texttt{h7+} \texttt{f7} 25.\texttt{h5+}

25...\texttt{g8}

On 25...\texttt{f8} White plays 26.\texttt{g5} \texttt{f7} 27.\texttt{xf4+} \texttt{g8} 28.\texttt{h4} \texttt{e8} (on 28...\texttt{f7} follows 29.\texttt{f3+}) 29.\texttt{h7+} \texttt{f7} 30.\texttt{g3} and wins.

26.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 27.\texttt{h8+} \texttt{f7} 28.\texttt{xa8}

Black resigns.
11 King's Gambit
Anderssen
Zukertort
Breslau, June 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\(\mathcal{N}\)f3 g5 4.\(\mathcal{N}\)c4 \(g/4\) 5.0-0 gxf3 6.\(\mathcal{N}\)xf3 \(g/6\) 7.e5 \(\mathcal{N}\)xe5 8.d3 \(\mathcal{N}\)h6 9.\(\mathcal{N}\)c3 h7 10.\(\mathcal{N}\)d2 \(\mathcal{N}\)bd6 11.\(\mathcal{N}\)ae1 \(\mathcal{N}\)f5 12.\(\mathcal{N}\)d5 \(\mathcal{N}\)d8 13.\(\mathcal{N}\)c3 \(\mathcal{N}\)e8 14.\(\mathcal{N}\)f6 \(\mathcal{N}\)f5 15.g4 \(\mathcal{N}\)g6 16.h4 d6?
...d5 is better.
17.g5 \(\mathcal{N}\)g7 18.\(\mathcal{N}\)xf4 h6 19.\(\mathcal{N}\)h2 a6 20.b4 b5 21.\(\mathcal{N}\)b3 a5 22.bxa5?
A mistake which promotes the development of the enemy game.
22...b4! 23.\(\mathcal{N}\)b2 \(\mathcal{N}\)xa5 24.\(\mathcal{N}\)e2 \(\mathcal{N}\)b7 25.\(\mathcal{N}\)g2
White now intends 26.h5.
25...\(\mathcal{N}\)f5! 26.\(\mathcal{N}\)e1 hxg5 27.h5

27...\(\mathcal{N}\)xf6! 28.hxg6 \(\mathcal{N}\)xb2
Black threatens to force the game with 29.\(\mathcal{N}\)d4+ 30.\(\mathcal{N}\)h1 fxg6 etc.
29.\(\mathcal{N}\)g4
On 29.\(\mathcal{N}\)e4, decisive is 29...fxg6.
29...\(\mathcal{N}\)d4+ 30.\(\mathcal{N}\)xd4 \(\mathcal{N}\)xd4 31.\(\mathcal{N}\)e3
\(\mathcal{N}\)g7 is not possible, since after 32.\(\mathcal{N}\)f3+ White loses the queen with check.
31...fxg6
White resigns.

White can no longer avert immediate loss; on 32.\(\mathcal{N}\)h3 Black plays 32...g4! 33.\(\mathcal{N}\)xg4 \(\mathcal{N}\)f1+ 34.\(\mathcal{N}\)h2 \(\mathcal{N}\)f2+ 35.\(\mathcal{N}\)h3 \(\mathcal{N}\)h1+ 36.\(\mathcal{N}\)g3 \(\mathcal{N}\)g2+ 37.\(\mathcal{N}\)f4 \(\mathcal{N}\)d5+.

12 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, June 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\(\mathcal{N}\)f3 g5 4.\(\mathcal{N}\)c4 g4 5.0-0 \(\mathcal{N}\)e7? 6.\(\mathcal{N}\)c3+
Slightly better, but also not sufficient, is 6...gxh3.
7.d4 \(\mathcal{N}\)xf4 8.\(\mathcal{N}\)e5 \(\mathcal{N}\)e6 9.\(\mathcal{N}\)d5!
\(\mathcal{N}\)a6 10.\(\mathcal{N}\)xf4 \(\mathcal{N}\)d6
The black queen has no better move: on any other White would again play his knight from f4 to d5 attacking it.
11.\(\mathcal{N}\)d5 f6

12.\(\mathcal{N}\)xg4! fxe5
If Black does not take the knight, then the queen check on h5 or g6 respectively will destroy him even more quickly.
13.\(\mathcal{N}\)h5+\(\mathcal{N}\)g6
On 13...\(\mathcal{N}\)d8, White plays 14.\(\mathcal{N}\)xf8+ \(\mathcal{N}\)xf8 15.\(\mathcal{N}\)g5+ \(\mathcal{N}\)e7 16.\(\mathcal{N}\)xe7 \(\mathcal{N}\)xe7 17.\(\mathcal{N}\)xe7+ \(\mathcal{N}\)xe7 18.\(\mathcal{N}\)xe5+ etc.
14.\(\mathcal{N}\)xe5+ \(\mathcal{N}\)e7
Slightly better was 14...\textit{e}7, though even then White wins with 15.\textit{W}xh8; on 14...\textit{W}e6 would also follow 15.\textit{W}xh8 c6 16.\textit{Q}f6+ \textit{xf6} 17.\textit{xf6} \textit{e}7 18.\textit{Q}h6.

15.\textit{W}xf8+ \textit{xf8} 16.\textit{W}xe7+ \textit{g}8
17.\textit{Q}f6+ \textit{xf6} 18.\textit{W}xf6 h5
19.\textit{Q}h6
Black resigns.

With this move White tries to tempt his opponent to take the bishop on \textit{f7}
19...\textit{Q}xf7, so as then to force victory by 20.\textit{Q}e6+ \textit{dxe6} 21.\textit{W}xf7+ \textit{b}8 22.\textit{W}xc8+ \textit{xc}8 23.\textit{W}d7+ etc., but, since Black does not fall into the trap set, the move turns out to be a loss of tempo – the queen must go at once to \textit{d2}.

19...\textit{Q}g7! 20.\textit{W}d2 \textit{xe}8
Black sacrifices the queen since this is the best way to achieve the better game.

21.\textit{Q}d5+
Slightly more favourable for White was 21.\textit{Q}e6+ \textit{xe}6 22.\textit{W}xg5 \textit{xf}7 23.\textit{W}xg7.

21...\textit{W}xd5 22.\textit{Q}xd5 cxd5
23.\textit{W}g5 \textit{f}8 24.\textit{W}xd5

24.\textit{W}e6
Black rightly sacrifices the knight, so as to be able to rapidly concentrate his remaining pieces for a decisive counterattack.

25.\textit{W}c4+ \textit{c}6 26.\textit{W}f4+ \textit{d}6
27.\textit{W}xh6 \textit{xb}4 28.\textit{W}xh7 \textit{b}6
29.\textit{W}f4 \textit{c}5 30.h4 \textit{b}7
31.\textit{W}f7 \textit{d}6 32.h5 \textit{d}2
33.\textit{W}g7 \textit{f}8 34.\textit{W}h2 \textit{ff}2
35.\textit{W}g8 \textit{xc}2 36.h6 \textit{gg}2+
37.\textit{W}h3 \textit{c}3+
White resigns.
14  King's Gambit

Zukertort

Anderssen

Breslau, June 1865

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5
4.Qc4 g4 5.0-0 Qf3 6.Wxf3 Wf6
7.e5 Wxe5 8.d3 h6 9.Qc3 Qe7
10.Qd2 c6? 11.Qae1 Wc5+
12.Qh1 d5 13.Qxd5
Better is firstly 13.Wh5.
13...cxd5 14.Qxd5 Qe6?
15.Qf6+ Qd8 16.Wxb7 Qc6
Black cannot protect his rook by...
...Qc6 in view of 17.Qa5+.

17.Qxf4! Qc8
and White announced mate in three
moves by 18.Qd4+ Qxd4 19.Qa5+
Wxa5 20.We7 mate.

15  Evans Gambit

Zukertort (without Qa1)

Student E****

Breslau, June 1865

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qc5
4.b4 Bxb4 5.c3 Qc3 6.0-0 d6
Qa5! 10.Qd3 Qg4 11.Qa4+ Qd7
12.Qc2 Qe7 13.Qc3 0-0 14.e5
Qg6 15.Qe4 dxe5 16.dxe5 Wf7
17.Wd2 Qc6 18.Qf6+! Qh8

It is clear that on 18...gxf6 19.exf6 followed by 20.Wh6 decides immediately.
19.Qg5 Qxe5
Black, having an extra rook, sacrifices a
knight in order to free himself from the
fatal position; how far he is from
achieving this is shown by the continuation.
20.Qxe5 Qxe5
On 20...Wxf6 follows 21...Qxg6+; on
20...gxf6 21.Qg4.
21.Qxe5 Qae8

22.Wh4! h6 23.Qe4 g6
24.Qxe8+ f6 25.Qxf6 Qxf6
26.Qxg6
Black resigns.

16  Game Position

Zukertort

Anderssen

Breslau, July 1865

Notes by Zukertort
1. \( \text{Wh}x5! \text{gxh}5 \) 2. \( \text{Eg}7+ \text{We}8 \\
3. \( \text{Ee}4+ \text{We}7 \) 4. \( \text{Exe}7+ \text{We}7 \\
5. \( \text{Exe}7+ \text{Ed}8 \) 6. \( \text{Ea}5+ \text{Ec}8 \) 7. f7! \\
8. \( \text{Hh}8 \text{Hh}3 \text{c}4 \\
\text{h}4 \\
\text{Black has no better move since the rook on b8 cannot leave the 8th rank because of 9. \text{Ee}8+}. \\
9. \( \text{Ec}3 \text{Ed}8 \) 10. \( \text{Ea}7! \\
\text{On 10. \text{Ef}6 Black would still achieve a draw by 10...c3 11. \text{Ea}7+ \text{Ec}8 12. \text{Exc}3 \text{Eb}7!}. \\
10... \text{Ec}8 11. \text{Eg}7 \\
\text{and White won.}

17 Sicilian Defence 
Zukertort 
Anderssen 
Breslau, July 1865 
Notes by Zukertort 
1. e4 c5 2. d4 cxd4 3. \( \text{Dd}4 \text{Ec}6 \) 4. \( \text{Dxd}4 \) \( \text{Df}6 \) 5. \( \text{Ec}3 \) \( \text{Dc}6 \) 6. \( \text{Dd}3 \) 
8. \( \text{Dxc}6 \\
\text{In Game 10, 8.exd5 was played here, which we consider better.} \\
8... \( \text{Bxc}6 \) 9. e5 \( \text{Dd}7 \) 10. \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0 \\
11.0-0 \( \text{f}5 \) 12. \( \text{Exf}6 \) \( \text{Wxf}6 \) 13. \( \text{Bh}1 \\
\text{White moves his king so as to be able to meet 13...d4 with 14. \text{Dxd}4.} \\
13...c5 14. \( \text{E}5 \) \( \text{Bxc}3 \) 15. \( \text{fxe}6 \\
\text{With this move White sacrifices the bishop on e3; that this may not be taken is shown by the sequel.}

15... \( \text{Wxe}6 \) 16. \( \text{bxc}3 \) \( \text{Wxe}3 \\
\text{If Black first of all exchanges the rooks, in order to divert the White queen, then 16. \text{Dxf}1+ 17. \text{Wh}x1 \text{Ee}6 and even now he cannot take the bishop because 18. \text{Ee}1 \text{decides at once.} \\
17. \( \text{Wh}5 \) \( \text{Dxf}1+ \) 18. \( \text{Dxf}1 \) \( \text{Df}6 \) 19. \( \text{Dxh}7! \\

19... \( \text{Df}8 \\
\text{On 19... \text{Wh}8 White best plays 20. \( \text{Dg}6+ \text{D}g8 \) (on 20... \text{Dh}6 follows 21. \( \text{Dxf}6 \)) 21. \( \text{Df}7+ \text{Df}8 \) 22. \( \text{Dxd}5 \); \\
\text{Black therefore best takes the bishop, but then White maintains the better game after 19... \( \text{Dxh}7 \) 20. \( \text{Dxd}5+ \text{D}e6 \) 21. \( \text{Dxa}8 \) (21. \( \text{Dd}8+ \) was not good) 21... \( \text{Df}6 \) 22. \( \text{Dxa}7 \). \\
20. \( \text{Dxd}5 \) \( \text{Df}2 \\
\text{Black has no better move; it was useless to play the rook to b8 because of 21. \( \text{Dd}6+, \) furthermore the Black queen must not leave the e-file since then follows 21. \( \text{Dd}6+ \text{D}e8 \) 22. \( \text{Dg}6 \) mate. On 20...b7 White plays 21. \( \text{Dg}8+ \text{D}e7 \) 22. \( \text{Dxg}7+ \text{D}d8 \) 23. \( \text{Dxb}7 \) etc.} \\
21. \( \text{Dg}8+ \text{D}e7 \) 22. \( \text{Dxg}7+ \text{D}d8 \) \\
23. \( \text{Dxf}6+ \text{D}e7 \) 24. \( \text{Dd}1+ \text{D}d7 \) \\
25. \( \text{Df}3 \) \( \text{Ec}8 \) 26. \( \text{Df}5 \) \( \text{Ec}7 \) \\
27. \( \text{Dxa}8+ \text{Ec}8 \) 28. \( \text{Dxa}7 \) \( \text{Ec}7 \) \\
29. \( \text{Db}8+ \text{Ec}8 \) 30. \( \text{Db}6+ \\
\text{Black resigns.}
18 King's Gambit
Kornfeld
Zukertort
Breslau, September 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3...c4 d5!
4...xd5 f6
Anderssen plays 4...h4+.
5...c3 b4 6...ge2 c6 7...b3
g4 8.d3?
Note must castle here.
8...xe4! 9.dxe4 h4+ 10.f1
f3 11.gxf3
Black mates in four moves.

19 Scotch Gambit
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, November 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2...f3 ...c6 3.d4 exd4
4...c4 ...c5 5.c3 ...f6 6.e5 d5
7...b5 ...e4 8.cxd4 ...b4+
Better here is 8...b6.
9...d2 ...xd2+ 10...bxd2 0-0
11.0-0 f5 12...c1 ...d7
Usually 12...e7 is played here.
13...b3 ...e8 14...c5 ...c8
15...b3 ...e7 16...d3! ...xc5
17...xc5 c6 18...b1 b6 19...c3 f4
Black wants to open the diagonal or his queen, though in any event the move is
dubious since it gives the enemy bishop a free attacking line.
20...e1 ...g4

21.e6
White sacrifices his e-pawn so as to be able to force an attack.
21...f6 22...b4 ...xe6 23...xe6
...xe6 24...xh7+ ...f8 25...c1
...d8 26...e1 ...d6 27...d2 ...f6
If Black plays to win a piece by 27...g6, then would follow 28...e5 ...g7
29...xf4 ...f7 (on 29...xh7 White plays 30...h4+ and 31...xe7) 30...g5
and White has a good attacking game.
28...b1 c5 29.h4 ...d6
Black tries to prevent, after 30...g5 ...g8, the threatening move 31...e6.
30.dxc5 bxc5

31...g5
With this begins the forced move for move final combination: both attack and defence are equally interesting.
20 Dutch Defence
Zukertort
Anderssen
Breslau, November 1865
Notes by Zukertort
1.e3 f5 2.d4 e6 3.c4 \b7 4.f4 c5
5.d5 \e7 6.d3 \e7 7.d2 \a6 8.0-0 \b6 9.\c3 \a6 10.b3 \b7
11.\b2 b5
Black sacrifices a pawn in order to open the diagonal for his bishop, but since the bishop is not particularly effective in the present position, the sacrifice cannot be called correct.
22.\e5! \g5! \g6
24.\e5 \g4 25.\e5 \e5
26.\e5 \xh5 27.\g6! \g5!
With this Black wins the enemy e-pawn, since 28.\e1 cannot be played because of 28...\e3 29.\h5 \e4, and 28.e4 because 28...\d4 + 29.\h2 \e3.
28.\h2 \d4 29.\h1 \e1+
30.\h2 \d4 31.\e5! \h1
32.\d2 \f5 33.\g4 \g1+
34.\g2 \h4+ 35.\g3 \h3+
36.\h4 \xh5 37.\h8+ \g7
38.\d7+ \f6 39.\f7+
White cannot take the h-pawn at once, since then 39...\f2 mate follows.
39...\e6 40.\h7 \e3! 41.\g3
Of course, 41.\xg6 cannot be played because of 41...\f2 mate.
41...\g5 42.\g6 \f6 43.\f5 \c5
44.\h4 \b3+ 45.\g2 \d6
46.\d7 \b8

47.\d4??
A big mistake. As is easily proved, White must here win the game by 47.h5:
A) 47...\g3+ 48.\f2 \xg4 (for 48...\h3 see B) 49.h6 \xf5 50.h7 \e5
51.\xe5 \h4 52.\f3 \h6 (on 52...\h3, \h1, \h5, follows equally 53.\f7+) 53.\f7+ \g6 (on 53...\e6 or \e4, decisive is 54.\f8, on 53...\g4 equally 54.\e5) 54.\e5+ \h5 and White mates in four moves;
Black has absolutely no saving move; on 20...Qxd2 follows mate in two moves.

21. Wh6!

Black resigns.

22. Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Knorre

Breslau, January 1866

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qc5
4.b4 Qxb4 5.c3 Qa5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 Qb6 8.cxd4 d6 9.Qc3 Qa5
10.Qd3 Qg4 11.Qe2 Qf3
12.gxf3 Qe7 13.d5 c5 14.Qb2
15.Qh1 Qc7 16.Qac1 a6 17.Qg3
Qd7 18.Qf5 b5 19.g4 b4
20.Qg1! b3 21.a3 Qb5 22.g5
Qxd3 23.Qxd3 Qe5?

24.gxf6! Qxf6

On 24...Qxd3 follows mate in two.

25.Qg7+ Qf8 26.Qxe5 Qxf5
27.Qd7+ Qe8 28.exf5

Black resigns.

23. Spanish Game

Knorre

Zukertort

Breslau, January 1866

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qb5 Qf6
4.0-0 Qxe4 5.d4 Qe7 6.Qe2
Qd6 7.Qxc6 bxc6 8.Qxe5 Qb7
9.c4 0-0 10.\( \text{\texttt{\texttt{e}}} \)e3 \( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c5 11.\( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c3 f5
12.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)ad1 \( \text{\texttt{c}} \)e6 13.\( \text{\texttt{w}} \)c2 \( \text{\texttt{e}} \)e8
14.\( \text{\texttt{e}} \)e2 a5 15.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)fd4 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xd4
16.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xd4
16.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xd4 was better.
16...f4 17.\( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c1 c5 18.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f3 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)a6
Black quickly develops his pieces and forces an attack.
19.g3 \( \text{\texttt{b}} \)b7 20.\( \text{\texttt{e}} \)e1 \( \text{\texttt{h}} \)h5 21.f3
\( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c6 22.g4 \( \text{\texttt{h}} \)h4 23.\( \text{\texttt{g}} \)g2?

24.\( \text{\texttt{b}} \)b5 23.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xf5 \( \text{\texttt{e}} \)e7 24.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e4 \( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c4
25.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xc4 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xc4 26.f5 \( \text{\texttt{e}} \)a7 27.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h5
\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xf5 28.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xf5 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xf5 29.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xf5
\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xe2 30.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xe2 \( \text{\texttt{f}} \)f8 31.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e4
\( \text{\texttt{h}} \)h8

32.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xg7! \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xg7 33.e7 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e8
34.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h4 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g8 35.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xg7 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xg7
36.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g5+ \( \text{\texttt{f}} \)f7 37.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e6 mate.

2.5 Game Position
von W****
Zukertort
Brunn, 20 August 1866
Notes by Zukertort

2.4 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Knorre
Breslau, January 1866
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f3 \( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c6 3.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)c4 \( \text{\texttt{c}} \)c5
4.b4 \( \text{\texttt{x}} \)xb4 5.c3 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)c5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)b6 9.d5 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)d5
10.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)b2 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e7 11.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)d3 0-0 12.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)c3
\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g6 13.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e2 c5 14.\( \text{\texttt{w}} \)d2 a6
15.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h1 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)d7 16.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g3 f6 17.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g1
\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)c7 18.f4 b5 19.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e2 b4
20.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)ac1 \( \text{\texttt{b}} \)b6 21.e5! f5 22.e6

1...\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h3+! 2.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xh3
On 2.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f3 follows 2...\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)d5+ 3.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f4 g5+
etc.
2...\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e3+ 3.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h4 g5+ 4.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h5
\( \text{\texttt{d}} \)g4+ 5.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h6 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f5+ 6.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h7 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)f8+
7.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h8 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g6+ 8.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)h7 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)e6+
9.\( \text{\texttt{a}} \)xg6 \( \text{\texttt{a}} \)g7
Mate.
26 King's Gambit
Anderssen
Zukertort
Breslau, December 1866
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3..f3 g5 4.h4
g4 5..e5 g7 6..xg4 d5 7..f2
dxe4 8..xe4 w7 9..e2 c6
10.c3 h6 11.f2 f5! 12..xe7+
h7 13.d4 g3 14.h2 g8
15.b5! f8+ 16.d1

16...h5
Stronger is 16...e3! 17..xe3 fxe3
18..d2 f5 19.a3 d8. After the
next move White can drive away the
Knight by 17..e2, but in fact the best is
17.h1.

17.d2 f5 18.f3 ad8
Black now threatens to force the game
with 19...xd4 20.cxd4 d4 21.xd4+xd4+
ecc.

19.xc6 bxc6 20.b3
Better here was 20.b4.

20.g8
It is clear that 20...c5 must not be
played because of 21..a3.

21.a3 e3 22.d2 g3
23.e1 de8 24.d1 e2!
Black now intends 25..c2+ 26.c1
e1+ 27.xe1 xe1+ 28.xc2
29. moves xf2.

25.h3 c2+ 26.a1 xe1+ 27..xe1
e2+ 29. moves xf2.

27 King's Gambit
Anderssen
Zukertort
Breslau, December 1866
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3..f3 g5 4.h4
g4 5..e5 g7 6.d4 f6 7.c3
d6 8.d3 0-0 9..xf4 xe4
Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort (without queen)
Senator
Posen, 14 July 1867
Notes by Zukertort

Although we do not normally publish games with all too great odds, we offer the following as an example of how, without big mistakes, such as leaving pieces en prise, a few weak moves in themselves are enough to make up for the odds of a queen.

1. d4 d5 2. c3 c6 3. f4 e6 4. 0-0-0 f6 5. f3 bd7 6. e4 dxe4 7. fxe4 e7 8. f3 c5 9. d5 exd5 10. exd5 b6 11. h3 d6 12. g5 e7 13. g4 h6 14. h4 d7? 15. d6 f8 16. e5 c6 17. xc6 bx6 18. g2 d7 19. he1+ d8 20. g3 g5
21...\texttt{e5} \texttt{g7} 22.\texttt{f1} \texttt{e8} 23.\texttt{xg7} \texttt{xg7} 24.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e8?} 25.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{wxc8}  

The only way to still win the game was by 26...\texttt{f8}.  

26.\texttt{xf7}  

White announced mate in five moves, starting with 8.\texttt{h5+}.  

32  Game Position  

\textbf{Zukertort}  

\textbf{Krause}  

Posen, September 1867  

Notes by Zukertort  

Black to move.  

Can Black win?  

No – as the following lines show.  

A) 1...\texttt{d6} 2.\texttt{xa6} \texttt{g5} 3.\texttt{b6} \texttt{xg4} 4.\texttt{c6} \texttt{xg3} 5.\texttt{xd6} h5 6.c4 bxc4 7.b5 h4 draw.  

B) 1...\texttt{g5} 2.\texttt{xa6} \texttt{xg4} 3.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xg3} 4.\texttt{c6}! h5 (on 4...\texttt{d2} follows 5.b5 \texttt{c4} 6.b6 \texttt{xb6} 7.\texttt{xb6} h5 8.c4 and White has drawing chances) 5.b5 h4 6.b6 h3 7.b7 h2 8.b8\texttt{w}+ \texttt{g2} 9.\texttt{wxh2+} \texttt{xh2} 10.c4 and White wins.  

In the game was played:  

1...\texttt{g5} 2.\texttt{xa6} \texttt{g4} 3.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xg3} 4.c4? h5 5.c5 h4 6.c6 h3 7.c7\texttt{d6}+  

On 7...h2 follows 8.c6.  

8.\texttt{c6} \texttt{c8} 9.\texttt{d7} \texttt{a7} 10.b5 h2 11.b6\texttt{c8}  

Better was 11...\texttt{h1}.  

12.b7! \texttt{b6}+ 13.\texttt{c6} \texttt{h1}+ 14.\texttt{xb6} \texttt{w6}+
The decisive mistake; he must play 15...\textit{Wh1}+.
15.\textit{Wa7} \textit{Wh3}+ 16.\textit{Wa8}
and White won.

3 3 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Lehmann
Posen, 6 December 1867
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{tf3} \textit{Ac6} 3.\textit{Ac4} \textit{Ac5}
4.b4 \textit{Ab4} 5.c3 \textit{Ac5} 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 \textit{exd4} 8.cxd4 \textit{Ab6} 9.d5
\textit{Aa5} 10.\textit{Ab2} \textit{Ag4} 11.\textit{Ad3} 0-0
12.\textit{Ac3} \textit{Ag6} 13.\textit{Ae2} c5
14.\textit{Wd2} f6 15.\textit{Ah1} \textit{Ac7}
16.\textit{Aac1} \textit{Ab8} 17.\textit{Ag3} b5 18.\textit{Af5}
\textit{Aa6}

Here this move is not to be recommended, since in any event the indirectly attacked rook goes to g1.
19.\textit{Ag1} c4 20.\textit{Ab1} b4 21.\textit{Ad4} c3
22.\textit{Wd1} \textit{Ac4} 23.g4 \textit{Ab2} 24.\textit{We1}
\textit{Af4}? 25.g5 \textit{Abd3}

26.gxf6! \textit{Exf6}
If Black takes the queen, then follows 27.\textit{Ah6}+ \textit{Wh8} 28.fxg7 mate.
27.\textit{Dxg7}+ \textit{Df8} 28.\textit{Dxd3} \textit{Dxd3}
On 28...\textit{Dxd3} White plays 29.\textit{Wg1}.
29.\textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 30.\textit{Dxc7}
Also 30.\textit{Dg5} could be played at once.
30...\textit{Dg6} 31.\textit{Dg7} \textit{Df6} 32.\textit{Dg5}
and White won.

34 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
**** Chess Club
Correspondence Game, played from
November 1867 to May 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 c5 2.\textit{Df3} \textit{e6} 3.\textit{Dc3} \textit{Dc6}
4.d4 \textit{Dxd4} 5.\textit{Dxd4} a6 6.\textit{Dc2}
\textit{Dc5} 7.\textit{Df3} \textit{Df6} 8.0-0
On 8.\textit{Dxc6} Black plays 8...\textit{Dxc6}:
8...\textit{Dxc6} was unfavourable because of the continuation 9.\textit{Dxa7} \textit{Dxa7} 10.\textit{Dd4}.
8...\textit{Dge7} 9.f4 d5 10.e5 0-0
11.\textit{Dh1} f5 12.a4 \textit{Dd7} 13.\textit{Df3}
\textit{Dg6} 14.\textit{Dd2}
White is forced into this loss of tempo, so as to be able to develop his queen's rook.
14...\textit{Dxd4} 15.\textit{Dxd4} \textit{Dxd4}
16.\textit{Dxd4} \textit{Df7} 17.\textit{Dh3} \textit{Df8}
18.\textit{Dh5} was threatened.
18.\textit{Dd1}!
In this difficult position White hits upon the right move, which puts him in a position to set up a powerful attack.
18...\textit{Dc8} 19.\textit{De3} \textit{Dc6} 20.g4 g6
21.\textit{Dg1} \textit{Dg7} 22.\textit{Dhg3} \textit{Dcc7}
23.\textit{Df3} \textit{Dcd7}
Black wants to parry 18.c4.

24.b3
The position is such that Black can, as it happens, only move the queen. White
therefore protects his pawn so that as soon as the queen goes to the queen's flank, he will have a free hand on the king's side.

24...\(\text{a}5\)

24...\(\text{b}6\) would have led to the loss of the queen after 25.g5 followed by 26.\(\text{g}2\).

25.\(\text{h}4\) 26.\(\text{h}5\) 27.\(\text{c}5\)

On 26...\(\text{g}6\) or 26...\(\text{g}5\), White plays 27.gxf5.

27.\(\text{c}3\) 28.\(\text{b}4\)

White forces the opponent into a decision and thereby prevents 28...\(\text{c}7\).

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

Even if it seems that the white queen takes little part in the attack, it was still better to exchange.

29.\(\text{h}2\)

White makes an essential king move, so as at a decisive moment to be able to move equally his queen and his bishop.

29...\(\text{d}8\) 30.\(\text{h}6\) \(\text{g}6\)

31.\(\text{d}1!\)

The introductory move of a decisive manoeuvre.

31...\(\text{b}5\) 32.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}4\)

Indeed, since on 32...\(\text{h}8\) White replies with 33.\(\text{g}xf5\) \(\text{exf5}\) 34.\(\text{f}5\).

33.\(\text{c}xg4\) \(\text{c}7\) 34.\(\text{f}6+\) \(\text{h}8\)

35.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{c}4\) 36.\(\text{fxg6}\) \(\text{hxg6}\)

In 36.\(\text{xd4}\), White mates in two moves.

37.\(\text{f}2\)

White must protect \(\text{f}6\), since otherwise Black goes over to the attack with an exchange sacrifice.

37...\(\text{h}4+\)

Black wants to displace the white rook before he carries out the exchange sacrifice which is necessary because of the weakness of the \(\text{g}6\)-point.

38.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 39.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{d}4\)

40.\(\text{axb5}\) \(\text{axb5}\) 41.\(\text{h}g3\) \(\text{d}5\)

42.\(\text{x}g6\) \(\text{d}6\) 43.\(\text{x}g6\) \(\text{e}3\)

So as to cut off the queen from \(\text{f}6\).

44.\(\text{g}3\)

44...\(\text{xf6}\)

The third exchange sacrifice. On 44...\(\text{f}8\) White mates in four moves by 45.\(\text{g}7\) \(\text{xf6}\) (45...\(\text{xf6}\) 46.\(\text{h}7+\) \(\text{xh7}\) 47.\(\text{g}7\) mate) 46.\(\text{xf6}\) and 47.\(\text{h}7+\) etc.

45.\(\text{xf6!}\)

Immediately decisive, whereas after 45.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{g}8\) 46.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{g}8\), Black has drawing chances on account of the disdained passed pawn.

45...\(\text{e}4\) 46.\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{d}2+\)

On 46...\(\text{d}6\) of course follows 47.\(\text{e}5+\).

47.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{f}5+\) 48.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{d}8+\)

49.\(\text{g}5\)

Black resigns.
Berlin – Match with Anderssen 1868

35 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Mayet
Berlin, 31 December 1867
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Opera 3.b5 a6
4.a4 f6 5.0-0 b5 6.b3 d6
7.d3 h6 8.d3 c5 9.d4 g6 10.exd5 cxd5 11.dxe5!
With the method of play chosen, White achieves an excellent attack, whereas on 11.dxe5 Black could easily obtain a counterattack by 11...bxc3 12.axb3.
11...exd4 12.e7 13.e2
d8 14.d2 a5 15.a4 b4 16.c3
bxc3 17.bxc3 d8
On 17...dxc3 naturally follows 18.exc3.
18.c4 d6 19.axa5 c5 20.d2
d8 21.a5 d7 22.a6 e8
On 22...d8 White wins by 23.dxe8+
dxe8 24.a7.
23.a4 d5 24.c6 d7 25.b7
g6 26.a5 d8
27.d8+ g7 28.dh8+ d8
29.d8+ g7
If Black here plays the king to h7 then admittedly he would have a refuge for his queen on g7; but even then White wins by 31.d6 since he obtains two rooks and a bishop for the totally displaced enemy queen.
30.d8 e5 31.dxe5 dxe5
32.b6 and White won.

Carl Mayet
Berlin – Match with Anderssen 1868

\[ \text{\textcopyright 20.\textcopyright e4 20.\textcopyright e4 \textcopyright c6! 21.\textcopyright eae1 \textcopyright h8} \]

Here \(21...\text{f5}\) could be played at once.

\[ \text{22.\textcopyright f4 f5 23.\textcopyright g5 h6 24.\textcopyright f3 \textcopyright b7! 25.\textcopyright e2 g5 26.\textcopyright e5+ \textcopyright g7 27.\textcopyright e1 g4 28.h4} \]

\[ \text{28...\textcopyright c7! 29.\textcopyright xd4 g3! 30.\textcopyright e7 \textcopyright xf2+ 31.\textcopyright h1?} \]

\text{a big mistake: White must play \textcopyright xf2, though even then Black has a better game.}

\[ \text{31...\textcopyright xg2+ 32.\textcopyright xg2 \textcopyright xg2} \]

\text{Note.}

37 Evans Gambit
\[ \text{Zukertort} \]
\[ \text{Schallopp} \]
\[ \text{Berlin, January 1868} \]
\[ \text{Notes by Zukertort} \]
\[ 1.e4 e5 2.\textcopyright f3 \textcopyright c6 3.\textcopyright c4 \textcopyright c5 \]
\[ 4.b4 \textcopyright xb4 5.c3 \textcopyright c5 6.d4 exd4 \]
\[ 7.0-0 d6 8.cxd4 \textcopyright b6 9.d5 \textcopyright a5 \]
\[ 10.\textcopyright b2 \textcopyright e7 11.\textcopyright d3 0-0 12.\textcopyright c3 \]
\[ 13.\textcopyright e2 c5 14.\textcopyright d2 \textcopyright f6 \]
\[ 15.\textcopyright h1! \textcopyright c7 16.\textcopyright ac1 \textcopyright a6 17.\textcopyright g3 \]
\[ 18.\textcopyright f5 b5 19.g4 \textcopyright xf5 \]

This exchange is unfavourable for Black, since in the sequel on the 21st move, in order to not lose the c-pawn, he has to take with the f-pawn and thus allow the enemy knight to invade his position.

\[ 20.gxf5 \]

Usually 20.exf5 is played here, so as then to attack the f6-point with the g-pawn; but here it is a mistake since Black already on the next move has to play \(...\text{fxe5}\).

\[ \text{20...\textcopyright e5 21.\textcopyright xe5 fxe5 22.\textcopyright g5 \textcopyright f6} \]

This loss of tempo is a consequence of his 17th move.

\[ \text{23.\textcopyright e6 \textcopyright e7 24.\textcopyright g1 \textcopyright f7 25.\textcopyright h6} \]

White has now obtained such an energetic attack that Black can no longer save the game.

\[ 25...\textcopyright h8 \]

If Black wants to prevent the move 26.f6 by 25...\textcopyright d8, then follows 26.\textcopyright xg7 \textcopyright xg7 27.\textcopyright xg7 \textcopyright xf7 28.\textcopyright g1.

\[ 26.\textcopyright h5 \textcopyright h6 \]

Black must parry 27.\textcopyright g5.

\[ 27.\textcopyright g6 \textcopyright d8 28.\textcopyright cg1 \textcopyright a7 \]

On 28...\textcopyright h4 follows 29.\textcopyright xh6+ \textcopyright xh6 30.\textcopyright xf7.

\[ 29.\textcopyright xg7! \textcopyright xg7 30.\textcopyright xh6+ \textcopyright g8 31.f6 \]

Black resigns.

38 Sicilian Defence
\[ \text{Hirschberg} \]
\[ \text{Zukertort} \]
\[ 7 board blindfold exhibition, Berlin, 3 February 1868} \]
\[ \text{Notes by Zukertort} \]
\[ 1.e4 c5 2.f4? \]
This continuation is not good.

2...e6 3...f3 d5!

4.e5 f5 5...b5+ ...c6 6.0-0 c4
7.d4 cxd4 8...xd4 c5+ 9...h1
...e7 10.c4 d4 11...d2 0-0 12.a3
a5 13...e1 b6 14...bd2 ...b7
After this Black has the better position.
15...g5 ...d7 16...f3 h6 17...h3
...c7 18...g3 ...ad8 19...f3 ...a8
20...d2 ...f7 21...f1 ...h8 22...f2
...g8 23...h3 ...b7! 24...g5

24...xe5!
With the exchange sacrifice linked to
this move, Black obtains an excellent
game.

25...xf7+ ...xf7 26...g3 ...d6
27...h5 ...e4 28...h4! ...g6!
29...h6+
White is forced into this sacrifice, since
on 29...h3 the game would be decided
even more quickly by 29...xd2
30...e1 ...xf4.

29...gxh6 30...xh6+ ...h7
31...xh7+ ...xh7 32...xe4 ...e4
33...e1 e3 34...g3 ...h4 35...g1
...xg2 36...xg2 e2 37...g1 ...xg3
Black could force mate in three moves
here by 37...d3+.

38...f2 ...xg2+
White resigns.

39 French Defence
Zukertort
Schulten
Berlin, 21 February 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3...c3 ...b4
4...d3 ...e7
4...f6 is better.

5...f3 0-0 6.0-0 ...g6 7.e5
It is well known that an immediate
advance of the e-pawn in the French
Defence is bad, but here Black's game
will now be very restricted.

7...f6
First of all, 7...xc3 should be played;
after that ...f5 was to be preferred.

8...e2 ...xe5 9...xe5 ...f6 10.f4 ...c5
11.c3 ...a5 12...g3 ...b6 13...h5!
...xd4 14...xg6 ...xc3+ 15...xh1 ...xg6
On 15...xb2 would follow mate in
four moves.

16...xg6 ...d8 17...h7+ ...f8
18...h5 ...d4 19...xc3 ...xc3

White mates in three moves.
40 King's Gambit
Schulten
Zukertort
Berlin, 3 March 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3...c4 d5
4.exd5 Wh4+ 5...f1 d6 6...f3
Wh6 7.d4 f5 8...b3 c5
Since White, with the retreat of his
bishop, announces his intention of ad­
vancing the c-pawn, Black immediately
advances his own two squares, so as to
take with the queen's knight if White
makes en passant.
9.c4 d7 10...c3 e7 11...b5
a6
Black could play at once 11...0-0-0 and
decisive the a-pawn.
12...xd6+ Whxd6 13.dxc5 ...xc5
14.Wd4 g6 15...d2
In 15...xg7 Black would certainly
obtain a fierce attack after
3...0-0-0.
15...0-0 16.h4 Wh8 17...c3 f6
18...d1
23...g4 would prevent the transfer of
the White knight to e6, through which
White gets an instant attack; however
Black wants to reserve the g4-square for
the knight.
24...e6 e5 25...xc5 bxc5
26...xc5 Wh8 27...b6 Whb8
28...d4 g4! 29.d6+ Whh8 30.d7
White obviously cannot move the
queen away.
30...xf2 31.dxe8 Wh+ dxe8
32...xf2 e5 33.c6 Whb5
34...d4 e2+ 35...xe2
and Black announced mate in six
moves.
41 King's Gambit
Mayet
Zukertort
Berlin, 8 March 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3...c4 d5
4.exd5 Wh4+ 5...f1 d6 6...f3
Wh6
Previously 6...Wh5 was played.
7.d4 e7 8...b5+
After this Black gains an advantage in
development.
8...d7 9...xd7+ ...xd7 10.c4 c5
11.dxc6 ...xc6 12.c5 ...c7 13...c3
0-0-0 14...e2 ...f6 15...c4 ...he8
16.b4 ...g4 17.b5

17...d4! 18.h4
On 18.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd4 Black forces mate by 18...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}h4 in at most five moves.

18...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f5 19.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xf7 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g3+ 20.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d6!21.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}a3

White must defend against the threatened mate from c5 and d6; on 21.cxd6 follows mate in three moves by 21...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b6+.

21...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d3 22.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d5

White has no better move: on 22.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e1 follows 22...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d4+ 23.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe1 mate.

22...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f1 + 23.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e2

Mate.

42. Evans Gambit
Anderssen
Zukertort
2nd Match Game. Berlin, 11 April 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f3 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c6 3.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c5
4.b4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xb4 5.c3 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b6 9.d5 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}a5
10.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b2 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e7 11.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d3 0-0 12.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c3
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g6 13.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d2 c5 14.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e2 f6
15.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}h1! \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b8 16.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g3 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c7
17.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f5

Better here is at first 17.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c1.

17...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xf5 18.exf5 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e5 19.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe5
dxe5 20.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}ac1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d6 21.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e4 b5
22.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e2 b4 23.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}h5 c4 24.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}cd1

24...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b7

Black owes the win to this timely transfer of the knight; on the other hand, the further advance of the c-pawn is hardly correct: it would drive the enemy bishop to a now more effective diagonal, while in addition White is allowed to play his queen's rook via d3 to h3.

25.f4 exf4 26.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f3 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c5 27.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c2

On 27.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}h3, Black would reply 27...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe4.

27...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d7 28.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}h3 h6 29.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g4

On 29.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g6 would follow 29...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e5
30.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe5 fxe5 31.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xh6 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xg6 32.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xg6
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b6 33.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f6 etc.

29...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e5! 30.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xf4?

Best here was 30.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e2, but even then Black maintains the better game.
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30...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d3!31.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d4

On 31.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd6 Black wins by 31...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f2+ 32.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xh3+ 33.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xh3
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd6.

31...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b6 32.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd3

A last try: on 32.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xc4 immediately decisive is 32...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f2+ 33.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd1+
34.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xb2.

32...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd4 33.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd4 c3 34.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c1
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e8 35.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e3 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e5 36.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g1 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}be8
37.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f2 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}c5 38.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e4 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}a5!
39.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe5 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xe5 40.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}b3 c2!
41.d6+

On 41.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xc2 Black wins by 41...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xa2.

41...\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f8 42.d7 \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e7 43.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}g3
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xd7 44.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}xg7+ \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e7 45.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e6+
\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}d6 46.\texttt{\textdaggerdbl}f4+ \texttt{\textdaggerdbl}e5

White resigns.
King's Gambit

Anderssen

Zukertort

Berlin, 14 April 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 d5 3.exd5 e4 4.b5+ c6 5.dxc6 Bxc6 6.d4 Bf6 7.h3

Lose of tempo in the opening, which the opponent skillfully exploits.


En 11.Be2 follows 11...0-0.

11...Bc3+ 12.Bxc3 Bxc3+


15.Bxe2 0-0 16.Bad1 Bde8


21...Bc3!

With this Black introduces a deeply conceived sacrificial combination.


24.Bg4 Bxg2+ 25.Bg3 Be2!

26.Bb1

White has no better move; on 26.Bxg2, after 26...Bxg2+ 27.Bh4 (27.Bg3 h5+ 28.Bh4 Bd8+ 29.Bg5 Bxg5 30.fxg5 Bxd4+), Black is mated in three moves with 27...Bd8+; on 26.f5 follows 26...Bxg3+ 27.Bxg3 Bg2+ 28.Bh4 Be4+ 29.Bh5 g6+ etc; on 26.h4 follows 26...h5+ with mate in two moves.

26...f5+ 27.Bh4 Bd8+ 28.Bg5

On 28.Bh5 follows mate in three moves.

28...h6?

Black here overlooks an elegant concluding combination; he could force mate in five moves by 28...Bxg5+.

29.Bc4+ Bh7 30.Bf7 hXg5+ 31.Bh5

On 31.fxg5 follows 31...Bxd4+ 32.h5 Bg4+ 33.hxg4 Bh2 mate.

31.gxf4 32.Bxf4 Bh7

and Black won.

44 King's Gambit

Anderssen

Zukertort

10th Match Game. Berlin, 16 April 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Bf3 g5

4.Bc4 g4 5.Be5 Bh4+ 6.Bf1


fxg2+ 10.Bxg2 Bg7 11.Bf4 0-0
12.\texttt{\&e3 \&h8 13.\&d2 f5}
Here, 13...\texttt{\&c6} must firstly be played.
14.e5 \texttt{\&xe5 15.\&xe5 \&c6}
On 15...\texttt{\&xe5} White best plays
16.\texttt{\&g6+ \&xg6 17.\&xh6.}
16.e6 b6 17.\texttt{\&d5 \&b7 18.h3}
\texttt{\&ad8 19.hxg4 \&xg4+ 20.\&f2}
\texttt{\&e7 21.\&ag1}

21...\texttt{\&xd5! 22.\&cxd5}
On 22.\texttt{\&xg4} White maintains the superior game by 22...\texttt{\&xg4+ 23.\&g3}
\texttt{\&xh1 24.\&el \&xe3.}
22...\texttt{\&xd5! 23.\&xd5}
Also here White would get the worst of it by 23.\texttt{\&xg4}, because of 23...\texttt{\&xe4}
24.\texttt{\&g3\&xf4 25.\&e1 \&xe3.}
23...\texttt{\&f4! 24.\&d4}
On 24.\texttt{\&xg4} follows 24...\texttt{\&xe3+}
25.\texttt{\&xe3 \&xg4+ 26.\&e4\&xd5!}
24...\texttt{\&xd5 25.\&xg7+}
On 25.\texttt{\&xg4} Black wins by 25...\texttt{\&xg4+}
26.\texttt{\&f3 \&xd4 27.\&e1 \&e5+ 28.\&f2}
f3.
25...\texttt{\&xg7 26.\&xd5 \&g4+}
27.\texttt{\&xg4 \&xg4 28.\&g1 \&h4+}
29.\texttt{\&f1 \&h3+ 30.\&g2 \&e3}
31.\texttt{\&e2 \&h3+ 32.\&e1 \&h4+}
33.\texttt{\&d2?}
A big mistake, which only accelerates the loss of the game; on 33.\texttt{\&f1} or
33.\texttt{\&f2}, decisive is 33...\texttt{f3.}
33...\texttt{\&d8}
White resigns.
This quickly accelerates the opponent's development.

8...\texttt{d}d7 9...\texttt{x}d7+ \texttt{xd}7 10.c4

10...0-0-0!

So as, on 11.c5, to continue the game by 11...\texttt{c}xc5 12.dxc5 \texttt{xc}5 13.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{xf}5.

11.\texttt{h}f2

11.\texttt{c}c3 was preferable.

11...c5 12.dxc6 \texttt{xc}6 13.c5 \texttt{c}c7

14.b4

On 14.d5 would follow 14...\texttt{xc}5.

14...\texttt{de}5! 15.g3 \texttt{xf}3 16.d5

On 16.\texttt{xf}3 or 16.\texttt{xf}3 follows 16...\texttt{xd}4(+).

16...\texttt{xe}2 17.d6 \texttt{fg}3+

18.\texttt{g}2

On 18.\texttt{xe}3 Black plays 18...\texttt{xd}6

19.cxd6 (19.\texttt{h}h6 \texttt{xd}1+ 20.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{x}h1 21.\texttt{g}xh1 gxh6) 19...\texttt{xd}6+ 20.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{g}6+, forcing the win in a few moves.
18...\(\text{Wf6}\)! 19.\(\text{Be3}\) 20.xd6

The quickest way to decide the game.

20.cxd6 21.d2 22.e3 xg3

Black was threatening 22...xd2 23.d2 f2+ etc.

22...xd2 23.d2 e3+ 24.g2

On 24.xh2 follows 24...f2 mate.

22...xd2 23.e2 f3+

White resigns.

47 Hungarian Defence

Zukertort

Mayet

Berlin 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.c3 4.d5 exd4 5.c4 d5 6.e5 a6 7.d3 c5 8.cxd4 c4 9.b4+ a5 10.a3 c6 11.bxc3 d6 12.bxc3 e7 13.b2 h6 14.e3 g6 15.g4 f6 16.d2 b5 17.f3 c4 18.b2 f6 19.xe7 fxe7

20.We6

On 20...gxf6 White wins by 21.dxe4.

21.e4 f5

On 21...g6 follows 22.Wd2 g8 23.h6 g8 24.g5.

22.fxg7


22.xg6

Decidedly better than taking the knight.

23.xf6 e7 24.f1 a5 25.h4

Before White strikes, he endeavours to force the opponent to advance his h-pawn two squares, through which the bishop is robbed of protection. How important this is, is shown by the continuation.

25.h5 26.f1 f4 ab8

27.xf7! xf7

On 27...xf7, 28.d6+ is immediately decisive; on 27...xe4 follows 28.xe4 e6 29.xf6 g8 (on any other move 30.g5 decides) 30.f8+ xh8 (on 30...xg7 follows mate in two moves) 31.gxf7+ g8 32.xg6+ or 28...xf7 29.xf7 xh7 30.w7 h8 31.xh5++; finally, or:

27...e6 28.xc7.

28.xf7 xf7 29.f2+ xg7

30.f6+ h7 31.xg5+ h6

32.e6 h8 33.xg5+ h7

34.xf4 g8

A last attempt at attack.
35.\( \text{dxh5} \) \( \text{Exh5} \) 36.\( \text{Wh5+} \) \( \text{Sh6} \) 37.\( \text{Wf5+} \) \( \text{Sg6} \) 38.\( \text{e6!} \)

The decisive move: on 38.h5, Black would win by 38...\( \text{Exh5+} \) 39.\( \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{Exh6} \) 40.\( \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{Sh6} \) 41.\( \text{g1} \) \( \text{b4} \).

38...\( \text{Exh4+} \) 39.\( \text{Wg1} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 40.\( \text{e7} \) \( \text{dxg2+} \) 41.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{g1+} \) 42.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g2+} \) 43.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g3+} \) 44.\( \text{f4} \)

Black resigns.

48 Spanish Game

Schnitzler

Zukertort

Correspondence Game, played from 3 June to 20 November 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{cb3} \) \( \text{cb6} \) 3.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{cb5} \) 4.0-0 \( \text{cbxe4} \) 5.d4 \( \text{Sh5} \) 6.\( \text{e2} \)

7.\( \text{dd6} \) 7.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{bc6} \) 8.dxe5 \( \text{d6} \)

9.\( \text{c4!} \) 0-0 10.\( \text{cc3!f5} \) 11.e6

The attacking combination intended with this move might succeed in a game played over the board. Correct here is 11.exf6.

11...\( \text{dxe6} \)

With 11...\( \text{dxe6} \), Black would totally compromise his pawn formation.

12.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{We8} \) 13.\( \text{f3} \)

13...\( \text{f6!} \)

13...\( \text{d8} \), White wins with 14.\( \text{cb5} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15.\( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{b8} \) 16.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 17.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{b7} \) 18.\( \text{d5}! \).

14.e7

On 14.\( \text{xc6} \) Black plays with advantage 14...\( \text{xc3} \) 15.\( \text{bxh6} \) \( \text{xe6} \).

14...\( \text{We7} \) 15.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{f7} \) 16.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c5}! \) 17.\( \text{xf6+} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 18.\( \text{e3} \)

On 18.\( \text{d7+} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 19.\( \text{xa8} \) Black wins by 19...\( \text{b7} \) 20.\( \text{xa7} \) \( \text{d8} \).

18...\( \text{d4} \) 19.\( \text{d2} \)

On 19.\( \text{d4} \) follows 19...\( \text{e6} \) 20.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 21.\( \text{b3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 22.\( \text{a5} \) or 22.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{ad8} \) and 24...\( \text{c5} \).

19...\( \text{d7} \)

In this way the attack goes over to Black. 19...\( \text{b7} \) was bad because of 20.\( \text{a5} \).

20.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f4!} \) 21.\( \text{f3} \)

So as not to have to move the bishop back to \( \text{c1} \) and also to prevent the further advance of the f-pawn.

21...\( \text{g5} \) 22.\( \text{f2} \)

22.\( \text{d5} \) cannot be played because of 22...\( \text{e5} \).

22...\( \text{c6} \) 23.\( \text{e1?} \)

After this White’s game will be totally cramped. White wants to play the bishop to \( \text{c3} \), so as to obtain an attacking diagonal for it; the direct 23.\( \text{ad1} \) was better.

23...\( \text{a8} \)

24.\( \text{f2} \)

The white queen has in fact no better square; on \( \text{d1} \) it obstructs the rook, on \( \text{d2} \) the bishop, on 24...\( \text{c2} \) would follow 24...\( \text{a5} \) 25.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 26.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e3} \).
27.\textit{Qf2} (to prevent 27...\textit{Wd4})
\textit{Qxd3} 28.\textit{Qxd3} \textit{Wg6} 29.\textit{Qfd1} \textit{Qxf3}+ 30.\textit{Qf1} \textit{Qe5}.

24...\textit{a5} 25.\textit{Qc2} \textit{Wg6} 26.\textit{Wh1} \textit{Qf5}
Black now goes over to a decisive final combination. The following ramble with the bishop is quite interesting.

27.\textit{Qd4}
On 27.\textit{Qc1} Black wins the exchange by 27...\textit{Qd3}, since 28.\textit{Qg1} cannot be played because of 28...\textit{Qe2}.

27...\textit{Qd3} 28.\textit{Qg1}
28.\textit{Qxc6} \textit{Qxf1} 29.\textit{Wxf1} offered longer resistance.

28...\textit{c5} 29.\textit{Qc6}
In this way White prevents 29...\textit{Qe2}.

29...\textit{Qxc4} 30.\textit{Qc3}
The bishop gets to its desired position too late. With 30.\textit{Qad1} White would give up a pawn, but keep the bishop from the d5-square; Black then continues the attack by 30...\textit{Qb5} 31.\textit{Qxa5} \textit{Qe2}.

30...\textit{Qd5}! 31.\textit{Qxa5} \textit{Wh5} 32.\textit{Wd2}
On 32.\textit{Qaf1} follows 32...\textit{Qe3} 33.\textit{Wd2} \textit{Qxf3} 34.\textit{gxf3} \textit{Qxf3}+ 35.\textit{Qxf3} (35.\textit{Qg2} \textit{Qfe8}) 35...\textit{Wxf3}+ 36.\textit{Wg2} \textit{Wg2}+ 37.\textit{Qxg2} \textit{Qf7} and Black must win.

32...\textit{Qxf3}
At the same time as this move I sent the following analysis: 33.\textit{gxf3} \textit{Wxf3}+ A) 34.\textit{Qg2} \textit{Qe2}

49 Evans Gambit

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Schulten}

Berlin, 8 July 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qc6} 3.\textit{Qc4} \textit{Qc5}
4.\textit{b4} \textit{Qxb4} 5.c3 \textit{Qa5} 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 b5 8.\textit{Qxb5} \textit{Qxe7} 9.cxd4
0-0 10.d5 \textit{Qb8} 11.\textit{Qb2} c6
11...d6 was slightly better.

12.\textit{Wd4!} f6 13.\textit{Qc4} \textit{Qh8} 14.d6
\textit{Qg6} 15.\textit{Qg5} \textit{Qe5} 16.\textit{Qb3} \textit{Qb6}
17.\textit{Wc3} \textit{Qa6}

18.\textit{Qxh7!} \textit{Qxh7}
The only move. On 18...\textit{Qe8} follows:
19.\textit{Wh3} g6 20.\textit{Qg5}+ and mate in two
moves; on 18...\texttt{xf1} 19.\texttt{xf8} g6
20.\texttt{h3}+ etc.

19.\texttt{h3}+ \texttt{g6} 20.\texttt{d2} \texttt{f7}
21.\texttt{xf1} comes 21.\texttt{xf1} followed by 22.\texttt{g3} and Black will lose despite his numerical superiority, since he has no time for development of his queen's flank.

21.\texttt{f5}+ \texttt{h6} 22.\texttt{f3} g6
23.\texttt{h3}+ \texttt{g6} 24.\texttt{h4}+! \texttt{g7}
25.\texttt{h3}+ \texttt{g6} 26.\texttt{h4}+! \texttt{g7}
On 26...gxh4 follows 27.\texttt{g4}+ \texttt{h7}!
27...\texttt{h6} 28.\texttt{c1}+ \texttt{h7} 29.\texttt{h5}+
\texttt{g7} 30.\texttt{h6} mate) 28.\texttt{h5}+ \texttt{g7}
29.c5 \texttt{e8} 30.exf6+ \texttt{xf6} 31.\texttt{g5}+
\texttt{h7} 32.\texttt{c2}+ \texttt{h8} 33.\texttt{h6}+ and
mate in two moves.

27.\texttt{g4} \texttt{h6} 28.\texttt{d1} \texttt{c4}
29.\texttt{d3} \texttt{e5}
On 29...\texttt{xb2} White mates in four moves by 30.\texttt{f5}+.

30.\texttt{f5}+ \texttt{g6}

31.\texttt{h5}+! \texttt{hxh5} 32.\texttt{h3}+ \texttt{g4}
On 32...\texttt{g6} follows 33.\texttt{h6} mate.

33.\texttt{c1}! \texttt{f3}+
The only move to avert the immediate mate which is threatened by \texttt{d1} and \texttt{h6}.

34.\texttt{xf3}\texttt{h8}
A careful study of the position will show that Black has no saving move.

35.\texttt{g3}+ \texttt{h5} 36.\texttt{f7}
Mate.
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50 Spanish Game
Schallopp
Zukertort
Aachen tournament, 4 August 1868
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 d6 3.b5 Qf6
4.0-0 Qxe4 5.d4 Qe7 6.Qe1 tDd6

7.dxe5
Though this move is perfectly safe, we think that White thereby forfeits the advantage of the first move, since the game soon takes on a drawish character.

7...Qxb5 8.a4 Qbd4
8...Qxe5 was bad since, after 9.Qxe5 Qd6, White plays 10.Qg5 f6 11.Qxf6 etc. Here 8...d6 also came into consideration, since after 9.axb5 Qxe5 10.Qxe5 dxe5 11.Qxd8+ Qxd8 12.Qxe5+ Qe6 Black actually stands slightly better.

9.Qxd4 Qxd4 10.Qxd4 0-0
11.Qc3 d6
Here 11...f6 could also be played.

12.Qd5 dxe5 13.Qxe7+ Qxe7
14.Qxe5 Qe6
After this the game has a totally drawn character due to the presence of opposite coloured bishops.

15.Qe4 c6 16.Qe3 Qfe8 17.Qc5
Qd7 18.Qe1 f5 19.Qe2 Qf7
20.f4 Qxe5 21.fxe5 b6?
A mistake which places the draw in question. Black must play 21...Qe6 and then, after 22...b6 and 23.Qae8, try to place the bishop on d5 and the rook on g6.

22.e6 Qxe6 23.Qxe6+ Qxe6
24.Qxe6 bxc5 25.Qxc6 Qf7
26.Qxc5 Qf6 27.b4 g5 28.Qc7 Qd8
Black sacrifices a pawn in order to force a draw.

29.Qxh7 Qd1+ 30.Qf2 Qd2-
31.Qf3 Qg4+ 32.Qg3 Qxg2
33.Qxa7 Qg5 34.Qh4+ Qh5
35.b5 Qc4!
With this, Black secures a draw.

36.b6f4+

On 37.Qf2 follows 37...Qc2+:
A) 38.Qf1 Qxb4 39.Qb7 Qb2 40.Qf3
Qg3 41.a6 Qbl+ (on 41...f3 White makes a draw by 42.gxf3 Qxf3 43.b8Q+ 42.Qe2 f3+ (on 42...Qxg3 White plays 43.a8Q f3+ 44.Qe3 Qb2-
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\[45. \text{d}2 \text{f}2 46. \text{b}8 \text{w}+ \text{xb}8 47. \text{g}7+ \text{f}3 48. \text{f}7+ \text{g}2 49. \text{g}7+ \text{f}1 \text{a}7 \text{draw;}
\]

3) 38. \text{el} \text{exh}4 (on 38... \text{e}xg2 White wins by 39. \text{b}7 \text{b}2 40. \text{a}5+ followed by 41. \text{b}5) 39. \text{b}7 \text{b}2 40. a5 \text{e}3 41. a6 \text{f}3 (on 41... \text{e}xg2 White wins by 42. \text{a}8 \text{f}3 43. \text{f}8 \text{g}3 44. \text{a}7) 42. \text{gxf}3 \text{gxf}3 43. \text{b}8 \text{w}+! \text{xb}8 44. \text{g}7+ \text{d}2 draw;

4) 38. \text{g}1? \text{exh}4 39. \text{b}7 \text{g}3 40. \text{f}1 \text{b}2 41. a5 \text{b}1+ 42. \text{e}2 \text{e}xg2 43. a6 \text{f}3+ and Black wins.

37... \text{exh}4 38. \text{h}7+ \text{g}5 39. \text{b}7 \text{g}3+ 40. \text{h}8 \text{c}1 41. \text{g}7+ \text{h}5

**42. \text{e}xg3??**

A comical oversight. White must of course play 42. \text{h}7+ \text{g}5 43. \text{g}7+ etc.

42... \text{h}1

Mate.

51 Spanish Game

Paulsen

Zukertort

Aachen tournament, 6 August 1868

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \text{e}5 2.\text{c}f3 \text{c}6 3.\text{b}5 \text{f}6

4.d3 d6 5.\text{xc}6+ \text{bxc}6 6.\text{h}3 \text{g}6

7.\text{c}3 \text{g}7 8.\text{g}5 \text{h}6 9.\text{e}3 \text{c}5

Anderssen considers the best here is

10.\text{f}2 \text{h}7 11.\text{g}4 \text{d}5 12.\text{c}5 \text{e}8 13.0-0-0.

10.0-0

We consider castling to be rather premature.

10...0-0 11.\text{e}2

Here 11.\text{g}4 must be played, so as to keep the enemy knight away from h5.

11...\text{h}5 12.\text{g}4 \text{f}6! 13.\text{c}3 \text{f}4

14.\text{xf}4 \text{exf}4

Black, of course, must not take with the queen because of 15.\text{d}5.

15.\text{d}5 \text{d}8 16.\text{xf}4 \text{xb}2

17.\text{b}1 \text{g}7 18.\text{h}2

18.\text{g}2 was better.

18...\text{e}6 19.\text{c}4 \text{c}6

Now that Black, after his previous manoeuvre, has taken the decisively better position, he carries out a successful attack on the enemy's centre.

20.\text{w}e2

On this and the following move White spent a full half hour.

20...\text{w}c7 21.\text{h}1 \text{e}8 22.\text{xe}6

White rightly exchanges, since after the breakthrough in the centre the bishop could become very dangerous; Black takes back with the rook since he wants to forcibly exploit the e-file.

22...\text{xe}6 23.\text{h}4?

A mistake through which White immediately loses the e-pawn.

23...\text{d}5 24.\text{f}3

On 24.f3 would follow 24...\text{g}3.
24...dxe4 25.dxe4 \(e7 \) 26.\( \)g2
\( \)xe4 27.bf1 f5 28.gxf5 gxf5
29.ee3
White wants to double the rooks on the b-file.

29...\( \)xe3 30.fx\( e3 \)
Now, after 30...\( \)e4 31.\( \)xe4 fxe4, White would make a draw in any event after 32.\( \)f4.

30...\( \)f7 31.\( \)e2

31...\( \)e8
With the following moves, which involve minor threats, Black also carries out a fierce attack on the very exposed enemy king, which eventually forces the opponent to sacrifice another pawn.

32.\( \)f1 \( \)e4! 33.c1 \( \)e5!
34.\( \)e2
From moves 22-34 White used up 1 hour 10 minutes in a game lasting seven and a half hours!

34...\( \)h8
Before he plays his queen on to the g-file, Black must move his king off that line, and, indeed, in such a way that his f-pawn cannot be taken with check; now, for example, after 35.\( \)f3 \( \)xc4 36.\( \)xc4 \( \)xc4, White must not take the pawn because of 37...\( \)c1+.

35.\( \)d3 \( \)c7 36.\( \)f4 \( \)xf4 37.exf4 \( \)e4 38.\( \)e3
On 38.\( \)d2 Black replies with 38...\( \)c7; on 38.\( \)d8+ \( \)g8 (38...\( \)h7 was wrong because of 39.\( \)d1) 39.\( \)f6+ \( \)g7 40.\( \)d8+ \( \)h7, since now, on 41.\( \)d1, follows 42.\( \)d4.

38...h4 39.b1 \( \)h7 40.f3 \( \)xc4 41.xc6 \( \)b4

42.\( \)d1
White would by no means achieve a draw after the exchange of rooks, as the continuation shows: 42.\( \)xb4 \( \)xb4 43.\( \)c5 (43.\( \)a4 \( \)d5+ 44 \( \)f5; 43...\( \)b7+ 44.\( \)h2 \( \)e4 45.\( \)xa7+ \( \)g6 46.\( \)b6+ (46.\( \)a6+ \( \)g5) 46...\( \)h5 47.\( \)g1 \( \)f4+ 48.\( \)h1 \( \)h4 49.\( \)e1+ \( \)xh3 and wins.

42...\( \)d4 43.\( \)b1
After 43.\( \)xd4 \( \)xd4 would follow perhaps 44.\( \)d6 (44.\( \)c5 \( \)d7; 44...\( \)b7+ 45.\( \)h2 \( \)e4 46.\( \)d7- \( \)g6 47.\( \)xa7 (47.\( \)d6+ \( \)h5) 47...f5 48.\( \)a6+ \( \)h5 49.\( \)f1 d3 and Black wins.

43...\( \)d5+ 44.\( \)xd5 \( \)xd5 45.\( \)b7+ \( \)g6 46.\( \)e7 c4 47.\( \)c7 \( \)a5 48.\( \)xc4 \( \)a2
Though Black is only a pawn ahead, \( \)h has a certain win because of the bad position of the white king.

49.h4 \( \)e2 50.\( \)f4 \( \)e4 51.h5+ \( \)g5 52.\( \)f2 \( \)h4+
In order to cut off the white king without loss of tempo, or force the exchange of rooks.
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53...g1 g4+ 54.h1 f4 55.h2
h4 56.xh4 xh4 57.g2
xh5 58.f3 g5 59.f2 g4
White resigns.

52 Centre Gambit

Zukertort

12 board blindfold exhibition, Berlin, December 1868
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.c4 b4+
Upon the correct continuation, this
mode of play is not advantageous to
Black.
4.c3 dxc3 5.bxc3 f6 6.xf7+
White best plays 6.xb4 xal 7.b3.
6...xf7 7.xb4 e7!
Much better than 7...f6, as after
e2 xf6 9.b3 Black loses his
queen.
8.c3 f6 9.g5 0-0 10.b3+

10...d5!
In this way Black maintains a decisive
advantage in development.
11.xf6 xf6 12.xd5+ e6
13.d2 c6 14.f3 ad8
15.b2 c4!
With this the game is in fact already de-
looked.
16.c1 d4 17.e5?
A mistake which allows opponent to
annihilate the game brilliantly.

17.wxf3! 18.g1
On 18.gxf3 follows 18..xf3+ mate.
18.xg2
White resigns.

53 Game Position

Von Treskow

Zukertort

Berlin, December 1868
Notes by Zukertort

The continuation was:
1...xc3! 2.xc3
and Black announced mate in four
moves by 2...xf1+! 3.xf1 e2+ 4.h1 f3+ 5.xf8 xg3 mate.
1...\text{\textit{\textbf{Wxc2!}}} 2.\textit{\textbf{Bxc2}} \textit{\textbf{Qxg3}} 3.\textit{\textbf{Qg6}} 
\textit{\textbf{Qf5}} 4.\textit{\textbf{Wd6!}} \textit{\textbf{Qa5}} 5.\textit{\textbf{Wxd5+}} \textit{\textbf{Qh8}}
6.\textit{\textbf{Wd1}}
On 6.a4 follows 6...\textit{\textbf{Qxc2}} and on 7.\textit{\textbf{Qxf8}} or 7.\textit{\textbf{fxg3}}, mate in three moves.
6...\textit{\textbf{Qfd8}} 7.\textit{\textbf{Qd6}} \textit{\textbf{Qe2}} 8.a4 \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}}
and Black won.

55 Pirc Defence
\textit{\textbf{S****}}
\textit{\textbf{Zukertort (without f7-pawn)}}
\textit{\textbf{Berlin 1868}}
Notes by \textit{\textbf{Zukertort}}
1.e4 d6 2.d4 \textit{\textbf{Qf6}} 3.\textit{\textbf{Qd3}}
\textit{\textbf{Qf6}} is better.
3...e5 4.\textit{\textbf{dxex5}} \textit{\textbf{dxe5}} 5.\textit{\textbf{Qb5+}} \textit{\textbf{Qd7}}
6.\textit{\textbf{Qc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qb4}} 7.\textit{\textbf{Qxd7+}} \textit{\textbf{Qxd7}}
8.\textit{\textbf{Qg5}} 0-0 9.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qc5}} 10.\textit{\textbf{Qxd8}}
\textit{\textbf{Qxd8}} 11.f3 \textit{\textbf{Qa4}} 12.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qxb2}}
13.\textit{\textbf{Qb1}}

A last attempt: White wants to avoid the exchange of both pieces in order to be able to hold up the a-pawn.
29.\textit{\textbf{Qxe2+}} 30.\textit{\textbf{Qf1}} a3 31.\textit{\textbf{fxe5}} a2
White resigns.

56 From Gambit
\textit{\textbf{Zukertort}}
\textit{\textbf{Schmidt}}
\textit{\textbf{Berlin 1868}}
Notes by \textit{\textbf{Zukertort}}
1.\textit{\textbf{f4}} e5 2.\textit{\textbf{fxe5}} d6 3.\textit{\textbf{exd6}} \textit{\textbf{Qxd6}}
4.\textit{\textbf{Qf3}} \textit{\textbf{Qh6}} 5.\textit{\textbf{d4}} \textit{\textbf{Qg4}} 6.\textit{\textbf{Qg5}} f6
7.\textit{\textbf{Qh4}} \textit{\textbf{We7}} 8.\textit{\textbf{Qd3}} 0-0 9.\textit{\textbf{Qe4}} \textit{\textbf{Qe8}}
10.\textit{\textbf{Qbd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qf5}} 11.\textit{\textbf{Qb3+}} \textit{\textbf{Qh8}}
12.e5 \textit{\textbf{Qc6}}
The best continuation.
If 12...c5, White proceeds with 13.\textit{\textbf{h3}} \textit{\textbf{Qh6}}
14.0-0-0.
13.0-0-0
If 13 \textit{\textbf{h3}}, Black would obtain a winning attack with 13...\textit{\textbf{Qxd4}}
14.\textit{\textbf{Qxd4}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe5+}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Qe2}} \textit{\textbf{Qe3}}.
13.\textit{\textbf{Qb4}} 14.\textit{\textbf{h3}} \textit{\textbf{Qh6}}
Black gains nothing by 14...\textit{\textbf{Qa5}}
15.\textit{\textbf{Qa4}} \textit{\textbf{Qe3}} 16.c3 \textit{\textbf{Qc2}} 17.\textit{\textbf{Qxb4}}
e tc.
15.\textit{\textbf{c3}} \textit{\textbf{Qa5}} 16.\textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{Qg6}}
17.\textit{\textbf{g5}}! \textit{\textbf{Qg8}}
White has now the superiority of numbers and position, whatever Black may play. 17...\textit{\textbf{fxg5}} was a little better.
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18.gxf6 gxf6 19.\(\text{c}4\)! \(\text{d}7\)
20.\(\text{e}xg8\) \(\text{e}xg8\) 21.\(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{g}7\)
22.h4 h5 23.\(\text{dg}1\) \(\text{e}8\)
23...\(\text{e}7\), White can win a piece with
\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{a}3\).
24.\(\text{e}xg6!\) \(\text{e}xg6\) 25.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{h}6\)
26.\(\text{c}2\)
White could force the game with
\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{f}7\) \(\text{g}8\) 27.\(\text{g}5\).
26...\(\text{g}8\) 27.\(\text{g}6\) \(\text{e}3\) 28.\(\text{g}5\)
\(\text{e}1+\) 29.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}1+\) 30.\(\text{x}d1\) \(\text{x}8\)
30...\(\text{a}3\) anywhere else then 31.\(\text{x}g7\).
White mates in 2 moves, starting with
\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{x}g7+\).

57 Dutch Defence
Schurig
Zukertort
Leipzig, 19 March 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.d4 f5 2.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 3.\(\text{h}3\) c5
4.dxc5 \(\text{a}5+\) 5.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{x}c5\)
6.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 7.e3 a6 8.\(\text{e}2\) e5
9.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 10.\(\text{d}2\) b5 11.0-0
0-0 12.a3\(\text{d}6\)
12...\(\text{e}4\) White plays first of all
\(\text{b}4\).
13.b4 \(\text{a}7\) 14.a4 \(\text{xb}4\) 15.axb5
a5 16.\(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 17.\(\text{g}5\) d5
18.\(\text{b}3\)
It is clear that White must not take the
pawn.
18...\(\text{d}4\)
\(\text{e}4\) was better.
19.\(\text{e}4x\text{e}\) \(\text{d}4\) 20.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}5\)
21.\(\text{e}5!\) \(\text{h}6\) 22.\(\text{xf}6\)
White would have had the rather better
game after 22.\(\text{f}3\).
22...\(\text{xf}6\) 23.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}7\) 24.\(\text{c}4\)
dxc3 25.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{e}8\) 26.\(\text{ad}1\)
\(\text{d}6\) 27.\(\text{b}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 28.\(\text{wa}2\) \(\text{b}4\)
29.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 30.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{xd}5\)
31.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{f}4\) 32.\(\text{c}4\)

32...\(\text{e}2+\)
The decisive manoeuvre.
33.\(\text{h}1\)
On 33.\(\text{h}2\) there follows 33...\(\text{c}3\)
34.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{x}d1\) 35.\(\text{xd}1\) \(\text{xd}1\) 36.\(\text{xe}8\)
\(\text{b}8+\)
33...\(\text{c}3\) 34.\(\text{e}6\) \(\text{xd}1\) 35.\(\text{xe}8\)
\(\text{xf}2+\) 36.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{b}8\) 37.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{e}4\)
White resigns.
If White moves the bishop back, then
follows 38...\(\text{d}2+\) 39.\(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{xd}3+\) 40.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{xd}3+\) 41.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{c}5+\).

58 Italian Game
Zukertort
Minckwitz
Leipzig, 20 March 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}5\)
4.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 5.d4 \(\text{xd}4\) 6.\(\text{xd}4\)
\(\text{b}4+\) 7.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xd}2+\) 8.\(\text{b}x\text{d}2\)
\(\text{x}e4\)
We do not think this continuation is as
good as 8...\(\text{d}5\); after 9.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{d}5\)
10.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 11.0-0 0-0 12.\(\text{c}3\) the
black queen has no good square of re­
treat. In another game Minckwitz
played 12...\(\text{h}5\) here. White also then
obtained a decisive advantage and lost
the game in the end only because of a
blunder.
9.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 10.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\)
11.0-0 0-0 12.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{d}8\)
On 12...\( \text{Wh} \)h5 White plays 13.d5 \( \text{Qe} \)7
(13...\( \text{Qe} \)5 14.\( \text{Qxe} \)5 \( \text{Whxe} \)5 15.\( \text{Qel} \) 14.\( \text{Qd} \)4.

13.d5! \( \text{Qe} \)7 14.\( \text{Qe} \)5 \( \text{Wd} \)6 15.\( \text{Qe} \)1
\( \text{Qe} \)8 16.\( \text{Qc} \)4! \( \text{Wc} \)5 17.d6 \( \text{Wxc} \)4
On 17...\( \text{cxd} \)6 follows 18.\( \text{Qxd} \)6 \( \text{Qd} \)8 19.\( \text{Qxe} \)7 \( \text{Qf} \)5 20.\( \text{Qcb} \)5 a6 21.\( \text{Wd} \)4.

18.\( \text{Qxe} \)7 \( \text{Qg} \)4 19.\( \text{Wf} \)1
Here 19.f3 came into consideration.
20...\( \text{Qd} \)7 20.\( \text{Wd} \)2 \( \text{Qc} \)6

21.\( \text{Qd} \)5!
The correct continuation and a totally
decisive combination for White.
21...\( \text{cxd} \)6
21...\( \text{Wxd} \)6 was not possible because of
22.\( \text{Qxd} \)7 \( \text{Wxd} \)7 23.\( \text{Qf} \)6+.
22.\( \text{Qc} \)1\( \text{Wb} \)5
On 22...\( \text{W} \)a4 follows 23.\( \text{b} \)3 \( \text{Wg} \)4 24.\( \text{h} \)3
\( \text{Wf} \)5 25.\( \text{g} \)4 and White wins the bishop.
23.\( \text{Qc} \)7?
At the decisive moment White lets the
win out of his grasp. With 23.\( \text{Qxe} \)8+
\( \text{Qxe} \)8 24.\( \text{Qc} \)7 \( \text{W} \)e5 (24...\( \text{W} \)b6 25.\( \text{Qxe} \)8
\( \text{Qxe} \)8 26.\( \text{Qc} \)8 \( \text{Wb} \)5 (26...\( \text{Wf} \)8 27.\( \text{Wc} \)2)
27.\( \text{Wxd} \)6 and 28.\( \text{Wd} \)7) 25.\( \text{Qxe} \)8 \( \text{Qxe} \)8
(25...\( \text{Qxe} \)8 26.\( \text{Qc} \)1 \( \text{Wb} \)5 27.\( \text{Wxd} \)6)
26.\( \text{Wxd} \)6 \( \text{Qc} \)6 27.\( \text{Qd} \)1 White must
win.
23...\( \text{Qxe} \)7 24.\( \text{Qxb} \)5 \( \text{Qxb} \)5
25.\( \text{Wxd} \)6
After a couple of hours and thirty
moves of manoeuvring arose the follow­
ing position...

55...\( \text{Qd} \)6 56.\( \text{Wxd} \)6
56.\( \text{Wf} \)7 was the simplest here.
56...\( \text{Qd} \)1 57.\( \text{Qxf} \)5 \( \text{Qxf} \)5 58.\( \text{g} \)4
58.\( \text{Wc} \)6 must not be played because c:
58...\( \text{Qd} \)4+.
58...\( \text{Qh} \)1+ 59.\( \text{Qg} \)3 \( \text{Qg} \)1+ 60.\( \text{Qf} \)3
\( \text{Qxg} \)4 61.\( \text{Qc} \)7 \( \text{Qg} \)5 62.\( \text{Wxb} \)6
\( \text{Qd} \)3 63.\( \text{Qd} \)4 \( \text{Qf} \)5+
If Black takes the b-pawn at once then:
White forces a draw by perpetual
check.
64.\( \text{Qe} \)3 \( \text{Qxb} \)5 65.\( \text{Qe} \)4 \( \text{Qd} \)7
66.\( \text{Qd} \)3 \( \text{Qc} \)8 67.\( \text{Qc} \)2
Draw.
A very interesting drawn position: the
White queen continually attacks the
bishop, which must protect the rook.

59 Petroff Defence
Zukertort
Minckwitz
Berlin, April 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.\( \text{e} \)4 \( \text{e} \)5 2.\( \text{Qf} \)3 \( \text{Qf} \)6 3.\( \text{Qxe} \)5 \( \text{d} \)6
4.\( \text{Qf} \)3 \( \text{Qxe} \)4 5.\( \text{d} \)4 \( \text{d} \)5 6.\( \text{Qd} \)3 \( \text{Qe} \)7
7.0-0 \( \text{Qd} \)6
Minckwitz considers this move worth:
of recommendation, since in this way
the attack introduced by c2-c4 on the
point d5, respectively e4, will be pre­
vented. However, Black also loses an
important tempo for development.
8.\( \text{Qc} \)3 \( \text{c} \)6 9.\( \text{Qe} \)2 0-0 10.\( \text{Qg} \)3
\( \text{Qe} \)6 11.\( \text{b} \)3 \( \text{Qd} \)7 12.\( \text{Qf} \)4 \( \text{Qf} \)6
13.\textit{He1} \textit{He8} 14.\textit{c3} \textit{g4} 15.\textit{h3} \textit{xf3} 16.\textit{xf3} \textit{d7} 17.\textit{e5}

White now has an excellent position, whereas Black's game is extremely cramped.

17...\textit{h6} 18.\textit{c4}

In this way White prevents the opponent's plan to somewhat improve his game with 19...\textit{h7}. On this would now follow 20.\textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 21.\textit{c5} \textit{xc8} 22.\textit{xf7}.

18...\textit{f8} 19.\textit{c5} \textit{de8} 20.\textit{f5} \textit{d8}

If Black does not move the bishop, he loses the exchange by 21.\textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 12.\textit{d6}.

\begin{center}
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21.\textit{xe7} 12.\textit{e5} \textit{xe8} 22.\textit{f5} \textit{e7} 23.\textit{xe7} \textit{xc6} 24.\textit{f5} \textit{e7}

\textit{xf5} was better.

25.\textit{cxd6}?

Premature. After 25.\textit{g3}+ \textit{h8} 26.\textit{cxd6} Black would be left with no resources at all.

25...\textit{xe5} 26.\textit{c3} \textit{g7} 27.\textit{f5} \textit{ae8} 28.\textit{f3} \textit{e6} 29.\textit{g4} \textit{g8}

White threatened to force the game with 30.\textit{g5}.

30.\textit{f2} \textit{f8} 31.\textit{h4} \textit{e7} 32.\textit{h1}

So as to immediately control the open file with the rook after 33.\textit{g5} \textit{hxg5} 34.\textit{hxg5}.

32...\textit{xg4}+?

A blunder which accelerates the end.

33.\textit{fxg4} \textit{f6} 34.\textit{e1}+

Black resigns.

---

60 King's Gambit

Schulten

Zukertort

Berlin, May 1869

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 \textit{xf4} 3.\textit{c4} d5

White has no saving move.

18...\textit{e4}+ 19.\textit{f3} \textit{xf3}+ 21.\textit{xf3} \textit{e4}+

Mate.
King's Gambit

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.dı c4 d5
4.exd5 wójh4+ 5.dı f1 dı d6 6.dı f3
wójh5 7.d4 dı e7 8.dı c3 dı f5 9.dı b5
g5 10.dı xg5+ xg5 11.dı e1 dı d7
12.dı b4 g4 13.dı e1 f3 14.dı g3 dı e4
15.dı f2 dı xg5 16.dı d3 0-0-0
17.dı f2 dı xg5 16.dı d3 0-0-0
18.dı b4 g4 19.f3 dı e4 20.dı xg4 dı h3!
21.dı g1 dı e6 22.c4

White gives up the d4-pawn to prevent Black from playing ...dı d5.

22...ı xg5 23.dı b4

23...dı e4!

If Black plays 22...ı xg5 then White would force at least a draw by 23.dı d6, but now White must move his bishop back and give up a pawn and a piece.

24.dı e3 ı xg5 25.dı d6 ı xg5
26.dı f4

On 26.b3 follows 26...dı d8 27.dı c5 ı e4 28.dı c3 (in order to prevent 28...dı d2+ and 29...ı e2 mate)
28...ı d8 29.dı c2 (or wherever; 29.dı h8+ ı d7) 29...ı f1 +.

26...ı xg5 27.dı e3 ı e2+
28.dı d3 ı d8

White resigns.

Evans Gambit

1.e4 e5 2.dı f3 ı c6 3.dı c4 ı c5
4.b4 ı xg5 5.dı c3 ı c5 6.0-0 dı d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cı d4 ı b6 9.d5 ı a5
10.dı b2 ı e7 11.dı d3 0-0-0 12.dı c3
ı g6 13.dı e2 c5 14.dı d2 ı c7
14...f6 is the usual and best move.

15.dı g3 ı c4

Not advisable, as the simple rejoinder: 16.ı c2 f6 17.ı d4 procures White the superior game.

16.ı xg7

The course proposed in the preceding note was the safer one.

16...ı xg7

Of course Black cannot take the queen's bishop, on account of 16...ı xg7 17.dı h5+ ı h8 18.dı h6 ı g8 19.ı g5 and wins.

17.dı h6 f6

Absolutely necessary, to prevent 18.ı g5.

18.dı h5 ı f7?

18...ı d7 was far better, and I doubt whether White would then have a winning attack.

19.ı xg5+

Black's game is now beyond redemption, whatever he may play.
Tournaments at Aachen 1868, Homburg and Barmen 1869

23.\texttt{exd3} \texttt{c5} 24.\texttt{g3} \texttt{ge2}
25.f4 b6 26.f5 \texttt{a6} 27.fxg6 \texttt{xg6} 28.\texttt{xh7} \texttt{wh7} 29.\texttt{exg6+} Black resigns.

63 King's Gambit
Stosch
Zukertort
Berlin, May 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\texttt{c4} d5
4.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{wh4+} 5.\texttt{f1} g5 6.\texttt{f3}
c6 7.\texttt{wc3} f6 8.\texttt{f3} \texttt{wh5} 9.\texttt{exg8}
xg8 10.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{g4} 11.\texttt{e5+}
11.\texttt{e5} follows 11...\texttt{e7} 12.\texttt{xg4!}
xg4 13.\texttt{c3} d1+.
11...\texttt{e7} 12.\texttt{c3} \texttt{d7} 13.d4
0-0 0-14.\texttt{bd2} \texttt{xf3} 15.\texttt{xh3}
15...\texttt{xf3} follows equally 15...g4.
15...g4 16.\texttt{g1} f3 17.g3 \texttt{c5!}
18.\texttt{xf4}
18.dxc5 Black wins by 18...\texttt{d1+} +
\texttt{f2} \texttt{xb5+} 20.\texttt{e3} \texttt{xe3+} followed by 21.\texttt{axa1}.
18...\texttt{xe4} 19.\texttt{wd3} \texttt{c5!}

A1) 24.\texttt{xgl} \texttt{wh3} 25.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{e2}
26.\texttt{xe2} \texttt{xe2} 27.\texttt{xel} (on 27.\texttt{f2}
follows 27...\texttt{f3+} 28.\texttt{xg1} g3)
27...\texttt{f3+} 28.\texttt{g2} \texttt{f3+} 29.\texttt{g1} g3;
A2) 24.h4 \texttt{b6} 25.\texttt{e1} (on 25.\texttt{xd1}
immediately decisive is 25...g3)
25...\texttt{b5}+ 26.\texttt{d3} \texttt{xe1}+ 27.\texttt{xe1}
\texttt{xd3} 28.cxd3 g3.
B) 21.\texttt{e5} \texttt{xd4}
B1) 22.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 23.\texttt{c3} f2 24.h3
(if White takes the pawn, then he will be mated in two moves, if he moves the knight then it is mate in three)
24...\texttt{f1}+ 25.\texttt{xe1} \texttt{f5+} 26.\texttt{g2}
\texttt{e2+} 27.\texttt{h1} \texttt{e4+};
B2) 22.\texttt{wd4} \texttt{xd4} 23.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{b5+}
24.\texttt{f2} \texttt{e2+}.
C) 21.\texttt{xe8} \texttt{xe8} 22.dxc5 \texttt{xc5} and
Black forces the win after 23.\texttt{c1} or
23.c3 with 23...\texttt{c4+} followed by
24...\texttt{e2+}, and on 24.\texttt{d1} with
24...\texttt{xc2} 25.\texttt{d2} \texttt{c1+} etc.
20...\texttt{f2}?
Premature. Black wins easily with
20...\texttt{f6}.
21.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{fxg1}+ 22.\texttt{exe1}
\texttt{g8} 23.\texttt{d3} \texttt{b6} 24.\texttt{g2}
\texttt{d5+} 25.\texttt{xf2} c5 26.\texttt{xe1} \texttt{xd4}
27.c4 \texttt{wh5} 28.\texttt{g1} \texttt{e3}!

20.c3
White plays 20.\texttt{exe4} then he loses
20...\texttt{ge8}, as the following variations demonstrate:
A) 21.\texttt{d3} \texttt{xd4} 22.\texttt{c3} (on
22.\texttt{b3} Black plays equally 22...\texttt{xf4})
22...\texttt{xf4} 23.gxf4 \texttt{g1}!!

29.\texttt{d2}
On 29.\texttt{xe3} dxe3 30.\texttt{e4} Black wins
by 30...\texttt{d2} 31.h4! (31.\texttt{h1} e2+
32.\texttt{g2} \texttt{h3 mate}) 31...\texttt{xh3} 32.\texttt{ac1}
Johannes Zukertort

64 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Schulten
Berlin, June 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Cf3 Cc6 3.Cc4 Cc5
4.b4 Cxb4 5.Cc3 Cc5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.Cxd4 Cb6 9.d5 Ca5
10.Cb2 Ce7 11.Cd3 0-0 12.Cc3
c5?
Here 12...Cg6 must be played.
13.e5! Cg6 14.exd6 Cxd6
15.Cg5 Cwf4 16.Cwh5 h6
16...Cwh4 cannot be played because of 17.Cxg6.

17.Cxf7 Cxf7 18.Cxg6 Cg6?
19.Ce4 Cd8 20.Cf3
This move is necessary here, in order to maintain the attack.
20.Cc4 21.Cg3 Cc3

22.Cd7+! Cg7
On 22...Cg8 decisive is 23.Cxg7—
(23.Cxh6 is bad because of
23...Cd5) 23...Cd7 24.Cg6+ Cd8
23.Cg5+ Cg8 24.Cxf3 Cxb2
25.Cae1 Cd7 26.Ce7 Ce8
27.Ce5 and White won.

65 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Schulten
Berlin, June 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Cf3 Cc6 3.Cc4 Cc5
4.b4 Cxb4 5.Cc3 Cc5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.Cxd4 Cb6 9.d5 Ca5
10.Cb2 Ce7 11.Cd3 0-0 12.Cc3
c5?
Here 12...Cg6 must be played.
13.e5! Cg6 14.exd6 Cxd6
15.Cg5 Cwf4 16.Cwh5 h6
16...Cwh4 cannot be played because of 17.Cxg6.
Tournaments at Aachen 1868, Hamburg and Barmen 1869

Plass of tempo, since the queen will be taken back to its old place.

25.\(d1\) \(\text{We}8\) 26.\(\text{Af}4\) \(\text{Wf}8\) 27.\(\text{Ah}4\) \(\text{Ac}5\) 28.\(\text{Aa}4\)

White will in this way perhaps not prevent the advance of the queen's knight, but, after 29.\(\text{Ax}e5\) \(\text{dx}e5\) \(\text{Axc}6\), he threatens to win the rook by 31.\(e7\). Thus this rook is placed to e8, so preventing Black from moving with the knight on the 31st move.

28...\(\text{Ee}8\) 29.\(\text{Wg}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 30.\(\text{Wh}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 31.\(\text{Ax}e5\) \(\text{dx}e5\) 32.\(\text{Wg}4\) \(\text{Ah}8\)!

32...\(\text{h}7\) White would force victory by 33.\(\text{Wg}6+\) \(\text{h}8\) 34.\(\text{Ax}f6\).

33.\(\text{Wg}6\) \(\text{e}7\) 34.\(\text{Ec}1\) \(\text{b}5\) 35.\(\text{Ad}1\)

35...\(\text{Ed}8\)

The manoeuvre through which Black succeeds in bringing up further protection for the threatened h6-point, after which, however, the f6-square loses the necessary cover.

Black best plays 35...\(b4\), so as not to allow the rook to c3 and, on 36.\(\text{Ac}4\), to seize a rook exchange by 36...\(\text{Ad}4\).

However, White would not take the pawn but continue the attack with \(\text{Ag}4\) and, after 36...\(\text{Ed}8\) 37.\(\text{gs}\) \(\text{We}8\), force victory by 38.\(\text{Ae}6+!\) \(\text{gxh}6\) \(\text{Ax}h6+\) \(\text{g}8\) 40.\(\text{gx}f6\).

36.\(\text{Ec}3\) \(\text{Ab}4\) 37.\(\text{Ech}3\) \(\text{Ad}2\)

38.\(\text{Ax}f6!\) \(\text{Wxf6}\) 39.\(\text{Wh}6+\) \(\text{Ah}6\)

40.\(\text{Ae}6+!\) \(\text{gx}h6\)

On 40...\(\text{g}8\) follows 41.\(\text{h}7+\) \(\text{f}8\) 42.\(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{e}7\) 43.\(\text{xg}7+\) \(\text{d}6\) 44.e7+.

41.\(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{h}7\) 42.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{Ec}7\)

43.\(\text{g}6+\) \(\text{g}8\) 44.\(\text{f}7+\) \(\text{f}8\)

45.\(\text{Wxh}6+\) \(\text{e}7\) 46.\(\text{f}6+\) \(\text{d}6\)

47.e7

Black resigns.

There could follow 47...\(\text{Ee}7\)

48.\(\text{d}2+\) \(\text{c}6\) 49.\(\text{xd}8\) \(\text{Ee}8\) (49...\(\text{Ed}7\) 50.\(\text{f}xe7\) 50.\(\text{Ax}d5+\) \(\text{b}6\) 51.\(\text{f}7\).

66 Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Von Schutz

Berlin, Summer 1869

Notes by Zukertort

1.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 2.\(\text{Af}3\) \(\text{Ac}6\) 3.\(\text{Ac}4\) \(\text{Ae}5\)

4.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{xb}4\) 5.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{Ac}5\) 6.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{ex}d4\)

7.0-0 \(\text{d}6\) 8.\(\text{c}xd4\) \(\text{Ab}6\) 9.d5 \(\text{Aa}5\)

10.\(\text{Ab}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 11.\(\text{Ad}3\) 0-0 12.\(\text{Ac}3\)

\(\text{Ag}6\) 13.\(\text{Ee}2\) \(\text{c}5\) 14.\(\text{Ed}2\) \(\text{f}6\)

15.\(\text{h}1!\) \(\text{Ac}7\) 16.\(\text{Ac}1\) \(\text{Ab}8\)

17.\(\text{fg}1\) \(\text{b}5\) 18.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{c}4\) 19.\(\text{Aa}1\) \(\text{b}4\)

20.\(\text{Ad}4\) \(\text{c}3\) 21.\(\text{Wd}1\) \(\text{Ab}6\) 22.\(\text{Af}3\)

\(\text{Aa}6\) 23.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{Ax}e2\) 24.\(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Ae}5\)

25.\(\text{Ax}e5\) \(\text{fx}e5\) 26.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{Ab}7\) 27.\(\text{g}5\)

a5 28.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{Ec}8\) 29.\(\text{Ah}2\) \(\text{We}8\)

30.\(\text{Wg}4\) a4 31.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{g}6\) 32.\(\text{Af}3\) \(\text{Ad}4\)

33.\(\text{Ac}1\) \(\text{Wf}7\) 34.\(\text{Wf}6\) b3 35.\(\text{ax}b3\)

\(\text{axb}3\) 36.\(\text{g}4!\) \(\text{Wxe}6\) 37.\(\text{dxe}6\) \(\text{c}2\)
38.e7! cxb1\(\text{\textpm})\ 39...\textbf{xB}1 \textbf{Qc}5
40...\textbf{Qh}6+ \textbf{Qh}8 41.exf8\(\text{\textpm})+\ \textbf{Qxf8}
42...\textbf{fxb}3 \textbf{Qxb}3
Black must take the exchange, otherwise \textbf{Qb}8 is played.
43...\textbf{xb}3 \textbf{Qf}2
White could announce mate here.

\textbf{44...Qb}7\! \textbf{Qxh}4 45...\textbf{Qg}7 \textbf{Qxg}5
Too late!
\textbf{46...Qg}8+ \textbf{Qxg}8 47...\textbf{Qf}7
Mate.

67 From Gambit
Zukertort
Schmidt
Berlin, July 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.f4 e5 2.fxe5 d6 3.exd6 \textbf{Qxd}6
4...\textbf{Qf}3 \textbf{Qh}6 5.d4 \textbf{Qg}4 6...\textbf{Qg}5 f6
7...\textbf{Qh}4 0-0 8.e4 \textbf{Qe}8 9...\textbf{Qc}4+ \textbf{Qf}8
10.\textbf{Qe}2 \textbf{Qe}7 11...\textbf{Qbd}2 \textbf{Qf}5
12...\textbf{Qd}3 c5 13.c3 \textbf{Qc}6 14.0-0 \textbf{Qad}8?
A mistake which accelerates the loss of the game.
15.e5! \textbf{Qd}7 16...\textbf{Qxf}5 \textbf{Qxf}5
17...\textbf{Qg}5 \textbf{Qc}8 18.\textbf{Qe}4 \textbf{Qh}6
19.\textbf{Qxh}7 \textbf{Qxe}5 20.dxe5 \textbf{Qxd}2
20...\textbf{Qxe}5 offered slightly longer resistance.
21...\textbf{Qh}8+ \textbf{Qg}8
\textbullet\textbf{21...Qe}7 follows 22...\textbf{Qxg}7+ \textbf{Qd}8
23...\textbf{Qxf}6.

22.exf6 gxf6

White announced mate in four moves by 23...\textbf{Qxf}6+ \textbf{Qe}7 24...\textbf{Qg}7+ \textbf{Qd}8
25...\textbf{Qd}6+ \textbf{Qxd}6 26...\textbf{Qe}6 mate.

68 From Gambit
Zukertort
Schmidt
Berlin, July 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.f4 e5 2.fxe5 d6 3.exd6 \textbf{Qxd}6
4...\textbf{Qf}3 \textbf{Qh}6 5.d4 \textbf{Qg}4 6...\textbf{Qg}5 f6
7...\textbf{Qh}4 \textbf{Qe}3 8...\textbf{Qd}3 \textbf{Qe}7 9...\textbf{Qf}2
\textbf{Qf}4 10...\textbf{Qxe}3 \textbf{Qxe}3 11...\textbf{Qbd}2 0-0
12.0-0-0 \textbf{Qc}6 13...\textbf{Qb}1 \textbf{Qb}4
14...\textbf{Qb}3+ \textbf{Qe}6 15...\textbf{Qc}4 \textbf{Qh}6
16.e4!
The right continuation, with white maintaining the better game.
16...\textbf{Qb}5 17.d5! \textbf{bxc}4 18...\textbf{Qxc}4 \textbf{Qf}7
The only move for the bishop. Further...
18...\textbf{Qab}8 see the following game.

160
19.d6
White could win back the sacrificed piece by 19.a3, but Black would then obtain an attack with 19...\textit{ab}8. Whereas on 19.d6 White maintains the attack and can win the piece back at any time.

19...\textbf{w}xe4 20.\textbf{ax}f7+ \textbf{xf}7 21.d7
In 21.\textbf{ed}4 Black could apparently equalise the game by 21...\textbf{wc}2+. Best was to play 21.dxc7.

21...\textbf{ed}8
In 21...\textbf{ac}6, 22.\textbf{he}1 decides at once.

22.\textbf{he}1 \textbf{wc}6
Black must play 22...\textbf{wc}2+ here; thus White's 21st move was not the best.

23.\textbf{we}8+!
With 23.\textbf{we}7, White would only force back to play the good move 23...\textbf{wc}2+.

23...\textbf{xe}8 24.d8\textbf{w}+ g6 25.\textbf{ed}7
Black resigns.

69 From Gambit
Zukertort
Schmidt
Berlin, July 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.f4 \textbf{e}5 2.\textbf{f}xe5 \textbf{d}6 3.exd6 \textbf{\textit{ad}}6
4.\textbf{\textit{a}}3 \textbf{h}6 5.d4 \textbf{g}4 6.\textbf{gf}5 f6
7.\textbf{hf}4 \textbf{e}3 8.\textbf{wd}3 \textbf{w}e7 9.\textbf{xf}2
\textbf{xf}4 10.\textbf{xe}3 \textbf{xe}3 11.\textbf{bd}2 0-0
12.0-0 0 0 0 13.\textbf{b}1 \textbf{b}4

14.\textbf{wb}3+ \textbf{ce}6 15.\textbf{c}4 \textbf{hf}6
16.e4! b5 17.d5! \textbf{xc}4 18.\textbf{xc}4
\textbf{ab}8 19.dxe6 \textbf{dd}5
So as to avoid 20.\textbf{ed}7 and obtain an attack himself.

20.\textbf{xd}5! \textbf{xb}3 21.\textbf{ed}7 \textbf{wc}5
22.\textbf{xb}3
Bad was 22.e7+ \textbf{wc}4 23.\textbf{ed}8 \textbf{xb}2+!
24.\textbf{xb}2 \textbf{b}4+ followed by 25...\textbf{we}7.

22...\textbf{eh}8 23.e7 \textbf{he}8 24.\textbf{hf}7
\textbf{we}7 25.\textbf{xe}8
Leading to a quicker decision than 25.\textbf{xe}7.

25...\textbf{xe}8 26.\textbf{hd}1
Black resigns.

70 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
Minckwitz
Hamburg tournament, 26 July 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \textbf{c}5 2.\textbf{ce}3 \textbf{c}6 3.\textbf{\textit{a}}f3 \textbf{e}6
4.d4 cxd4 5.\textbf{xd}4 \textbf{a}6 6.\textbf{e}2 \textbf{g}6
We think that White's way of playing against the Sicilian Defence gives him the better game and Minckwitz agrees with us. The posting of the bishop, intended with the text move, does not improve Black's position.

7.f4 \textbf{g}7 8.e5 f5
Essential, in order to prevent 9.\textbf{e}4.
Schallopp
Zukertort
Barmen tournament, August 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2."c4 lLl6 3.d3 tt:.c6
4.f4 .tcs 5.fxe5
5...ttJxe5 6."b3
On 6.d4 follows 6...ttJxc4 7.dxc5 ttJc7.
On 7.d4 Black wins by 7...ttJxe4 followed by 8...ttJh4+. 7."g5 was better.
7...ttJxf3+ 8."xf3 d5! 9."g5
White does not take the pawn, since his then would lose the right to castle with a very unfavourable king position.
9...dxe4 10.dxe4
On 10."xf6 Black wins by 10...exf6 11."xd8 fxg2.
10...ttJg4 11."d3
On the same grounds 11."xf6 also cannot be played. 11."xe4 came into consideration.
11...ttJe7 12."c3 "ad8 13."g3
On 13."d5 Black plays 13...ttJe5.
13...ttJf6

27.a5!
Any attempt of an attack on the king's flank would be unsuccessful; the breakthrough must come on the queen's side.
27...ttJc7
27...ttJf6 was better.
28."f2 ttJb7 29."b6 ttJc8
If Black exchanges queens, then he gives the opponent a strong passed pawn, whereas his own a-pawn cannot be held in the long run.
30.c4 ttJf7 31.b5 axb5 32.cxb5 ttJc8 33."c3 ttJb8 34."xb8 ttJxb8 35.b6
35.bxc6 was bad, since after 35...dxc6 36."xc6? White loses a piece by 36...ttJc7.
35...ttJb7 36."e2 ttJa8 37."a3 ttJa6 38."xa6 ttJa6 39.b7 ttJe8
40."xd7+ ttJf8 41."c7 ttJb8 42."c8+
Black resigns.

162
White plays, for instance, 14...\texttt{xf6} to
in a piece, then follows 14...\texttt{xe4}+!
\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4}+ 16.\texttt{fl} \texttt{e2}+ foled
by mate in four moves.

14...\texttt{gxg4} 15.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 16.\texttt{f1}
\texttt{b4} 17.\texttt{f4} \texttt{f6} 18.\texttt{fl} \texttt{xc3}
19.bxc3 \texttt{xe4} 20.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4}
21.\texttt{e1} \texttt{d2}+
\texttt{xc3} was not good because of
\texttt{xe7}.

22.\texttt{f2} \texttt{xb3} 23.\texttt{xb3} \texttt{d2}+
24.\texttt{e2} \texttt{xe2}+ 25.\texttt{xe2} \texttt{f5}
26.\texttt{e3} \texttt{f7} 27.\texttt{d4} \texttt{e6} 28.\texttt{c4}
g5 29.g3 h5 30.b4 c6 31.a4 \texttt{d6}
32.b5 a6
\texttt{xe7}

... \texttt{c2}!
Black sacrifices an important passed
pawn to snatch away the attack from the
opponent.

37.\texttt{xc2} \texttt{xf3}+ 38.\texttt{g2} \texttt{bc7}
On 38...\texttt{xf6} White holds a draw with
39.\texttt{c8}+ \texttt{h7} 40.\texttt{c2}+ \texttt{g8}
(40...\texttt{f5}? 41.\texttt{xg7}+) 41.\texttt{c8}+.

39.\texttt{b2} \texttt{h3}+
On 39...\texttt{xf6} follows 40.\texttt{g7}+
40.\texttt{g1} \texttt{e3}+ 41.\texttt{h2} \texttt{e5}+
42.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{dxe5} 43.\texttt{fxg7} \texttt{xg7}
44.\texttt{xb4} \texttt{xg2}+ 45.\texttt{xe2} \texttt{c2}+
46.\texttt{f3} \texttt{xa2}
and Black won.

73 Nimzowitsch Defence

Zukertort

Paulsen

Barmen tournament, 11 August 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \texttt{c6}

As the Paulsen brothers inform us,
Fischer, a very strong player from
Detmold, has a preference for this reply.

2.\texttt{f3}
Here, 2.d4 came into consideration; on
2.\texttt{f3} Black is free to transpose into the
king's knight game by 2...\texttt{e5}.
2...d5 3.exd5 Qxd5 4.Qc3 Qa5
The early development of the queen is not advantageous, nor is the chosen position here any more favourable, though he had nothing better.

5.d4 Qg4 6.Qe2 0-0-0 7.Qe3 e6
On 7...e5 could follow 8.Qxe5 Qxe5 9.Qxe2 Qxe5 10.dxe5 Qxe5 11.0-0 and White is better developed.

8.a3
So as to prevent 8...Qc5 and at the same time introducing an attack on the badly posted Black queen.

8...Qd6 9.0-0 Qe7
Black must prevent 10.d5 followed by 11.b4.

10.h3 Qxf3
10...Qf5 is not playable because of 11.b4, on 10...Qh5 follows first of all 11.g4, on 10...Qh5 11.Qe4.

11.Qxf3 Qf5 12.Qe4 h5
Black cannot avoid the exchange of the second bishop for a knight since 12...Qf4 may not be played because of 13.g4; on 12...Qe5 White plays with gain of tempo 13.c3 followed by 14.Qa4.

13.Qg3 Qxg3 14.fxg3 Qg6
15.Qf2 e5 16.c3 e4 17.Qe2 f5
On 17...Qf5 follows 18.g4 hxg4 19.Qxg4 Qe7 (19...Qb8 20.Qxf5 Qxf5 21.Qh4) 20.Qe1.

18.b4 Qd5

19.Qc1!
A very strong move with unusual scope; this posting of the queen turns out to be extremely advantageous later.

19...Qf6
So as to prevent 20.c4, after which Black could now play 20...Qxe5 19.g3 Qe3 20.Qxe3 Qe8 21.Qf3 Qg4 would be incorrect because of 22.Qc5.

20.b5 Qa5 21.Qb1
On 21.c4, Black would play 21...Qg4 (bad was 21...Qb3 22.Qb2 Qa4 23.cxd5 Qxd5 24.Qxa1) 22.Qe1 Qe4 23.Qb2 Qxd4!

21...b6
On 21...e3 follows with advantage 22.Qel and 23.c4.

22.Qe7 Qe3! Qb8
Black cannot play at once 23...Qg6 because of 24.g4 hxg4 25.Qxf5.

24.Qd1! Qd8?

Black wants to now go over to the attack by 25...g5 but thereby allows White to carry out a decisive attacking combination. Admittedly White has already had the superior game for some time.

25.Qg5! Qe6
On 25...Qf7 follows 26.c5.

26.Qd5 Qd6 27.Qf4
Not so advantageous was 27.c5 bxc5 28.Qf4 Qb6 29.d6 Qg6.

27...Qc5+ 28.Qe3 Qd6 29.c5 Qd7
Tournaments at Aachen 1868, Hamburg and Barmen 1869

74 King's Gambit
Ritter
Zukertort
Berlin 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.h4 \textit{e}e7
4.\textit{g}g4 d5 5.\textit{x}xf4 dxe4 6.\textit{x}xe4 \textit{f}f6 7.\textit{f}f3 0-0 8.c3 \textit{c}c6 9.d4
\textit{g}4 10.\textit{f}f2 \textit{c}c5 11.\textit{e}e3
On 11.dxc5 follows 11...\textit{d}d1 mate.
11...\textit{e}e8 12.\textit{d}d2 \textit{xd}4 13.\textit{c}xd4
\textit{xd}4 14.\textit{c}c4 \textit{d}5 15.\textit{e}e2
\textit{xe}3 16.\textit{xe}3 \textit{xe}3 17.\textit{g}g3
\textit{d}d2+ 18.\textit{f}f1

18.\textit{e}e4 19.\textit{x}xg4
Longer resistance was offered by 19.\textit{xf}3.
19...\textit{x}g4 20.\textit{f}f3 \textit{e}e8 21.\textit{h}h3
\textit{b}6 22.\textit{d}d1
On 22.\textit{w}xg4, 22...\textit{d}d3+ decides.
22...\textit{e}e4!
White resigns.

75 Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort
H.M.
Berlin 1869
Notes by Zukertort

1.d4 d5 2.\textit{f}f4 \textit{f}5 3.e3 e6 4.c4
\textit{b}4+ 5.\textit{c}c3 \textit{f}6 6.\textit{f}f3 \textit{e}e4
7.\textit{w}b3 \textit{xc}3+
A mistake after which Black remains behind in development; he should play 7...\textit{e}e6.
8.bxc3 b6 9.cxd5 exd5 10.c4 c6
11.ae2 0-0 12.0-0 eg4 13.fe1
f5 14.e5! axe2 15.e2 wh8
16.f3 ef6 17.ac1 eh5 18.cxd5
xf4 19.exf4 cxd5

20.ac2! ef8

In order to ward off 21.ac8 (also
21.df7+ xf7 22.ac8). On 20...a6
White forces the knight to retreat by
21.ac5.

21.ac8 wd6

If Black takes two rooks for the queen,
then White forces a smothered mate in
five moves by wxd5+.

22.axf8+ xf8

On 22...wxf8 follows 23.wxd5+ eh8
24.ac8 wxc8 25.df7+ ef8 26.ac6+

etc.

23.ac8+ ef7 24wb5!

24...ef6

The only move to ward off the threat-
ened mate in two moves by 25.we8+.

25.g4

On 25.wf8 would now follow
25...w7, on which White could win the exchange by 26.ad7+.

25...fxg4 26.fxg4 wa3

An attempt to force a draw by perpetual
check, since Black cannot avert forces.
loss. On 26...h6, 27.wf8 is decisive:
26...we6 27.g5+ ef5 28.f8+ ef6
26...we7 27.g5+ ef5 28.ad3+ ef6
29.ag3+ ef4 30.g4+ etc.

27.ac6+ ef7

On 27...ac6 follows mate in three
moves.

28.ac7+ ed8 29.ad7+ ec7
30.axd5 wc1+ 31.wh2 we2-
32.ad3+ ef1+ 33.ad3 eh3 we3-
34.ac4 2f2+ 35.ca5

Black resigns.

76 Evans Gambit
Zukertort (blindfold)
Consultants
Berlin, October 1869
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.2f3 2c6 3.2c4 2c5
4.b4 db4 5.c3 2c5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 d6 8.cxd4 2b6 9.d5 2a5
10.ad2 ad7 11.ad3 0-0 12.ac3
2g6 13.ad2 c5 14.wd2 ef6
15.2h1 2c7 16.ac1 a6

Since, in the defence chosen by Black,
the immediate advance of the queen
flank is not to be considered, and the
bishop on c8 will soon be exchanged:
then ...a6 may be just about as good as ...
b8.

17.ag3 ef7 18.cf5 xf5 19.exf5
e5 20.axe5

We are of the opinion that White must
hold on to the bishop b2, if, after
20.axe5 dxe5 (20...fxe5? 21.ag5), he
can take the c-pawn with impunity.

20...dxe5
Tournaments at Aachen 1868, Hamburg and Barmen 1869

In 20...fxe5 White obtains an irresistible attack by 21.f4.

21.\e4! \w6 22.\c3 c4 23.\g3 b5 24.\h6

The quickest way to bring the queen into the attack.

24...\h8

Would be slightly better to refrain from this king move.

25.\h4 \b6

This bishop move makes possible the intervention of the rook on \f1, though we do not think that Black has any better continuation: on 25...\c8 follows 26.\h3 h6 27.\g4 \b7 28.f4 exf4 29.\g5 \g8 30.\g6 h7 (30...\g8 31.\h7 \g8 32.\h6 \g7 33.\h8+ \g7 34.\xg7+ \xg7 35.\h7.

26.f4 exf4 27.\f4 \c8 28.\h3 \h6 29.\g4 \c5

Black has no saving move: on 29...b4

30.\xg7! \xg7 31.\xh6+ \g8 32.\xf6 \f8 33.d6 \c5

34.\xg7 \xg7 35.\g3.

7-0 d6 8.exd6 \b6 9.d5 \a5
10.\b2 \e7 11.\d3 0-0
12.\c3 \g6 13.\e2 \c5
14.\d2 f6 15.\h1 \c7
16.\ac1 a6 17.\g3 \f7 18.\f5 \xf5 19.exf5 \e5 20.\xe5 dxe5 21.\e4 \w6 22.\c3 b5
23.\d1 \c4 24.\c1 \b6
25.\h3 \h6 26.\g4 \f8
27.\g6 \e7 28.f4 c4

Black refrains from capturing the pawn, so as not to open the e-file for the opponent.

29.fx5fxe5

30.\e6+! \f8

On 30...\xe6 White wins by 31.dxe6

31.\xh6! \gxh6

32.\xh6+ \g8 (33...\xg7 34.f6)

34.\xf7+ \xf7 35.\xa8.

32.\xh6+ \g8 33.f6!
White threatens 34.\textit{g}4+ \textit{h}8 35.\textit{g}7+ \textit{g}8 36.\textit{h}7+ and mate in two moves.

\begin{center}
33...\textit{w}xe6 34.dxe6
\end{center}

34...\textit{A}xf6
A remarkable position: Black having an extra rook, cannot avert forced loss despite the exchange of queens. It would be best to play at once 34...\textit{A}d8 (34...\textit{A}f8 35.f7+) 35.exf7+ \textit{xf7}: White then wins with 36.g4.

35.\textit{A}xf6 \textit{A}d8
On 35...\textit{E}e8, decisive is 36.e7 \textit{C}c8 37.\textit{A}d5+ \textit{E} moves 38.\textit{A}f8.

36.\textit{A}g6+ \textit{h}8 37.\textit{A}g7+ \textit{wh}7 38.\textit{A}g5+ \textit{g}8 39.\textit{A}f6+ \textit{f}8 40.e7+
Black resigns.

78 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
A.W.
Berlin, January 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{B}f3 \textit{A}c6 3.\textit{B}c4 \textit{B}c5
4.b4 \textit{A}xb4 5.c3 \textit{A}c5 6.d4 \textit{exd}4
7.0-0 \textit{d}6 8.cxd4 \textit{B}b6 9.\textit{A}c3
\textit{A}f6? 10.d5 \textit{C}e5? 11.\textit{A}xe5 \textit{dxe}5
12.\textit{A}a3 \textit{A}d7
A vain attempt to make possible castling by 13...\textit{A}c5; on 12...\textit{c}5 follows 13.f4.

13.\textit{A}a4 \textit{h}5 14.\textit{h}h1 \textit{h}h6 15.f4
\textit{A}d4

16.fxe5! \textit{x}xe5
On 16...\textit{A}xc3 follows 17.e6 \textit{fxe}6
18.dxe6 \textit{B}f6 (18...\textit{A}f6 19.e5) 19.e5 \textit{A}xe5 20.\textit{A}f1 \textit{f}5 21.\textit{A}ad1 etc.

17.d6f6
On 17...\textit{A}f6 follows 18.dxc7 \textit{A}xf7
19.\textit{B}d5 \textit{xf}1+ 20.\textit{A}xf1; on 17...\textit{Ew}+-
18.\textit{A}xf7+ \textit{A}g8 19.dxc7+ \textit{A}xf7
20.\textit{A}d5+ \textit{B}b8 21.\textit{g}3 \textit{A}xg3 22.\textit{B}c2
18.dxc7 \textit{B}xc7 19.\textit{B}d5 \textit{A}c6
20.\textit{A}b5 \textit{w}e6 21.\textit{A}ad1 \textit{A}f+
22.\textit{A}e3
22.\textit{A}b6 would be incorrect because 22...\textit{A}xb5 23.\textit{A}xa8 \textit{A}xb6.

22...\textit{g}6 23.\textit{A}c4 \textit{w}c6 24.\textit{A}b4
\textit{E}h7 25.\textit{A}g8 \textit{eg}8 26.\textit{A}xd7
\textit{A}xd7 27.\textit{A}d1+ \textit{A}c7 28.\textit{A}c1 \textit{A}d7
On 28...\textit{A}xc1+ follows 29.\textit{A}xc1 \textit{A}xe5
30.\textit{w}c4+ and on 28...\textit{A}xg8 29.\textit{A}c3
\textit{A}b8 30.\textit{A}xc6.

29.\textit{A}d5+ \textit{B}b8 30.\textit{A}xc6 \textit{A}xe5
31.\textit{w}f8+ \textit{A}a7 32.\textit{A}c5+
Black resigns.

79 Spanish Game
Munk
Zukertort
Berlin, February 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{A}f3 \textit{A}c6 3.\textit{A}c4 \textit{A}c5
4.\textit{A}a4 \textit{A}f6 5.d3 \textit{d}6 6.\textit{A}xc6-
\textit{B}xc6 7.h3 \textit{g}6 8.\textit{A}g5 \textit{h}6 9.\textit{A}e3
\textit{A}g7 10.\textit{A}bd2?
The knight must go to c3 and later to e2. White castles kingside. On d2 it is very badly placed.

10...0-0 11.0-0  ♙h5!

In this way Black already takes the better position.

12.g4  ♙f4 13. ♙h2 d5 14. ♙c5 ♙e8 15. ♙g1 ♙b8 16. ♙b1

16... ♙h7

The introductory move of a deeply calculated attacking combination.

17. ♙g3 ♙h8 18. ♙g1 ♙g8

19. ♙df3 h5 20.gxh5

White must take the pawn, since on 20...gxh5 follows ...h4.

20... ♙xh5 21. ♙f1

White makes a defensive move, which will be necessary later on in any case. Immediately, since he cannot free himself from his cramped position.

21... ♙e6 22.exd5

With this and the following moves, White tries to break the attack by giving away the pawn.

22...gxh5 23.d4 e4 24. ♙e5 ♙h4 25. ♙c6 ♙e8 26. ♙g4 ♙h6

26... ♙d7 27. ♙e5 ♙xe5 28.dxe5 ♙xe5 29.d4 Black would totally lose the attack. Not much better was 29. ♙xe5 28.dxe5 ♙xe5.

27. ♙bb3 ♙f5 28. ♙e5 f6 29. ♙f3

mate's game can no longer be held; his attack on the queen is a last try.

29...exf3 30. ♙xf3

30... ♙xh3+! 31. ♙xh3 ♙xh3!

31... ♙xh3+ was bad.

White resigns.

If White moves his queen away, then follows 32... ♙g2+ 33. ♙g3 ♙h3+ 34. ♙g4 f5 mate. The only manoeuvre to avert the mate was 32. ♙h4 ♙xf1 33. ♙g3, on which Black best continues with 33... ♙xh4 34. ♙xh4 ♙e2.

80 Danish Gambit

Zukertort

Munk

Berlin, March 1870

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.c3

This opening is not quite correct.

3... ♙xc3

Here Black can avoid all the opponent's attacks by 3...d5.

4. ♙c4 cxb2 5. ♙xb2 ♙b4+

6. ♙c3 ♙c6 7. ♙f3 ♙f6 8.0-0 d6

With this Black subjects himself to a strong attack. Better was 8... ♙xc3 9. ♙xc3 0-0.

9. ♙d5! ♙xd5

Black now loses a piece. On 9... ♙xe4 follows 10. ♙xb4 ♙xb4 11. ♙e1 d5 (11... ♙f5 12. ♙xg7; 11... ♙f5 12. ♙d4)

12. ♙a4+ ♙c6 13. ♙d1 ♙e6 14. ♙xg7 ♙g8 15. ♙xd5 ♙xd5 16. ♙xe4+ ♙xe4!

17. ♙xd8+ ♙xd8 18. ♙xe4+ ♙e7 19. ♙a4+ c6 20. ♙f6 etc.

10.exd5 0-0
This is in fact the best Black can do; on 10...\texttt{e7} follows 11.\texttt{a4+}.
11.\texttt{dxc6} bxc6 12.\texttt{d4!} \texttt{f6}
13.\texttt{xf6} gxf6 14.\texttt{x6 d5?}
A mistake, admittedly the game is already decided.
15.\texttt{d3} h6

16.\texttt{g4!}
White concludes the game with an interesting final manoeuvre.
16...\texttt{xg4}
If Black does not take the pawn, then it advances.
17.\texttt{e5} \texttt{h3} 18.\texttt{h1} \texttt{fc8}
On 18...\texttt{xf1} follows 19.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{fd8!}
(19...\texttt{fc8} 20.\texttt{d7} 20.\texttt{xd8} \texttt{xd8}
21.\texttt{xc6}.
19.\texttt{g1+} \texttt{f8} 20.\texttt{h7} \texttt{e8}
21.\texttt{g8+} \texttt{f8} 22.\texttt{xg8+} \texttt{f8}
23.\texttt{g1}
Black resigns.

17.\texttt{xc4!}
The queen sacrifice is absolutely correct. White now obtains by force the superior game.
17...\texttt{xc4} 18.\texttt{xc6+} \texttt{e7}
On 18...\texttt{d8} follows 19.\texttt{e5} \texttt{b1:}
20.\texttt{g5} \texttt{h8} (20...\texttt{h6} 21.\texttt{g6} \texttt{ac8} 22.\texttt{xf6} 21.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{ac8} 22.\texttt{f7} \texttt{ac1} 23.\texttt{ae1}; on 18...\texttt{d7} 19.\texttt{e5} (als: 19.\texttt{xax8} gives White the superior game) 19...\texttt{b8}, 20.\texttt{e6} \texttt{h8} 21.\texttt{g6} and White wins.
19.\texttt{e5} \texttt{b8} 20.\texttt{xf6+} \texttt{xh6}
21.\texttt{xe1+} \texttt{d8} 22.\texttt{g5} \texttt{h8}
Black has no saving move.
23.\texttt{xf6+}
Black resigns.

81 King's Gambit
Zukertort (without \texttt{b1})
L****
Berlin, April 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e5} 2.\texttt{c4} \texttt{c5} 3.\texttt{b4} \texttt{xb4}
4.\texttt{f4} \texttt{d6} 5.\texttt{gf3} \texttt{c6} 6.0-0 \texttt{af6}
7.\texttt{c3} \texttt{c5+} 8.\texttt{d4} \texttt{b6} 9.\texttt{d3} \texttt{e6}
10.\texttt{b5} a6 11.\texttt{a4} \texttt{a7?} 12.\texttt{fxe5}
\texttt{dxe5}

82 Bishop's Opening
Zukertort (without \texttt{b1})
L****
Berlin, April 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e5} 2.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f6} 3.\texttt{w2}
The right move in an odds game.
Tour naments at Aachen 1868, Hamburg and Barmen 1869

3...c5 4.b4 c6 5.f4 d6 6.d3 d5 7.g5 8.d4 9.d2 10.b3 d4 11.c3 f3 g8 12.c4 c6 13.d5 e6 14.b4 a6 15.d2 f5

Black does not exchange, as not to expose himself to the double attack on f7 and d5. After 16...e5 17.exd5 cxd5 18.d4 a6 15.0-0 c6 16.e6 c5 17.xc5 f3

Black resigns.
The mate can only be delayed for a few moves by a queen sacrifice.

83. King's Gambit
Zukertort (without b1)

Berlin, April 1870
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.d5 g5 4.c4 g7 5.d4 d6 6.d3 h6

So as to win a piece after 8.e5 dxe5 9.hxg5 hgx5 10.xh8 xh8 11.xh7

7.xd3

As, after 13...exd5, to advance the c-pawn with gain of tempo, due to the uncovered attack by the bishop on the defended b5-pawn.

13...exd5 14.d4 a6 15.0-0 c6 16.h3 f6 17.xc6+ bxc6 18.xd5 f7 follows 19.xb7 f6 19...h1 or 19...e7 19...xh5. At the same time, thinking of opening a tempo by the attack on the rook.

17.xd5 f6 18.xf7 f7 19.xh6; on 18...xf7 19.xh6; on 18...d7 19.d6+ d8 20.xh6 exb1 21.xf7 etc.

19.xf5 e7 20.e6 d6 21.xd5! cxd5 22.xd5 c8

22...a7 follows 23.d6+ f8 24.d1 + g8 25.d5.

23.xf1 f8 24.h5+ g6 25.xf8+ xf8 26.xh7

Seemingly a blunder which loses a piece, in reality a fine move which lures the opponent into a mistake — a typical trick for an odds game. On the other hand, bad was 16.xd2 gxf3 17.xe3 g4.

16.xf4+ 17.e3

White allows an exchange of queens here (which at other times must be avoided in an odds game) in order to transfer the queen to a more effective diagonal, since it is certain that the opponent, under the delusion of winning a piece, will not exchange.
17...\textbf{wxg3} 18.\textbf{xf7+! ef7} 19.\textbf{g5+ \textit{f8}}

\textit{It is clear that Black cannot take the bishop, since he would then lose his queen by 19.\textbf{fxg4}. Better was 18...d8.}

19.\textbf{g5+ \textit{f8}}

\textbf{20.fxg4! \textit{f8}}

\textit{A last attempt to save the game.}

21.\textbf{xf4 \textit{g2+ 22.e3 \textbf{g3+}}} 23.\textbf{f3 \textbf{xf3+}} 24.\textbf{xf3 \textbf{g4+}} 25.\textbf{f3 \textbf{xf7} 26.f1+ \textit{e8}}

On 20...\textit{e6} follows 27.d5 mate.

27.\textbf{g7}

and White won.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\caption{Diagram for the position after 20...\textit{e6}.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\caption{Diagram for the position after 21.\textbf{xf4}.}
\end{figure}

84 Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Dufresne and Von Schutz

Berlin, April 1870

Notes by Zukertort

1.\textit{e4 e5 2.\textbf{c3 c6 3.\textbf{c4 \textit{c5}}}} 4.\textbf{b4 \textbf{xb4}} 5.\textit{c3 \textbf{c5}} 6.d4 exd4

7.0-0 d6 8.cxd4 \textit{b6} 9.d5 \textit{a6}

10.\textbf{b2 \textit{e7}} 11.\textbf{d3 0-0 12.e3 \textit{g6} 13.e2 \textbf{c5} 14.\textbf{d2 f6}}

15.\textbf{h1 \textbf{f7}} 16.\textbf{ac1 \textbf{b8}}

17.\textbf{g3 b5} 18.\textbf{f5 c4} 19.\textit{e2 b4}

20.\textit{d4 c3 21.d1! \textbf{b6} 22.g4 \textit{e5}} 23.\textbf{xgb6 \textit{xb6}} 24.\textit{c3d4 \textbf{c4}}

25.\textbf{c6 \textit{f7} 26.\textbf{g1 xf2}}

27.\textbf{g2 \textbf{b6} 28.\textbf{xc4 \textit{xc4}}} 29.\textbf{e1! \textbf{bb7}} 30.\textbf{g5 fxg5}

31.\textbf{hxg5 \textbf{h8} 32.\textbf{h4}}

The right move here is 32.\textbf{g3}.

32.\textit{e5}

Black must play 32...\textit{e3}.

33.\textbf{eg1}

33...\textit{f3}?

Black overlooks the disaster which is threatening him, though the game was not to be held anyway. On 33...\textit{g6} (33...\textit{h6} 34.e6) could follow 34.\textbf{d6 \textit{d6} 35.\textit{xe6! \textbf{xe6}}} 36.\textbf{xe6 \textbf{f6}}! 37.\textbf{exg6 \textbf{f6}} 38.\textbf{exf7 \textbf{f8}} 39.\textbf{xf4} or in fact even better 37.\textbf{xf4 \textbf{xf4} 38.e5}.

White announced mate in five moves by 34.\textbf{xf7+! \textit{xh7} 35.\textit{e5+ \textbf{g6}}} 36.\textit{h6+ \textit{e6} moves 37.\textit{xf7+ \textbf{g6}}} 38.\textbf{g7 mate.}

85 Vienna Gambit

H****

Zukertort

Berlin, November 1870

Notes by Zukertort

1.\textit{e4 e5 2.\textbf{c3 c6 3.\textbf{c4 \textit{c5}}}} 4.d4 \textbf{c5} 5.\textit{c3 \textbf{c5}} 6.\textit{d4 exd4}

7.d5 \textit{a6} 8.cxd4 \textit{b6} 9.\textit{e5 \textbf{f6}}

10.\textbf{f4 \textbf{f4}} 11.\textit{e2 b4} 12.\textit{xe2 \textbf{e2}} 13.\textit{e2 \textbf{e2}}

14.\textbf{f3 d5} 15.\textit{e2 \textbf{e2}} 16.\textit{e2 \textbf{e2}} 17.\textbf{g1 \textit{f3}}
Tournaments at Aachen 1868, Hamburg and Barmen 1869

18...\text{xd}1!

The queen sacrifice is in fact the quickest way to force the win.

19.\text{xf}5+ \text{b}8 20.\text{xf}h5 \text{f}1+ 21.\text{f}d1 \text{xd}4 22.\text{f}6

On 22.\text{h}3, decisive is 22...g4.

22...\text{f}3+ 23.\text{xf}h1

On 23.\text{g}2 follows 23...\text{d}2+ 24.\text{h}3

24...\text{xf}1+ 24.\text{g}2 \text{g}1+ 25.\text{f}2

\text{d}2+ 26.\text{e}3\text{e}1

Mate.

Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Wladimiroff

Berlin 1870

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\text{f}3 \text{c}6 3.\text{c}4 \text{c}5 4.\text{b}4 \text{b}6 5.0-0 \text{d}6 6.a4 a6 7.c3

\text{f}6 8.d3 \text{h}6 9.\text{a}3 \text{g}4 10.\text{c}2

0-0 11.\text{e}3 \text{h}5 12.\text{h}1 \text{e}7

13.wc2 \text{xf}3 14.gxf3 \text{d}5 15.\text{a}2

d4 16.\text{c}4! dx\text{c}3 17.\text{xb}6 \text{cxb}6

18.wx\text{c}3 \text{g}6

The game passes into a quite interesting phase; Black posts his knight excellently.

19.\text{g}1

White threatens to take the knight; on 19...\text{f}4 follows 20.\text{xf}4 exf4 21.\text{g}2

with an excellent game for White.

19...\text{h}7 20.\text{b}2

In order to develop the queen's rook.

20.\text{d}6 21.\text{d}2 \text{f}4 22.d4

\text{h}5 23.\text{a}1 \text{a}8 24.\text{b}1f6

It is clear that Black cannot capture; he must therefore protect the pawn again, since he would otherwise lose it by 25.\text{e}1.

25.\text{e}1 \text{c}7 26.d5! \text{h}3 27.\text{g}4

\text{d}4 28.\text{c}1! \text{h}5

29.\text{xf}4!

The exchange sacrifice is absolutely correct. White rids himself of the troublesome knight and obtains two connected passed pawns. White must decide the game in his favour.

29...\text{xf}4 30.\text{xf}4 exf4 31.e5+

\text{h}6

Better was 31...f5.

32.\text{e}4 f5 33.\text{xf}4+ g5 34.\text{e}3

\text{d}8 35.d6 \text{d}7 36.\text{c}2 \text{f}6!

A really good move, which prevents the further advance of the white pawns and at the same time gives Black countering chances.

37.\text{b}3 \text{g}6 38.\text{d}4 \text{d}4 39.f4 h4

40.e6 \text{g}xe6

After 40...\text{c}6+ 41.\text{d}5 the White pawns can no longer be held up.

41.\text{xe}6 \text{xe}6

On 41...\text{xe}6 follows 42.d7 \text{d}8

43.f3! (43.\text{e}5 \text{c}6+) 43...\text{g}6!

44.\text{e}4 \text{f}7 45.fx\text{g}4 fx\text{g}4 46.\text{d}6 and White wins.

42.\text{h}8+ \text{g}6 43.\text{g}8+ \text{f}6
On 43...\textit{h}6 follows 44.\textit{W}g5+ \textit{h}7
45.\textit{W}xf5+ \textit{h}8 46.\textit{W}xe6 \textit{Wxe6} 47.d7.
\textit{W}g5+ \textit{f}7 46.\textit{W}xe6 \textit{xe6} 47.d7.
\textit{W}h5+

46...\textit{f}8?
A mistake which leads to mate or loss of the queen. Longer resistance was offered by 46...d8 47.\textit{W}h4+ \textit{e}8
48.\textit{W}h8+ \textit{e}8 49.\textit{W}cl+ \textit{b}8
50.\textit{W}d4!.
47.\textit{W}h7+ \textit{f}7 48.\textit{W}h7+ \textit{e}8
49.\textit{W}g8
Mate.

87 King’s Gambit
Zukertort
Munk, Littduer and Wladimiroff
Berlin 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textit{d}c4 d5
4.\textit{d}x\textit{d}5 \textit{W}h4+ 5.\textit{f}1 \textit{g}5
This favourite defence (the sacrifice of the d-pawn, followed by the check) was first tried, more than twenty years ago, by Dufresne against Anderssen. It was then taken up again in 1862, by Steinitz against Dubois, and Anderssen against Paulsen. In these games, however, as also in the match games between Suhle and Anderssen (played 1864), Black continued by 5...c6, a very inferior move, which drives the adverse bishop on a far more favourable square than d5, and hampers the development of the queen’s knight.
6.\textit{e}3 \textit{e}7?\footnote{The only correct move at this stage is 6...\textit{g}7. The move in the text was for a long time considered the best; its correctness was first pointed out in a correspondent of the \textit{Neue Berliner Schachzeitung}, in the beginning of 1870. See also the next note.}

7.\textit{f}3 \textit{h}5 8.h4 \textit{h}6

9.\textit{xf}7+!
This sacrifice was first tried practically in this consultation game.
9...\textit{xf}7 10.\textit{e}5 \textit{f}6 11.\textit{h}5–
\textit{d}8 12.\textit{f}7+ \textit{d}7 13.\textit{x}g5
The simplest course was 13.\textit{e}7+ \textit{x}h8 14.\textit{h}xg5, but the continuation chosen here favours the development of White’s game, whilst Black is forced to lose important time to save the exchange.
13...\textit{a}6+ 14.\textit{d}3 \textit{h}7
If 14...\textit{g}8, White wins at once by 15.gxh6 and 16.h7.
15.\textit{xf}4 \textit{e}6
Necessary, to force the development of the pieces on the queen’s side.
16.\textit{e}5+ \textit{d}8 17.gxh6 \textit{f}6
18.\textit{xe}2! \textit{e}6
If 18...\textit{xf}4 19.\textit{af}1 \textit{gh}6 20.\textit{xh}6 \textit{xh}6 21.\textit{axh}6 \textit{gh}6 22.\textit{f}8 mate.
19.\textit{af}1
White has now all his pieces in action, and four pawns for the sacrificed bishop.

19...\textit{wh}8 20.g4 \textit{cd}7 21.g5 \textit{xe}5 22.\textit{xe}5 \textit{gg}8 23.\textit{xf}8+! \textit{xf}8 24.g6 \textit{gx}6 25.\textit{gx}6 \textit{gg}8.

If 25...\textit{g}8, White replies 26.\textit{d}5; if 25...\textit{f}7 26.h7.

26.\textit{g}7

The game is now clearly decided, by numerical superiority, in favour of White; but the exposed position of both kings renders the final skirmish interesting.

26...\textit{wd}7 27.d4 \textit{c}6 28.d5 \textit{xd}5 29.exd5 \textit{He}8

The last effort.

30.\textit{e}4!

30...\textit{xd}5

The allies dare not deliver their exposed king to the combined attack of White's pieces by retiring the bishop to \textit{f}7. The proposed move would lead to very complicated variations, which, however, all result in a clear won game for White, e.g. 30...\textit{f}7 31.\textit{f}5+ \textit{d}8 (if 31...\textit{c}7, White checks at once with the bishop at \textit{e}5) 32.\textit{f}6+ \textit{c}7 33.\textit{e}5+ \textit{d}8 (if 33...\textit{b}6, White forces the mate in a few moves, beginning with 34.\textit{f}2+) 34.\textit{f}6+ \textit{c}8 (if 34...\textit{d}7 or \textit{e}7, White mates accordingly in two or three moves) 35.\textit{d}6+ \textit{e}7 36.\textit{xf}7 \textit{g}2+ (if 36...\textit{xf}7, White mates in three moves) 37.\textit{e}3 \textit{xd}5 (if 37...\textit{g}3+, White wins by 38.\textit{d}4 \textit{g}4+ 39.\textit{d}3) 38.\textit{f}5+ \textit{e}6 (if 38...\textit{e}6, White forces the game by 39.\textit{d}1+; if 38...\textit{f} moves, White replies likewise) 39.\textit{hx}7 \textit{c}5+ 40.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}5+ 41.\textit{e}4 and wins easily.

31.\textit{d}1 \textit{xe}4+

There is no other move, because White threatens 32.\textit{xd}5+ \textit{xd}5 33.\textit{xe}8+ \textit{xe}8 34.\textit{f}6+. If Black plays 31...\textit{e}7, White wins by 32.\textit{d}6+ \textit{e}8 33.\textit{b}8+ etc.

32.\textit{xe}4 \textit{c}6

33.\textit{xd}5!

The shortest road to victory.

33...\textit{xd}5 34.\textit{e}3

The just coup. If 34.\textit{xh}7, Black would draw the game by perpetual check. White could, however, here exchange the queens at once.

34...\textit{d}6 35.\textit{xd}5+

35.\textit{f}8+ \textit{c}6 36.\textit{xh}7 also wins, as Black would not now have perpetual check; but the course adopted is the most simple.

35...\textit{xd}5 36.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}6 37.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}7 38.\textit{f}5 \textit{a}6 39.\textit{b}4 \textit{b}6 40.\textit{a}4 \textit{b}5 41.\textit{a}5 \textit{g}8

Playing for the evergreen stalemate idea, if 42.\textit{g}6.

42.\textit{f}6

Black resigns.
Ponziani Opening
Zukertort
Munk
Berlin 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.c3 d5
4.e5 dxe4 5.dxe5 w.d5 6.w.a4
e7 7.xc6
On 7.f4 White has the better development, with the continuation chosen here, he plays for the win of the e-pawn.
7...xc6 8.0-0 w.d6 9.0-0
The best that Black can do, since the e-pawn cannot be held.
10.xc6 bxc6 11.wxe4 w.h5
12.g3 g4
On 12..f5 follows 13.wxc6 (absolutely necessary, so as to prevent 13...w.a8) 13.d3 14.b4 f6 15.a3
w.a8 16.b2; the move chosen by Black is indeed the best and his position such that we instantly prefer it, and so White's 7th move must be considered incorrect.
13.d4

13...wae8
Here Black rushes the attack; he should play 13..f3 14.d3 w.a8 15.w3 w.e4! 16.d2 (16.wf1 w.h4 and wins) 16...w.h4+! 17.w.xh4 w.h4+ mating.
14.wxe8 xe8 15.xe8+ w.f8
16.w.f4 f6 17.wb8

The only correct move! On 17...f3, threatening ...c5, or an immediate 17...w.b5 could be played.
17...w.h3
After the game, Black maintained that he had let the win out of his grasp which he could have forced(?)... 17...g5 18.xc7 w.f3 19.d2 g4; however, after 20.xf3 gxf3 21.wf5 22.w.h2, White would have very soon exploited his numerical superiority.
18.w.d2 w.d5 19.f3 w.d7 20.w.e5 21.xg5
Much better than an immediate 21.w.e8.
21..fxg5 22.w.e8 g7 23.xf6 w.e6 24.w.g8+ w.h6 25.w.f2
wxa2
25...f5 offered longer resistance.
26.g4 w.e6 27.wbe8 w.d6 28.w.e5!
The game has entered a very interesting phase, attack and counterattack alternate.
28...c5 29.wxg5
The strongest continuation here was 29.w.e4 w.b6 30.g3!
29..cxd4 30.w.e4 w.b6 31..b5
w.c6

32.w.g3! w.f1 33.w.g8!
White concludes the game elegantly.
33...wxb5
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Black must take the rook on b5, otherwise 34...\textit{h}5 mate would follow; on 34...\textit{xb}5 is played equally 34...\textit{g}5+.

34.g5+ \textit{h}5 35.\textit{f}6+ \textit{x}f6
36.\textit{xf}6 \textit{c}4 37.\textit{d}8 dxc3
38.\textit{bxc}3 \textit{g}6 39.\textit{d}7 a5
40.\textit{xc}7 \textit{b}3 41.\textit{f}7 \textit{g}7
42.\textit{f}8\textit{w}+\textit{xf}8 43.\textit{x}h7
and White won.

89 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Munk
Berlin 1870
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}5
4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.c3 \textit{c}5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \textit{b}6 9.d5 \textit{a}5
10.\textit{b}2 \textit{f}6 11.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}7
With this Black tries to prepare queen's side castling.

12.e5!\textit{f}xe5 13.\textit{xe}5 \textit{f}6
On 13...\textit{dxe}5 follows 14.\textit{h}5+ \textit{g}8
15.\textit{a}3+ \textit{e}7 16.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}7 17.\textit{d}2
and White wins.
14.\textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 15.\textit{e}1+ \textit{f}7
16.\textit{ee}6! \textit{he}8
On 16...\textit{xd}5 follows 17.\textit{f}3+ \textit{f}6
18.\textit{xf}6+ gxf6 19.\textit{xf}6+ etc.
17.\textit{xf}6 gxf6 18.\textit{h}5+ \textit{g}8
19.\textit{d}2
The simplest was 19.\textit{h}7+ \textit{g}7
19...\textit{h}7 20.\textit{xe}8+ \textit{xe}8
21.\textit{h}7+ \textit{f}8 22.\textit{h}8+ \textit{g}8
23.\textit{xf}6+.
19...\textit{xe}6 20.dxe6 \textit{g}7 21.\textit{e}1
\textit{c}6 22.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}5
On 22...\textit{d}4 follows 23.\textit{g}3.
23.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 24.\textit{xe}h7+ \textit{f}8
25.e7+\textit{e}8

26.\textit{f}5!
A fine move which decides the fate of the game. White threatens 27.\textit{xe}5 \textit{dxe}5 28.\textit{g}6+.
26...\textit{xe}7 27.\textit{g}6+ \textit{d}7
On 27...\textit{d}8 follows 28.\textit{g}8+.
28.\textit{h}3+ \textit{d}8 29.\textit{h}8+ \textit{d}7
30.\textit{f}5+ \textit{c}6 31.\textit{c}1+ \textit{c}5
32.\textit{xa}8 \textit{g}5 33.\textit{c}4+ \textit{d}5
34.\textit{e}8+
Black resigns.

90 Bishop's Opening
Zukertort (without \textit{b}1)
A****
Berlin, February 1871
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{c}4 \textit{f}6 3.\textit{e}2 \textit{c}5
4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.f4 d6 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}4
7.c3 \textit{c}5 8.d3 0-0 9.f5 \textit{xf}3
10.\textit{xf}3 h5? 11.g4 \textit{h}8 12.g5
\textit{g}8 13.\textit{h}5 \textit{h}7 14.\textit{xf}7 \textit{e}7
15.\textit{g}6+\textit{h}8

\textit{177}
16.\textit{f2}

The decisive preparatory move.

16...\textit{c6} 17.\textit{gxh6} \textit{gxh6} 18.\textit{axh6} \textit{axh6} 19.\textit{wh6+} \textit{g8} 20.\textit{ag1} \textit{ag1} 21.\textit{xg1}

Black resigns.

91 Evans Gambit

Munk

Zukertort

Berlin, March 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \textit{e5} 2.\textit{df3} \textit{c6} 3."\textit{c4} \textit{c5} 4.b4 \textit{gxb4} 5.\textit{c3} \textit{a5} 6.d4 \textit{exd4} 7.0-0 \textit{dxc3} 8.\textit{fb3} \textit{f6} 9.e5 \textit{g6} 10.\textit{xe1}

11.\textit{f3}

The counter gambit in the Compromised Defence was already tried as far back as 1851 by Dufresne, but it was offered on the 10th move instead of 10...\textit{ge7}. The attempt proved unsatisfactory. It was introduced by Anderssen on the 11th move in the spring of 1868, whilst playing with Zukertort at Berlin. The latter abandoned then the usual continuation 11.e2, and introduced the text move, which, however, was again demolished by Zukertort himself.

11...\textit{b5}

Neumann played against Anderssen at the Baden Baden tournament, 11...\textit{b8}, which is unsatisfactory on account of 12.\textit{eh4} \textit{h5} 13.\textit{e4}, threatening 14.\textit{e2}.

12.\textit{xb5}

12...0-0?

Weak; Zukertort gives in his analysis in \textit{Neue Berliner Schachzeitung} the following victorious defence: 12...\textit{xf6} 13.\textit{eh4} (there is nothing better: 13.d2 then 13...\textit{xd2} 14.\textit{xd2} \textit{f5} 15.\textit{xc7+} \textit{d8}) 13...\textit{g4} (the \textit{German Handbuch} in its sixth edition [1880] is still unaware of the text move and gives the far inferior continuation 13...\textit{wh5} 14.\textit{wa4} (if 14...\textit{xf7+}, Black moves the king to d8, and must then gain a piece) 14...\textit{d8} (Black may continue with 14...\textit{xe1} 15.\textit{xf7+} \textit{xf7} 16.\textit{wg4} \textit{xb5}, but the king's move is safer) 15.\textit{f3} \textit{xe1} 16.\textit{exe1} \textit{a6} 17.\textit{a3} \textit{b4} 18.\textit{w2} \textit{xe5} with the exchange and two pawns ahead.

13.\textit{eh4}

White should now get a decisive attack with 13.\textit{d3} \textit{h5} (13...\textit{we7} 14.\textit{xe7+} \textit{h8} 15.\textit{wa4}) 14.\textit{e4}, for if now 14...\textit{g6}, then 15.g4 \textit{wh5} 16.\textit{f1}.

13...\textit{g4}

13...\textit{wh5} would be very inferior on account of 14.\textit{e4} \textit{g5} 15.\textit{e2} \textit{wh5} 16.\textit{f3}.

14.\textit{e3}
In the following game, Munk proceeded here with 14.\textit{\texttt{w}}a4.

14...\textit{\texttt{wxh}}4 15.\textit{\texttt{Bh3}} \textit{\texttt{w}}g4 16.f3 \textit{\texttt{b6}}+ 17.\textit{\texttt{h}}1 \textit{\texttt{g}}6 18.\textit{\texttt{d}}3 \textit{\texttt{f5}}

19.g4

The strongest continuation, but not properly followed up (see next note).

19.\textit{\texttt{w}}c2 would not recover the sacrificed piece, e.g. 19.\textit{\texttt{w}}c2 d5 20.g4 (if 20.exd6, then 20...\textit{\texttt{b}}b4; if 20.\textit{\texttt{a}}3, then 20...\textit{\texttt{dxe}}5) 20...\textit{\texttt{b}}b4 21.\textit{\texttt{xf}}5 \textit{\texttt{xc}}2 22.\textit{\texttt{xf}}6 \textit{\texttt{g}}6.

19...\textit{\texttt{d}}e7 20.\textit{\texttt{a}}3?

Overlooking the opponent's crushing reply: 20.\textit{\texttt{e}}4, threatening 21.\textit{\texttt{a}}3, would recover the piece with a very fine position.

20...\textit{\texttt{w}}xg4! 21.fxg4 \textit{\texttt{b}}7+
22.\textit{\texttt{e}}4 \textit{\texttt{xe}}4+ 23.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 \textit{\texttt{h}}4
24.\textit{\texttt{f}}1 \textit{\texttt{xf}}3 25.\textit{\texttt{xf}}3 \textit{\texttt{g}}6
26.\textit{\texttt{xf}}8 \textit{\texttt{exe}}5 27.\textit{\texttt{g}}2 \textit{\texttt{xf}}8
28.\textit{\texttt{g}}3 \textit{\texttt{xf}}3

White resigns.

White might considerably prolong the fight, but his queen has no chance against rook, two bishops, and three pawns.

92 Evans Gambit

\textit{\texttt{Munk}}
\textit{\texttt{Zukertort}}

Berlin, March 1871
Notes by \textit{\texttt{Zukertort}}

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 \textit{\texttt{c}}6 3.\textit{\texttt{c}}4 \textit{\texttt{c}}5
4.\textit{\texttt{b}}4 \textit{\texttt{xb}}4 5.\textit{\texttt{c}}3 \textit{\texttt{a}}5 6.\textit{\texttt{d}}4 exd4
7.0-0 dxc3 8.\textit{\texttt{w}}b3 \textit{\texttt{w}}f6 9.e5 \textit{\texttt{w}}g6
10.\textit{\texttt{xc}}3 \textit{\texttt{ge}}7 11.\textit{\texttt{xe}}1 \textit{\texttt{b}}5
12.\textit{\texttt{xb}}5 0-0?

As analysed in the previous game, 12...\textit{\texttt{b}}8 alone may be played.

13.\textit{\texttt{h}}4 \textit{\texttt{g}}4 14.\textit{\texttt{a}}4?

For 14.\textit{\texttt{e}}3 see the previous game.

14...\textit{\texttt{xe}}1! 15.\textit{\texttt{xf}}7+ \textit{\texttt{xf}}7
16.\textit{\texttt{w}}xg4 \textit{\texttt{xf}}2+ 17.\textit{\texttt{h}}1 \textit{\texttt{xa}}4
18.\textit{\texttt{a}}3

On 18.\textit{\texttt{g}}3 follows at once 18...\textit{\texttt{b}}7.

18...\textit{\texttt{a}}6 19.\textit{\texttt{xc}}7 \textit{\texttt{xa}}8 20.\textit{\texttt{g}}3

On 20.\textit{\texttt{h}}3, Black wins by 20...\textit{\texttt{f}}4.

20...\textit{\texttt{b}}7 21.\textit{\texttt{g}}1

It is clear that White cannot take the bishop with either the queen or the pawn.

21...\textit{\texttt{xe}}5 22.\textit{\texttt{w}}b4

Actually the best move; on 22.\textit{\texttt{wh}}5 Black forces the win even more quickly with 22...\textit{\texttt{g}}5.
23. gxh4
White has no better move; the queen has no good move, any rook move is pointless, on 23. Qb5 follows 23... g5.

23... Qf3+
23... Qf2 was not good because of 24. Qb3+ Kg8 25. Qxe7 Qg2 26. Qh1 Qg3+ 27. Qd5.

24. Qf2
On any king move follows 24... Qd4+.

24... Qd4+ 25. Kg3
and Black mates in four moves.
Victory over Anderssen 1871

93 Vienna Game
Zukertort
Anderssen
Berlin, 4 April 1871
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 4.d3
White delays the development of his king's knight as long as possible, so that he can play f4 as soon as the opponent moves ...\(\text{d}f6\).
4...\(\text{d}6\) 5.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 6.\(\text{e}2\) d5
7.exd5 \(\text{ xd5}\) 8.\(\text{g}3\) 0-0 9.0-0 \(\text{e}6\) 10.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}6\) 11.\(\text{d}2\) h6
12.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}7\)
This and the previous move virtually provoke a sacrifice.
13.\(\text{xe}6!\)
We consider this sacrifice quite correct, since Black at best can now only achieve a draw.
13...\(\text{gxh}6\) 14.\(\text{wxh}6\) f6
On 14...f5 White wins by 15.\(\text{g}5\); then
15...\(\text{xf}6\) 16.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 17.\(\text{xe}6\) or
15...\(\text{e}8\) 16.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 17.\(\text{g}5\).

15.\(\text{f}5!\) \(\text{wh}7\)
In 15...\(\text{xf}5\) follows 16.\(\text{xd}5+\) \(\text{e}6\)
\(\text{g}6+\) \(\text{h}8\) 18.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}7\) 19.\(\text{h}4+\)
\(\text{g}8\) 20.\(\text{xe}6+\) etc., or 16...\(\text{f}7\)
17.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{h}7\) 18.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 19.\(\text{xf}7\)
\(\text{xf}7\) 20.\(\text{e}3\).
On 15...\(\text{g}7\) 16.\(\text{w}6+\) \(\text{f}8\) 17.\(\text{h}6\)
\(\text{g}7\) 18.\(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{e}8\) 19.\(\text{g}5\) and Black has to sacrifice the exchange, so that White has rook and three pawns for two minor pieces. Black best plays 15...\(\text{f}7\), whereupon White makes a draw by 16.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{xf}5\) 17.\(\text{g}4+!\) \(\text{xe}4\) 18.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 19.\(\text{g}6+\).
16.\(\text{g}5!\) \(\text{fxg}5\)
On 16...\(\text{wh}6\) follows 17.\(\text{wh}6+\) \(\text{g}7\) 18.\(\text{xe}6+\) \(\text{h}6\) 19.\(\text{xf}8\); on
16...\(\text{xf}5\) 17.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xe}6\) 18.\(\text{g}6+\)
\(\text{h}8\) 19.\(\text{e}4\).
17.\(\text{xe}6+\) \(\text{h}8\) 18.\(\text{xd}6\) f4
A last try; on 18...\(\text{cxd}6\) 19.\(\text{xd}5\) White retains two extra pawns and the superior position.
19.\(\text{f}7+\) \(\text{g}7\) 20.\(\text{d}7\)
Black resigns.

94 Evans Gambit
Anderssen
Zukertort
1st Match Game, Berlin, 7 April 1871
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 4.b4 \(\text{xb}4\) 5.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 6.d4 \(\text{xd}4\)
7.0-0 \(\text{xc}3\) 8.\(\text{wb}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 9.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{g}6\)
10.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{ge}\) 11.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}5\)
12.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 13.\(\text{b}2\) \(\text{g}6\)
14.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 15.\(\text{d}5\)
Stronger than 15.e6 \(\text{xf}4\) 16.\(\text{xf}7\)
\(\text{f}8\) 17.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{xe}6\) 18.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{b}7\)
19.\(\text{xb}5\) 0-0-0.
15.\(\text{wc}5?\)
A mistake, which subsequently leads to the loss of the queen.
16.\textit{\textbf{e4}} 0-0 17.\textit{\textbf{e3}}
White plays logically for the win of the enemy queen; the game enters a really interesting phase.
17...\textit{\textbf{w4}} 18.\textit{\textbf{w1}} \textit{\textbf{c3}} 19.\textit{\textbf{c1}} b4
20.\textit{\textbf{x}} 7
With an attack on the rook, White cuts off the line of retreat for the black queen. Here also 20.a3 came into consideration.
20...\textit{\textbf{b8}} 21.\textit{\textbf{d2}} \textit{\textbf{e2}} 22.\textit{\textbf{f3}}
22...\textit{\textbf{xe3}}
Black gives up his queen for the best possible price.
23.\textit{\textbf{fxe3}} \textit{\textbf{xd2}} 24.\textit{\textbf{d5}}
Since the exchange cannot be saved – 24.\textit{\textbf{d1}} \textit{\textbf{xe3}}+ 25.\textit{\textbf{h1}} \textit{\textbf{d4}} 26.\textit{\textbf{xc6}}
\textit{\textbf{axa1}} 27.\textit{\textbf{xd7}} \textit{\textbf{xe5}} 28.\textit{\textbf{xc8}} and Black has a good game – White brings a displaced piece back into play and protects the attacked pawn.
24...\textit{\textbf{xc1}} 25.\textit{\textbf{xc1}} \textit{\textbf{xe5}}
26.\textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{b7}} 27.\textit{\textbf{d2}} a5 28.\textit{\textbf{f1}}
\textit{\textbf{bc8}} 29.\textit{\textbf{f4}}
In order to obtain any sort of attack, White must exchange one of the two enemy knights.
29...\textit{\textbf{c3}} 30.\textit{\textbf{g6}} \textit{\textbf{g6}}
It is clear that 30...fxg6 may not be played – 31.\textit{\textbf{xf8+}} followed by 32.\textit{\textbf{d6+}} – on the other hand 30...hxg6 was to be considered: on 31.\textit{\textbf{d4}} would then follow 31...f6.

31.\textit{\textbf{xd7}} \textit{\textbf{xe3}} 32.\textit{\textbf{c4}} \textit{\textbf{e5}}
33.\textit{\textbf{xf7+}} \textit{\textbf{xf7}} 34.\textit{\textbf{xb7}} \textit{\textbf{a3}}
35.\textit{\textbf{f2}}
After the game a spectator maintained that White in this way lets the win slip from his grasp and that 35.\textit{\textbf{d5}} was correct. This is not the case. Also on 35.\textit{\textbf{d5}} Black carries out, with 35...a5 followed by ...b3, an exchange similar to that which occurs in the game.
35...\textit{\textbf{b3}} 36.\textit{\textbf{d5}}
Of course White must not take the pawn: 36.a\textit{\textbf{x}} 7 37.\textit{\textbf{f1}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf1}} \textit{\textbf{d6+}}. To a draw led 36.\textit{\textbf{xf7}}
1.e4 e5 2.Nc3 c5 3.Qc4 Qf6 4.f4 d6 5.Nf3 c6 6.d3 b5 7.Qb3 a5 8.a4

This move is much better than that made by Steinitz in the Baden tournament, 8.a3. With the move a4, the pawn attack on the queen's flank comes to a halt and White can later castle on the queen's side without danger.

8...b4 9.Qe2 Qbd7 10.Qg3 0-0 11.Ne2 a6 12.fxe5 dxe5 13.Qf5 g6?

A mistake; Black obviously overlooks White's 15th move.

14.Qh6+ Qg7 15.Qg5! Qe7 16.Qxh6 Qxf7+.

16...Qxf7 17.Qxf7 h5

18.Qf1?

Premature; White hereby forfeits castling and hands over the attack to the opponent, whereas he must easily win the game by 18.Qh6+ Qh7 19.0-0-0.

18...Qd4! 19.Qh6+ Qh7 20.Qc1

On 20.0-0-0 White would lose a pawn by 20...Qc5 21.Qg5 Qxb3+ 22.Qxb3 Qxf7 23.Qxf6 Qxb3 24.Qc2 Qa2 and place himself under an unpleasant attack.

20...Qg7

Black will not allow the opponent to move back his knight with gain of tempo.

21.Qh6+ Qh7 22.Qc1 Qg7 23.Qh6+ Qh7 24.Qc1 Qg7 25.Qf3c5
25. \( \text{d}c5 \) would be very weak because of \( \text{d}g5 \).

26. \( \text{h}6+ \text{h}7 27. \text{d}2 \text{c}4 28. \text{g}5+ \text{g}7 29. \text{dxc4?} \)

White does not want to exchange his bishop for one that is presently idle, and overlooks that, by capturing with the pawn, he will put his bishop out of play for a long time, whereas the enemy's can soon be well posted. This second mistake could easily cost the game.

29... \( \text{xb2} \) 30. \( \text{d}d1 \text{f}8 \) 31. \( \text{h}3 \text{c}5 \) 32. \( \text{e}3 \text{c}8 \) 33. \( \text{f}3 \text{c}3+ \)

33... \( \text{g}4 \) was much better, since White cannot play 34. \( \text{xc5} \text{xc5} \) 35. \( \text{wxg4} \) because of 35... \( \text{e}3+ \) 36. \( \text{w}e2 \text{c}3+ \).

34. \( \text{w}e2! \text{xb3} \)

If Black plays for the win of the enemy queen by 34... \( \text{g}4 \), then he loses by 35. \( \text{xc5} \text{xf3}+ \) (if Black takes the bishop, then follows 36. \( \text{wxg4} \))

36. \( \text{xf3} \text{b7} \) 36... \( \text{e}8 \) is no better

37. \( \text{xf8}+ \text{xf8} \) 38. \( \text{xf6}+ \text{e}8 \)

(38... \( \text{g}8 \) 39. \( \text{c}5+ \text{h}8 \) 40. \( \text{f}7 \))

39. \( \text{e}6+ \text{f8} \) 40. \( \text{f}1+ \) etc.

Black now exchanges so as possibly to play for the win of the queen on the next move, which, admittedly, he then again rightfully rejects. In any event, as later joint analysis showed, he has no move at all that would have averted final defeat.

35. \( \text{cxb3} \text{h7} \) 36. \( \text{g}3 \text{g}4+ \) 37. \( \text{f}3 \text{g}5 \) 38. \( \text{c}5 \text{g}5 \text{f}5 \)

39. \( \text{h}3 \text{d}4 \)

A last attempt on 39... \( \text{f}4 \) follows first of all 40. \( \text{d}7+ \) and then 41. \( \text{xg}4 \).

40. \( \text{d}3 \text{xf3}+ \) 41. \( \text{dxf3} \text{g}3 \)

42. \( \text{c}3 \text{c}8 \) 43. \( \text{g}3 \text{h}6 \)

44. \( \text{h}4 \text{d}8 \) 45. \( \text{f}8 \)

Black resigns.

9.6 Evans Gambit

Anderssen

Zukertort

3rd Match Game, Berlin, 8 April 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1. \( \text{e}4 \text{e}5 \) 2. \( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 3. \( \text{c}4 \text{c}5 \)

4. \( \text{b}4 \text{xb4} \) 5. \( \text{c}3 \text{c}5 \) 6. \( \text{d}4 \text{exd4} \)

7.0-0 \( \text{d}3 \text{xc3} \) 8. \( \text{w}3 \text{f6} \) 9. \( \text{e}5 \text{g}6 \)

10. \( \text{c}3 \text{g}7 \) 11. \( \text{e}2 \text{b}5 \)

12. \( \text{d}3 \text{e}6 \) 13. \( \text{w}2 \text{c}2 \text{g}6 \)

14. \( \text{f}4 \text{f}7 \) 15. \( \text{d}5 \text{e}6 \)

16. \( \text{b}5 \text{f}8 \text{0} \text{0} \)

16... \( \text{b}8 \text{was because of 17. \( \text{w}x5 \) \( \text{xa}5 \) 18. \( \text{xc}7+ \).

17. \( \text{a}3 \text{b}8 \text{c}5 \)

18... \( \text{b}6 \)

A mistake on three counts. For the present, the bishop is quite excellent: placed on a5, since it covers the very important e1-square against the enemy rook, then Black, with this move, drives away the badly posted enemy queen and, in addition, loses a tempo himself since he must now move away the attacked rook.
19.\( \text{cxb6} \) axb6 20.\( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{xe8} \)
21.\( \text{ae1 b7} \) 22.\( \text{c4} \)

Here, 22 \( \text{f5} \) came into consideration.

22...\( \text{g4} \)

22...\( \text{d4} \) 23.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{g4} \) was wrong because of 24.\( \text{f4} \).

23.\( \text{e4 f5} \)

On 23...\( \text{xf4} \) White would win a pawn

24.\( \text{xf7}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) (24...\( \text{xf7} \))

25.\( \text{c4+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 26.\( \text{xf4} \) 25.\( \text{xf4} \)

26.\( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 27.\( \text{b2} \), but hand over the attack to the opponent. The
game is now very interesting since both
sides in fact play aggressively.

24.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f4} \) 25.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{g4} \)

26.\( \text{c1} \) \( \text{g5} \)

27.\( \text{xf4} \)

White gives up the exchange in the interests of the attack: the knight will ad-
mittedly now be a fearsome piece on f5.

After 27 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 28.\( \text{g3} \), Black would have played 28...\( \text{h8} \), so as, after
28...\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 30.\( \text{gxf4} \) \( \text{g8} \)+ 31.\( \text{h1} \)
31...\( \text{d4+} \) 32.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xc2} \),

remains the exchange ahead with

equal pawns.

27...\( \text{gxf4} \) 28.\( \text{xf5}! \) \( \text{e6} \) 29.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{wh5} \)

Black cannot protect the f4 pawn: on
29...\( \text{g5} \) follows 30.\( \text{h4} \).

30.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{e6} \)?

In order to activate the bishop and

right by ...\( \text{b4} \) or ...\( \text{d4} \). In this re-

spect, much better was 30...\( \text{be8} \).

31.\( \text{we3} \)

Very interesting continuations arise from 33 \( \text{c4} \); Black has two recommendable moves: 33...\( \text{xe5} \) 34.\( \text{wd4 f6} \)
35.\( \text{xe6 xf3} \) 36.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{fg4}+ \) 37.\( \text{f1} \)
\( \text{dx6} \) 38.\( \text{xe5 xes} \) 39.\( \text{xf6+} \)
\( \text{g8} \)
40.\( \text{wd7} \) \( \text{c4}+ \) 41.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{g4}+ \) and
Black must take a draw, or 33...\( \text{f8} \! \)
34.\( \text{xe6 fx6} \) 35.\( \text{h6} \) \( \text{ff7} \) 36.\( \text{h4} \)
(36.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{wh4} \) 37.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xe5} \) and

wins another pawn) 36...\( \text{xe5} \)
37.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 38.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 39.\( \text{xf3} \)
\( \text{xf3} \) 40.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xf3} \) and wins.

33...\( \text{f6} ? \)

The decisive mistake. Black overlooked
here that, after 34.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{fxe5} \) 35.\( \text{xc6} \)
\( \text{xc6} \) 36.\( \text{xe5+} \) \( \text{g8} \), the queen check
37.\( \text{w5}+ \) forces the win. Here, as
Munk pointed out after the game,
33...\( \text{ce8} \) must be played, after which
Black wards off the attack and would
have brought his material advantage to
account.
34. \( \text{e4} \)
Decisive, since, as given in the previous note, 34. \( \text{fxe5} \) cannot be played. Bad, of course, was 34. \( \text{f2} \) (in order to play for the win of the queen by 35. \( \text{f1} \)) because of 34... \( \text{dxe5} \) 35. \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 36. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e1+} \) 37. \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{a6} \) 38. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Wh4} \) and Black wins without difficulty.

34... \( \text{d6} \)
A last attempt, since Black can now no longer avert loss. On 34. \( \text{dxe5} \) White, with 35. \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{gx4} \) 36. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g8} \) (36... \( \text{b8} \) 37. \( \text{xd7} \) 37. \( \text{fxg4} \), wins two pieces for three pawns with a totally secure position. On 34... \( \text{c8} \) 35. \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{dxe4} \), White forces the win by 36. \( \text{c3} \).

35. \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{d5} \) 36. \( \text{h6} \)
Black resigns.

97 Vienna Game
Zukertort
Anderssen
4th Match Game, Berlin, 10 April 1871
Notes by Zukertort
1. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 2. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 3. \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{f6} \)
4. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 6. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 7. \( \text{b3} \)
a5 8. \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 9. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 10. \( \text{g3} \)
0-0 11. \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{a6} \) 12. \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \)
13. \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 14. \( \text{f1} \)
With this and the following move, White pursues the attack very powerfully.

14. \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{e8} \) 15. \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{h6} \) 16. \( \text{h3} \)
\( \text{wh7} \)
On 16... \( \text{h8} \) follows at once 17. \( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{ghx6} \) 18. \( \text{xh6} \); on 16... \( \text{xe4} \) 17. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 18. \( \text{xh6} \) and 19. \( \text{xf6} \).

17. \( \text{f3} \)
Black has to go for a coup d'état, since otherwise the White attack - 18. \( \text{g3} \) - will be irresistible. On 17... \( \text{h5} \) follows 18. \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{g8} \) (18... \( \text{g8} \) 19. \( \text{h4} \) mate; 18... \( \text{hxg5} \) 19. \( \text{h3} \) and forces the win) 19. \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{f4} \) 20. \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{exf4} \) 21. \( \text{h5} \), and Black has no move to avert forced loss; on 21... \( \text{e5} \), 22. \( \text{e6} \) is decisive, on 21... \( \text{f6} \) 22. \( \text{xf6} \).

18. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 19. \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e4} \)
20. \( \text{g5+} \)
White could here also play 20. \( \text{g3} \); after 20... \( \text{xd3} \) + 21. \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 22. \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{e2} \) + 23. \( \text{b1} \), Black can prevent the forced mate only by the sacrifice of a second piece - 23... \( \text{d3} \).+.

20. \( \text{h8} \)
20... \( \text{g8} \) would be more disastrous because of 21. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{exe4} \) 22. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 23. \( \text{h6} \) + \( \text{e5} \) 24. \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{xe6} \).+.

21. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \)
On 21... \( \text{xe4} \) + 22. \( \text{exe4} \) \( \text{e8} \) could follow 23. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 24. \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 25. \( \text{xf6} \) +, or 24... \( \text{g8} \) 25. \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 26. \( \text{xf6} \).

22. \( \text{dxe4} \) \( \text{we5} \)
23.\text{xh6!}

An absolutely decisive move, but which is not obvious.

24.\text{xe4+} 25.\text{xe4} \text{xe4+} 26.\text{xe3} \text{xe3}

as to be able to continue the attack on the black queen by 25.g3.

24.\text{xe4} 25.f4

clear that now, on 25.g3, \text{wxg5} would follow.

25.\text{xg2!}

A mistake which, however, only accelerates his downfall – White overlooked that with 27...\text{d3} the f4-pawn would be attacked for a third time – on 27.fxe5, immediately decisive is 27...\text{xe5}. White best plays 27.\text{a3}, after which would follow 27...\text{g4!} 28.\text{c3!} (28.\text{hxg4} \text{hxg4+} 29.\text{h1} \text{e2}) 28...\text{e2+} 29.\text{h1} \text{f6} and, apart from his material superiority, Black has an excellent game.

26.\text{xb6}

White resigns.
Vienna Game

Zukertort vs. Anderssen
6th Match Game, 11 April 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(c3\) \(\alpha5\) 3.\(c4\) \(\alpha6\)
4.f4 d6 5.\(c3\) c6 6.d3 \(e7\)

Anderssen is of the opinion that Black too in this opening should choose queen's side castling, since White's attack on the king's flank is overwhelming.

7.fxe5 dxe5 8.\(f1\) \(\alpha4\) 9.h3 \(\alpha5\)
10.\(g5\) \(\alpha bd7\) 11.\(d2\) 0-0-0
12.0-0-0

Better was in fact at first 12.\(e2\), as after immediate castling Black obtains an attack.

12...\(b4\) 13.\(d1\)

Essential for the protection of the pawn – compare Black's 14th move.

13...\(b5\) 14.\(b3\) \(\alpha5\) 15.\(xf6\)
\(gxf6\)

Black takes with the pawn so as to hold on to the attack, which, after 15...\(xf6\)
16.\(g5\) \(xg5+\) 17.\(xg5\), would go over to White.

16.\(h4\) a5 17.\(f5\)

17...\(c7\)

With this move Black lets the better position slip from his grasp; he must play 17...\(a7\), after which White, in order to prevent the loss of a piece, would have to play the much weaker move 18.\(h6\).

18.e3

In this way White equalises the game again; 18.a3 would be ruinous because of 18...\(xd3\)!

18...\(a4\) 19.a3 \(xc3\) 20.bxc3 \(xb3+\) 21.cxb3 \(xb3\) 22.\(b2\)
\(b7\) 23.\(a1\) \(a5\) 24.\(g3\) \(g6\)
25.\(xf6\) \(d7\) 26.\(c5\)

We think that White already has the better game, since his position is totally secure and, for the endgame, the possession of an extra pawn and a knight against a bishop is in fact decisive.

26.\(c8\) 27.\(d1\) \(d8\) 28.\(f3\) \(f6\)
29.\(xb3\) \(f7+\) 30.\(c2\) \(g8\)

Anderssen expressed the opinion after the game that, due to this mistaken manoeuvre, he allowed the win to slip from his grasp, which would have been his after 30...\(a8\). This is in fact not the...
since, as analysis showed, White would then have the better game with $\text{d}4$.

31. $\text{xb}1$ $\text{a}2$ 32. $\text{b}2$ $\text{g}7$

33. $\text{xf}6$ $\text{cc}7$

Absolutely essential, since White threatened to force mate by 34. $\text{xb}5$+. 34. $\text{f}8$ $\text{we}6$

35. $\text{f}5$

35. $\text{xb}5+$ $\text{cxb}5$ 36. $\text{xb}5+$ would have led only to a draw by perpetual check.

35... $\text{g}2+$ 36. $\text{c}1$ $\text{g}6$ 37. $\text{a}4$

Black can no longer avert defeat.

38. $\text{xd}5$ $\text{xc}6$ 39. $\text{a}5$ $\text{h}6+$ 40. $\text{d}2$

Black resigns.

100 Evans Gambit

Anderssen

Zukertort

7th Match Game, Berlin, 12 April 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1. $\text{e}4$ $\text{e}5$ 2. $\text{f}3$ $\text{c}6$ 3. $\text{c}4$ $\text{c}5$

4. $\text{b}4$ $\text{xb}4$ 5. $\text{c}3$ $\text{a}5$ 6. $\text{d}4$ $\text{exd}4$

7. 0-0 $\text{dxc}3$ 8. $\text{wb}3$ $\text{f}6$ 9. $\text{e}5$ $\text{g}6$

10. $\text{xc}3$ $\text{ge}7$ 11. $\text{e}2$ $\text{b}5$

12. $\text{d}3$ $\text{e}6$ 13. $\text{wb}2$ $\text{g}6$

14. $\text{f}4$ $\text{e}7$ 15. $\text{d}5$ $\text{e}6$

16. $\text{e}4$ 0-0 17. $\text{wc}2$ $\text{b}7$ 18. $\text{b}1$

19. $\text{f}4$ $\text{xf}4$ 20. $\text{xf}4$ $\text{h}7$+$

20. $\text{xf}4$ was better.

21... $\text{b}4$! 22. $\text{xb}4$

White must give up the exchange, otherwise he loses a piece: 22. $\text{f}5$ $\text{xf}3$ (22... $\text{g}6$? 23. $\text{g}5$ $\text{xf}3$ 24. $\text{f}6+$ $\text{g}8$ 25. $\text{g}5$) 23. $\text{xf}3$ $\text{g}6$ 24. $\text{g}5$

$\text{xf}7$ 25. $\text{h}6+$ $\text{g}8$ and on 26. $\text{fe}1$

$\text{d}3$ 27. $\text{g}5$ $\text{xe}5$.

22... $\text{xb}4$ 23. $\text{f}5$ $\text{c}4$ 24. $\text{xc}4$

$\text{xc}4$ 25. $\text{e}1$

On 25. $\text{xd}7$ Black brings his superiority to account with 25... $\text{ad}8$ 26. $\text{g}4$

$\text{xf}3$ 27. $\text{xf}3$ $\text{d}2$ 28. $\text{xd}2$

25... $\text{d}5$!

Apparently a blunder, since in this way a piece is lost. But Black in fact sacrifices a piece for a pawn so as to again connect his pawns, which are then irresistible.

26. $\text{b}1$

On 26. $\text{exd}6$ follows 26... $\text{xd}6$ 27. $\text{xd}6$

$\text{xc}6$ 28. $\text{xc}4$ $\text{g}6$ 29. $\text{d}3$

$\text{fc}8$. 
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The last attacking chance.

30...fxe6 31...e5 c5 32.h4 c3
33...g5 c2 34...c1 b3 35...xe6 d4

White resigns.

101 Evans Gambit
Zukertort (without b1)
Berlin. May 1871
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.c4 c5 4.b4 ...b4 5.c3 c5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 d6 8...xd4 ...b6 9.e1 ...f6
10.e5 dxe5 11...a3 e4? 12.d5 ...a5 13...g5 ...xc4 14...a4+
...d7 15...xc4

The move 15...xe4 was altogether incorrect, because of 15...e5
(15...xa4? 16...xf6 mate).

15...f5 16...xe4 ...xe4
17...xe4+ ...d7

The right move: on 17...xe4 White forces the win by 18...xe4+
...d7 19...f5+ ...e8 20...e1+

18...e7+ ...c8 19.d6 c6 20...xf7 ...d5 21.d7+ ...c7

The king is forced to go forward since on 21...b8 would follow 22...e8.

22...d6+!

22...xd5 was bad because of 22...xe7.

102 Game Position
Zukertort (without a1)
X.
Berlin, July 1871
Notes by Zukertort

1...xf7! ...xf7 2...h5+ ...f8
Better was 2...g6, on which White plays 3...f5.

3...xd6+! ...xd6 4...f5 ...c6
Loss of the queen or mate cannot be prevented.

5...xf6+ ...g8 6...e8+ ...h7
7...g6 mate

103 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Stosch
Berlin, summer 1871
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3...f3 g5 4.h4
g4 5...e5 ...f6 6...c4 d5 7.exd5
...d6 8.d4 ...h5 9...c3 ...e7
10...b5+ ...d8
...c6, 10...gxf8 and 10...d7 are the other three moves given in the 'books', four lead in practical play to a very favourable game for the first player.

11.0-0 \( \text{Wh} x h4 \)

Victory over Anderssen 1871

12. \( \text{Qxf7} + \)

The 'books' give here 12. \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Qxf}4 \) 13. \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 14. \( \text{Qxe}5 \) etc., and warn against 12. \( \text{Qxf7} + \), giving as a consequence 12... \( \text{Qe}7 \) 13. \( \text{Qxh}8 \) \( g3 \) 14. \( \text{Qe}2+ \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 15. \( \text{Qe}8+ \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 16. \( \text{Qf}7+ \) \( \text{Qxh}8 \) \( \text{Qxe}8+ \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) and Black wins. I think the course chosen in the game is superior to the immediate sacrifice of the exchange, as it wins a pawn and breaks Black's queen's flank.

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

13. \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qxd}6 \)

Black plays 13... \( g3 \), White forces the move by 14. \( \text{Qe}2+ \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 15. \( \text{Qe}8+ \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) \( \text{Qf}7+ \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) 17. \( \text{Qxf}4 \).

14. \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Qxf}4 \) 15. \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \)

15... \( g3 \) would avail nought, e.g. 15... \( g3 \)
16. \( \text{Qe}1+ \) \( \text{Qd}8 \) 17. \( \text{Qx}g3 \) \( \text{Q}xg3 \)
18. \( \text{Qx}g3 \), and White will win after capturing the d-pawn, which cannot be effectively defended.

16. \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 17. \( \text{Me}1+ \) \( \text{Qd}8 \)
18. \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \) 19. \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{Qh}3 \)

This precipitates the defeat, but Black's game was, anyhow, past redemption.

20. \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{Qg}6 \) 21. \( \text{We}7 \)

Black resigns.

104 King's Gambit
Zukertort (without \( \text{Qb}1 \))

Berlin, September 1871
Notes by Zukertort

1. \( e4 \) \( e5 \) 2. \( f4 \) \( exf4 \) 3. \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( g5 \)
4. \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( g4 \) 5.0-0 \( \text{gx}f3 \) 6. \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \)
7. \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 8. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) 9. \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \)
10. \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 11. \( \text{Qae}1+ \) \( \text{Qd}8 \)

12. \( \text{Qg}4! \)

The introduction to the following final combination.

12... \( \text{Qg}8 \) 13. \( \text{Qxf}7! \)

In odds play, at times a direct offer of exchange of main pieces is the right way of playing the advantage: this game offers such an example.

13. \( \text{Qx}g4+ \)

On 13... \( \text{Qx}g4+ \) could follow 14. \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 15. \( \text{Qxf}6+ \) \( \text{Qxf}6 \) 16. \( \text{Qe}8+ \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 17. \( \text{Qg}4+ \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 18. \( \text{Qf}3+ \) \( \text{Qb}6 \)
19.\textit{xc}8 \textit{xf}7 20.\textit{e}1, or 18...\textit{d}7 19.\textit{h}3+ \textit{c}6 20.\textit{xc}8.

14.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4+ 15.\textit{h}1 d5?
A mistake which results in an immediate loss. After 15...c6 White would have only won back the sacrificed piece, although he maintains an excellent attacking game.

16.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{d}7 17.\textit{e}8+ \textit{d}6 18.\textit{e}7
Mate.

105 Italian Game

\textit{Munk}

Zukertort

Berlin, September 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{lf}3 \textit{lc}6 3.\textit{lc}4 \textit{cc}5 4.0-0 \textit{gf}6 5.d4 \textit{xd}4 6.\textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 7.f4 \textit{f}4 d6 8.fxe5 dxe5 9.\textit{g}5 \textit{we}7

This move, first played by Kolisch against Shumov, is quite good.

10.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}6 11.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 12.\textit{d}2
On 12.\textit{xe}6 would follow 12...\textit{fxe}6, so that, on 13.\textit{f}3, the f-pawn can be protected by 13...\textit{f}8.

12...\textit{d}7 13.b4 0-0-0 14.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}4
With this Black takes the attack.

15.g3 \textit{hg}8 16.\textit{h}1

16...\textit{h}3
Black attacks both the rook and the knight on \textit{d}2, so that on 17.\textit{xf}4 White would only get rook and bishop for the queen after 17...\textit{g}2+ etc.

17.\textit{f}2 \textit{g}4 18.\textit{we}3 \textit{h}3 19.\textit{g}2 \textit{b}8 20.a4 \textit{d}6 21.b5 \textit{gd}8
Black now intends 22...\textit{xd}2 23.\textit{xc}7 \textit{xd}2 24.\textit{xd}2 \textit{f}3+.

22.\textit{d}5 \textit{f}5 23.\textit{c}4 \textit{f}4 24.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 25.\textit{wd}4
On 25.\textit{c}5, decisive is 25...\textit{xd}5!

25...\textit{e}6 26.\textit{e}5 26.\textit{d}2 was better.

106 Spanish Game

\textit{Zukertort}

\textit{Munk}

Berlin, October 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{b}5 \textit{a}6 4.\textit{a}4 \textit{b}5 5.\textit{b}3 \textit{f}6 6.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}5 7.\textit{xd}5 \textit{a}5 8.0-0 \textit{xb}3 9.\textit{xb}3 \textit{h}6 10.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}4 11.\textit{e}1 \textit{e}7 12.\textit{e}5 \textit{xd}5 13.d4 \textit{exd}5 14.\textit{c}3

Much better than taking the pawn once, after which would follow 14...\textit{b}7.

14...\textit{b}7 15.\textit{xd}3 0-0
16...\(\text{xh6}\)!

Through White, with this sacrifice, obtains only rook and pawn for two minor pieces, at the same time he gets a good attacking game.

16...\(\text{gxh6}\) 17.\(\text{g6 d6}\)

In 17...\(\text{fxg6}\) White forces the win by \(\text{Wg6+ Kh8 19.hxg6}\).

18.\(\text{xf8}\) 19.\(\text{d4 g8}\)

20.\(\text{d5 e6}\) 21.\(\text{f6 e7}\)

22.\(\text{d5+ d7}\) 23.\(\text{c4 xd5}\)

24.\(\text{cxd5 e7}\) 25.\(\text{g4+ f5}\)

26.\(\text{xe7+!}\)

Through this exchange sacrifice, White is absolute master of the situation.

26...\(\text{xe7}\)

In 26...\(\text{xe7}\) follows 27.\(\text{e1+ d8}\) 27.\(\text{f6}\) 28.\(\text{e6+}\) and mate in five moves; 27...\(\text{f7}\) or 27...\(\text{f8}\)

28.\(\text{xf5+ g7}\) 29.\(\text{e6; 27...d7}\)

28.\(\text{g7+}\) or 28.\(\text{xf5+}\) followed by 28...\(\text{g8}\) or \(\text{f6+}\) etc.) 28...\(\text{g8}\) 29.\(\text{e6+ d8}\) 30.\(\text{e8}\) mate.

27.\(\text{xf5+ d8}\) 28.\(\text{e1 b6}\)

29.d6!

29...\(\text{xd6}\)

On 29...\(\text{xd6}\) follows 30.\(\text{xe7 e7}\) 31.\(\text{e4+}\) followed by \(\text{xe8}\); on 29...\(\text{xe7}\) 30.\(\text{e4+}\) 31.\(\text{e8+}\)

32.\(\text{f7+; on 29...h4}\) 30.\(\text{f8+ d7}\)

31.\(\text{f7+ c8}\) (31...\(\text{e6}\) 32.\(\text{g1+}\) 33.\(\text{f6+}\) \(\text{c5}\) 34.\(\text{g5+}\) \(\text{b4}\)

35.\(\text{d4+}\) \(\text{a5}\) 36.\(\text{b4+}\) \(\text{a4}\) 37.\(\text{a2}\) mate) 32.\(\text{e8+ d8}\) (32...\(\text{b7}\)

33.\(\text{d5+}\) 34.\(\text{f7+}\) 33.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{d7}\)

(33...\(\text{c6}\) 34.\(\text{e6+}\) \(\text{b7}\) (34...\(\text{b8}\)

35.\(\text{d7}\) 35.\(\text{d7+}\) \(\text{c7}\) 36.\(\text{d8+}\)

\(\text{xa8}\) 37.\(\text{dxc7}\) 34.\(\text{e6+}\) \(\text{e6}\)

35.\(\text{e4+}\) \(\text{d7}\) 36.\(\text{dxc7!}\) \(\text{c8}\)!

37.\(\text{cxd8+}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 38.\(\text{e7+}\) \(\text{c8}\)

39.\(\text{xd8+}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 40.\(\text{xd8+}\) \(\text{xd8}\)

41.d4 and wins.

30.\(\text{f3!}\) \(\text{c8}\) 31.\(\text{d1 e8}\)

32.\(\text{h5+ d7}\) 33.\(\text{xd6+ cxd6}\)

34.\(\text{h6}\)

Black resigns.

107 Spanish Game

Munk

Zukertort

Berlin, November 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{f6}\)

4.0-0 \(\text{xe4}\) 5.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{d6}\)

6.\(\text{xe5}\)
6...\textit{\textsc{d}d4} 7.\textit{\textsc{w}e3}

Over-bold; another continuation for White was 7.\textit{\textsc{w}d3} \textit{\textsc{c}6xb5} (7...\textit{\textsc{d}4xb5} 8.a4 d6 9.\textit{\textsc{f}f3} \textit{\textsc{f}f5} 10.\textit{\textsc{w}e3}+ \textit{\textsc{e}7} 11.axb5 \textit{\textsc{c}xc2}.

7...\textit{\textsc{x}xc2} 8.\textit{\textsc{f}f4} \textit{\textsc{e}7} 9.\textit{\textsc{c}c3} \textit{\textsc{x}a1} 10.\textit{\textsc{e}e1}

Better was at once 10.\textit{\textsc{d}d3}.

10...0-0

After 10...\textit{\textsc{c}c2} 11.\textit{\textsc{e}e2}, the knight has no line of retreat.

11.\textit{\textsc{d}d3} \textit{\textsc{f}f6} 12.\textit{\textsc{d}d5} \textit{\textsc{x}e5} 13.\textit{\textsc{e}xe5} \textit{\textsc{e}e8}

14.\textit{\textsc{e}e7+}

In making this combination, White does not take into account that he is a rook down: therefore at the decisive moment Black can sacrifice his queen. After 14.\textit{\textsc{e}xe8+} \textit{\textsc{x}xe8} 15.\textit{\textsc{w}e4} g6 16.b3 d6 17.\textit{\textsc{b}b2} \textit{\textsc{a}xb3} 18.axb3 \textit{\textsc{x}e6}, Black, admittedly, would have also brought his superiority to account.

14...\textit{\textsc{e}xe7} 15.\textit{\textsc{w}h4} \textit{\textsc{x}e5}

Black could play 15...\textit{\textsc{g}g8} and win 16.\textit{\textsc{x}xe7} (16.\textit{\textsc{x}h7} \textit{\textsc{x}e5} 17.\textit{\textsc{w}c4} \textit{\textsc{e}e8})! 16...\textit{\textsc{x}xe7} 17.\textit{\textsc{x}h7} \textit{\textsc{w}e1}+ 18.\textit{\textsc{d}e4} 19.\textit{\textsc{w}h8}+ \textit{\textsc{e}7} 20.\textit{\textsc{h}h4}+ g5.

16.\textit{\textsc{w}x}d8+

Bad was 16.\textit{\textsc{g}x}h7+ because 16...\textit{\textsc{h}h8} 17.\textit{\textsc{w}xd8}+ \textit{\textsc{e}e8}!

16...\textit{\textsc{e}e8}

Now Black has the chance to set up a counterattack.

17.\textit{\textsc{w}x}c7 \textit{\textsc{e}e1}+ 18.\textit{\textsc{f}f1} b6 19.\textit{\textsc{d}d3} \textit{\textsc{a}a6} 20.\textit{\textsc{c}c2}

So as first of all to displace the rook. 20.\textit{\textsc{w}c3} \textit{\textsc{d}d1} 21.\textit{\textsc{d}d2}, Black wins.

20...\textit{\textsc{d}d1} 21.\textit{\textsc{w}xd6} \textit{\textsc{f}f2}

22.\textit{\textsc{w}f4!}

On 22.\textit{\textsc{w}xd7} follows 22...\textit{\textsc{x}xe7}.

23.\textit{\textsc{w}d5} (23.\textit{\textsc{d}d3} \textit{\textsc{d}d1}+; 23.\textit{\textsc{w}e} d8) 23.\textit{\textsc{f}f8} 24.\textit{\textsc{w}f3} \textit{\textsc{d}d8}.

22...\textit{\textsc{e}c2}

22...\textit{\textsc{d}d1} cannot be played because 23.\textit{\textsc{w}f3}.

23.\textit{\textsc{w}a}4 \textit{\textsc{b}b7} 24.\textit{\textsc{w}xd7} \textit{\textsc{c}c5} 25.\textit{\textsc{w}d} d4 \textit{\textsc{e}e8} 26.\textit{\textsc{h}h4} \textit{\textsc{c}c1}

Black now intends 27...\textit{\textsc{b}x}f1+ 28.\textit{\textsc{b}c} \textit{\textsc{e}e1}+ 29.\textit{\textsc{w}xe1} \textit{\textsc{c}c2}+.

27.\textit{\textsc{w}f}f4! \textit{\textsc{b}b} b1 28.\textit{\textsc{g}g} g4 \textit{\textsc{h}h6}

Stronger was at once 28...\textit{\textsc{c}c2} with threat 29...\textit{\textsc{b}x}f1+ 30.\textit{\textsc{w}xf1} \textit{\textsc{e}e1} mate.

29.\textit{\textsc{g}g} 5 \textit{\textsc{c}c2} 30.\textit{\textsc{f}f3} \textit{\textsc{e}e1} 31.\textit{\textsc{w}b}8+ \textit{\textsc{h}h7}

White resigns.
obtains the superior game with the manoeuvre 22...\text{\texttt{c}}e5 and 23...\text{\texttt{d}}ac4, exploiting the position of the queen on e3.

22...\text{\texttt{c}}e5

Here also, the only correct reply Black will not allow the white h-pawn to advance with an attack on the knight and at the same time prepares the immediate entry of his queen's knight into the offensive.

23.h5 \text{\texttt{d}}ac4 24.\text{\texttt{f}}4 \text{\texttt{f}}xf3

On 25.\text{\texttt{f}}xf3 follows 25...\text{\texttt{c}}e5.

25...\text{\texttt{f}}xf3 26.\text{\texttt{d}}xc4

White already plays for opposite coloured bishops with heavy pieces, since he has few chances of attack.

26...\text{\texttt{d}}xd4 27.exf5 \text{\texttt{c}}e5 28.\text{\texttt{g}}4 h6

After the long chain of theoretical moves in the opening and Black's subsequent knight manoeuvre, which has
Johannes Zukertort

brought about an exchange of three minor pieces, the game now passes into a new phase in which Black must first of all secure his somewhat threatened king's flank.

29.\texttt{Bg1} \texttt{f7} 30.\texttt{We4}
On 30.\texttt{Wg6} follows 30...\texttt{fg8} 31.\texttt{Wh7} \texttt{b6} or \texttt{c7}.

30...\texttt{b6} 31.\texttt{Ag4} \texttt{xf2} 32.\texttt{Ac2}!
A really good move. 32.\texttt{f4} was weak because of 32...\texttt{Wd2} 33.\texttt{Cc1} (33.\texttt{Cc2} \texttt{Wd1}+) 33...\texttt{c2}.

32...\texttt{Ac5} 33.\texttt{Ab3}
With this White introduces a manoeuvre which has the aim of winning the bishop on e5; the retreat of the white bishop was also necessary because Black, after ...\texttt{a5-a4} and ...\texttt{Cc7}, would sacrifice the exchange and force victory with his pawns.

33...\texttt{Wf8} 34.\texttt{Wd3}

34...\texttt{Be8}!
The introductory move to a deeply calculated attacking combination which is absolutely correct in all its phases.

35.\texttt{Cc4} \texttt{Wb6}
Here Black could still avoid the loss of a piece by 35...\texttt{Wb5}, but he prefers to give up the idle bishop to obtain a good attack.

36.\texttt{f4} \texttt{xf4} 37.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{Be1}+ 38.\texttt{Ef1}
On 38.\texttt{Wg2} follows 38...\texttt{Wgl}+ 39.\texttt{Ef3} \texttt{fl}+ 40 \texttt{W} moves \texttt{Ee7}+.

38...\texttt{Bf7} 39.\texttt{Wg2} \texttt{Bf4}+
Now it can be seen that White's c2 is driven completely out of the game, leaving her husband to his own fate.

40.\texttt{Cc4} \texttt{Bf4} 41.\texttt{Wd3} \texttt{Bf4}+

42.\texttt{Wh1}
On 42.\texttt{Wg3} could follow 42...\texttt{Wg6} 43.\texttt{Be2} \texttt{Bh5}+ 44.\texttt{Wg4} \texttt{Bf4} 45.\texttt{Wf4} \texttt{Bx4} 46.\texttt{Wf6} \texttt{Bx6} 47.\texttt{Bxh3} \texttt{a5} 48.\texttt{Wd4} \texttt{Wc5} 49.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 50.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 51.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 52.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 53.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 54.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 55.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} 56.\texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} \texttt{Bxg5} and Black must win.

42...\texttt{Be3}! 43.\texttt{Wd1} \texttt{Bd4}! 44.\texttt{Wf2} \texttt{Bf4}+ 45.\texttt{Wxh2}
On 45.\texttt{Wg2}, immediately decisive would be 45...\texttt{Wd4}.

45...\texttt{Wxh2}+
The best continuation; also decisive was 45...\texttt{Wd4} 46.\texttt{Wc2}! \texttt{Wg4} 47.\texttt{Bc1} \texttt{Wc2} 48.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 49.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxg2} 50.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2} 51.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2} 52.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2} 53.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2} and Black wins.

46...\texttt{Wxh2} 47.\texttt{Wc2} \texttt{Bxg2} 48.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2}+ 49.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 50.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 51.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 52.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 53.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ and Black wins.

46...\texttt{Wxh2}+ 47.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 48.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 49.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 50.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 51.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 52.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 53.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ 54.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxh2}+ and Black wins.

48...\texttt{Bh3} also leads to victory.

49.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bd6}+
An immediate 49...\texttt{Bh3} was simpler.

50.\texttt{Bxh2}
On 50...\texttt{Bxh2} follows 50...\texttt{Bh4} 51.\texttt{Bxg3} 52.\texttt{Bf1} \texttt{Bh4} 53.\texttt{Bxh2} \texttt{Bxg2}+ 54.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2}+ 55.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2}+ 56.\texttt{Bxg2} \texttt{Bxg2}+ and Black wins.
Evans Gambit

Winawer

Zukertort

blindfold Game, Berlin November 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.d3 d6 3.d4 d5
4.b4 dxc4 5.a5 c3 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 dxc3 8.d3 d6 9.b3 g6
10.c3 eg7 11.e2 b5
12.d3 w6 13.w2

In any event, weaker than 13.wb2.

13...c4 14.wc3 xd3 15.wa5

Inter does better to take the knight; if Black exchanges an undeveloped piece for a developed one, the noble exchange is favourable for Black. In addition, the rook is no better placed.

15.xc1 16.xc1 w6
17.wc3

Immediate 17.wd2 was probably better.

17...d5 18.wd2 b7 19.fd4
0-0 20.f4 c5 21.cf5 c4+

On 22.dh1 follows 22...g6 followed by a later...e5, on 22.ed4 the Black c-pawn could advance at once.

22...fe8

Black intends 23...d6 and, on 24.exd6, 24.gxe2 followed by 25.wxh4+

23.dh1 ac8 24.f3 b4 25.bh3 c3

The fact that Black here drives the white queen to an attacking square is not a mistake, since it can attack the same points from c2. The advanced passed pawn is an important support for Black's game.

26.wd3 g6 27.f5 wg5

After 27.wxg2+ 28.wxg2 d4+ 29.wf2 xd3+ 30.bxd3xed5 Black has four pawns for a minor piece, but the excellent position of the white knight would greatly hinder their advance.

28.wg3

Definitely necessary. 28.f6 would be mistaken, because of 28...xf6 29.wg3 wxe5.

On 22.dh1 follows 22...g6 followed by a later...e5, on 22.ed4 the Black c-pawn could advance at once.

22...fe8

Black intends 23...d6 and, on 24.exd6, 24.gxe2 followed by 25.wxh4+

23.dh1 ac8 24.f3 b4 25.bh3 c3

The fact that Black here drives the white queen to an attacking square is not a mistake, since it can attack the same points from c2. The advanced passed pawn is an important support for Black's game.

26.wd3 g6 27.f5 wg5

After 27.wxg2+ 28.wxg2 d4+ 29.wf2 xd3+ 30.bxd3 ed5 Black has four pawns for a minor piece, but the excellent position of the white knight would greatly hinder their advance.

28.wg3

Definitely necessary. 28.f6 would be mistaken, because of 28...xf6 29.wg3 wxe5.
\( \text{e}6 \) and Black holds five pawns for a piece.

\[ 29. 4x5 \text{f}3 \text{fxe4} \]

In this way Black is in a position to capture the e-pawn with the rook, since it can then be used for the protection of his threatened king's flank.

\[ 31. \text{d}1 \text{xe}5 \text{32.f6 g6 33.5f3} \]

Better was 33...c2 34.\( \text{c}1 \text{h}5 \).

\[ 34. \text{c}1 \text{h}5 35. \text{e}1 \]

With this Black compels the opponent to play for the win of the queen, which involves the loss of the game; White cannot protect the f-pawn, on which hangs the last attacking chance.

\[ 36. \text{e}5 \text{xe5} 37. \text{xe}5 \text{xe5} \]

\[ 38. \text{h}3 \]

White has no saving move; on 38.\( \text{d}3 \) follows 38...c2 39.\( \text{xd}7 \text{ce}8 \)

(39...\( \text{e}1+\) 40.\( \text{xe}1 \text{c}1 \text{w}41. \text{d}8+ \text{xd}8 42.\text{xc}1 \text{c}40. \text{g}1 \text{b}e1+ \text{e}1+ 41.\text{xe}1 \text{xe}1+ 42.\text{f}2 \text{xe}8+ 43. \text{c}7 \text{bc}8 \). On 38.\( \text{g}1 \), Black plays 38...c2 39.\( \text{f}2 \text{f}5+ 40. \text{xe}1 \text{b}e1+ 40. \text{xe}2 \text{a}6+ 41 \text{K moves \text{f}1} 40.\text{f}6 \text{followed by} 41.\text{d}6 \text{or} 41.\text{g}6. \)

\[ 38... \text{c}2 39. \text{h}2 \text{e}1! 40.\text{f}6 \text{h}1! 41.\text{xh}1 \text{c}1 \text{w}+ 42.\text{xc}1 \text{xc}1+ 43. \text{f}2 \text{xc}2 44. \text{h}4 \text{xa}2 \]

\[ 45. \text{d}3 \text{c}6 \]

White resigns.

110 King's Gambit

Zukertort

*F*****

Berlin 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\( \text{f}3 \text{g}5 \)

4.\( \text{c}4 \text{g}7 5. \text{d}4 \text{d}6 6. \text{h}4 \text{xc}6 \)

7.\( \text{d}3 \text{c}6 8. \text{hxg}5 \text{hxg}5 9. \text{exe}4 \text{e}8 \)

10.e5 dxe5 11.\( \text{wh}7 \text{xe}5 \)

12.\( \text{w}xg8+ \text{d}7 13. \text{dxe}5 \text{g}7 \)

14.e6+ \( \text{c}7 15. \text{exe}7 \text{c}5 \)

16.\( \text{f}xg5 \text{f}6 \)

16...\( \text{e}5+ \) also could not have saved Black's game.

17.\( \text{xe}4+ \text{d}7 \)

On 17...\( \text{b}6 \) follows 18.\( \text{w}d8+ \text{c}5 \)

19.\( \text{f}8 \text{w}+ \).

111 Spanish Game

Anderssen

Zukertort

Berlin 1871

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 3. \text{b}5 \text{f}6 \)

4.\( \text{a}4 \text{f}6 5. \text{d}3 \text{d}6 6. \text{xc}e6 \)
bxc6 7.h3 g6 8.c3 g7 9.e3 0-0 10.d2 d5 11.h6 6.d6 12.xg7 7xg7 13.0-0 6.e6 14.e1 e4

Black is forced to advance, otherwise White obtains the advantage with 15.d4.
15.e2 7
15...a2 follows 16.a5 and White wins the far more important pawn. Black must move the knight, so to avoid 16.a4 exd4 exd4 17.e5.
16.c4 7b8 17.g5 f6 18.g3 6b6 19.d2 6ab8 20.e2
Black threatened 20...a3.

20...xb2 21.exd4
White is forced into this sacrifice, since, e.g., 21.axb2, 21...a3 is decisive.
21...b1 22.d2 6b4+
23.e2
23.c3 Black wins by 23...exd4 6xe4 6xe1 25.xe6+ (25.xc6 =b2+ 26.a2 Ee2+) 25...f7.
23...xe1+ 24.xe1 exd4
25.xc7 c5 26.f4 6b6
White resigns.

112 Spanish Game
Anderssen
Zukertort
Berlin 1871
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 a6
4.a4 f6 5.d3 d6 6.xc6+

bxc6 7.h3 g6 8.c3 g7 9.e3 0-0 10.d2 d5 11.h6 6.d6 12.xg7 7xg7 13.0-0 6.e6 14.e1 d4 15.e2 7d7 16.c4 6b8 17.c2 6b6 18.c1 6ab8 19.b3 a5 20.a5 6c5 21.d2 6a6 22.g5 f6 23.g3 6ba8 24.h2

24...a2 25.a2 a2 26.b1 d4 27...a2
If White takes the knight or moves the queen away, then Black mates in a few moves by 27...a3.
27...xg3 28.fxg3 6b4 29.a3 6a5+ 30.b1 6c3 31.a2 a5 and Black won.

113 Bird’s Opening
Zukertort (without a1
De Kostaki Epoureano
Berlin, May 1872
Notes by Blackburne
1.f4 e6
1...d5 followed by ...g6 and ...g7 is the proper defence when receiving the odds of knight.
2.a3 f6 3.b3 d5 4.a2 c5
5.e3 c6 6.a3 a6
This is a needless loss of time.
7.d3 d6 8.e2 0-0 9.g4!
6xg4
Johannes Zukertort

Just what White wanted, as he is enabled to concentrate his forces on the g-pawn.

10.\(\text{g}2\) 11.\(\text{h}4\) 12.\(\text{h}5\) 13.0-0-0 14.\(\text{dg}1\) 15.\(\text{h}7\)

A good move, for if Black takes the bishop, mate follows by 15...\(\text{h}7\)

16.\(\text{g}6\) 17.\(\text{h}xg6\) 18.\(\text{xh}6\)

The terminating moves are very beautiful.

19...\(\text{d}7\) 20.\(\text{g}6\) 21.\(\text{xg}6\) 22.\(\text{xh}8\) 23.\(\text{f}7\)

Black resigns.
London 1872 and Match with Steinitz

114 Two Knights Defence
Zukertort
Gossip
London tournament, 24 June 1872
Notes from Westminster Papers
1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qf6
4.g5 d5 5.exd5 a5 6.b5+ c6 7.dxc6 bxc6 8.Qe2
The best move in this position. If a4, then 8...h6 9.Qf3 e4 10.Qe5 etc.
8...h6 9.Qf3 e4 10.Qe5 Qd4
11.f4 Qc5 12.Qf1

12...Qd6
necessary, because White now threatens to play 13.c3 followed by 14.b4.
12...Qd8! 13.c3 Qd5!, intending to met 14.b4 with 14...Qh4+ 15.g3
=sh2, is best.
13.c3 Qb6 14.b4 Qb7 15.Qa3
Qe6 16.Qa4
The best mode of continuing the attack.
16...Qd8 17.Qac4 Qc7 18.Qa3
0-0
though not satisfactory, this seems to
Black’s only resource for otherwise
White can now play b5, followed by c6+.
19.0-0-0 c5

Played under the impression that he could take the knight, after the capture of the bishop, with the queen, but that course would obviously be quite as disastrous as the loss of the rook.

If 21...Qd5, then follows 22.bxc5 Qb7
23.Qxf8+! Qxf8 24.cxb6+ etc.
22.Qxb4 Qd5 23.Qa3 Qxb4
24.Qxb4 f6 25.Qc4 Qc6
26.Qd6 Qf7 27.Qxc6 Qc8
28.Qd6 Bxc6 29.Qxf7 Qxf7
30.Qb2
And White won.

115 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Wisker
London tournament 1872
Notes from Westminster Papers
1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qb5 a6
4.Qa4 Qf6 5.d3 d6 6.Qxc6+ bxc6 7.Qh3 Qe7 8.Qc3 0-0 9.0-0
Qe8 10.d4 f6 11.Qe2 Qe6
12.Qe3 Qb8 13.b3 Qb4 14.Qd2
Qd8
It would have been better to have played the queen to b7 before making the move in the text.
15.\(\text{d5}\)
This forces the exchange of queens.
15...\(\text{Wxd2}\) 16.\(\text{xe7+}\) \(\text{xf7}\)
17.\(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{xe7}\) 18.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{xf7}\)
Although this does not prevent the loss of a pawn, it is perhaps the best move at his command.

19.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{fxe5}\) 20.\(\text{g5+}\) \(\text{e7}\)
21.\(\text{xh7}\) \(\text{f4}\) 22.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{h4}\)
23.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 24.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{xf4}\) 25.\(\text{xf4}\)
\(\text{h5}\) 26.\(\text{ae1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 27.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{hh8}\)
28.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{d5}\) 29.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{df8}\) 30.\(\text{d4}\)
\(\text{c5}\)

31.\(\text{c1}\)
Threatening 32.\(\text{a3}\).
31...\(\text{xf1+}\) 32.\(\text{xf1}\) \(\text{e4}\) 33.\(\text{g2}\)
\(\text{d7}\) 34.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{g6}\) 35.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{c3}\)
36.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b5}\)
Obviously, the capture of the a-pawn would cost the piece.
37.\(\text{f6}\) \(\text{d4}\) 38.\(\text{cg6}\) \(\text{d5+}\)
39.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{d3}\)
Mr. Wisker plays all this part very carefully and well.
40.\(\text{g7+}\) \(\text{e8}\) 41.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{d4}\)
42.\(\text{cxd5}\) \(\text{f3+}\) 43.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{xd2}\)
44.\(\text{d6}\)
44.\(\text{dxc6}\) would have been better, giving White an easy game to play.
44...\(\text{cx}d6\) 45.\(\text{exd6}\) \(\text{xb3}\) 46.\(\text{f5}\)
Of course not 46.\(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{d2}\).
46...\(\text{d2}\) 47.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{d4}\) 48.\(\text{bb7}\) \(\text{h6}\)
49.\(\text{d7+}\) \(\text{d8}\) 50.\(\text{b2}\)

50...\(\text{f3}\)
An ingenious rejoinder to White's last combination.
51.\(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{hxg3+}\) 52.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xe6}\)
53.\(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{e1}\) 54.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{c5}\) 55.\(\text{g6}\) \(\text{c4}\)
56.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{xd7}\) 57.\(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{e7}\)
58.\(\text{c6}\) \(\text{f8}\) 59.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{g7}\)
60.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{f1+}\) 61.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{g1}\) 62.\(\text{a4}\)
\(\text{g5+}\) 63.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 64.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{g5}\)
65.\(\text{a5}\) \(\text{h5}\) 66.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{g5}\) 67.\(\text{c4}\)
\(\text{g4}\) 68.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{g5}\) 69.\(\text{b6}\)
\(\text{exg6+}\) 70.\(\text{b7}\)
Black resigns.

Mr. Wisker was thought too hasty tendering his resignation, for it subsequently appeared, by gallery analysis at least, that he could have drawn the game. Mr. Steinitz however believes that White can win.

116 Vienna Game
Zukertort
MacDonnell
London tournament 1872
Notes from Westminster Papers
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c6}\)
4.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 5.\(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{g4}\) 6.\(\text{xf5}\)
For if 6...\(\text{dxe5}\) 7.\(\text{xf7+}\) \(\text{xf7}\) 8.\(\text{xe5+}\) etc.
7.\(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 8.\(\text{a4}\) \(\text{xd6}\)
After this White obtains two bishops for two knights, and so it was better to retreat the bishop to e7.


20...\texttt{h5}

21...\texttt{h6} would follow 21.\texttt{xf6}
\texttt{xf6} (21...\texttt{hxg5} 22.\texttt{xf7}) 22.\texttt{xe5}
\texttt{d7} 23.\texttt{e7} winning the queen.

21.\texttt{Wh3 f6} 22.\texttt{Axg8 wag8}

This is much better than capturing the

203

23.\texttt{Ah5! gxh5} 24.\texttt{e7 e8}
25.\texttt{xf6 g4} 26.\texttt{Xg4 hxg4}
27.\texttt{Ah5 f6} 28.\texttt{Xf6 Ad8}
29.\texttt{Ac6 Xd3} 30.\texttt{Af2 Ad2+}
31.\texttt{Ag3 Ad7} 32.\texttt{Ah6 Aa2}
33.\texttt{Xh7+ Ad8} 34.\texttt{Xg4 Aa4}
35.\texttt{Af5 Aa2} 36.g4 Aa4 37.g5

Löwenthal suggested 37.\texttt{Ah8+} followed by \texttt{Aa8}, after which it would be
difficult for Black to hold the game. But
the text is also good.

37...\texttt{a3} 38.g6 \texttt{xf2+} 39.\texttt{e6 ef8}

40.g7

Another way to win is 40.\texttt{f7! e8+}
(40...\texttt{xf7?} 41.gxf7; 40...\texttt{g8} 41.g7
\texttt{e8} 42.\texttt{xc7 d8} 43.\texttt{Aa7 wins})
41.\texttt{d5 a2} 42.\texttt{f1 g8} 43.\texttt{Aa7} etc.

40...\texttt{e8+} 41.\texttt{d5 a2} 42.\texttt{h8}
\texttt{a1e} 43.\texttt{xe8+ xe8} 44.g8+w+
\texttt{e7} 45.\texttt{e6+ d8} 46.\texttt{xe5}
\texttt{a2+} 47.\texttt{c6??}

An unbelievable blunder! White can
play 47.c4 \texttt{d2+} 48.\texttt{e6 d7+}
49.f6 winning.

47...\texttt{a8 mate}

117 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
De Vere
London tournament, 3 July 1872.
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 c5 2.Af3 Axc6 3.Ac3 e6
4.d4 cxd4 5.Axd4 a6 6.Ae2
Stronger than 6.\( \text{e}3 \) and 7.\( \text{d}3 \); the weakness of Black's position is on the queen's side.

6...\( \text{c}7 7.0-0 \text{\text{ge}7} \)?
Black overlooks the dangerous position of his queen.

8.\( \text{db}5! \)
A perfectly sound sacrifice.
8...\( \text{axb}5 9.\text{xb}5 \text{a}5 \)
9...\( \text{b}8 \) was perhaps the best, but this only prolongs the game.
10.\( \text{d}2 \text{b}6 \)
If 10...\( \text{a}4 \) White wins the queen by 11.\( \text{b}3 \).

11.\( \text{e}3 \text{a}5 12.\text{d}6+ \text{d}8 \)
13.\( \text{xf}7+ \text{e}8 14.\text{d}6+ \text{d}8 \)

15.\( \text{c}4! \)
Winning the queen or mating in two moves.
15...\( \text{b}4 \)
Intending to win three pieces for the queen by 16.\( \text{b}6+ \text{e}8 17.\text{d}6+ \text{xd}6 18.\text{xd}6 \text{d}5 19.\text{g}3 \text{xb}6. \)

16.\( \text{a}3 \text{xc}4 17.\text{xc}4 \)
Black resigns.

118 Italian Game
Zukertort
Steinitz
Handicap tournament, London, July 18...:
Notes from Westminster Papers
1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 3.\text{c}4 \text{f}6 \)
4.\( \text{c}3 \text{f}6 5.\text{d}4 \text{exd}4 6.\text{xc}4 \)
7.\( \text{b}4+ 7.\text{d}2 \text{xd}2+ 8.\text{bxc}5 \text{d}5 9.\text{exd}5 \text{xd}5 \)

10.\( \text{b}3 \)
A favourite move of the late Mr. Buck in this position.
10...\( \text{a}5 \)
It is doubtful whether e7 is not a better square for the knight.
11.\( \text{a}4+ \text{c}6 12.\text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 \)
13.0-0 0-0 14.\( \text{fc}1 \)
It is of some importance here which rook is played.
White now threatens to win the c6-pawn by b4, whereas if he had played the queen's rook instead, the following would probably have been the continuation: 14.\( \text{a}1 \text{b}6 15.\text{b}4 \text{b}7 \)
16.\( \text{xc}6 \text{xa}2 \) and White has gained nothing.
14...\( \text{b}5 \)
The best reply to save the pawn.
15.\( \text{a}3 \text{b}6 16.\text{c}3 \)
Again threatening the pawn by 17.b4 etc.

16...\(\text{d7}\) 17.\(\text{e5}\)

The play on both sides to win and save the pawn is unusually interesting and instructive.

17...\(\text{xfd8}\)!

Very finely played. If the queen's rook is played instead, White plays 18.\(\text{df3}\), and afterwards b4, winning the pawn. Should he now attempt to win it, Black replies with ...\(\text{ac8}\), and the pawn is safe.

18.b4 \(\text{b7}\) 19.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e8}\)

Apparently the only move. If 19...\(\text{d6}\), then 20.\(\text{xc6}\), and if 19...\(\text{d5}\), then 20.\(\text{xd5}\) \text{cxd5} 21.\(\text{c7}\) etc.

20.\(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 21.\(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xb4}\)

22.\(\text{b3}\)

Black cannot now play 22...\(\text{d6}\), because of 23.a3, and when the queen retires, 24.\(\text{xd6}\) etc.

22...\(\text{a3}\)!

Again finely played. Black foresees everything.

23.h4 \(\text{d6}\) 24.\(\text{ac1}\) \(\text{e8}\)

Both players have completed twenty four moves within their first hour, and the play of both combatants is ample proof; if any proof were needed, that it is possible to produce a fine game even were the time limit contracted to twenty moves an hour.

25.h5

If Black now plays 25...\(\text{f6}\), White replies with 26.h6.

25...\(\text{h6}\) 26.\(\text{e1}\)!

White sees that he will regain the pawn very shortly.

26...\(\text{xa2}\) 27.\(\text{e7}\) \(\text{f6}\) 28.\(\text{cc7}\)

Well played. If he had played 28.\(\text{f8}\) to protect the pawn, then follows 29.\(\text{xf7}\) \(\text{xf7}\) 30.\(\text{xa8+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 31.\(\text{xa7}\)

\(\text{xb3}\) 32.\(\text{xg7+}\) \(\text{h8}\) 33.\(\text{g6}\) \(\text{f7}\)

34.\(\text{xf6+}\) \(\text{h7}\) 35.\(\text{xf7}\) \(\text{xf7}\)

36.\(\text{xb6}\) and wins.

29.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{d5}\) 30.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{d8}\)

31.\(\text{xa7}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 32.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{d7}\)

33.\(\text{e6}\)!

An excellent conception.

33...\(\text{f6}\) 34.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{b4}\)

If 34...\(\text{e1}\), White plays 35.\(\text{c6}\).

35.\(\text{g4}\)!

Much better than taking the pawn at once, because, in that case, Black checks with ...\(\text{d6+}\) etc.

35...\(\text{d6+}\) 36.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{f8}\) 37.\(\text{xe6}\)

\(\text{xf2+}\) 38.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{f7}\) 39.\(\text{a8+}\) \(\text{b8}\) 40.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{d7}\)!

Mr. Steinitz was of opinion that he could have drawn, by playing 40...\(\text{e5}\) at this point. This is very doubtful however. Suppose: 40...\(\text{e5}\) 41.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d6}\)

42.\(\text{e6!}\) \(\text{d8}\) (best. If 42...\(\text{xe6}\)+ then 43.\(\text{xe6}\) wins) 43.\(\text{g6!}\) etc.
Johannes Zukertort

41.\texttt{c7+} \texttt{h7} 42.\texttt{xb8} \texttt{d8} 43.\texttt{e4+} \texttt{g8} 44.\texttt{xd8+} \texttt{xd8} 45.\texttt{d5+} \texttt{xd5} 46.\texttt{xd5} b5 47.\texttt{g4} \texttt{f7} 48.\texttt{f5}

Black resigns.

119. King's Gambit
Steinitz
Zukertort
8th Match Game, London, 22 August 1872
Notes from Westminster Papers

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\texttt{f3} g5 4.h4 g4 5.\texttt{g5} h6 6.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf7}

7.\texttt{c4+} d5 8.\texttt{xd5+} \texttt{g7}

This and the next move of Black forms a new defence, played and analysed first by Anderssen and Zukertort.

9.d4

If White now plays 9.\texttt{xb7} to draw, Black replies: 9...\texttt{f3} 10.\texttt{xa8} fxg2 11.\texttt{f2} gxh1=\texttt{w} 12.\texttt{xf2} c6 and Black wins.

9...\texttt{f6} 10.e5

10...\texttt{g6}!

Much better than playing 10...\texttt{f5}. Herr Zukertort's move forces 11.h5, and thus gains time.

11.h5

A young player would take the f-pawn with the bishop, but if he does, Black wins a piece by playing 11...\texttt{e7}.

11...\texttt{f5} 12.0-0 \texttt{f3} 13.\texttt{d2} \texttt{e7} 14.\texttt{e4} \texttt{xh5} 15.\texttt{xf3}! \texttt{dxc6}

If 15...\texttt{gxf3} 16.\texttt{xf3} and wins by force:

16.\texttt{h2}

Forced. If 16.c3 \texttt{xf5} 17.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{d6} 18.\texttt{h2} \texttt{exe5}! and wins.

16...\texttt{g6} 17.\texttt{f6} \texttt{gxe5} 18.\texttt{dxe5} \texttt{c5+} 19.\texttt{h1} \texttt{xe5} 20.\texttt{f1} \texttt{xe4} 21.\texttt{f4} \texttt{h5} 22.\texttt{e1} \texttt{c6} 23.\texttt{g3}

If White plays 23.\texttt{c3}, Black replies 23...\texttt{f6}.

23...\texttt{f6} 24.\texttt{f2} \texttt{xf8} 25.\texttt{af1} \texttt{b7} 26.b3 \texttt{a8}

Intending to play ...\texttt{xf8} and afterwards ...\texttt{e7}, and then to give up the exchange.

27.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f8} 28.\texttt{c2} \texttt{e7} 29.\texttt{b1}

29.\texttt{xf4}! 30.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{xf4} 31.\texttt{xf4}

If White takes 31.\texttt{xf4}, Black wins by force by moving ...\texttt{d7}.

31...\texttt{f7} 32.\texttt{e3} \texttt{xf4}

If 32...\texttt{g3}, Black can only draw thus:

33.\texttt{xc7}+ \texttt{xd1} 34.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{xd1} 35.\texttt{xf4}.

33.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{e5}

It is curious that Black overlooked that he could win much more easily by:

33...\texttt{g3}! 34.\texttt{xc7}+ \texttt{d7} 35.\texttt{xd7} \texttt{xc7} \texttt{d1}+.

34.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 35.\texttt{f1} \texttt{d6}

36.\texttt{h2} \texttt{c5} 37.\texttt{g3} \texttt{d4}

38.\texttt{f4} \texttt{d3}+ 39.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{xd3}

40.\texttt{e3} \texttt{h5} 41.\texttt{g3} \texttt{a5} 42.\texttt{g2} \texttt{d2} 43.\texttt{e3}
43...a4!
The winning move.

44.bxa4

The winning move.

44.e4 e2 45.f4 a3 46.c2 b5
47.cxb5 h4 48.gxh4 g3 49.e3 xb3!

and wins.

44...d3 45.a3 xc4 46.f5

In a second game between the same players, Black here played 23...e5, and the game was continued thus: 24.g3 g6 25.xc4 xc4 26.h4 h8 27.h5 e7 28.xg7 f7 29.e6 a8 30.c3 and won.

24.xc3 e5 25.h3 d3

Black threatened 29...exe4 30.fxe4

29.a5 30.e3 a4 31.e6

A pretty finish to a very interesting game.

Black resigns, because if 33...gxh6, White mates in two moves, and if 33...xc7, White wins easily by 34.fxg7.
121 King’s Gambit

Amateur
Zukertort
Simpson’s Divan 1872
Notes by De Vere

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5 4.h4
g4 5.Qe5 Qg7 6.Qxg4 d5 7.Qf2
dxe4 8.Qxe4 Wxe7 9.Qe2 Qc6 10.c3 Qh6 11.d4?
The first ten moves are the best of this
variation of Paulsen’s defence in the
Allgaier Gambit. The correct sequence
was 11.Qf2. By the move in the text,
White loses a piece.

11...Qg4 12.Wd3 f5 13.Qxf4
fxe4 14.Qb5 0-0-0 15.Qd2 Qf5
16.d5

16...e3!
The first move of a brilliant combina­
tion.

17.Qc4 Qd4! 18.cxd4 Qxd4
19.Qa4 Qb4+! 20.Qxb4 Qc2
Mate.

122 Scotch Game
Hunter and Jenkins
Zukertort
Glasgow, 4 February 1873
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.d4 exd4
4.Qxd4 Qh4 5.Qf3
The usual move is 5.Qb5, as played in the
London-Vienna correspondence
game; the move in the text is
adopted by Mr. G.B. Fraser.

5...Qxe4+ 6.Qe2 Qb4+
We believe, against the opinion of
Fraser, that this move is very good.

7.c3 Qe7 8.0-0 Qf6 9.Qe1 Qc4
10.Qd3 Wg4 11.h3
12.Qbd2 d5
This is rather hazardous, 12...d6,
the intention of playing ...Qe5, would
be better.

13.Qf1 Qd6 14.Qg3
15.fxg3 d4 16.Qg5
White wins a piece, but exposes the
game to great danger.

16...Qxc3! 17.bxc3
If 17.g4 Qxg4 18.hxg4 Qxg4 19.h5
Qd8 20.bxc3 Qxf3 21.gxf3
22.Qe3 Qxd3 23.Qxd3 Qg6+ and wins.

17.h6 18.g4 Qxg4 19.hxg4
Qxg4 20.Qe3 Qd8 21.Qe1
Qce5 22.Qf5 Qxf3+ 23.Qxf3
Qxe3 24.Qxe3 Qg5+ 25.Qd5
Qd5 26.Qd3 Qh4+ 27.Qc2
Qh2+

28.Qe1
White might have prolonged the game
by 28.Qd1 Qh1+ 29.Qe1 Qxf3+ 30.Qd2 Qfd8 31.Qe3 Qf2+ 32.Qe2
Qf4+ 33.Qe3 c5:
A) 34.Qe2 Qh2+ 35.Qd1 Qh1=
36.Qel Qf3+ 37.Qe2 Qxd3+ and
wins;
13...d4+ winning the rook.

28...g1+

White resigns.

123 Italian Game

Zukertort

Ballard

10 board blindfold exhibition,

City of London Chess Club, 6 June 1873

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Nf3 Nc6 3.b4 c5

4.c3 d6 5.b5 a6 6.a4 a6 7.d3 h6 8.a3

This variation of the Giuoco Piano, producing a position also resulting from the declined Evans, requires great care on the part of the second player to avoid an inferior game.

8...f6 9.e2 e7 10.c4 d7?

9...a7 is better. White then replies ...e3 etc.

11.axb6 cxb6 12.e3 b5

13.axb5 axb5 14.0-0

White, as regards his pawns, has now the superior position, and a certain victory in the end.

14...0-0 15.e4 h6 16.g3 g6

17.h3 d8 18.d1 a6

18...e4 19.dxe4 dxh4 20.d6 with the better game.

19.b3 c6 20.d5 f8

21.xa6 bxa6 22.d5 g5 23.c4

If 23.xg5+ h5 24.xg5 e8 25.f4 g7+ and Black keeps the sacrificed piece.

23.xc4

It would have been better not to take this pawn.

24.dxc4 xxd5

The best move is 24...b8.

25.xd5 d8 26.c5 b5 27.xc1 f5 28.c6 c8 29.g2 g6 30.f4

f6 31.g2 f7

The best move here is to give the knight for the two advanced pawns.

32.g1 e4 33.gxf5+ gxf5

34.d4+ g6

If 34...e5 35.d4+ xd4 37.b2+ and wins.

Editors' note: here the moves 35.xb5 axb5 should be inserted before 36.d4+.

35.xe4+ g7

36.xb5

This line of play forces two passed pawns, and gives a certain victory. The following is stronger however:

36.xe6+! h8 (36...g8 37.d4 e5 38.f4) 37.d4 e5 38.f4 gxf4

39.g6 and wins.

36.axb5 d4 e5 38.xe5
dxe5 39.g2 f8 40.f3 e7

41.xd2 c6 42.g2 f8

43.e3

Black resigns.

London 1872 and Match with Steinitz
City of London Handicap 1874

124. Bird’s Opening
Zukertort (without ♜b1)
Cohen
City of London Handicap tournament 1874
Notes by Potter

1. f4 d5
This is no doubt the best answer to White’s first move, whether in even games or otherwise.

2. ♜f3 c5
2...g6 followed by ...♗g7 for the 2nd and 3rd moves of the second player, forms a good mode of defence, even between equal players, in this opening, and in games at odds should be still more advantageous, as thereby the first player’s contemplated moves of b3 and ♝b2 are completely foiled.

3. b3 ♜c6 4.e3 e6 5.♗b2 ♜f6
6.a3 ♜e7

7.♗e2
This is a move now frequently adopted by givers of odds in this opening, and the advantage which often accrues therefore shows that games at odds are not governed by the same principles as those upon even terms.

7...a6 8.g3 b5 9.♗g2 ♜b6 10.0-0 ♝b7 11.♖h4 d4

Black plays into the opponent’s hands by this move.

12.e4 ♝d8
This appears to be losing time. We would rather have played ...c4.

13.d3 0-0 14.g4 ♝e8 15.♖g5 ♜f6
16.♖g6 h6 17.f5
All this is well played by Herr Zukertort; and gives him an attack which promises to be overwhelming.

17...e5 18.♗c1 ♜c7 19.♕h5 ♝d6
20.♗f3 ♜e7 21.♖g3 ♜d7 22.h3 ♛c7 23.♖f3 ♝d6

24.♗h2
We now see the object of White’s 22nd move; at the same time it is amusing to observe the leisurely accuracy which the position admits of.

24...♗f7 25.gxf7+ ♜xf7 26.♕g6
Black resigns.

125. Queen’s Gambit
Zukertort (without ♜g1)
Osborne
City of London Handicap tournament 1874
Notes by Steinitz

1.d4
Steinitz invariably adopts this opening when giving the king’s knight. It gives
the first player as good a chance as any other, especially against an opponent who is well acquainted with the book openings.

1...d5 2.c4 e6 3.a3 f6 4.d3 d7 5.g5 dxc4

Weak 5...c5 or 5...e7 would have been much better.

6.e4 e7 7.xc4 h6 8.e3 c6

This confines Black’s position still more, and blocks up the queen’s bishop and knight.

9.0-0 c7 10.f4 0-0 11.c1 b5

Compelling the opponent to make a good move. It was evidently White’s intention to retreat the bishop, and to open an attack against the hostile king.

12.d3 b7

Almost the only move, unless the queen choose to return to her own square, as White was threatening to take the pawn with the knight.

13.b1 a6 14.e5 d5

This loses the game, which might have been saved by 14.e8; but recipients of large odds rarely resist the temptation of indiscriminately offering the exchange of pieces.

15.xd5 cxd5 16.d3

16...f5

g6 would have availed Black but very little, e.g. 17.h4 h5 18.gxh5 hxg4 19.h5 with an overwhelming attack.

17.exf6 xf6 18.h7+ f7 19.f5 exf5 20.xf5 xf5 21.d6 e6

22.e1

White plays the game remarkably well; every move tells.

22...d6 23.f4+

Black resigns.

White must win the game in a few moves. If Black now moves 23...d7, then 24.xf6; and if 24...c6, White checks first with the rook at e6, and takes the bishop afterwards, with an easily won game.

126 French Defence

Zukertort

De Vere

City of London Handicap tournament,
16 February 1874

Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Potter

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.d3 f6

Zukertort: 4.d3 is not favourable to the first player, on account of the answer 4...c5.

4.exd5

Zukertort: Much better than 4.exd5, which leaves the queen’s bishop out of play.

5.e3 f6 6.d3 0-0 7.0-0 g4

Zukertort: As the second player in the French Opening plays only for a draw, the pinning of the knight may be considered satisfactory. However, I prefer 7...c6.

8.g5

Steinitz: In one of the match games between Blackburne and Steinitz, in 1863, the latter played here 8.e2, which seems to give the first player the best of the game, especially if Black replies with ...xf3.

8.xc3 bxc3 d6 9.xf6 xf6 10.xf6 e2

211
11...\textit{d}d7

\textit{Steinitz}: Black is not exercising proper discrimination in thus observing the generally sound strategical principle of early developing the pieces, which, we believe, could have been safely dispensed with in the present exceptional position, as White had already a weak point on c3, upon which all the forces ought to have been speedily brought to bear. 11...\textit{x}f3 would have been perfectly sound, although it required the protection of the d-pawn by \ldots c6 immediately afterwards. There would have been plenty of time for bringing out the knight later on, followed by ...b5, which threatened to play the knight over b6 to a4, attacking the weak pawns on the queen's side.

\textit{Zukertort}: 11...\textit{c}c6 seems more to the purpose.

12.\textit{B}b1 \textit{ab}8

\textit{Steinitz}: It may have been prudent not to move ...b6, in order to reserve the latter square for the knight at a more opportune moment.

13.h3 \textit{e}e6

\textit{Steinitz}: 13...\textit{x}f3, followed by the line of play indicated above, would have been much stronger even now.

\textit{Zukertort}: As this move does not prevent the advance of the White c-pawn I consider it loss of time.

14.c4

\textit{Zukertort}: White maintains now the superior game to the end. His play is most brilliant, but sound.

14...\textit{fe}8

\textit{Potter}: Surely it was better to play ...ce

\textit{Steinitz}: Mr. de Vere must have been out of form when playing this game, as he would not have failed to see that taking off the pawn would have obtained him a much better game than the one of play adopted, e.g. 14...dxc4 15.\textit{x}f5 \textit{xc}4 16.\textit{xb}6 17.\textit{b}3 or 17.\textit{xd}8, threatening ...c6 with a very fine game.

15.cxd5 \textit{xd}5 16.c4 \textit{e}e4

\textit{Zukertort}: Forcing the opponent's rook to a better square.

17.\textit{B}b3 h6

\textit{Potter}: Did Black fully examine ...c5 at this point?

\textit{Steinitz}: This defensive move is not necessary.

18.\textit{e}3 \textit{f}4 19.\textit{f}1 \textit{xf}3

\textit{Steinitz}: We should have preferred 19...\textit{f}6. The move in the text gives White the command of the e-file with both rooks.

20.\textit{xf}3 \textit{ed}8

\textit{Zukertort}: A very good move, threatening a strong attack against White's advance pawns. White's advantage of position however is too considerable to be matched by any counter attack.
21.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Ze}}}}\textbf{e4}

Zukertort: This and the next move of White force the black queen on a square which is formidable for the black knight.

21...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}d6 22.c5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}f6 23.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}b3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}f8

Zukertort: If 23...c6 24.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}e7 with a fine attack.

24.d5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}g6 25.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}a4

Zukertort: A very strong move, attacking the pawns on the queen's side and threatening to bring the unfortunate knight out of play by h4 and h5.

25...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}h7

Zukertort: The only reply, I think, enabling Black to capture the d-pawn.

26.h4!

Zukertort: An exceedingly unpleasant move, and one which very much influences the result.


31.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}f1

31...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}xc5?

Zukertort: A blunder, which however only accelerates White's victory. Black had no means to save the game, e.g. 31...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h4 32.g3

A) 32...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}h3+ 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}g1 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}xh5 33...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}d5 34.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}b1+ f5 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}e5

B) 32...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}h5! 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}xb1+ \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}g6 34.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xe5+ \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}g7 (best) 35.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}e2 and wins.

Steinitz: An error, all the more unaccountable as, in our opinion, Black could have easily drawn the game at least, by playing 31...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h4. White seems to have had nothing better in answer but to return with the king to g1; for if he attempted to play for winning the game by 32.g3, he must have come out with a disadvantage in position. For instance: 31...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h4 32.g3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h2! 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}e4+ (best; for if 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}e2 at once, ...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h3+ wins) 33...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}h8 34.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}e2 (best; for if 34.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Z}}}}g2 instead, ...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}h3 wins) 34...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}xe2 35.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}xe2 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}xe2 36.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}xe2 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}xh5 and we prefer Black's game.

32.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}e4+ f5 33.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}xf4 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}xa2 34.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}g3

Black resigns.

127 Queen's Gambit

Zukertort

De Vere

City of London Handicap tournament,
20 February 1874

Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Blackburne

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.a3

Blackburne: In our opinion White can allow the knight to be 'pinned', and, therefore, this move is needless.

3...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}c6

Steinitz: We do not consider this move advisable, as the knight blocks up the c-pawn, which, in this opening, it is important to move, according to circumstances, one of two squares before playing the knight, in order to liberate the queen.
Zukertort: The c-pawn must be played two squares before putting the knight at c6, in all openings of this kind. Black cannot recover the mistake committed on the third move.

4.e3 \text{f6} 5.\text{c3} a6

Blackburne: We fail to see the object of this move; ...\text{e7} or ...\text{d6} would have been more to the purpose.

Steinitz: This seems to us a loss of time now. 5...\text{e7} at once appears to be stronger.

6.\text{f3} \text{e7}

Zukertort: Threatening 7...\text{dxc4} 8.\text{xc4 \text{ed5}}.

7.b3 b6 8.\text{d3} \text{b7} 9.0-0 \text{g6} 10.\text{b2} \text{d6} 11.\text{c1} \text{e4}

Zukertort: The exchange resulting from this move gives Black a chance of an attack, but it weakens his queen’s side.

12.\text{xe4}

Steinitz: The proper reply, which doubles one of Black’s pawns and leaves the others on the king’s side very weak. From this point to the end White plays the game remarkably well.

12...\text{dxe4} 13.\text{d2}

13...f5

Blackburne: Black here fails to take advantage of the last move which ought to have been 13.\text{e1}; 13...\text{h4} would have given him an equal, if not superior position, for if White in reply has played to win the pawn by \text{g3} \text{e7} would have lost; for, suppose: 14.\text{g3} \text{h3} 15.\text{dxe4 \text{h4}} winning easily. Therefore he must have played 14.\text{h3}: Black then castles or plays ...f5, and although White’s pawns on the queen’s side are very strong, and will, in doubt, be troublesome, we prefer Black’s game.

14.\text{h5} 0-0

Zukertort: If 13...\text{h4} 14.\text{h3} (very bad would be 14.\text{g3} \text{h3} 15.\text{dxe4 \text{e7}}, forcing the game) 14...0-0 15.\text{g4} \text{g4} (if 15...\text{e7} 16.b4) 16.\text{hxg5} \text{fxg5} 17.\text{gxf5} \text{exf5} 18.b4 c5 19.bxc5 bxc5 20.\text{b3} with the far superior game.

14.\text{h4} 15.\text{xh4} \text{h4} 16.b4 c6 17.c5 bxc5 18.\text{dxc5} \text{e7} 19.a4 and Black has hardly a chance to draw the game.

15.\text{f3} c5

Zukertort: Black’s position is weak on the queen’s side. This move, properly answered, weakens it still more.

16.d5 \text{exd5} 17.\text{xd5} \text{xd5} 18.\text{cxd5}

Blackburne: From this point White’s game is won. The concluding moves are well played by Dr. Zukertort.

18.\text{e7}

Steinitz: Exchanging pawns at first would not have improved matters, e.g.: 18...\text{xf3} 19.\text{xf3} \text{e8} 20.\text{g2} \text{xe3+} 21.\text{h1} \text{h6} 22.\text{wxd6} a5: White wins a piece.

Zukertort: If 18...\text{xf3} 19.\text{xf3} \text{e7} (best) 20.\text{d1}.

19.\text{fxe4 fxe4} 20.\text{wxd4 \text{xf1+}}

Zukertort: If 20...\text{e8} 21.\text{c4} winning the pawn. Or 20...\text{e8} 21.\text{xf8+ \text{xf8}} and again 22.\text{c4}.

21.\text{xf1 \text{e8}}
The first move of a winning combination. White’s 24th move is the deadly stroke.

22...b5

Zukertort: 22...c7 would have been preferable; however, Black’s game always remained bad.

23.\texttt{\textit{xc}}d6 \texttt{\textit{xd}}6 24.\texttt{\textit{f}}f5! \texttt{\textit{xf}}8

Zukertort: If 24...\texttt{\textit{f}}f8 25.\texttt{\textit{d}}d7 \texttt{\textit{e}}7 26.\texttt{\textit{c}}6 and wins.

25.\texttt{\textit{xe}}4 \texttt{\textit{xf}}1 + 26.\texttt{\textit{xf}}1 \texttt{\textit{e}}7

Zukertort: Black has now no good move.

27.\texttt{\textit{g}}4 \texttt{\textit{g}}6 28.e4 \texttt{\textit{xd}}5

Blackburne: He has nothing better, for if he takes the h-pawn with the queen, White wins as follows: 29.\texttt{\textit{e}}6+ \texttt{\textit{f}}8 30.\texttt{\textit{f}}6+ \texttt{\textit{e}}8 31.d6 etc.

\textit{laussa}: A desperate measure, but anyway White must have won the game slowly but surely.

29.exd5 \texttt{\textit{xd}}5 30.\texttt{\textit{f}}3 \texttt{\textit{d}}2 31.\texttt{\textit{c}}3

Black resigns.

22.\texttt{\textit{c}}4!

Zukertort: The first move of a winning combination. White’s 24th move is the deadly stroke.

22...b5

\textit{laussa}: 22...c7 would have been preferable; however, Black’s game always remained bad.

23.\texttt{\textit{xc}}d6 \texttt{\textit{xd}}6 24.\texttt{\textit{f}}f5! \texttt{\textit{xf}}8

Zukertort: If 24...\texttt{\textit{f}}f8 25.\texttt{\textit{d}}d7 \texttt{\textit{e}}7 26.\texttt{\textit{c}}6 and wins.

25.\texttt{\textit{xe}}4 \texttt{\textit{xf}}1 + 26.\texttt{\textit{xf}}1 \texttt{\textit{e}}7

Zukertort: Black has now no good move.

27.\texttt{\textit{g}}4 \texttt{\textit{g}}6 28.e4 \texttt{\textit{xd}}5

Blackburne: He has nothing better, for if he takes the h-pawn with the queen, White wins as follows: 29.\texttt{\textit{e}}6+ \texttt{\textit{f}}8 30.\texttt{\textit{f}}6+ \texttt{\textit{e}}8 31.d6 etc.

\textit{laussa}: A desperate measure, but anyway White must have won the game slowly but surely.

29.exd5 \texttt{\textit{xd}}5 30.\texttt{\textit{f}}3 \texttt{\textit{d}}2 31.\texttt{\textit{c}}3

Black resigns.

128 French Defence

\textit{Zukertort (without \textit{b}1)}

\textit{Soother}

City of London Handicap tournament 1874

Notes by Blackburne

1.e4 e6 2.f4

This move, although not theoretically sound, leads to more complications than 2.d4, and therefore is often adopted when giving the odds of a piece.

2...c5 3.\texttt{\textit{f}}3 d5 4.e5 \texttt{\textit{c}}6 5.c3 g6

A very weak move, as the bishop can be of no use whatever at g7; 5...\texttt{\textit{b}}6, followed presently by ...f6, breaking up White’s centre, is the proper line of play.

6.\texttt{\textit{e}}2 b6 7.0-0 \texttt{\textit{b}}7 8.d4 \texttt{\textit{g}}7

9.\texttt{\textit{d}}3 \texttt{\textit{c}}7 10.\texttt{\textit{e}}3 c4 11.\texttt{\textit{c}}2

12.\texttt{\textit{g}}e7 12.\texttt{\textit{e}}1 \texttt{\textit{d}}7 13.b3 \texttt{\textit{a}}6

14.b4 \texttt{\textit{b}}7 15.a4 a6 16.g4 h6

17.\texttt{\textit{h}}4 \texttt{\textit{d}}8

We fail to see the object of Black’s last few moves; it appears to us as if his thoughts were fixed more upon his sandglass than on the game.

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

Well played; in fact, throughout the play on the part of White is of the highest order.

18...\texttt{\textit{g}}xf5 19.gxf5 \texttt{\textit{e}}g8 20.\texttt{\textit{h}}1

\texttt{\textit{exf}}5

20...\texttt{\textit{xe}}5 might perhaps have been worth trying.

21.\texttt{\textit{xf}}5 \texttt{\textit{xf}}5 22.\texttt{\textit{xf}}5 \texttt{\textit{c}}7

23.\texttt{\textit{d}}6 \texttt{\textit{af}}8 24.\texttt{\textit{f}}4 \texttt{\textit{e}}6 25.b5

\texttt{\textit{d}}8 26.a5 \texttt{\textit{h}}8

He has nothing better as his only hope now is in a counter attack on the king’s quarters.

27.axb6+ \texttt{\textit{xb}}6 28.bxa6 \texttt{\textit{a}}8
28...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c6}} instead, would probably have saved the game.

29.\texttt{b1+} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c7}} 30.\texttt{e2} \texttt{g4}
31.\texttt{a2} \texttt{e6} 32.\texttt{g3} \texttt{h5}
33.\texttt{a5+} \texttt{d7}

34.\texttt{a4+}!
Beautifully played: Black has no resource, for if he play 34...\texttt{e7}, mate follows in three, thus: 35.\texttt{e8+}! \texttt{xex8}
36.\texttt{xf7+} \texttt{d8} 37.\texttt{b8} mate. And if 34...\texttt{c6}, then the following is the probable continuation: 35.\texttt{b7+} \texttt{c7}
36.\texttt{a5} \texttt{xb7} 37.\texttt{ab7} \texttt{h4} 38.\texttt{e6+} \texttt{exe6} 39.\texttt{a4+} \texttt{e7} 40.\texttt{c6} and wins.

34...\texttt{c7} 35.\texttt{b8}!
The coup de grace.

35...\texttt{xb8} 36.\texttt{d7}
Black resigns.

129 Evans Gambit
Coburn
Zukertort
Simpson's Divan 1874
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{f3} \texttt{c6} 3.\texttt{c4} \texttt{c5}
4.b4 \texttt{xb4} 5.c3 \texttt{a5} 6.d4 \texttt{xd4}
7.0-0 dxc3 8.\texttt{wb3} \texttt{wf6} 9.e5 \texttt{g6}
10.\texttt{xc3} \texttt{ge7} 11.\texttt{a3} \texttt{b5}
12.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{db8} 13.\texttt{wa4} \texttt{a6}
14.\texttt{bd4} \texttt{xd4} 15.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xb7}
16.f3 \texttt{b6} 17.\texttt{ad1} \texttt{f5} 18.\texttt{wb4}
This leads to the loss of an exchange.

18...\texttt{xf3}!
18.a5 would also win the exchange but the move in the text forces, besides the exchange of three pieces.

19.\texttt{xf7+}
The only reply, avoiding the immediate loss.

19...\texttt{xf7} 20.\texttt{xf3} \texttt{xd4+}
21.\texttt{xd4}
If 21.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xb4} 22.\texttt{xb4} \texttt{g5}
23.\texttt{f4} \texttt{b8} 24.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{b1+} 25.\texttt{g2}
\texttt{xf1+} 26.\texttt{g3} \texttt{h6} and Black will win easily.

21...\texttt{xd4} 22.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf7} 23.\texttt{xd4}
\texttt{e6}
White resigns.

130 Evans Gambit
Zukertort (without \texttt{b1})
Amateur
London 1874
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{f3} \texttt{c6} 3.\texttt{c4} \texttt{c5}
4.b4 \texttt{xb4} 5.c3 \texttt{a5} 6.d4 \texttt{xd4}
7.0-0 dxc3 8.\texttt{wb3} \texttt{wf6} 9.e5 \texttt{g6}
10.\texttt{xc3} \texttt{ge7} 11.\texttt{a3} \texttt{b5}
12.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{db8} 13.\texttt{wa4} \texttt{a6}
14.\texttt{bd4} \texttt{xd4} 15.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xb7}
16.f3 \texttt{b6} 17.\texttt{ad1} \texttt{f5} 18.\texttt{wb4}
This answer is not perfectly satisfactory. 9.\texttt{a5} is the most usual move, which leads to a position very similar to...
10.e5 dxe5

11.Qa3

This attacking move is here perfectly correct, because White is able to bring his queen's rook into cooperation at once. In an even game I continue the attack as follows: 11.d5 Qe7 12.Qxe5 Qxe5 13.Qa3, with a fine position.

11...Qxd4

One of those rare cases where a move, correct in an even game, becomes un­ safe when receiving odds. I think the best move would have been 11...Qe7.

12.Wb3 Qd7 13.Qad1 Qa5

I cannot find any satisfactory way of play for Black.

14.Qxd4

The move in the text introduces a nice finish, but it is not the strongest. The safer course was 14.Qxe5 Qxb3 (best) 15.Qxd7+ Qxd7 (if 15...Qd8 White wins by 16.Qe5) 16.Qxh7 b6 17.Qxd4+ Qc6 18.Qd1 and White has recovered the piece and has an over­ whelming attack.

14...Qxb3 15.Qxe5+ Qd8 16.Qe7+ Qxe7

It would have been better to play the king.

17.Qc6+ Qe8 18.Qd8 Mate.

131 King’s Gambit

Ranken
Zuker­ tory

Simpson’s Divan, July 1874
Notes by Seinitz

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qc4 d5

4.Qxd5 Qh4+

Morphy does not give this check, but plays at this point ...Qf6 instead. As far as modern practice tends to prove, the defence adopted in the text, which has been popular since 1862, is the more preferable, and secures a drawn game at least to the second player.

5.f1 Qg5 6.d4 Qe7

This move is the best in answer to 6.d4, but it would have been incorrect if White had played 6.Qc3 at this juncture, in which case it would have been imperative for Black to play 6...Qg7 instead. Supposing 6.Qc3 Qe7 7.Qf3 Qh5 8.h4 h6 9.Qxf7+ Qxf7 (best) 10.Qe5 Qf6 11.Qh5+ Qd8 12.Qf7+ Qd7 13.Qxh8 Qxh8 14.hxg5 etc.

7.Qb3

A weak move; 7.Qc3 is the usual, and in our opinion, the strongest continuation. In any case, if White wished to preserve his bishop, he ought to have
retreated him to c4, whereupon he might have been brought to e2 in case of need, and thus made available for the defence of the king side.

7...b6c6 8...f3 Wh5 9...c3 g4 10...b5 0-0-0 11.d5 a6

Herr Zukertort has now completely turned the tables, and he prosecutes in fine style the attack, which passes into his hands from this point.

12...bd4 xd4 13...xd4

By accepting Black's cleverly conceived sacrifice of the exchange, White left himself open to immediate destruction, as shown in our next note, but he must have lost also, though perhaps not so speedily, if he had taken the bishop, e.g.

14.gxf3 Whxf3+ 15...g1 c6 16...f2 Whxe4 followed by ...d4 with a winning advantage.

14...xf5

This is certainly very pretty, but seems to us nevertheless a superfluous expenditure of brilliancy. Instead of choosing this circuitous way of winning the game, Black might have forced a straight and short passage to victory by taking the g-pawn with the bishop, checking, for if 15...xg2 We2+ 16...g1 (best) 16...f3 and mates next move; and if 15...g1 Wf3 16...d2 h3, and mate is again inevitable.

15...c3

The capture of the bishop or knight would have entailed the loss of the queen, for Black would have accordingly either checked with the queen at f3, taking the pawn, or with the bishop at e2, followed by checking with the other bishop at b4 or c5.

15...g3+

White had nothing better; for if he took the knight, Black would have taken the rook with check, and mated in two more moves; and if he moved the king to gl or f2, Black would have won the queen by ...e2+ or ...xe4+.

16...xg2 17.xg3

If 17...d2 xe4 18...g1 e8 winning easily.

17...xh1+ 18...d2 f3

White resigns.

132 Sicilian Defence
Marrett
Zukertort (without f-pawn)
St George's Chess Club, 29 July 1874
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4c5

This sacrifice of a pawn is not sound.

2...h5+ g6 3...xc5 c6 4.c3

A good move; White obtains by this slow, but safe course, a well developed game.

4...f6 5...c4 g7 6...f3 e6 7.e5 d5 8...e2 d79.d4

White has now established a formidable centre.

9...0-0 10...a3 b6

10...a6, preventing the entry of the adverse queen's knight, was better.

11.h4 h6 12...c2 e7 13...d3 f5 14.g4 e7 15...h3 f7

Black has no better move; if 15...e1 16...b5.
16.g5
White pursues the attack in vigorous style, but his 16th move improves the chances of his opponent.
16...h5 17.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash h2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f5}}\) 18.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash b5}}\) a6
19.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xf5}}\) exf5 20.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash d6+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash g8}}\)
21.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash c7}}\) 22.b3 \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e6}}\) 23.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash a3}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash fd8}}\) 24.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash c5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash d7}}\) 25.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash b4}}\)

25...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xexe5!}}\)
The first move of a long combination which turns the tables completely.
26.dxe5 \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xexe5}}\) 27.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e2}}\)
The only move to avoid the immediate loss of a piece.
27...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f7}}\) 28.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xf7}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xf7}}\) 29.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e3}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}}\), Black wins a piece by \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash a5}}\).
29...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e8}}\) 30.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f3}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}}\) would again be replied to by \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash a5}}\).
30...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f4}}\) 31.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash d3}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f1-0-0}}\), the game would take the following course:
31.0-0-0 a5 32.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash a3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xexe3+}}\) 33.fxe3
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xxc3+}}\) 34.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash b1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xexe3}}\) 35.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash d2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xd2}}\)
Black dare not take the knight;
35.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xxd2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash h3}}\) 37.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash b2}}\) (if 37.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash a+}}\) ) 37...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e8}}\) 38.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash h1}}\) 39.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e3}}\)
\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xxd1+}}\) 40.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xxd1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e4}}\) and Black fought to win.
31...\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash xexe3}}\) 32.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash wxd5+}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash g7}}\)
33.fxe3 \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash ad8}}\) 34.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash c4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash g6}}\) 19.\(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash e2}}\)

19...f4!
This move forces the exchange of the pawns, as Black is threatening 20.f3, and establishes an irresistible attack against White's king's flank.
20.exf4 exf4 21...e3 d4
22...c4+ h8 23...xc5
If 23...h1 h4, and White has no means to avoid the disaster.

23...f3+ 24...h1 h4 25.gxf3
If 25.h3 c8 and Black forces the game by 26...xh3 or 26...xg2+! 27...xg2 (best) 27...xh3+ 28...g3 d6+.
25...xh2+ 26...xh2 d6+
White resigns.

It is very desirable that the new school should take as example the marvellous rapidity of play shown by Mr. Cochrane in all the skirmishes in which I had the honour to meet the Nestor in Caissa's Empire.

134 Evans Gambit
Blydenstein
Zukertort
Simpson's Divan 1874
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2...f3 c6 3...c4 c5
4.b4 xb4 5.c3 a5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 dxc3 8...a3

In one of Morphy's games his adversary answered here 8...d6, and the game proceeded 9.e5 dxe5 10...xf7+ ...xf7 11...xe5+ ...e8 12...h5+ g6 13...xe7+ f6 14...e1+ and wins. But it seems to us that White would obtain no advantage if Black on the 9th move of this pretty variation had played ...d7; and we also doubt whether, even after Black's taking the e-pawn, White's sacrifice of the piece would have been successful if Black had boldly played 11...f6 instead of ...e8.

9.e5 g6 10...b3 c7
11...xc3 b5
Originally Anderssen's counter attack, but to Mr. Zukertort belongs the credit of having contributed towards its development in theory and practice at least as much as the inventor.

12...xb5...b8 13...xe7

13...a6
The right reply. 13...xe7 would obviously fail to 14...d6+, and it needs further demonstration to show that 13...xe7 is inferior to the move in the text.

14...a3
14...c5 seems to us stronger, but we are not prepared to assert that it breaks the point of the counter-gambit.

14.axb5 15...d5 b4 16...b2 e7
17...c4 b7 18...ad1 ...c6 19...g3

Morphy sometimes adopted this move at this point against opponents of inferior calibre. It is of no particular moment, since Black, by replying with ...f6 as in the present game, can bring about an ordinary position of the Compromised Defence.

8...f6
Eeuble. 19.\textit{d}d4 would have given White much better chances of sustaining the offensive.

19...0-0 20.\textit{h}h4

Even now 20.\textit{d}d4 was preferable.

20...\textit{g}4 21.f3 \textit{h}3 22.\textit{c}c2 g5

23.\textit{g}2

This loses the game. White's best resort was to force the exchange of queens by 23.\textit{g}2.

23...\textit{f}f5!

Very well played. The game is forced now:

24.\textit{d}d3 \textit{b}6+ 25.\textit{f}f2 \textit{xf}3

26.\textit{e}e1 \textit{xd}1 27.\textit{xf}5

White had played 27.\textit{xd}1, Black would have won by 27...\textit{xf}2+ 28.\textit{g}2 \textit{yg}3+ 29.\textit{g}1 \textit{yg}2+, followed by 30.\textit{e}e3+.

27.\textit{xc}2 28.\textit{xh}3 \textit{g}6

29.\textit{xd}7 \textit{bd}8 30.e6 \textit{xf}2+

White resigns.

135 Scotch Game

Oppenheim

Zukertort

Simpson's Divan 1874

Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}f3 \textit{c}c6 3.d4 exd4

4.\textit{xd}4 \textit{c}c5 5.\textit{e}e3

The new move 5.\textit{f}f5, introduced by Mr. Burn, is now gaining more favour.

5...\textit{f}f6 6.\textit{c}c3 \textit{ge}7 7.\textit{d}d3

If done with the intention of bringing the knight to d2, and castle on the queen's side, it would not have been a bad plan, but White's pursuing continuation is not consistent with this assumption. Paulsen usually plays here \textit{e}e2, but we believe the king's bishop may also be played to c4, for White would gain a move by retreating the bishop to e2 whenever Black attacks it by ...\textit{e}e5, because he can then advance his pawn to f4.

7...d5 8.\textit{xc}6

This leads to an exchange of queens. 8.\textit{d}d2 at once was better.

8...\textit{xc}6 9.exd5 \textit{xd}5 10.\textit{xc}5

11.b4

Weak. White's best play was now to exchange queens by 11.\textit{b}b5+.

11...\textit{e}e7+ 12.\textit{f}f2

Had the bishop interposed, the game might have continued 12.\textit{e}e2 \textit{d}f4 13.\textit{f}f3 (best) 13...g5 14.\textit{f}f1 (best, for Black threatens to win by ...\textit{d}d7 followed by ...\textit{c}c6 or ...\textit{b}b5) 14...0-0 15.\textit{e}e3 \textit{f}f6 with a fine game.

12.\textit{e}e6 13.g3 0-0-0 14.\textit{g}2

14...\textit{xb}4!

An excellent sacrifice, and well warranted by the strength of the position.

15.\textit{xb}4

As is often the case, the discarded variations are superior in brilliance to those actually played. It would seem at first as if White could recover the pawn by the counter sacrifice of \textit{xb}7+ but in that case Black would have won by the following beautiful variation: 15.\textit{xb}7+ \textit{xb}7 16.\textit{b}b5+ \textit{a}8 17.\textit{xb}4 \textit{g}g4+ and if White take the queen, mate follows at once with the rook, and if the
king move, Black mates in two moves, commencing with ...\texttt{\texttt{h3+}}.
\begin{align*}
15\ldots & \texttt{bx}\texttt{b4+} & 16. \texttt{d2} & \texttt{g4} \\
17. & \texttt{xb7+} & \\
\end{align*}
The only move. If 17.\texttt{b1} or \texttt{we3}, Black wins a piece by ...\texttt{xd2}!
\begin{align*}
17. & \texttt{xb7} & 18. \texttt{b1} & \texttt{xb1}+ \\
19. & \texttt{xb1} & \texttt{xe}2 & 20. \texttt{xe}2 & \texttt{he}8+ \\
21. & \texttt{f3} & \texttt{d3}+ & 22. \texttt{g2} & \texttt{e2} & 23.a3 \\
& \texttt{b3} & 24. \texttt{d1} & \texttt{eb2} & 25. \texttt{d2} & \texttt{d3} \\
\end{align*}
Black handles his superior forces with great exactitude.
\begin{align*}
26. & \texttt{c4} & \texttt{xf2}+ & 27. \texttt{xf2} & \texttt{xd1} \\
\end{align*}
White resigns.

\section*{Bishop's Opening}
\textbf{Zukertort (without \texttt{b1)}}
\textbf{Beardsall}

City of London v Bermondsey,
23 October 1874

Notes by Blackburne and Potter

1.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e5} 2.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f6} 3.\texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 3.\texttt{e2}

Blackburne: A very favourable move in odds games, avoiding all book variations.

3...\texttt{d6}

Blackburne: 3...\texttt{c5} or 3...\texttt{c6} are better.

4.\texttt{f4} \texttt{e7} 5.\texttt{f3} \texttt{g4} 6.0-0 0-0

7.\texttt{d3} \texttt{c6} 8.\texttt{c3} \texttt{a5}

Blackburne: This manoeuvre loses time, and brings the knight out of play, while the adverse bishop remains very well placed.

9.\texttt{b5} \texttt{c6} 10.\texttt{a4} \texttt{b5} 11.\texttt{c2} \texttt{wc7}

Blackburne: This and the 13th move of Black brighten the prospects of White's attack.

12.\texttt{h3} \texttt{xf3} 13.\texttt{xf3} \texttt{ae8}

Potter: Black has a bad position, which this move does not improve; 13...\texttt{ad8} was better, threatening ...\texttt{d5} in various positions.

14.\texttt{g4h6}?

Potter: Worse and worse. 14...\texttt{exf4} was his obvious and only move.

15.\texttt{g5} \texttt{hxg5} 16.\texttt{fg5} \texttt{eh7} 17.\texttt{b7} 18.\texttt{wh5}

Blackburne: White obtains a very powerful attack by this move.

18...\texttt{d8}

Blackburne: 18...\texttt{d8} is better.

19.\texttt{b3}

19...\texttt{g6}

Blackburne: The best course was 19...\texttt{e6}.

20.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{cxd5} 21.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{b6+} 22.\texttt{e5} \texttt{g6} 23.\texttt{wh6}, but even this was not satisfactory. If 19...\texttt{e6}, White forces the game by 20.\texttt{xf7}! \texttt{xf7} 21.\texttt{g6} \texttt{h7}

22.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{f6} 23.\texttt{xe6+} etc.

20.\texttt{hxg6}+ \texttt{h8} 21.\texttt{wh5l}

Blackburne: Far better than 21.\texttt{xf7}.

21...\texttt{d5}

Potter: The only way to prevent the immediate loss threatened by 22.\texttt{xf7} and g6.

22.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{cxd5} 23.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{b6+} 24.\texttt{gd} \texttt{g6} 25.\texttt{wh6}

Blackburne: Better than 25.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xh5} 26.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf1} 27.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{f8+} a=. 28...\texttt{g5}.

25...\texttt{fxg6} 26.h4 \texttt{xf1} 27.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{xf8} 28.\texttt{a4}

Blackburne: This wins the third pawn, and so decides the game against an play.
28...bxa4 29...xa4...e6 30...xa7...f4 31...xf4...xf4 32.d4...d6 33...d7...b8 34.c4

Blackburne: If 34.h5 gxh5 35.g6...e6 36...xe6...xe6 37...d8+...g7 38...xb8...c6 with a good chance to draw the game.

34...f3 35.h5...g3 36...xf3 gxh5 37.g6...e6

38...h7+

Potter: All this is well played by Herr Zukertort.

38...g8 39...d5...h4 40.c5...f6 41.c6...g7 42.c7

Black resigns.

137 Italian Game
Bird and Zukertort
Potter and Wisker
Consultation Game, London, 19 December 1874
Notes by Wisker

1.e4 e5 2...f3...c6 3...c4...c5 4.c3...f6 5.b4

This deviation from the ordinary course in the Giuoco Piano is assuredly not advisable. The white pawns on the queen’s side become weak, and in order to get up an attack the first players must expose themselves on both flanks.

5...b6 6.d3 d6 7.a4 a5 8.b5...e7 9...a3...g6

The white allies have gained nothing by the advance of these pawns, whilst on the other hand Black’s queen’s knight has been driven to a better position.

10...g5 h6 11...e3...xe3! 12.fxe3

This exchange is in favour of the black allies as it tends still further to disunite the white pawns.

12...0-0 13.0-0 d5

It is not easy to find a better move for Black. 13...d5 as made gives them a good game.

14.exd5...xd5 15...d2...h7

Threatening ...f5.

16...xd5...xd5 17.e4

White thus prevent the advance of the black f-pawn, but they still further weaken their d-pawn.

17...e6 18...c4 b6 19.h4

A hazardous advance. Properly answered their play gains nothing, whilst it exposes yet another pawn to the assaults of Black.

19...f6 20...e3...b7

Black freely allow the adverse knight to take possession of f5.

21...f5...ad8

The black allies have now thoroughly developed their forces, and the superior position of their pawns gives them the better game.

22...e3
Necessary to avert the capture of the e-pawn.

22...\(\text{f7}\) 23.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{g8}\)!

24.\(\text{h2}\)

White foresees that the on-coming of the black knight will end in the loss of a pawn, and they therefore wisely determine to prosecute operations on the king's side. From this point they make the most of their chances.

24...\(\text{d7}\) 25.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 26.\(\text{ad1}\) \(\text{f7}\) 27.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{xa4}\)

White could not save this pawn save at a ruinous sacrifice of position.

28.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{b2}\) 29.\(\text{de1}\) \(\text{c4}\) 30.\(\text{we2}\) \(\text{d6}\)

Black have gained a passed pawn and brought back their knight in safety. Their bishop is indeed temporarily shut out, but he can be easily brought into action again at c8 square.

31.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{we8}\) 32.\(\text{g4}\) h5?

A grave error which throws away the game.

By simply taking 32...\(\text{xf5}\) and then moving 33...\(\text{d6}\) Black would have preserved their advantage.

\(\text{33.xg7!}\)

Very finely played.

33...\(\text{xf7}\) 34.\(\text{xf6}\)

35.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{h8}\) 36.\(\text{f6}\)

37.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{h7}\) 38.\(\text{g5}\)

The on-coming of these pawns constitutes the great strength of White's game.

38...\(\text{xe4}\)

This attempt to retrieve the fortunes of the day is frustrated by the unfortunate position of the black bishop.

39.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 40.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{g8}\)

41.\(\text{ef1}\)

The h-pawn could not be taken on account of 42.\(\text{f8}\) followed after the exchange of rooks by \(\text{f5}\) +.

42.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{c8}\) 43.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{d7}\)

A miscalculation. The game could have been drawn by moving the bishop backwards and forwards.

44.\(\text{xc7}\) \(\text{h7}\) 45.\(\text{f8}\) \(\text{xf5}\)

White's move leaves them with a better resource.

46.\(\text{h5}\) \(\text{h6}\) 47.\(\text{h6}\) \(\text{g7}\)

48.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{g5}\) 49.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{g5}\)

50.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 51.\(\text{c8}\) \(\text{d5}\)

52.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 53.\(\text{xf5}\)

Black resigns.
Match with Potter 1875

138 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Amateur
12 board blindfold exhibition,
Nottingham 19 January 1875
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\f3 \f6 3.\c3
The authorised move at this point is 3.\exe5, which according to modern research leads to an even game. The line of play here adopted is certainly quite good enough to preserve the advantage of the first move, though, if properly met, it also precludes any lively complications arising from the early part of the opening.

3...\c6
The proper reply. 3...\c5 instead, would enable the opponent to gain some advantage in position by 4.\exe5, for if then Black reply 4...\xf2+ followed by 5...\exe5, White would obtain a fine centre by taking 5.\xf2, and afterwards attacking the knight by 6.d4.

4.\b5d6
The game is now reduced into an ordinary form of the Ruy Lopez in which the move in the text is considered a satisfactory defence for the second player.

5.d4\d7
The customary and superior rejoinder at all these kind of positions is to capture the pawn, followed by ...\d7.

6.\g5
It would not have been good play to attack the \c6 at once by d5, for then the adversary’s knight would have selected a more convenient retreat at e7.

6...\e7 7.d5 \b8 8.\d3 c5 9.h3 \b6 10.b3 \a6 11.a3 h6
12.\d2

12...0-0
Black’s pieces are choked up and he could hardly stir. Nevertheless it would have been better policy to delay castling until the opponent's tactics had been more declared, and ...\h7 at once would have been an uncompromising move for the waiting purpose. Since White is in no need for castling, he can now institute an attack with his pawns on the king side, without much preparation.

13.\e2 \h7 14.g4 \d8 15.\g3 \g5
This was certainly injudicious, and could only tend to accelerate the operation of the hostile pawns. He ought to have retreated the queen's knight to c7, and then endeavoured to balance the positions by a counter attack on the queen's side, which at least might have had the effect of preventing the opponent's castling on that wing, and then bringing both his rooks into play.

16.\xg5 \xg5 17.h4 \h7 18.g5 g6
He had nothing better.

19.gxh6 \c7 20.\f3 \f6
21.\g2 \h8 22.0-0-0 b5
23.\d1 \g8
24.f4!
The blindfold performer has shown in the last series of moves a solid exactitude in the arrangement of his forces for the attack, which he now pursues with unflinching energy and a clearness which is all the more remarkable under the circumstances of his playing eleven other games at the time without sight of board or men. He risked nothing by thus allowing the adversary to open the file for the queen, for if Black capture 24...exf4, White would reply 25...xf4, and easily stand the check at a1, as we shall show next.

24...\textit{we7}

Had he taken the pawn, the game might have proceeded 24...exf4 25...xf4 \textit{wa1+} 26.d\textit{d}d2 \textit{xa3} 27...xd6 \textit{e8} 28...e7 and Black’s counterattack will hardly leave any impression.

25...f6 26.f5

It would have been no doubt more prudent to advance the pawn to g5, which would have given him a defensible position, whether White took the pawn once or answered 26...\textit{h}h5. By the text the enemy obtains leave to move all obstacles obstructing the path of his rooks and bishops which have been masked by the pawns on both sides.

27...\textit{xf6} \textit{gxf6} 28...\textit{f5} \textit{axb5} 29...\textit{xg5} \textit{a8} 30...\textit{e2} \textit{e4}

31...\textit{f3} \textit{h2} 32...\textit{e1}

Black resigns.

The blindfold player’s persistent prosecution of the rook shows complete mastery of the position. Black loses the exchange, and, being a pawn behind already, he must succumb.

139 Italian Game

\textbf{Martin}

\textbf{Zukertort}

10 board blindfold exhibition,
Old Change Chess Club, London,
22 January 1875
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 \textit{e5} 2.d\textit{f}d3 \textit{c6} 3.d\textit{c}4 \textit{d5} 4.d\textit{c}\textit{c3}

Anderssen often jocosely remarked the name of Giuoco Pianissimo would be more fitting to this dull and uninteresting form of debut.

4...f6 5.g5

One of the first rules of development always to avoid moving one and the same piece twice early in the opening; unless a special clear purpose of attack or defence has to be served. The present juncture cannot be regarded as one of the latter exceptional situations, and precipitate sortie of the knight must therefore result in a loss of two tempi, for White will have ultimately to recapture the knight, since he will not receive...
sufficient satisfaction by sacrificing two minor pieces for rook and pawn.

5...0-0 6.0-0 h6 7.\(d\)f3 d6

8.h3

Superfluous. Even under ordinary circumstances, the move of the h-pawn is now rejected by modern masters, though it was much in favour with the old school. In the present position there was still less need for the precaution, and White ought to have freed his queen's bishop by d3 at once. If then the opponent pinned the knight, White would have obtained a good game by \(xe3\) followed afterwards by \(wd2\), for Black, having already castled on the king side, could hardly afford to take \(xf3\) since White, after gxf3 would retreat the king to h1 and get up an attack with the rooks on the open g-file.

8...\(d\)e79.d3

\(d\)d4 was preferable.

9...\(e\)g6 10.\(d\)d5 \(\alpha\)xd5 11.\(\alpha\)xd5

c6 12.\(\alpha\)c4 \(\alpha\)e6

Herr Zukertort, though playing ten games blindfold at the time, conducts his game with profound judgement. The more natural-looking move 12...\(h\)h7, with the intention of throwing the f-pawn forward to f5, was inferior since White had a powerful rejoinder at command to ...f5 in \(g5+!\) winning at least the exchange.

10.xe5 13.xc4 14.dxc4 f5 15.exf5

\(xf5\) 16.\(w\)d3 \(w\)f6 17.b4 \(\alpha\)b6

18.\(\alpha\)d2 \(f\)f8 19.\(\alpha\)ae1 \(\alpha\)h4

20.\(\alpha\)xh4 \(w\)xh4 21.\(\alpha\)e3

21...\(xf\)2!

A very fine coup. The blindfold player is wide awake, though his eyes are closed to the game.

22.\(\alpha\)xb6

Apparently the best. Taking the rook with the bishop would have resulted in the loss of a piece, with only a delusory prospect of a draw, e.g. 22.\(xf\)2 \(xf\)2+ 23.\(\alpha\)h1 \(\alpha\)xe1 24.\(xf\)8+ \(xf\)8 25.\( wd6+ \(f\)7 26.\( wb6 \(w\)e7 etc.

22...\(\alpha\)xb6 23.b5

White's game was past recovery. 23.\( wd6 \) was of no avail, on account of Black's reply 23...\( g3 \). If then White checked with the queen at e6, followed by \( g4 \), Black would mate in two moves, commencing with ...\( xg2+ \).
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23...\textbf{B}xf3!
Masterly played.

\textbf{24.} \textbf{B}xf3
White had nothing better. Had he taken the d-pawn, he would have been mated in four moves after 24.\textbf{B}xd6 \textbf{B}xg2+ 25.\textbf{B}xg2 \textbf{B}xh3+ 26.\textbf{Q}g1 \textbf{B}g4+ 27.\textbf{Q}h1 \textbf{B}h3 mate.

\textbf{24...}\textbf{B}xf3 25.gxf3 \textbf{B}g3+ 26.\textbf{Q}h1 \textbf{B}xh3+ 27.\textbf{Q}g1 \textbf{B}g3+ 28.\textbf{Q}h1 \textbf{B}h4+ 29.\textbf{Q}g1 \textbf{B}xc4 30.bxc6 \textbf{B}xc3
White resigns.
Black's overwhelming superiority of pawns is well supported and unapproachable. White obviously cannot retaliate by 32.\textbf{B}xd6, on account of 32...\textbf{B}c5+, winning the rook.

140 Evans Gambit
\textbf{Zukertort}
\textbf{Martin}
8 board blindfold exhibition, London, 1 May 1875
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.\textbf{Q}f3 \textbf{B}c6 3.\textbf{B}c4 \textbf{B}c5 4.b4 \textbf{B}xb4 5.c3 \textbf{B}a5 6.0-0
Herr Anderssen's and Herr Zukertort's analytical labours and practical examples have latterly thrown such doubt upon the soundness of the customary continuation of 6.d4 at this point, since it may lead to the Compromised Defence coupled with the counter gambit of ...b5 at a later stage which leaves the second player many resources to maintain his numerical superiority without great danger.

6...\textbf{B}f6 7.d4 0-0 8.\textbf{Q}xe5
A novelty introduced some time ago by Mr. Richardson, an American player, and deserving of great consideration, as it seems to be the root of many interesting complications.
15...\textcolor{blue}{c2}

The blindfold player is wide awake, although his eyes are closed to the board. With fine perception, he forces the weakening of the adversary's position on the king side before proceeding to recover the pawn.

15...g6 16.\textcolor{blue}{xa4} wxa4 17.\textcolor{blue}{xc5} e8 18.\textcolor{blue}{d6} b6 19.\textcolor{blue}{f3}

This was manifestly a loss of time, since White could not accept the offer of the exchange of queens, contained in Black's reply, without much diminishing his chance of succeeding in more than a draw.

19...\textcolor{blue}{wc6} 20.\textcolor{blue}{g3} \textcolor{blue}{b7} 21.\textcolor{blue}{ac1} \textcolor{blue}{we4}

Also uselessly dilatory. The queen ought have moved to d5 at once.

22.\textcolor{blue}{efe1} \textcolor{blue}{d5} 23.a3

The prospect of attack was not so sure and immediate as to warrant the sacrifice of the a-pawn, which would have hit Major Martin with two combined strong passed pawns on the queen side.

23...\textcolor{blue}{ac8} 24.\textcolor{blue}{cd1} \textcolor{blue}{we6} 25.\textcolor{blue}{g5} \textcolor{blue}{g7} 26.\textcolor{blue}{d4} \textcolor{blue}{c6}

Overlooking probably that White could safely ignore the menaced capture of the bishop by the reply actually adopted. Black had a good prospect of drawing by playing 26...h6.

Had he taken the bishop, White would have won thus: 27...\textcolor{blue}{xd6} 28.\textcolor{blue}{h6+} g8 29.\textcolor{blue}{xh7+} f8 30.\textcolor{blue}{h8+} e7 31.exd6 etc.

28.\textcolor{blue}{xh5} h8 29.\textcolor{blue}{xh8} \textcolor{blue}{xh8} 30.\textcolor{blue}{e7}

Not as decisive as 30.\textcolor{blue}{h6+} followed by 31.\textcolor{blue}{f8}, for, in answer to the move in the text, Black might have prolonged the combat by replying with 30...f5. Still, however, White was bound to win under any circumstances.

30...\textcolor{blue}{g8} 31.\textcolor{blue}{f6} \textcolor{blue}{f5} 32.\textcolor{blue}{h6}

Black resigns.
correspondence match, and therefore makes it more advisable for the second player to avoid the extremely difficult complications arising upon Black’s playing 4...\textit{h}4, and White’s reply 5.\textit{b}5.

\textbf{Zukertort:} 4...\textit{h}4 (as played in the London-Vienna match), 4...\textit{c}5, and 4...\textit{xd}4 followed by 5.e7 and 6.\textit{c}6, are here the usual continuations. The move in the text is a novelty, and not a bad one, I think.

5.\textit{xc}6

\textbf{Zukertort:} The best reply: 5.g5 would be met by 5...\textit{h}6, and 5.\textit{c}3 by 5...\textit{b}4.

5...\textit{bxc}6 6.\textit{d}3 d5 7.\textit{we}2

\textbf{Zukertort:} The best rejoinder; e4-e5 must be postponed as long as possible.

7.\textit{e}7 8.0-0 0-0 9.\textit{f}4

\textbf{Zukertort:} The proper course to proceed with the development. The queen’s knight can now be posted at d2 or c3, according to circumstances, without blocking the bishop, and the latter will protect at f4 the e-pawn if advanced to e5.

\textbf{9.\textit{b}8}

\textbf{Steinitz:} The Black allies seize the first opportunity of taking possession of the open b-file with the rook, and generally in similar positions the earliest occupation of that file proves sufficient compensation for the c-pawn being elbled. Yet in the present instance a difference of opinion is still prevalent amongst the combatants of this game, whether ...\textit{e}8 instead would not have been better, on the ground that it eventually stopped the advance of the hostile e-pawn to e5 for in that case Black might reply with ...\textit{d}6. Upon consideration, we must confess that at least the reason advanced for the preference that should have been given ...\textit{e}8 is not convincing to our minds for the white pawn appears to us to be more harassing to the defence, if it is supported at e4, than when once advanced to e5, and it should therefore be the aim of the second player to induce the opponent to push the pawn further.

\textbf{Zukertort:} Premature, as it does not prevent the further development of White’s forces, whilst it deprives Black of a counter attack. See note 11...\textit{f}8.

10.\textit{d}2

\textbf{Steinitz:} The proper rejoinder. Black may not venture in reply the capture of the b-pawn, for White would then answer e5 followed by \textit{b}3.

\textbf{Zukertort:} 10.b3 would be bad on account of 10...\textit{dxe}4 11.\textit{xe}4 12.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}6 13.\textit{e}5 \textit{w}7 14.\textit{e}8 15.f4 \textit{c}5+ 16.\textit{h}1 \textit{e}8 17.\textit{exe}5 f6.

10...\textit{e}8

\textbf{Zukertort:} If 10...\textit{xb}2, 11.\textit{b}3 wins the exchange. Very unfavourable Black would be 10...\textit{dxe}4 11.\textit{xe}2 \textit{xb}2 (if 11...\textit{e}8 12.\textit{ad}1) 12.\textit{xe}8 \textit{e}8 13.\textit{e}5 \textit{b}4 (if 13...\textit{xf}6 14.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 15.\textit{e}4 winning a piece, or 14...\textit{xf}6 15.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 16.\textit{h}5 forcing the mate) 14.\textit{f}6 \textit{xf}6 15.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 16.\textit{h}5
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12...gxf4

Steinitz: This was one of the turning points where the whole policy of the future plan of defence had to be settled. It is open to question whether it would have been better to play the knight to g4, followed by ...h6, in answer to ...xf6, even at the hazard of allowing the pawns to be doubled on the h-file, and do not think that White's attack would have been strengthened if this expedient had been adopted.

13...g3 c5

Steinitz: In keeping with the spirit of Black's conduct of the game, the advance of this pawn becomes incumbent upon them sooner or later in order to make their rook available to be brought to the king side by way of b6. The black allies could not safely capture the e-pawn with the knight, followed by ...f6, for White would have obtained a formidable attack by Wh5, after taking the knight with the bishop.

14.c4

Steinitz: As will be seen shortly, this advance presents more threatening features than might appear from it being absolutely imperative for defensive purposes at this juncture.

14...d4 15.f4

Zukertort: 15...a5 would be met by 15...b6 and if 16...b3 c4 17...c6 d6.

15...b6 16...e1 b8 17...c2

Steinitz: An excellent move in every respect, as it not alone weakens the adversaries' position on the king side, but also enables the inactive white knight to be brought into operation for the support of the attack.

17...g6

18...d2

Steinitz: The prosecution of the attack by 18.f5 would have led to no great result
after 18...gx5 19...xf5 10xf5 20...xf5 
followed by ...g6 if White refuse to exchange queens.

18...f5

Zukertort: Black must prevent the white knight from occupying e4, and 18...b7 would be met by 19.f5.

19.exf6

Steinitz: Undoubtedly the best play, or else Black's position would have become perfectly secure, and they might have gained time to consolidate their forces for an attack on the queen side.

19...xe1 20...xe1

Steinitz: In our opinion the white allies here choose a rather artificial mode of procedure, thereby giving their opponents subsequently a good opportunity for recovering advantageous ground. Their object in retaking with the bishop seems to have been to make room for posting the knight at g3, but we believe that the straightforward course of retaking with the rook would have been stronger play, e.g. 20...xe1 

21...e4 d8 (seemingly the best post)

22...g5 g7 23...f3, followed by the after some preliminary precautions may become necessary, for instance a3, in case Black reply ...c6, and retaining a strong attack.

Zukertort: White take with the bishop intending to post the knight at g3 - White's 21st and 22nd moves.

20...xf6 21...e4 e7 22...c6 23.a3

23...g7

Steinitz: This move was hastily made under the pressure of the time which was all the more urgent as the black allies had already called for exhausted their extra twenty minutes grace. It is only fair to their opponents to state that the latter had economized their time, and, though they had just within their time limit, they had occasion to avail themselves surplus twenty minutes accorded them by the stipulations. Instead of the tardy defensive move in the text, we believe, might have turned the game into their favour by pursuing the course of sacrificing the exchange.

23...e3+ 24.h1 xb2 25...xd3 26.b5 d7 27.a5 strongest move, according to Blackburne) 27...a6 (better 27...d6, in which case White would still capture the c-pawn, recovering
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piece by \( \text{wb7} \) 28.\text{wb7} \) (best) 28.\text{xa3} 29.\text{xc7} \text{d4}, followed by \text{dxc6} with a fine game.

Zukertort: Black's best chance was here to force the end-game, by giving up the exchange: 23...\text{e3+} 24.\text{h1} \text{xb2} 25.\text{xb2} \text{xd3}. This continuation was at the time of the game undervalued by both parties, but Black would, I think, still have to fight for a draw. The position is too complicated to admit here a thorough analysis; the following variation is one of the likely continuations: 26.\text{b5} \text{d2} 27.\text{b7} \text{xc4} 28.\text{xc7} \text{d5} 29.\text{f5} \text{xf5} \text{f1}\text{f2} \text{g3}+ \text{d2} with a fine attack) 30.\text{xf5} \text{g5} 31.\text{d2} \text{c4} 32.\text{g5} \text{c3} 33.\text{c8}, threatening \text{h6}, or \text{d8} or \text{xf5}.

24.\text{d2} \text{d7} 25.\text{e1} \text{xf8} 26.\text{b4}!

Steinitz: A very strong onslaught, which was at any rate very difficult to resist.

Zukertort: A happy rejoinder, which gives White the superiority against any reply. White get rid of the only weak point in their position.

26...\text{xb4}

Steinitz: Black's position was very much harassed by their doubled pawn, and at first sight it seems a great relief to them get rid of it; but this premature capture was nevertheless like throwing up the game of a sudden, since all the white pawns and pieces on the queen side thereby were released from inactivity, while Black's position lost its cohesion, and the separated pawns became difficult to defend. We believe there was still sufficient defensive power latent in Black's position to render the game quite even, had they simply retreated the queen to \text{b8}, instead of adopting the ruinous moves in the text.

Zukertort: The move in the text provides the opponents with an easily won game, but neither 26...\text{h8} nor 26...\text{a6} would equalise matters, e.g.

(1) 26...\text{h8} 27.\text{b5} \text{d7} (27...\text{d8} 28.\text{a5} \text{d7} 29.\text{e4}) 28.\text{a5} \text{d7} 29.\text{d5} \text{xf5} 30.\text{xf5} \text{xf5} 31.\text{xf5} \text{e8+} \text{h8} 32.\text{d7} \text{b8} 34.\text{xc7} \text{c8} 35.\text{d6};

(2) 26...\text{a6} 27.\text{b5} \text{axb5} 28.\text{cxb5} \text{d7} 29.a4 followed up by 30.\text{a5}. Better still than 27.\text{b5} would be 27.\text{e4} \text{xb4} 28.\text{c5} \text{h8} 29.axb4 \text{h8} (29...\text{xb4} 30.\text{b3} \text{h8} 31.\text{xb4} \text{a5} 32.\text{d5}) 30.\text{d1} \text{a8} 31.\text{a2} (attacking the pawn and threatening 32.\text{g5}) 31...\text{f5} 32.\text{d5} \text{e7} 33.\text{d7} \text{c8} (if 33...\text{c6} 34.\text{e1}) 34.\text{xc8}+ \text{c8} 35.\text{a1} \text{a8} 36.\text{b5} etc.

27.\text{c5} \text{b8} 28.\text{axb4} \text{e8}

Zukertort: If 28...\text{h8}, White proceed with 29.\text{b5} \text{d8} 30.\text{c6} \text{e6} 31.\text{a4} \text{a8} 32.\text{b6} \text{c5} (32...\text{d6} would be equally met by... 33.b7 \text{b8} 34.\text{c1} \text{b6} 35.\text{a5} \text{b2} 36.\text{b1} \text{a2} 37.\text{xa2} \text{a2} 38.\text{xc7} \text{xb1} 39.\text{xd8}! queening in two more moves.

29.\text{xe8} \text{xe8}

Steinitz: There is much to be said pro and contra the chances of either ...\text{xe8} or ...\text{xe8}, but Black's game was bad anyhow.

Zukertort: If 29...\text{xe8} 30.\text{b5} \text{e7} 31.\text{a2}+ \text{h8} 32.\text{c6} and 33.\text{xa7}.
This form of attack has latterly come into favour, and seems to be quite as efficacious as the older line of 5.d4, at this point which, if properly defended, leads mostly to a drawn game.

5...b5 6...b3

6...a7

The only proper move at this point. If ...c5 at once would enable the player to gain an advantage in position by throwing the a-pawn forward to e4 since Black could not reply ...b4 on account of White's answer a7xf7+. Followed by wc4+, if the bishop be taken. The text move may be safely adopted regardless of White's attack by c7 since Black may then reply with ...e5 and White dare not venture the capture of the f-pawn neither with the bishop check, nor with the knight. For in either case Black would win a piece, e.g. firstly: 7.g5 d4 8.xf7+ xf7 9.xd3 (or d1) h6 etc.; secondly: 7.g5 d4 8.xf7 xe7 followed by ...xb3.

7.c3

This strikes us as quite as good as the usual continuation of d3, or c3.

7...c5 8.d5?

A feeble move. We might recommend here 8.c2, followed by xe5 if Black allows.
8...0-0 9.\xe5
Strong as it looks, it seriously compromizes White’s game if properly replied to, and of course Mr. Zukertort is not prone to neglect the exact measures which give him the advantage.
9...\x6d5 10.\x6c6 dxc6!
Well played, though the queen’s bishop is temporarily blocked, its release is not alone secured, but its action must become more formidable subsequently, in conjunction with the open file for the queen.
11.d4 \xb6 12.exd5 \xe8 13.\xe3

13...c5!
Black pursues the attack with judicious care, without relaxing in vigour. This advance is much stronger than taking the d-pawn at once with the queen, for White might then have offered the exchange of queens at f3.
14.0-0 cxd4 15.cxd4 \x6d5
16.\x6g4 \xe4 17.\x6g3 \xd7 18.h3
\xe6 19.\x6f4 \xd5!
The return of the queen to d5 is well timed, and the most effectual mode to prevent White from making his position comparatively safe by f3. He evidently cannot adopt the latter resource now, for Black would then capture the bishop with the rook.
20.\x6h2 \x6g6 21.g4
Had White advanced this pawn only as far as g3, the game might have gone on thus: 21.g3 \x6d4 22.\xc3 \x6x3+ 23.fxg3 (best) 23...\xe3+ 24.\x6f2 \xd2, with a winning game.
21...f5 22.\xc3 \x6f3 23.g5

23...\x6d4!
The situation is prolific of fine opportunities for brilliant combinations, of which Mr. Zukertort is not slow to avail himself. Black’s terminating manoeuvres are executed in the most finished style.
24.\xf4 \x6xg5+! 25.\x6xg5 \xe5
White resigns.

143 Italian Game
Blackburne and Potter
Steinitz and Zukertort
Consultation Game, London,
24 July 1875
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz
Steinitz: The following remarkably interesting game was played at a chess party given by Mr. Kunwald at the latter gentleman’s residence in New Burlington Street, and for a prize liberally offered by the host. The time for deliberation allowed to each party was ten moves per hour, and the limit was regulated by the means of sand glasses.
1.e4 e5 2.\xf3 \xc6 3.\xc4 \xc5 4.b4 \xb6
Steinitz: The Evans Gambit Declined is a safe game for the second player, and in
our opinion the chances are even in the latter's favour, if the attack proceed in the usual way by b5.

5.a4
Steinitz: Anderssen's favourite continuation, and no doubt less compromising than 5.b5, which may be defended in the following manner: 5...\(\text{Qa5}\) 6.\(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Qh6}\) 7.d4 d6 8.\(\text{Qxh6}\) dxe5 9.\(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) (9...\(\text{Qxd4}\), recommended by Mr. Zukertort, may perhaps be quite as good) 10.\(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qxf7}\) 11.\(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Qg5}\), with an excellent game, though White has four pawns for the piece.

5...\(\text{Qa6}\) 6.\(\text{c3}\)
Zukertort: Choosing an old Giuoco Piano variation.

6...\(\text{Qf6}\) 7.\(\text{Qe2}\) d6
Zukertort: After 7...0-0 8.d3 d5 9.exd5 \(\text{Qxd5}\) 10.0-0, the protection of Black's e-pawn would become difficult.

8.d3 \(\text{Qe6}\) 9.\(\text{Qa3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 10.0-0
Steinitz: It would have probably been much more troublesome to the defence if White had here captured the queen's bishop, followed by \(\text{Qc4}\), driving back the bishop a step further. The black allies immediately provide a retreat for their bishop by the answer they adopt.

10...\(\text{c6}\) 11.\(\text{Qh1}\) h6
Zukertort: To prevent the continuation 12.\(\text{Qg5}\) and 13.\(\text{f4}\), which would increase the advantage of the first players.

12.\(\text{Qg1}\)
Steinitz: Anderssen generally prefers, in all similar positions, to retreat the knight to e1, and we believe that the latter course is more commendable, giving the knight wider scope of action. In some cases he may then be brought to the queen side by way of c2, and in others he may be posted at g2, to the support of the point of attack at f4 after making room by g3.

Zukertort: I prefer 12.\(\text{Qxe6}\) fxe6 13.\(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 14.d4 exd4 15.\(\text{Qxd4}\) etc.
12...g5 13.\textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Steinitz}: The immediate attack by d4, after exchanging bishops, would have been premature against the best defence, e.g. 13.\textit{\textbf{x}e6 fxe6 14.d4 exd4 15.e5 dxe5 16.\textit{\textbf{xe6+}} \textit{\textbf{xd}5} 17.\textit{\textbf{xe6+}} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 18.\textit{\textbf{f}5} 0-0 maintaining the pawn, with a good game.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Zukertort}: The exchange of bishops, followed up by the advance of the d-pawn, would now simplify matters very much, but its ultimate result was favourable to Black, e.g. 13.\textit{\textbf{x}e6 fxe6 14.d4 exd4 15.e5 dxe5 16.\textit{\textbf{xe5}} \textit{\textbf{f}7} 17.\textit{\textbf{c}4} \textit{\textbf{c}7} 18.\textit{\textbf{xd}4} \textit{\textbf{xd}4} 19.\textit{\textbf{cxd}4} \textit{\textbf{g}6} 20.\textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{a}d}8 etc.
\end{quote}

13...\textit{\textbf{c}7} 14.f3
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Steinitz}: To advance the d-pawn without exposing the e-pawn to capture. If instead 13.\textit{\textbf{x}e6 fxe6 15.d4}, the game would proceed as follows: 15...\textit{\textbf{x}e4} 16.\textit{\textbf{h}5+} \textit{\textbf{d}7} 17.\textit{\textbf{d}5}.
\end{quote}

14.\textit{\textbf{g}6} 15.\textit{\textbf{g}3} d5 16.\textit{\textbf{a}2}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Zukertort}: White does not take the pawn, as Black would retake with great advantage with the knight.
\end{quote}

16...0-0

17.\textit{\textbf{f}d1}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Steinitz}: Thus far both parties had carefully kept watch upon every point where either opponent might possibly seal a march upon the other, and the balance of power had been sustained by the manoeuvres on each side. Here, however, the white allies seem to have underrated the importance of Black's reply, otherwise they must have certainly preferred securing their position on the queen's wing by a5.
\end{quote}

17...a5
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Steinitz}: By this move Black either obtains open passage for the queen's rook, with a strong attack upon the hostile a-pawn, or they relieve their queen from the pressure of the adversaries' queen's rook by forcing the reply of b5, which enables them to occupy the comfortable post at e7, clear from all apprehensions from the opponent's queen's bishop. Obviously White would only lose time by trying to support their pawn by \textit{\textbf{c}5}, since Black, after removing the rook to e8, threatens \textit{\textbf{b}6}.
\end{quote}

18.\textit{\textbf{b}5} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 19.\textit{\textbf{c}2} c5 20.\textit{\textbf{c}1}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Zukertort}: This move, in connection with the 18th and 19th of Black, constitutes the turning point in the game. White ought to have played 17.a5, and would then maintain the advantage on the queen's flank and in the centre.
\end{quote}

20...d4
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Steinitz}: With the intention of closing up the game on the queen side completely, and then to break in on the other flank after due preparations. This plan seemed to be the most promising, more especially as room would have been left for various uncertainties if the opponents' knight had been allowed to be posted at e3.
\end{quote}

21.\textit{\textbf{x}e6} \textit{\textbf{x}e6} 22.c4
\begin{quote}
\textbf{Zukertort}: White has now no prospect to win the game; the queen's side is shut up, and the position of the king's flank is clearly in Black's favour.
\end{quote}
22...b6
Steinitz: The black side could well abide their time, since the aims of their prospective attack, the hostile pawns on the king side, were properly fixed; and in the meanwhile they cut off the only bridge on the queen side where the enemy might possibly cross, by sacrificing the b-pawn if they were pushed hard.
Zukertort: To bring matters to a perfect block on this side, before beginning the storm against the adverse king's quarters.

23.Rf1 Qg7
Zukertort: If 23...Qe8 at once, White could reply 24.h4.

24.Wg2 Qh7

25.d2
Steinitz: White wisely refrained from advancing his f-pawn, which might have led to the following continuation: 25.f4 exf4 26.gxf4 f5 27.e5 (best; for if 27.fxg5 instead, Black may answer 27...fxe4, retiring the king to h8 in answer to gxh6+, with a fine game) 27...Qh8 with a strong attack.
Zukertort: If 25.f4 exf4 26.gxf4 f5 27.fxg5 (27.e5 Qh8 28.fxg5 Qxe5 etc.) 27...fxe4 28.gxh6+ Qh8 29.Qxf8+ Qxf8 30.dxe4 (best) 30...Qg8, and Black's attack is irresistible.

25...f5 26.ae1 Qae8 27.Qh3
36.gxh5

Steinitz: Of course, with the intention of sacrificing the exchange, which was their only resource. Had they retreated the knight to e1, the only other alternative, unless they abandoned the important f-pawn, their pieces would have been hopelessly clotted together close to their king, who must have ultimately died of plethora.

Zukertort: The sacrifice of the exchange was the best resource which White had. If 36...e1, Black could either bring more forces in the field or at once sacrifice the knight at f3 with advantage, as the following variations may show:

36...e1 e4 37.xg1 xf3 38.xf3 e4 39.xg4 (if 39...e1 g3 40.xf3 axf2 41.axe2 g4 etc.) 39...xg4 40.xg2 d5 41.e4 (41.xh2 g4 42.e1 e6 43.xd2 g3 44.xg2 xd8 45.xg1 xe4 followed up by 46...f5) 41...g4 42.e4 g3 43.xh3 (43.xh3 xh3 44.xh3 e7 and Black regain the piece, and are two passed pawns ahead) 43...e4.

36...e4 37.xg2 e5 38.xg2

38...xh5

Steinitz: The black allies injudiciously disdain here to force in a simple manner in their own favour by only playing for exchanging queens, and remaining with a clearly won ending game. They ought to have taken with the rook, when the subjoined continuation must in all probability have arisen:

38...xh5 39.xf6+ xf6 40.xg4 xh8 41.xg2 xh6 42.xc8+ xh8 43.xc6+ xxc6 44.bxc6 xh3 45.xe1 xg4 46.fxg4 xh4 and wins.

Zukertort: Black overlooks here that the strongest continuation is 38...xh5, which wins easily, e.g.

A) 39.xf6+ xf6 40.xg4 (40.f1 xh8 41.xg2 xh6 42.xg1 xh3 43.xe1 xd8 and White has no means to prevent the advance of Black’s attack) 40...xg4 41.xc8+ xh8 42.g2 xh6 43.xc6+ (forced) 43...xh6 44.bxc6 xh3 45.xe1 xg4 46.fxg4 d4 47.xg5 xe1 48.c6 xh3 and Black wins;

B) 39.xg1 xh8 40.g2 d3 41.xe1 xg2+ 42.xe2 xh6 43.xc1 f3 44.xf2 xh2+ 45.xh2 xh2+ 46.xh2 d3 47.g1 (best) 47...f2+ 48.xf1 xg1+ 49.xe1 xd8 etc.

39.xg1 xd8 40.xe1

40.xf6

Steinitz: At this point one of those microscopic changes in the position occurred which so often exercise an important influence on the main issue without being perceptible previously. The knight had to be removed sooner
or later, and it seemed to make no difference whether he retreated at once. Yet it was not possible to win the game after that, for White gained time to fortify their only vulnerable spot, the h-pawn. The proper play would have been ...$\text{h}7$, and not to remove the knight so long as the hostile queen commanded the square g4. The game must have then been won by force for Black, and the most probable continuation was the following: 40...$\text{h}7$ 41.$\text{h}3$ $\text{gh}8$ 42.$\text{f}1$ $\text{f}6$ 43.$\text{h}2$ (best) 43...$\text{g}4$ 44.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{g}4+$ 45.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{x}h2$ 46.$\text{f}3$ $\text{h}3$ 47.$\text{d}1$ f3, threatening mate in two more moves, commencing with 48...$\text{g}2+$, and wins easily.

Zukertort: The doubling of the rooks, followed up by ...$\text{f}6$, would have again won for Black, as the following continuation may show: 40...$\text{h}7$ 41.$\text{h}3$ $\text{gh}8$ 42.$\text{f}1$ $\text{f}6$ 43.$\text{h}2$ $\text{g}4$ 44.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{x}g4+$ 45.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{x}h2$ 46.$\text{g}2$ (Best. If 46.$\text{f}3$ $\text{h}3$ 47.$\text{d}1$ f3) 46...$\text{x}g2+$ 47.$\text{x}g2$ f3+ 48.$\text{g}3$ $\text{h}1$ and Black must win.

41.$\text{h}3$ $\text{f}7$

Steinitz: The chief difference consisted now in White being able to offer the exchange of queens without sustaining any loss if Black took the knight, e.g. 41...$\text{g}4$ 42.$\text{g}4$ $\text{g}4+$ 43.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{h}3$ 44.$\text{g}2$ $\text{gh}8$ 45.$\text{f}2$ $\text{h}2+$ 46.$\text{f}1$, followed by $\text{f}1$, and Black cannot win, their bishop being shut out from the game.

Zukertort: The king was played to protect the queen, and so to prevent the continuation 42.$\text{x}f6+$ $\text{x}f6$ 43.$\text{g}4$. The king ought to have been played, however, to $d7$, which would have given Black the chance to win the game still: 41...$\text{d}7$ 42.$\text{f}1$ $\text{h}7$ 43.$\text{h}2$ $\text{gh}8$

44.$\text{g}2$ $\text{g}4$ 45.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{f}3$ 46.$\text{g}3$ $\text{f}6$ 47.$\text{f}3$ $\text{f}7$ 48.$\text{f}4$ 49.$\text{f}4$ $\text{f}4+$ etc.) 46...$\text{f}7$

47.$\text{f}2$ $\text{f}6$ etc.

42.$\text{f}1$ $\text{h}5$ 43.$\text{h}2$ $\text{gh}8$

44.$\text{g}2$ $\text{h}8$ 45.$\text{a}1$ $\text{c}7$

46.$\text{b}3$ $\text{c}8$ 47.$\text{c}1$ $\text{h}6$

48.$\text{f}2$ $\text{h}4$ 49.$\text{e}2$

49...$\text{e}7$

Zukertort: Preventing the intended move of the adverse king to $f1$. If now 50.$\text{e}4$ $\text{g}4$ 51.$\text{x}g4$ $\text{f}3$ 52.$\text{x}f3$ $\text{f}7$, followed up by 53...$\text{g}4$.

50.$\text{h}1$

Steinitz: Black's last move was a trap in the faint hope of taking the opponents unawares. By the move in the text the white allies, who had played the latter part of the game admirably, forced a dead block, and secured a draw.

50...$\text{g}7$ 51.$\text{g}1$

Draw.

144 Evans Gambit

**Burn, Steinitz and Zukertort**

**Blackburne, MacDonnell and Byrne**

Consultation Game. Glasgow.

6 August 1875

Notes by Zukertort

1.$\text{e}4$ $\text{e}5$ 2.$\text{f}3$ $\text{c}6$ 3.$\text{c}4$ $\text{c}4$

4.$\text{b}4$ $\text{xb}4$ 5.$\text{c}3$ $\text{c}5$ 6.0-0 $\text{d}5$

7.$\text{d}4$ $\text{d}4$ 8.$\text{xd}4$ $\text{b}6$ 9.$\text{c}3$
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The game was at this point adjourned, having lasted four hours. It is already clearly in White's favour; Black's pieces are in a cramped position, and their pawns very weak on both flanks.

32...e7 33.f4 g6 34.h3!
The first move of a little manoeuvre, forcing the advance of the adverse f-pawn, which weakens Black's game and blocks the only available square for their knight.

34...g7 35.e2! h8 36.g4 f5 37.e2 f7 38.c3

A very important move. White may now direct his attack on either side, without having to watch for all the consequences which could arise by the capture of the knight at a later part of the game.

16...h5 17.c1 ge7
Compare note to 15...g6.

A bad square for the queen; 13...c8 was preferable.

14.a4 a5
A+...a6 was better. The move in the text weakens the queen's flank.

15.ge2 g6
15...xf3 would not improve Black's prospects, but the move in the text is certainly loss of time, as the knight must return to e7, to relieve the queen from guarding the queen's knight.

16.gf1
An important move. White may now direct his attack on either side, without having to watch for all the consequences which could arise by the capture of the knight at a later part of the game.

16...h5 17.c1 ge7
Compare note to 15...g6.

18.f3 f5 19.wd2 wc8 20.f4
d8 21.gh3 e6 22.xe6+ xe6 23.g5 h4 24.f2
To open the diagonal for the queen and avoid the exchange of bishop against the adverse knight, when at f5.

24...c6 25.d3 f5 26.wf4 ad8
Black ought to have played for a draw, as their numerical superiority is amply matched by the position of their adversaries. 26...g3+ would lead to a drawn game, probably, e.g. 27.xg3 hxg3 28.h3 wd7 29.b1 a7 30.fd1 etc.

27.fe1 h5 28.xe6+ xe6
28...xe6 was preferable.

29.b1 b6
If 29...b8 or ...a7, White would force the advance of this pawn by doubling the rooks on the b-file.

30.wd2 b8 31.ec1

31...g8
If 31...e7, with the view of establishing the bishop at b4, White would force the game in grand style by 32.xa5! bxa5 33.xb8+ ad8 34.xd8+ e7 35.b8:
A) 35...f6 36.el d7 or 36.wd7 37.eb1;
B) 35...g3+ 36.gl wh6 37.cb1.

32.c2
If 31...e7, with the view of establishing the bishop at b4, White would force the game in grand style by 32.xa5! bxa5 33.xb8+ ad8 34.xd8+ e7 35.b8:
A) 35...f6 36.el d7 or 36.wd7 37.eb1;
B) 35...g3+ 36.gl wh6 37.cb1.

32.c2
32...e7 33.f4 g6 34.h3!
The first move of a little manoeuvre, forcing the advance of the adverse f-pawn, which weakens Black's game and blocks the only available square for their knight.
Preparing the attack against the adverse f-pawn, whilst keeping the storm against the queen’s flank. White’s play from the 30th move to the end is distinguished by great precision.

38...\h7 39.\c2 \d7 40.\bc1 \c8

There is no satisfactory defence. If 40...\c7, White proceed with 41.\e1 \bh8 42.\b5.

41.\e1 \g8 42.\b5 \e7
43.\a6\c7
If 43...\a8 44.\d3.
44.\xh4\e6

45.\g3
This move brings to an end a hard fought battle; whatever Black may reply the loss of a second pawn is inevitable.

45...\f7
If 45...\e8, White win by 46.\x7 \hx7 (46...\xe7 47.\b5; if 46...\xe7, White equally reply...)
47.\xc6+ \xc6 48.\xc6+ \xc6 (if 48...\d7 49.\d6+ \c7 50.\c3+ etc.)
If 48...\f7 49.\xg6+ \f8 50.\f6+ \f7 51.\b5 \e7 52.\e6) 49.\xg6+ \d7 50.\b5.
46.\xe7 \xe7 47.\b5 \c5
48.\xc5 \xb5 49.\c6
If 49.cxb6, Black would reply 49...\c4!
49...\e7 50.axb5 \b4 51.\g5 \e7

Henry Bird

If 51...\e4, White proceed with
52.\f6+ \e8 53.\xg6+ \f8 54.\g3, and if then 54...\cg7 55.c7.
52.\xe7+ \xe7 53.\d2 \e6
54.\cd1 \g5 55.fxg5 \xe5
56.\xd5+ \f4 57.\g6 \f6
58.\d7 \g3 59.\xe7

Black resigns.

145 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
Moriau
17 board simultaneous exhibition at City of London Chess Club, 1 September 1875
Notes by Potter
1.e4 \c5 2.\f3 \e6 3.\c3 \c6
4.d4 \cd4 5.\xd4 \a6 6.\e2 \c5 7.\e3 \f6
Black’s last move we do not approve of but this leads to immediate embarrassment.
8.\f5! \xe3 9.\d6+ \f8
10.fxe3 \h6 11.\f3 \g6 12.0-0
White has evidently a fine position.
12...\g7 13.\e1 \f8 14.\d1
\[ \text{f/e} 7 15. \text{f/g3 f5 16. e} 5 \text{ } \text{f7} \\
17. \text{x/c6} \]

White has all along had an eye to keeping his opponent’s bishop locked up, but now does not mind unfastening one of his padlocks. He will scarcely be able to influence the course of the game much.

17...dxc6 18. e4 \text{h} 6
18...\text{h} 8 would appear better.

19. \text{d} 2 b5 20. \text{f/d} 1 \text{a} 7 21. \text{h} 1 \text{c} 7

22. \text{e} 2!

As it were chiseling the game quietly into the desired shape.

22...\text{h} 8 23. \text{f} 4 fxe4

This certainly aids the adversary.

24. \text{x} e 4 \text{d} 7 25. \text{x} d 7 \text{x} d 7

26. \text{f} 6 \text{e} 8 27. \text{w} 3

Black resigns.

If 27...\text{g} 7 or 27...\text{w} 7, White wins a rook by 28. \text{x} 6. If 27...\text{f} 5 28. g 4 g 5
29. \text{x} 6. If 27...\text{g} 8 (best) 28. \text{x} 6 \text{w} 6 29. \text{x} 6 etc.

Editors’ note: After 27...\text{f} 5 or 27...\text{g} 8, 28. \text{d} 7 looks even stronger.

146 Queen’s Pawn Game

Potter

Zukertort

1st Match Game, West End Chess Club, 2 November 1875

Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1. \text{d} 4 d 5 2. \text{g} 3

Steinitz: Recommendable when the second player has answered ...f5, but rather tame and meaningless in the regular continuation. White will find it difficult now to utilise the e-pawn. The Indian players, with native genius, play in the king’s fianchetto the d-pawn one square and in the queen’s fianchetto the e-pawn one square. Now that White’s d-pawn is already moved to d4, the king’s fianchetto looks like a breach of the aesthetic rules of development.

Zukertort: The peculiar way chosen by Mr. Potter to develop his game is, even for a close game, slow.

2...\text{f} 6 3. \text{g} 2 e 6 4. c 3 b 6

Steinitz: It strikes us as much better to reserve an outlet for the queen on the queen side, and we should therefore have preferred ...c5. Since White could, then, never advantageously capture the c-pawn, Black would have had the option at any time to support the pawn by ...b6, or else of leaving the line open for the queen as exigencies required.

Zukertort: To establish the queen’s bishop at b7, which prevents any advance of the adverse centre; it opens, besides, to the bishop the important square a6.

5.f3

Steinitz: Too early for a waiting opening, though it may be done sometimes after bringing the pieces out and castling.
5...\texttt{b7}
6.\texttt{h3} \texttt{c5} 7.\texttt{f2} \texttt{c6}
8.\texttt{g5}

Zukertort: Giving to the opponent the opportunity to get rid of the weak pawn $e3$; 11...\texttt{c8} was sound.

12.\texttt{xd4}
Steinitz: Still more surprising is White's weak reply. Instead of availing himself of his only chance of relieving the e-pawn from all embarrassment, he retains it in the old position, and, as will be seen, this constituted the sore point in White's game all through.
Zukertort: Inferior to 12.\texttt{exd4}.

12...\texttt{c8} 13.\texttt{a3}
Zukertort: If 13.\texttt{c3}, then likewise:
13...\texttt{a6} and 14...\texttt{a5}.

13...\texttt{a6}

14.\texttt{d2}
Steinitz: Mr. Potter does not play the game with his usual circumspection: otherwise he would have certainly moved the queen to $a4$ instead, and thereby have driven the bishop to the file where he prevented the casting. Of course it would have been useless for Black to attempt to keep the watch of the line by 16...\texttt{c4}. If White would have simply answered, 16...\texttt{d2}, and if Black then ventured...\texttt{b5}, attacking the queen, the latter could safely retire to $d1$, threatening to win a piece.
Zukertort: 14.\texttt{wa4} was of doubtful merit as the following continuation ma...
show: 14.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\texttt{wa4}}} \textcolor{green}{\texttt{c4}} 15.\texttt{d2} b5
16.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{wd1}} \textcolor{green}{\texttt{wa5}}:

\begin{center}
\textbf{analysis diagram}
\end{center}

A) 17.\texttt{b3} \texttt{wc3} 18.\texttt{bxc4} (18.\texttt{g4} \texttt{\texttt{xe3!!}) 18...\texttt{xe3+} 19.\texttt{e2} (19.\texttt{f1} \texttt{xd4}) 19...\texttt{xe2+} 20.\texttt{xe2} \texttt{\texttt{xd4+}}
21.\texttt{f1} (21.\texttt{d1} \texttt{\texttt{f5}) 21...\texttt{c2}
22.\texttt{c1} (22.\texttt{a2} \texttt{e3+} 23.\texttt{g1} bxc4)
22...\texttt{xa3} 23.\texttt{c5} \texttt{\texttt{c4} 24.\texttt{b3} a5 and
Black will remain with four pawns
against a piece and the better position;
B) 17.\texttt{b4} \texttt{\texttt{b6} 18.\texttt{xc4} bxc4
19.\texttt{g4} \texttt{e7} 20.0-0 a5 21.bxa5 \texttt{\texttt{wa5}}
with the superior game.

14...\texttt{a5} 15.\texttt{f1}
Steinitz: This was now the best. Had he
played 15.\texttt{b4}, Black could answer
15...\texttt{c3}!.

15...\texttt{xf1} 16.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{\texttt{d7} 17.\texttt{g2}
\texttt{\texttt{c7} 18.\texttt{e1}}
Steinitz: White gives the enemy too much
time for concentrating his forces on the
queen side. He ought to have opposed
his rook at c1.

Zukertort: 18.\texttt{c1} was not satisfactory,
but certainly better.

18...\texttt{fc8} 19.\texttt{e2} \texttt{\texttt{b5} 20.\texttt{b4}
Steinitz: 20.b3 appears stronger play.
Black's knight is only driven where he
wanted to go.

Zukertort: On 20.b3, Black replies with
20...\texttt{c2}.

20...\texttt{b7}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Match with Potter 1875}
\end{center}

Zukertort: Superior to 20...\texttt{c4}, which
would relieve White of his cramped
position, by exchanging knights.

21.\texttt{b1} \texttt{\texttt{c2}}
Steinitz: Black has now obtained the
vastly superior position.

22.\texttt{f3}
Zukertort: Necessary, to protect the rook.
Black threatened 22...\texttt{a2}, 23...\texttt{c2},
and 24...\texttt{xe2}!

22...\texttt{d6}

23.\texttt{a1}
Steinitz: Mr. Potter seems to have run here
unawares into the overt danger. His
game was here utterly lost by his neg­
lcting to stop his opponent's knight
from coming in at f5. 23.g4 would have
palpably served that purpose, and then
his game would have been fairly defen­
sible, though Black had certainly the
best of it.

Zukertort: 23.g4 was here indispensable,
as the entry of the adverse knight car­
rries the day at once. The move, how­
ever, but prolongs the contest, as the
following continuation would win:
23.g4 \texttt{\texttt{b8c3} 24.\texttt{b3} \texttt{\texttt{exe2} 25.\texttt{we2}
\texttt{wa4}}:

A) 26.\texttt{a1} \texttt{\texttt{c4} 27.\texttt{d1} \texttt{xa3}
28.\texttt{c2} (28.\texttt{b2} \texttt{a2} and 29...\texttt{d2+})
28...\texttt{c2} 29.\texttt{c1} \texttt{\texttt{b3} etc.};
B) 26.\texttt{c1} \texttt{\texttt{c2} 27.\texttt{d1} \texttt{\texttt{c2} and
28...\texttt{d2+};
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C) 26.\text{\textit{W}}a2  \textit{Q}c4 27.\textit{Q}d1  \textit{E}xb3  
28.\textit{E}xb3  \textit{W}xb3 29.\textit{W}xb3  \textit{Q}d2+ 30.\textit{W}e2  \textit{Q}xb3 31.\textit{W}d3  a5 32.\textit{W}c3  
34.

23...\textit{Q}f5 24.g4

Steinitz: This gives Black occasion to execute a forcible series of onslaughts, but White could hardly save the game anyhow. If he played 24.\textit{Q}b1, the telling answer was 24...\textit{E}8c3; and if he retired the knight to f1, a clear pawn was lost thus: 24.\textit{Q}f1  \textit{E}xe2 25.\textit{W}xe2  \textit{Q}xe2+ 26.\textit{W}xe2  \textit{E}xc3  
26.\textit{W}xb5  \textit{Q}xd4+.  

Zukertort: Black threatened 24...\textit{Q}xe4 25.\textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}xd4+. Besides the move in the text, White had two other answers which may be examined:

A) 24.\textit{Q}b3  \textit{E}xe2 25.\textit{W}xe2  \textit{Q}xe4+ 26.\textit{W}xe2  \textit{E}c3 27.\textit{E}c1 (best)  
27...\textit{E}xe3+ 28.\textit{W}d2  h5 29.\textit{Q}d3  \textit{E}e4 30.\textit{Q}f2  \textit{Q}xd4 31.\textit{W}c8+  \textit{Q}h7 32.\textit{Q}xe4  
\textit{Q}xb3+ 33.\textit{W}e3 (best) 33...\textit{Q}xe4 and Black maintains bishop, knight and pawn against a rook;  

B) 24.\textit{Q}f1  \textit{E}xe2 25.\textit{W}xe2  \textit{E}c3! 26.\textit{W}xb5  (26.\textit{Q}d1  \textit{E}xe2+ and  
27...\textit{Q}xa3, or still stronger, 26...\textit{W}a4!  
27.\textit{Q}g2  \textit{W}xa3 etc.) 26...\textit{Q}xd4+  
27.\textit{Q}g2  \textit{Q}xb5 etc.

24...\textit{Q}xe3!

Steinitz: A very fine conception. Best play matched against best could not save White’s game now.
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Zukertort: The proper rejoinder, must stronger than 24...\textit{Q}xd4 25.gxf5 \textit{Q}xa1  

25.\textit{Q}xe3  

Zukertort: If 25.\textit{Q}xe3, Black can simply proceed with 25...\textit{E}8c3+ 26.\textit{Q}d3  
\textit{Q}xd3+ 27.\textit{W}f2  \textit{Q}xd4+ and 28...\textit{Q}xa1  

25...\textit{Q}xd4 26.\textit{Q}e2  

Zukertort: There is nothing better to be done: if 26.\textit{Q}f1  \textit{Q}xa1 27.\textit{W}xa1  \textit{E}ch1  
26.a4  \textit{W}xb4; if 26.\textit{Q}b1  \textit{Q}xe3 27.\textit{Q}xe3  
\textit{E}8c3+ 28.\textit{W}d4  \textit{Q}xd2+! 29.\textit{W}xc1  
\textit{Q}c4+ 30.\textit{Q}e5  \textit{Q}c7+ 31.\textit{W}d4  \textit{Q}e5+ etc.  

26...\textit{Q}xa1 27.\textit{W}xa1

27...\textit{E}2c3+  

Zukertort: The continuation actually played I had in view when sacrificing the knight. The simpler course was  
27...\textit{E}8c3+ 28.\textit{Q}e3  d4 29.\textit{Q}xc3  \textit{d}x\textit{c}3  
30.\textit{Q}d4 (30.\textit{W}f1  \textit{W}xf1 31.\textit{Q}xf2+! 32.\textit{Q}x\textit{f}2  c2) 30...\textit{W}e2+  
31.\textit{Q}g3  \textit{W}e3+ 32.\textit{Q}h4  \textit{W}xf2. 

28.\textit{Q}e3  d4 29.\textit{Q}xc3  \textit{Q}xc3- 
30.\textit{Q}g2  \textit{Q}c6+ 31.\textit{Q}d4  
Zukertort: If 31.\textit{Q}f4 Black proceeds with  
31...f5 (not good is 31...\textit{Q}d3? 32.\textit{Q}f5  
33.gxf5  \textit{Q}xf5 34.\textit{W}a2+) 32.gxf5  \textit{Q}xf5  
33.\textit{W}a2+  \textit{Q}f8 34.b5  \textit{W}b7 35.\textit{W}e6  \textit{fxe}4  
36.\textit{W}f5+ (36.\textit{W}d6+  \textit{Q}f7) 36...\textit{W}e7  
37.\textit{W}xe4  \textit{W}g6+.  

31...f5 32.gxf5  \textit{Q}xf5 33.\textit{W}a2+  \textit{Q}c4  
Steinitz: The proper rejoinder, after which no hope is left for White.
Zukertort: If 33...\( \text{f8} \), White would prolong the contest by 34.b5 \( \text{wb7} \) 35.\( \text{we6} \).
34.\( \text{ag3} \) fxe4 35.\( \text{axe4} \) \( \text{f8} \)
36.\( \text{g5} \) h6 37.\( \text{f3} \) bc3
White resigns.

147 Bird's Opening
Potter
Zukertort
11th Match Game, West End Chess Club,
27 November 1875
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz
1.f4 \( \text{d5} \) 2.e3 \( \text{f6} \) 3.\( \text{f3} \) e6 4.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5.0-0 0-0 6.d3
Steinitz: The outlet for the bishop is generally opened by b3 in this debut, and this course seems to us the more rational. The present mode of proceeding just disengages one square for one bishop while it entirely blocks up the other.
6...b6
Steinitz: We would always recommend for the second player in this opening to postpone this move until ...c5 and ...\( \text{dc6} \) are played. The move in the text becomes a loss of time in some cases, where a break can be forced by the advance of the e-pawn.
Zukertort: Necessary, to be ready to play ...\( \text{b7} \) whenever White threatens to advance his e-pawn.
7.h3 c5 8.\( \text{we1} \) \( \text{c6} \)

9.g4
Steinitz: We are decidedly of opinion that the balance of chances will mostly turn in favour of the defence against this sort of attack, with the pawns on the king side, when almost wholly unsupported by any of the minor pieces, as in the present case.
Zukertort: This premature advance must involve his own king in difficulties.
9...e5
Zukertort: The right rejoinder: preparing to dislodge the adverse knight and opening the file for the queen's bishop.
10.\( \text{wh4} \) e4 11.\( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 12.\( \text{c3} \) exd3 13.cxd3 d4 14.\( \text{ae4} \)
Zukertort: 14.exd4 was preferable; the move in the text gives Black the opportunity to weaken the opponent's game on both flanks.
14...dxe3
Steinitz: If our contention in the next note be correct, then this capture at the present moment would amount to an ill-timed transposition of otherwise proper manoeuvres. It seems, moreover, that if Black had now played ...\( \text{d6} \) the same position must have been brought about as actually occurred, without in the least compromising Black's game.
15.\( \text{xf6+} \) gxf6 16.\( \text{xe3} \)
Steinitz: And why not \( \text{xf6} \)? It seems to us that the opponent's far-advanced pawn could not then be maintained and the most likely continuation was as follows: 16.\( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{d5} \) 17.\( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 18.\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 19.\( \text{f3} \) etc.
16...\( \text{g6} \)
Zukertort: Black takes now the attack in his hand (see note to 9.g4) and turns all his forces against the weak flank of the adverse king. From this point to the 32nd move Black proceeds in the best way.
17. \( \text{Wg3 f5} \)
Zukertort: To prevent the later advance of White's f-pawn.

18. \( g5 \text{ e8} 19. \text{c2} \)
Steinitz: 19. \( \text{g2} \) strikes us as much stronger play. The knight was useless on the queen side, while in the place we indicated the f-pawn, which proved such a source of weakness in White's game, acquired additional protection.

19. \( \text{b7} \)
Zukertort: 19... \( \text{c7} \) at once was not preferable, as White may reply 20. \( \text{ae1} \), and Black cannot then sacrifice the exchange (... \( \text{xe3} \)) with any advantage.

20. \( \text{ae1 c7} 21. \text{d2} \)
Zukertort: Black threatened 21... \( \text{xe3} \); if then 22. \( \text{xe3} \) (22. \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 23. \( \text{w}h4 \) \( \text{g6} \) 22... \( \text{xf4} \) 23. \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) etc.

21. \( \text{e7} \)
Steinitz: On principle we would have put the rook at e6, with the additional support from the pawn in certain contingencies, and also with the view of opening the game by ...f6, if opportunity be favourable.

22. \( \text{d1 e8} 23. \text{xe7 xe7} 24. \text{h4} \)
Zukertort: 24. \( b3 \) would avail nought, as Black answers 24... \( b5 \).

24... \( \text{c4} \)
Steinitz: An excellent move. Whether White take this pawn, or advance his own d-pawn, the reply of ... \( \text{e4} \) would be decisive. The expedient usually resorted to by White does not recommend matters.

25. \( \text{h5 cxd3} 26. \text{hxg6} \)
Zukertort: 26. \( \text{b4} \) was not preferable, as account of 26... \( \text{e2} \) 27. \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 28. \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 29. \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 30. \( \text{d2} \).

26... \( \text{dxc2} 27. \text{gxf7+} \)
Zukertort: 27. \( \text{gxh7+} \) would be countered by 27... \( \text{hxh7} \) 28. \( \text{h3}+ \) \( \text{e8} \) 29. \( \text{c3} \) \( f6 \) and 30... \( \text{h7} \). If 27. \( \text{e1} \) then 27... \( \text{fxg6} \) 28. \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{e2} \) 29. \( \text{e1}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) and White must give up queen.

27. \( \text{xf7} \)
Steinitz: In our opinion this was an ill-advised capture. It appears to us that adversary's plans for a counter attack would have been completely upset if Black had simply moved the king to f8. If then White played 28. \( \text{h5} \), telling answer would have been 28... \( \text{c4} \); and if he moved the bishop to f3, Black would proceed 28... \( \text{c5+} \), followed accordingly with ... \( \text{c4} \) or ... \( \text{e2} \).

28. \( \text{h5 e7} 29. \text{b3+} \) \( \text{f6} \)
30. \( \text{h3 c5+} 31. \text{h2} \)
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out subjecting himself to immediate
destruction, nor ought the resource
adopted have been of any real avail.
Zukertort: A nice coup, threatening to
play 32...c1 queening, 33...xc1 xc1.
The rook cannot be taken of course.

32...wb3 d5 33...d3 c1

Steinitz: Black’s fine leap of genius
marked in our last note seems to have
brought in its wake a lapse of energy.
The proper move was 33...c4!

Zukertort: The strongest continuation was
33...c4:
A) 34...f3 xf1 35...a8+ g7
36...c3+ xc3 and wins;
B) 34...c3 e5 35...xel ff2+ 36...h3 fl+ etc.
A simple way of winning the game was
33...g3 34...xf1 d4 35...c1 xa2
36...g3 d5 and Black has the far
superior position, and is two pawns
ahead.

34...xc1 xc1 35...xf5+

35...g8

Steinitz: Black had still the game in hand
but failed to perceive the difference
that must have arisen in the end posi­
tion if he had now played the king to
e7.

Zukertort: Giving the game out of hand at
the last moment: 35...e7 wins against
any play. Should White then proceed to
check, Black will bring his king in

safety on the queen’s side, and so re­
main a piece ahead; should White cap­
ture the rook at once, then the follow­
ing continuation is equally deciding:
36...xc1 ff2+ 37...h3 g2+ 38...g4
e3+ 39...h3 g2+ 40...h4 h2+
41...h3 ff4+ 42...g4 xg4
43...xg4 xc1 44...e4+ g8
45...a8+ c8 46...xa7 c4+ etc.

36...xc1 ff2+ 37...h3 g2+
38...g4 f3+ 39...h3 g2+
40...h4 f2+

Zukertort: I repeated here the moves to
gain time for re-examination of the
position.

41...h3 g2+ 42...g4 f3+
43...h3 g2+ 44...h4 f2+
45...h3 g2+ 46...h4 h2+
47...h3 ff4+

Zukertort: 47...g8 and 48...xh5
would but draw.

48...g4 xg4

Steinitz: The repetitions were evidently
for the purpose of making up for short­
ness of time, and in order to keep
within the stipulated limit.

49...g4

Draw.
- see our note here - in which case the same situation must have been arrived at, with the difference in favour of Black that his bishop was protected.

Zukertort: Black can now give perpetual check.

148 Dutch Defence

Zukertort
Potter
12th Match Game, West End Chess Club,
2 December 1875
Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Potter

1. c4 g6

Steinitz: The fianchetto is an introduction from the East, and may almost be ranked amongst its mysteries. If theoretically sound it may be adopted by any party, first or second player, for it seems to leave scarcely any mark in the opening. But who is to prove its correctness, when so much depends upon the apparently most trifling incident in the progress of the game?

Potter: Many strong players approve this defence, and upon principle it should seem sound, for a diagonal is obtained bearing down upon White's weakest part. Nevertheless Dr. Zukertort considers this defence to be worth but little, and there is no doubt much to be said on behalf of his view, on account of the difficulty the second player has in developing his pieces, and perhaps the temptation which the opening subjects him to of developing his pawns instantly is something in point too.

2. d4 Kg7 3. Qf3 d6

Steinitz: Now the game would be reduced to the Indian Defence, but for the difference that White has not played e4. We rather think that the distinction is fatal to the analogy, and that the defence towards the ultimate advance of the e-pawn must lose its chief force when the opponent's d-pawn can be supported by another pawn.

4. e3 f5

Steinitz: Black is early playing the pawn game on his tender flank, the king side. Always a dangerous policy, for the pawns become stationary, and the opponent can abide his time for assaulting them, either with pawns or pieces, when there is a chance of uncovering the king, who is relying upon their support.

Zukertort: Black should develop his king's knight.

5. Qe2 c6

Zukertort: This and the next move prepare the advance of the e-pawn, but they give time to the opponent to bring all his forces into action.

6. 0-0 Wc7
Potter: With the object of playing ...e5. His purpose, therefore, though second player, is to get up an attack, an offence against the principles of the game for which he soon suffers.

7...c3 e5

Steinitz: That was no doubt premature, and 7...g6, with the view of castling, was certainly more to the purpose. If White in the meanwhile advanced the pawn to d5, the rejoinder of ...a6 followed by ...c5, must have left still in suspense, the calculation of chances in the fight for position.

8.e4

Steinitz: And White is not loath to take time by the forelock. It was a fine moment to offer the cavalry fight if Black take either pawn.

Zukertort: The right moment to open the game.

Potter: The advance of the king's pawn to his fourth when it can be made, and as a breaking-up agent, always tells in close games.

8...d6

Steinitz: A multitude of different games could be produced from the variations arising here, and it would therefore be impracticable to give a full analysis, but we may just point out two of the main lines of play that might have occurred if Black had answered differently. In the first place: 8...fxe4 9.dxe4 d5 10.cxd5 cxd5 11.c3 e4 12.e5, with the superior game. Secondly: 8.f4 9.c5 exd4 10.cxd6 xd6 11.e5 e6 12.e4 d5 13.e4, with a winning attack.

9.dxe5 dxe5 10.c5

Potter: Unmasking a most formidable battery, for he now threatens d4, combined with g5.

10..h6

Potter: Quite necessary, but still very weakening.

Zukertort: If 10...0-0, White proceeds with 11.d4+ and 12.g5.

11.d4 d7 12.d6

Zukertort: The only way to protect the attacked pawn. 12.b4 would be met by 12...a5.

12...w5

Potter: 12...xd6 was no doubt better, but the outlook would scarcely have been lively.

Steinitz: For better or worse Black ought to have accepted the exchange of queens and relied upon the weakness of the opponent's far-advanced d-pawn as a compensation for his cramped position. After retreating the king's knight to g8, he might then have supported his weak point at g6 by ...f8 if White attacked it by vh, and we believe he would have had a good prospect of ultimately coming out with a tolerably defensive position.
Zukertort: 12...\(\text{Bxd6}\) 13.\(\text{cxd6 fxe4}\) was certainly not favourable for Black, but better than the course chosen.

13.\(\text{exf5 gxf5}\) 14.\(\text{Bd1}\)

Steinitz: Probably good enough, but still we think that 14.\(\text{Bxe6}\) would have been an improvement, e.g. 14...\(\text{e4}\) 15.\(\text{Bd4 exf5}\) 16.\(\text{Bxc8 Bxc8}\) 17.\(\text{Bxf5}\) followed by \(\text{Bxg6+}\), with an excellent attack.

14...\(\text{Bf8}\)

Steinitz: In the match between London and Vienna, in which Mr. Potter took such an important part, innumerable opportunities occurred where the queen could be safely sacrificed for two minor pieces in combination with a well-defensible far-advanced passed pawn. We can therefore scarcely account for Mr. Potter leaving here such a fine occasion open to his astute adversary for effecting such a surprise.

Zukertort: If 14...\(\text{Bxc5}\) 15.\(\text{Bxc5}\) \(\text{Bxc5}\) 16.\(\text{Bxe5}\).

15.\(\text{Bxe6!}\)

Potter: A most beautiful manoeuvre, and possessing that quality without which brilliancy is little to be admired – viz., soundness.

Zukertort: The sacrifice of the queen, connected with this capture, is perfectly sound: White gets a victorious attack.

15...\(\text{Bf6}\) 16.\(\text{Bxg7}\)

Steinitz: Evidently deliberately and determined upon with perception of the strength of position. His king is inaccessible hostile attack, and all his pieces developed. The passed h-pawn, in conjunction with the two pieces, alone be sufficient to win in the end.

16...\(\text{Bxd6}\) 17.\(\text{cxd6}\)

Potter: Numerically White has but rook, bishop and pawn queen, but practically he obtains a game.

17...\(\text{Bg6}\)

Zukertort: If 17...\(\text{Bc5}\), 18.\(\text{Bxe5}\).

18.\(\text{Bd1}\)

Steinitz: 18.\(\text{Bg5}\), threatening two moves, was at least equally Black’s best answer was then 18...\(\text{Bxh6}\), whereupon White might have checked with the bishop at f7, forcing the adverse king to d7 for if ...\(\text{Bd8}\) White could first check with the other bishop and then follow it up by \(\text{Bd1}\).

Zukertort: Keeping the triple attack against the adverse e-pawn. If 18...\(\text{Bc8}\), Black improves his game by 18...\(\text{Bd8}\).

18...\(\text{b5}\)

Potter: The line of play initiated by this move answers its purpose – viz., place the king on the other side of the queen’s rook – but the temporary shelter has to be paid for.
Zukertort: There is nothing better to be done; if 18...e4, White proceeds with 19.Qxe4 fx e4 20.Qxe4+ Qd8 21.Qf7.
19.Qe6 b4
Zukertort: 19...Qd8 would be followed up by 20.Qxc8 Qxc8 21.Qxe5.
20.Qxd7+ Qxd7 21.Qxe5 0-0-0
Zukertort: 21...Qxe5 22.Qxe5+ Qxe5 23.Qxe5 bxc3 24.Qxc3 would lead to an endgame with bishops of different colours, but White being then three pawns ahead would easily carry the day.
22.Qxg6 bxc3 23.Qxc3 Qa4
Steinitz: Black's game was untenable, but he might have had some hopes for a protraction of the struggle by now playing the queen to b5.
Zukertort: If 23...Qxa2, then 24.Qa1; if 23...Qa6, then 24.Qd4 Qb7 25.Qe5 etc.
24.Qd4 Qxa2 25.Qb4

25...Qe6
Zukertort: If 25...Qe8 (the only move besides the coup in the text) 26.Qe7+ Qd7 27.Qb7+ Qxd6 28.Qe5+ Qe6 29.Qg3+ Qf6 (29...Qf7 30.Qxc6+ Qd7 31.Qe5+) 30.Qh4+ Qg7 31.Qxf5+ Qg6 32.Qxd8 Qxf5 33.g4+ Qd8 34.Qxe8.
26.Qe7+ Qd7 27.Qb7+ Qxd6
Steinitz: White's way of effecting the mate after this move is indeed very elegant, and we recommend it to the attentive study of our readers.

Potter: In making this move Black principally concerned himself with the move of Qb4+, after which he thought he saw a chance of escape, though in that he was mistaken. The alternative of 27...Qe8 involved likewise speedy ruin - e.g. 28.Qxf5, threatening 28.Qxe6:+
A) 28...Qd7 29.Qg7+ Qf7 30.Qxe6, winning easily;
B) 28...Qf8 29.Qh6 Qd7 30.Qb4, and Black collapses.
White announced mate in three moves.
Zukertort: Mate follows, of course, by 28.Qe5+ Qc5 29.Qc1+ or Qc4 30.b4 mate.

149 Queen's Indian Defence

Zukertort
Potter

14th Match Game, West End Chess Club, 7 December 1875
Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Potter

1.e3
Potter: e3 being the foundation of the close openings, can without any disadvantage be played first by the player who has the move.
Steinitz: An opening well to be recommended against an opponent who persistently refuses to play an open game as second player. It is always better in that case to anticipate the close fight in a way similar to the above, which makes the game easy enough for the first player, while the adversary has to be on his guard, and, in match games wherein a time limit is adopted, cannot bring any theoretical knowledge to his assistance in saving time.

1...e6
Potter: No doubt as good as any other reply.
2.Qf3 b6 3.d4 Qb7 4.Qe2
Steinitz: Mr. Zukertort considers this the best mode of situating the bishop in this opening, but we believe that $\text{d}3$, with the purpose of reserving the square at $\text{e}2$ for the queen's knight to be brought over by way of $\text{c}3$, has its undeniable advantages.

4...$\text{c}f6$ 5.0-0 $\text{e}7$ 6.c4 0-0 7.$\text{c}3$

Steinitz: Quite as good at least as the way of retreating the knight to $\text{e}1$, often adopted in similar positions.

Zukertort: The right square for the knight from where it can be played advantage on either side.

10...$\text{d}6$ 11.f4 $\text{f}5$ 12.$\text{b}2$

 Potter: Of course unsound. In fact, any attempt of the second player to force an early attack must be so.

Steinitz: Of course unsound. In fact, any attempt of the second player to force an early attack must be so.

Steinitz: At the time when the present game was played — which, as it turned out, wound up the match — Mr. Potter was pushed hard by the state of the score, according to which he would have lost the match, if his opponent was enabled to draw a game. But certainly the position was not so pressing as to call for immediate action in order to avoid a draw, nor was the attack to be obtained on the king side in any way so promising as even to neutralise the disadvantage of the doubled pawn. No doubt it was better, under all the circumstances, to temporise for a more favourable opportunity.

Steinitz: Under the present conditions, Black had to win at all hazards. could not afford a drawn battle. the plan of attack does not appear to us the most efficacious, and we should certainly have preferred forcing a break by ...$\text{g}5$, and then, after endeavouring to bring the king into safety, to accumulate all attacking forces on the $\text{g}$-file.

Zukertort: This and the next move are certainly premature, but I may mention that Mr. Potter plays under the disadvantage of being forced to try to win.

13.$\text{c}1$

Zukertort: Developing all his forces. The best move is 13.$\text{c}5$ $\text{bxc}5$ 14.$\text{dxc}5$ $\text{xc}5$ 15.$\text{xf}6$ $\text{xe}3+$ etc., and Black has a good position and two pawns for the exchange.

13...$\text{h}6$ 14.$\text{f}2$ $\text{d}7$ 15.$\text{f}1$

Steinitz: Developing all his forces. the best move is 13.$\text{c}5$ $\text{bxc}5$ 14.$\text{dxc}5$ $\text{xc}5$ 15.$\text{xf}6$ $\text{xe}3+$ etc., and Black has a good position and two pawns for the exchange.

13...$\text{h}6$ 14.$\text{f}2$ $\text{d}7$ 15.$\text{f}1$

Steinitz: Quite as good at least as the way of retreating the knight to $\text{e}1$, often adopted in similar positions.
Zukertort: Necessary, to prevent the advance of White's pawns on the queen's side.

16...g4

Steinitz: White commences now a well-prepared and well-timed onslaught against the opponent's ill-protected king side.

Zukertort: Having brought all his pieces into action, White begins the attack.

Potter: And Black feels that his life may be short, but will scarcely be merry.

16...fxg4

Steinitz: Forced. The opponent's g-pawn could not be allowed to advance further without getting the rook into trouble.

17...hxg4 18...f6 19...cc2

Potter: A powerful stroke that Thor might try.

19...e8

Steinitz: It appears to us that the only remedy for the weakness in Black's position was to take the d-pawn at once, as to compel the adversary to retake with the bishop, whereupon Black retained a chance of dissolving his double pawn at a favourable occasion. If White, in answer to our proposition, retook with the queen, the game might have gone on thus: 19...cxd4 20...xd4 d8 21...cd2 c7 22...c3 d3, with a good game, for White cannot capture the rook without opening the range of the hostile queen's bishop against his own rook, and thus submitting to the ultimate loss of the exchange. On the other hand, if the queen retreat, either to c2 or c1, Black again can dissolve his double pawn by ...e5.

20...cd2 e8

Steinitz: White threatened dxc5, followed by xf6 and d7; but probably it would have been better to submit to that than to allow the queen's bishop to be blocked out.

Potter: This not only seems but must be feeble. Still, if 20...e6, White may reply 21...xe6+.

Zukertort: Not satisfactory, but is there anything better?

21.d5 exd5 22...xd5 b7 23.e6+

Potter: There is a strong taste of prussic acid about this move.

23...h8 24...g3

Potter: And now Hope says she has an appointment elsewhere.

24...g6

Steinitz: 25...f5 would have been equally good, for Black had no better answer than to retreat the queen at once, whereupon White could take the rook, followed by h4 etc; but it would have been bad play now to capture the
knight at once in order to win the e-pawn, e.g. 25.\textbf{\textit{xf6}} \textbf{\textit{xf6}} 26.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} \textbf{\textit{g2+}} 27.\textbf{\textit{g2}} (best) 27...\textbf{\textit{xe6}} and wins.

\textbf{Zukertort:} Much better than the immediate capture of the knight, e.g. 25.\textbf{\textit{xf6}} \textbf{\textit{xf6}} 26.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} \textbf{\textit{xe6}} 27.\textbf{\textit{xe6}} \textbf{\textit{g2+}} and Black remains in any case, with two bishops against rook and pawn.

\textbf{25...\textit{g5}} 26.\textbf{\textit{xf6}} \textbf{\textit{xf6}}

\textbf{Steinitz:} Evidently with the determination of following it up by the desperate measure of sacrificing a piece; but what else could he do? If 26...\textbf{\textit{gxf6}} 27.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} \textbf{\textit{g2+}} 28.\textbf{\textit{g2}} \textbf{\textit{e5}} 29.\textbf{\textit{g4}} (threatening mate in two moves) 29...\textbf{\textit{h6}} 30.\textbf{\textit{h5}}, followed by \textbf{\textit{g6}} winning easily.

\textbf{Zukertort:} 26...\textbf{\textit{xf6}} would lead to the following continuation: 27.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} \textbf{\textit{g2+}} 28.\textbf{\textit{g2}} \textbf{\textit{h6+}} 29.\textbf{\textit{g1}} \textbf{\textit{g5}} 30.\textbf{\textit{h4}} \textbf{\textit{g5}} 31.\textbf{\textit{f6}} winning the queen back. If 26...\textbf{\textit{gxf6}}, then 27.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} \textbf{\textit{g2+}} 28.\textbf{\textit{g2}} anything 29.\textbf{\textit{g4}}, forcing the game.

\textbf{27.\textbf{\textit{xe4}}}

\begin{center}
\textbf{27...\textit{\textbf{h2+}}}
\end{center}

\textbf{Steinitz:} Nothing presents any better prospect than this sacrifice, for the game was hopelessly lost if Black exchanged rooks first, which would have involved also the exchange of the bishop for the knight, after which White could win easily by playing the queen to a1.

\textbf{Zukertort:} This sacrifice avails nothing. Black's game is past redemption. If 27...\textbf{\textit{g2+}} 28.\textbf{\textit{g2}} \textbf{\textit{e7}} 29.\textbf{\textit{d6}} \textbf{\textit{d6}} 30.\textbf{\textit{al}} \textbf{\textit{e7}} etc.

\textbf{Potter:} In making this move Black observed that he would die with dignity. Dr. Zukertort, with characteristic politeness, offered no objection to his opponent choosing this particular manner of dissolution.

\textbf{28.\textbf{\textit{h2}}  \textbf{\textit{e5+}}  29.\textbf{\textit{g3}}  30.\textbf{\textit{f3}} \textbf{\textit{h6+}}  31.\textbf{\textit{g1}} \textbf{\textit{h3}}}

\textbf{32.\textbf{\textit{f4}}}

\textbf{Steinitz:} At once cutting the Gordian knot. Black has nothing better than to exchange and recover his piece, and the rest is a mere matter of detail.

\textbf{Zukertort:} 32.\textbf{\textit{f2}} would keep the piece but give Black the means to prolong the contest for some time. The move in the text forces the game in a few moves.

\textbf{32...\textbf{\textit{xf4}}  33.\textbf{\textit{ef4}} \textbf{\textit{g9xg3}}  34.\textbf{\textbf{\textit{g3}}  \textbf{\textit{xg3+}}  35.\textbf{\textit{h2}}}

Black resigns the game and the match.

\textbf{Steinitz:} Wherever the rook now moved, White would advance the d-pawn, with an irresistible attack, which must have won in a short number of moves.
Zukertort: Wherever the rook goes, White forces the game, e.g. 35...\textit{f}3 36.d6 \textit{c}6 37.d6 etc; or 35...\textit{g}4 36.d6 \textit{c}6 37.d7 \textit{x}d7 38.\textit{x}d7 h5 39.f6 \textit{x}f4 40.\textit{d}8+ and 41.f7; or 35...\textit{e}3 or \textit{c}3 36.d6 \textit{c}6 37.d7 \textit{x}d7 38.\textit{x}d7 h5 39.\textit{d}8+ \textit{h}7 40.\textit{g}8+ and mates in three more moves.

150 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Lindsay
20 board simultaneous exhibition,
London 1875
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}5 4.b4 \textit{x}b4 5.c3 \textit{c}5 6.0-0
\textit{g}e7?
A serious opening error. He must of course play 6...d6.
7.d4 \textit{exd}4 8.\textit{cx}d4 \textit{b}6 9.\textit{g}5 d5
\textit{n}9...0-0 follows 10.\textit{h}5!
10.\textit{ex}d5 \textit{a}5 11.d6 \textit{xc}4 12.\textit{dx}e7\textit{xd}4 13.\textit{wb}3 \textit{d}6
On 13...\textit{xa}1 would follow 14.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}6 15.\textit{a}3 \textit{xf}1+ 16.\textit{xf}1 h6
17.\textit{xd}6! \textit{hx}g5 18.\textit{a}3 with a winning position.
14.\textit{c}3 \textit{h}6

15.\textit{b}5! \textit{f}6
On 15...\textit{xa}1, White wins by 16.\textit{xd}6+.
16.\textit{xd}6+ \textit{cx}d6 17.\textit{e}4 \textit{xe}7 18.\textit{xd}6+! \textit{xd}6 19.\textit{a}3 \textit{f}6?
19...\textit{c}5 was the best chance.
20.\textit{fe}1+ \textit{e}6 21.\textit{b}5+ \textit{d}8 22.\textit{ed}1+ \textit{c}8 23.\textit{ac}1+ \textit{c}7 24.\textit{d}6 \textit{d}8 25.\textit{xc}7 \textit{xd}1+ 26.\textit{xd}1 \textit{xc}7
and White announced mate in four moves by 27.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}8 28.\textit{d}6+ \textit{c}8 29.\textit{c}1 + \textit{c}4 29.\textit{xc}4 mate.
Simpson's Divan Tournament and World Blindfold Record, London 1876

151 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Martin
12 board blindfold exhibition, West End Chess Club, 12 February 1876
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{a}f3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{c}5 4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.\textit{c}c3 \textit{a}5 6.0-0 d6
The orthodox continuation is 6...\textit{f}6. Black may proceed, likewise, with 6...\textit{b}6. The move in the text is not so good.

7.d4 exd4 8.\textit{b}3
This move, which constitutes 'Waller's attack', is the strongest at this juncture, although the dictum is opposed to the opinions of the majority of chess writers.

8...\textit{f}6 9.e5 dxe5 10.\textit{e}1

10...\textit{d}7
The \textit{Handbuch} gives here, as the strongest reply, 10...\textit{h}6, and proceeds with 11.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}5 12.\textit{d}5?. White has here, however, a winning attack by playing on the 12th move \textit{a}3!, a move pointed out first by Mr. Steinitz.

11.\textit{xe}5

12...\textit{d}8
If 12...\textit{xf}7, White would obtain a won end game by 13.\textit{xe}5+ \textit{f}8 14.\textit{a}3+ \textit{e}7 15.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{f}7 16.\textit{xe}7+ \textit{e}8 17.\textit{xd}7 \textit{he}8 18.\textit{fl} dxc3 19.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}7 (19...\textit{ad}8 20.\textit{f}3+ \textit{g}6 21.\textit{xc}5) 20.\textit{c}3 \textit{ad}8 21.\textit{d}5+ \textit{e}5 22.\textit{b}2+ \textit{e}4 23.\textit{bd}4 etc. Should Black play on his 12th move 12...\textit{f}8, White continues with 13.\textit{xe}8 b6 (13...\textit{f}7 14.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xf}7 15.\textit{a}3+ \textit{g}8 16.\textit{xa}5) 14.\textit{a}3+ c5 15.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}8 16.\textit{xc}5 \textit{c}6 17.\textit{f}5+ \textit{e}8 18.\textit{b}5+ \textit{d}7 19.\textit{e}2+

13.\textit{xe}8 \textit{d}3 14.\textit{f}1 \textit{xc}1?
Black has well conducted the game up to now, but he lets slip the opportunity to obtain an attack by 14...\textit{c}6. The move in the text is in favour of White.
15...\textbf{xc1} \textbf{c8}

If now \textit{15...c6}, White rejoins with \textit{16\textbf{a}d1 \textbf{g}5 17\textbf{xd}4+ \textbf{c}8 18\textbf{d}5 \textbf{d}8 19\textbf{e}6+ \textbf{b}8 20\textbf{xd}8+ \textbf{xd}8 21\textbf{a}3.}

\textbf{16\textbf{d}2 \textbf{d}8 17\textbf{d}5 \textbf{c}6}

\textbf{17.\textbf{c}4! \textbf{c}7}

Black dare not capture the bishop, e.g.

\textit{18...\textbf{cxd}5 19\textbf{d}6+ \textbf{c}7 20\textbf{xb}7 \textbf{b}8 20...\textbf{f}6 21\textbf{xd}4+ \textbf{c}6 (21...\textbf{b}8 22\textbf{xa}5+ \textbf{b}6 23\textbf{g}3+) 22\textbf{xa}5+) 21\textbf{xd}4+ \textbf{c}6 22\textbf{xc}6+ \textbf{b}xc6 23\textbf{c}1+ \textbf{d}7 24\textbf{xd}5+. Should Black play \textit{18...\textbf{xc}3}, White pursues the attack with \textit{19\textbf{a}b1.}

\textit{19\textbf{c}4 \textbf{h}4 20\textbf{g}3 \textbf{xd}4 21\textbf{ab}1 \textbf{b}8 22\textbf{g}2 \textbf{e}8 23\textbf{d}1 \textbf{g}4 24\textbf{f}3 \textbf{e}6 25\textbf{e}1 \textbf{g}6}

To capture two rooks for the queen would be fatal. Before Black could bring his queen's rook into play, White would win Black's pawns on the king's side.

\textit{26\textbf{a}3 \textbf{f}7 27\textbf{xe}8+ \textbf{xe}8 28\textbf{g}4+ \textbf{d}7 29\textbf{xd}7+ \textbf{d}7 30\textbf{d}8+ 31\textbf{e}5 \textbf{d}5 (31...\textbf{e}7 32\textbf{f}5+ \textbf{c}7 33\textbf{d}1) 32\textbf{g}7 etc.}

\textit{30\textbf{d}1+ \textbf{c}8 31\textbf{d}6+ \textbf{xd}6 32\textbf{xd}6 \textbf{e}8 33\textbf{a}4}

Useless; White should play at once \textit{33\textbf{d}3.}

\textbf{33...a5}

33...b6 was much better.

\textbf{34\textbf{d}3}

\textbf{34...\textbf{a}8?}

A blunder which precipitates the defeat. Black's best rejoinder was \textit{34...b6 (34...\textbf{e}1+ 35\textbf{g}2 \textbf{e}4+ 36\textbf{h}3 \textbf{f}5+ 37\textbf{g}4), but even then White wins by 35\textbf{f}3 \textbf{b}7 36\textbf{e}3 \textbf{c}8 37\textbf{e}7+ \textbf{a}8 38\textbf{c}7 \textbf{e}8 (38...\textbf{a}6 39\textbf{xc}6+ \textbf{b}7 40\textbf{c}8+ \textbf{a}7 41\textbf{e}8) 39\textbf{d}3 \textbf{b}5 40\textbf{xb}5 \textbf{xb}5 41\textbf{g}7 \textbf{a}4 42\textbf{x}7 \textbf{e}1+ 43\textbf{g}2 \textbf{a}5 44\textbf{e}4 \textbf{a}6 45\textbf{c}7 \textbf{b}6 46\textbf{e}8+ \textbf{b}8 47\textbf{xc}6+ \textbf{xc}6 48\textbf{xc}6.}

\textit{35\textbf{f}3 \textbf{e}1+ 36\textbf{g}2 \textbf{e}4 37\textbf{f}8+}

Black resigns.

152 Italian Game

Janssens

Zukertort

Simpson's Divan tournament,

27 March 1876

Notes by Steinitz

\textbf{1.e4 e5 2.d\textbf{f}3 \textbf{c}6 3.e\textbf{c}4 \textbf{c}5 4.e\textbf{c}3 \textbf{d}6 5.d\textbf{d}6 6.a\textbf{a}4}

In all likelihood the best continuation of this dull sort of opening, which has been humorously styled by Anderssen the Giuoco Pianissimo. It gets rid of one of the opponent's bishops, and doubles his pawns, though the latter advantage
Johannes Zukertort

is neutralised by Black opening his a-file.

White in his turn has now to provide against the same sort of manoeuvre on the part of the opponent, who might also threaten an exchange of the bishop for the knight by ...\texttt{\textemoji{Q}}a5, and he might have done so with even greater force if White, for instance, castled at this point, for in that case Black, by replying ...\texttt{\textemoji{Q}}a5, would have also forced the doubling of the adversary's pawns without affording the latter the solace of an open file for the rook.

8...h6

Probably for the purpose of avoiding another exchange of pieces, and in order to prevent the game drifting early into a drawn position. This move is often also made useful for the purpose of supporting an attack by ...g5 after the opponent has castled.

9.0-0 \texttt{\textemoji{Q}}g4 10.c3 \texttt{\textemoji{Be}}7 11.h3 \texttt{\textemoji{Qh}}5

White had already somewhat imperiled his game by advancing the h-pawn on the wing where he had himself sought shelter for his king, and before the opponent had castled on the same side. But still, he might have staved off the assault for some time if he had now advanced the pawn to g4 at once, so as to delay the adversary's attack by Black could not then afford to sacrifice the knight for the two pawns, since White, in that case, could easily release his game, after capturing the piece by d4, followed by \texttt{\textemoji{Qe}}2.

12...g5 13.g4 \texttt{\textemoji{Qg}}6 14.\texttt{\textemoji{Qg}}2?

The ultimate collapse of White's game may be traced from this move, which looks much better than it is. It was of the utmost importance for White's position to keep Black's bishop confined; and therefore White's pawns at g4 and e4 were the doors guarded against the entrance of the enemy, and wanted the firmest support. He ought to have played knight to d2, followed, if Black castled on the queen's side, by f3. The point of difference would have been that it would have enabled him to retreat the bishop to b3, in answer to ...d5, without being obliged to capture that pawn and thus to release Black's bishop.

14...0-0-0 15.\texttt{\textemoji{We}}2 d5 16.exd5 \texttt{\textemoji{Qxd}}5 17.\texttt{\textemoji{Be}}1 f5 18.f3 \texttt{\textemoji{Qe}}7 19.\texttt{\textemoji{Qd}}2

This looks quite as unwholesome as the whole of White's position. He had more chance of spinning out the fight by taking the f-pawn.

19...f4 20.\texttt{\textemoji{Qf}}2 hxg4 21.fxg4
21...e4!
An excellent move. Black has all along
pushed his advantage in a relentless
manner.
22.d2 f3+ 23.g1
23.h2 was of no more use, for Black
would have still captured the h-pawn
with the rook, checking, followed by
h7+, if White's king took the rook.
23...hxh3 24.dxe4 xe4 25.d3
h7
White's game is now irretrievably lost.
26.d4 h1+ 27.f2 h4
Mate.

53 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
Janssens
Simpson's Divan tournament,
27 March 1876
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 c5 2.c3 e6 3.f3 c6
4.d4 cxd4 5.cxd4
Not a commendable continuation.
6.xd4 e7 7.f4
The soundest line of play was 7.b5
7....c6 8.f2 b4 9.e2
e2 is the right move in the usual con­
tinuations of the Sicilian. At the present
position, however, b3 seems prefera­
able.
9...0-0 10.0-0 a5 11.a4 xc3
12.bxc3 d5 13.e5 a6
Loss of time. Black could force here the
exchange of queens by 13...d4, but his
chances in the end-game would not be
bright, e.g. 13...d4 14.cx d4 x d2
15.xd2 xd4 16.d3.
14.f3 d7 15.g3 e7
16.e3 d7 15.g3 e7
16.d3 c6 17.d2
17.xh7 + xh7 18.f4 + g8
19.fxe7 would lead but to a draw on
account of the remaining bishops of
different colours.
17...g6
If 17...d4, White wins a pawn by 18.g5
g6 (18..c6 19.f6) 19.cxd4.
18.h4 h8 19.h5 e7 20.h6

20...g6
Best. If 20...gxf6, White forces the
game with 21.xh6 g8 22.h4. If
20...g8, White rejoins with 21.g5;
if 20...g6, the continuation would be
21.g5 g8 22.f4.
21.hxg7+ xg7 22.g5
The move in the text keeps up the attack
for a longer time, I think, than any
other, save 22.h2, which would but
lead to a transposition of moves, e.g.
22.h2 h5 (best. 22.g8 23.g6+ h8 24.g5) 23.g5 (much inferior
is 23.xh5 b8 24.g5 c8) 23..g7 24.g5 h8
22...g8 23.f6+ f8 24.h3
a4
Intending ...g4.
25.h6+ e8 26.xh7 e7
27.f4
Preventing the intended sally of the ad­
verse queen to g4, and bringing the
rooks into cooperation.
27.xc6 d8.f2 d4 29.f5 d5
This, or ...d7, were the only saving
moves. 29...dxc3 would be met with
30.fx6, and 29...exf5 with 30.e6.
30.\textit{fxe}6 \textit{\&xe}6 31.\textit{\&af}1 \textit{\&f}8
White threatened 32.\textit{\&xe}7 \textit{\&xe}7
33.\textit{\&xf}7+.
32.\textit{\&g}7!
White could obtain a won endgame by
32.\textit{\&xe}7 \textit{\&xe}7 33.\textit{\&h}4+ and 34.\textit{\&xd}4.
The move in the text introduces a final combination, which forces, by a few
strokes, the game in every variation.
32...\textit{\&g}8 33.\textit{\&xf}7! \textit{\&xf}7 34.\textit{\&xf}7

34...\textit{\&xa}3
The only rejoinder which prevents the immediate mate, as the following variations may show:
A) 34...\textit{\&xf}7 35.\textit{\&f}6+ \textit{\&g}7
36.\textit{\&xg}7+ \textit{\&e}6 37.\textit{\&xe}7+ \textit{\&d}5
38.\textit{\&d}6+ and wins;
B) 34...\textit{\&xg}7 35.\textit{\&xg}7 \textit{\&xa}3 36.\textit{\&e}6;
C) 34...\textit{\&d}7 35.\textit{\&xe}7+ \textit{\&xe}7
(35...\textit{\&xe}7 36.\textit{\&xg}8+ \textit{\&d}7 37.\textit{\&f}5+)
36.\textit{\&f}6+ \textit{\&e}6 37.\textit{\&f}5+ \textit{\&d}5
38.\textit{\&d}7+ and mates in three more
moves.
35.\textit{\&xe}7+! \textit{\&xe}7 36.\textit{\&h}6+ \textit{\&e}6
If 36...\textit{\&d}8, White proceeds with
37.\textit{\&f}5 (much stronger than capturing the rook at once) 37...\textit{\&e}7 38.\textit{\&xg}8+
\textit{\&c}7 (if 38...\textit{\&e}8, 39.\textit{\&d}5+, mating in three more moves) 39.\textit{\&xc}8+ \textit{\&b}6
40.\textit{cxd}4.
37.\textit{\&c}4+! \textit{\&xe}5 38.\textit{\&xg}8 \textit{\&xc}3
Black could prolong the contest by
giving up the exchange.
39.\textit{\&e}7+ \textit{\&f}5 40.\textit{\&h}7+
Playing hastily, White
40.\textit{\&e}6 mate.
40...\textit{\&g}4 41.\textit{\&g}5
Mate.

154 King's Gambit
Martin
Zukertort
Simpson's Divan tournament 1 April
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.f4 \textit{exf}4 3.\textit{\&c}4
4.\textit{\&f}1 \textit{c}6
This defence was recommended by
Boden in 1851. The variations given
in the \textit{Handbuch} are not satisfactorily
analysed.
5.d4
If 5.\textit{\&c}3, then 5...\textit{\&c}5 6.\textit{\&el}
(6.\textit{\&d}4; 6.\textit{\&h}3 \textit{d}5) 6...\textit{\&xe}1+ 7.\textit{\&d}4
8.\textit{\&b}3 (8.\textit{\&d}1 \textit{d}6 9.\textit{\&c}3
8...\textit{\&d}6 9.\textit{\&d}3 \textit{\&e}6 10.\textit{\&d}5 0-0-0 11.\textit{\&xd}5
(11.\textit{\&xf}4 \textit{\&c}6) 11...\textit{\&xb}3 12.\textit{\&xd}5
13.\textit{\&xd}5 \textit{\&f}6 14.\textit{\&d}4 \textit{\&b}6
15.\textit{\&g}5 h6 16.\textit{\&xf}4 \textit{\&de}8+
17...\textit{\&h}8) 15...\textit{\&he}8+ 16.\textit{\&f}2
The above variation is taken from
a game played by me (Black) six months
ago at the Witte Society in The Hague.
5...\textit{\&g}5 6.\textit{\&c}3
6.\textit{\&f}3 followed by 7.d5 would
White nought, e.g. 6.\textit{\&f}3 \textit{\&h}5 7.
Simpson's Divan Tournament and World Blindfold Record, London 1876

12...g5 8.d6 (if 8...d4, then 8...g6)
9.cxd6 9...xd6 c6 10.d5 h6
1.e5 g6 12...xf7+ xf7
13.xf7+ e7 14.xc6+ dxc6
15.b3 xe4.
This occurred in one of the games which I played simultaneously in November last, at Bristol.

6...g7 7.f3 Wh5 8.e5
White's strongest move is 8.d5, and then 8...d8, 9.e5. Black can, however, maintain the gambit-pawn with a safe position, e.g. 8.d5 d8 9.e5 xe3 (xe7) 9...d6 10.h4 h6 11.g1 g6 12.d3 if5.

8...xe7 9.d5?
Very weak: White could not get any equivalent for the sacrificed pawn, but might keep up the attack for some time by 9.e4 h6 10.e1 (threatening 11.e6+, and if 10...f5, then d5) 10...d8 11.c3 e8 12.h4 f6.

9...xd5 10.xd5 e7 11.e4 d5 12.d3
dx6 would not equalise matters, but it was certainly better than the move in the text.

12...f5!
The right coup: it forces the following exchange, and leaves Black with a pawn ahead, two bishops and a splendid position.

13.xf5 xf5 14.d2 0-0-0
15.b4
To no purpose; but is there anything for White to do?

15...f6! 16.e3
If 16.fx6 xf6. If then 17.e5, Black can proceed simply with 17...xd1+ 18.xd1 xc2 19.c1 g6.

16...g4! 17.e1
If 17.exf6, then 17...gxfl! 18.xg2 fxg2+ 19.xg2 g5+ 20.f2 Wh4+ 21.g2 Whg8, forcing the game in a few moves.

17...fxe5 18.d2 f3! 19.e3
If 19.gxf3 gxf3 20.xf3 (20.xf3 g4 winning a piece) 20...g4 21.g3 Whf8+ 22.g2 Whg8. If 19.g3, then 19...f2! 20.xf2 (best) 20...f4 21.g2 Wh3.

19...e4 20.Wd2 exd4 21.xd4
If 21.f2, Black wins by 21...fxg2+ 22.xg2 Wh3 23.g3 Whf8+ 24.g1 Wh6. If 21.f4, then 21...fxg2+ 22.xg2 Whf8 23.g1 Wh3 24.g5 Whf5.

21...fxg2+ 22.xg2 Whf8+ 23.g1 xxd4+ 24.wxd4 Wh3
25.Wd2
If 25.e3, Black forces the game with 25...f3.

25...xg2
White resigns.
155 Scotch Game
MacDonnell
Zukertort
Simpson's Divan tournament, 15 April 1876
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.d4 d:ac6 3.d4 exd4
4.\xf6d4 \xc5
The line of play commencing with
4...\xf6h4 is perfectly sound, but too difficult to be adopted in a game played
with a time limit.

5.\xf6e3 \xf6f6 6.c3 \xec7 7.\xe2
White has here two other continuations: 7.c4 and 7.f4.
The move in the text was introduced by
L. Paulsen.

7...d5

8.\xf6f3
The orthodox reply, but, if properly met, leaving Black with a slight advantage. White may play here 8.\xb5, which leads to some interesting variations, e.g. 8.\xb5 \xe3 9.fxe3 \xf6h4+
10.\xf6f1 (best. If 10.g3 \xe4; if 10.\xd2 0-0 11.\xc7 dxe4) 10...0-0
11.\xc7 dxe4, and White dare not take the rook on account of 12.\xb8a8 \xf5
13.\x82g1 \xe3 14.\xc1 (if 14.\xd2 \xb8d8) 14...\x82xg2! 15.\xf1 (if 15.\x82xg2,
Black forces the mate by 15...\x82h3+ 16.\x82g1 e3) 15...\x82h3 and Black has an
overwhelming attack.

8...\xc4d4

The correct move, which isolates
White's c-pawn.

9.cxd4
9.exd5 would lose a piece by
10.dxc6 \xb6b6 11.cxb7 \xb7xb7.

9...\xda4 10.\xe4 0-0 11.
\xf5 12.0-0
The first eleven moves are identical
with the moves in the 7th match-
tournament, between Mr. Potter and myself. Then
12.\xf3 \xd6 13.g3? \xe4 14.
\xe4 15.\xe4 \xf5 led to Black's
disadvantage.

12.\xe4
12...\xb8d8 was better style. But I wanted, however, to avoid the change. \xc6, which would lead to some interesting variations.

13.\xe4 \xe6 14.\xc5
The right way to play the knight move
for protection of the isolated d-pawn.

14...\xb6 15.\xb3 \xb8d8 16.\xc1

16.f5
16...\xd7 was the soundest continuation. The course chosen by Black
up a pawn, but gives him a great superiority of position.

17.\xf4 \xb5 18.\xf3
19.\xc7 \x82d7 20.\xf1h6
20...\xe4 first was better, I think.

21.h3
If 21.\xf3, Black would continue
21...\xe6, and after 22.\xf4, with 22...
21...\(\text{Be}4\) 22.\(\text{Qg3}\)?

White underrates the power of Black's position. He should try to force the exchange of a piece at the cost of a pawn by playing 22.\(\text{Be}5\), or 22.\(\text{Wg3} \text{Be}6\) 23.\(\text{Be}5\).

22.\(\text{De}7\) 23.\(\text{Wd}3\) f4 24.\(\text{Wc}4\)

Besides the move in the text, White could proceed here with 24.f3 (if 24.\(\text{Wh}4\), then 24...\(\text{We}1+\) 25.\(\text{Wh}2\) \(\text{Wx}d3\) 26.\(\text{Wxd}3\) \(\text{Wx}c1\) 27.\(\text{Qxe}7\) \(\text{Wc}2\) 28.\(\text{Wd}6\) (28.\(\text{W}a3\) b5) 28...\(\text{Wxb}2\) 29.\(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Wxd}2\) 30.\(\text{Qxd}2\) \(\text{Qx}d4\) 24...\(\text{We}1+\) 25.\(\text{Qxe}1\) \(\text{Qxe}1+\) 26.\(\text{Qxe}1\) \(\text{Wxd}3\) 27.\(\text{Wxc}6\) \(\text{Qxe}3\), and although White has two rooks and a pawn for the queen, Black should win by the superiority of his position.

24...\(\text{Qb}4!\) 25.\(\text{a}3\)

I do not think that White has any move to equalise the game, as the following continuations may show:

A) 25.\(\text{Wh}4\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 26.\(\text{Wf}1\) \(\text{Wx}c1\) \(\text{Wh}5\) 28.\(\text{Qe}3\) 29.\(\text{W}e2\) (29.\(\text{W}e1\) \(\text{Qbc}2\)) 29...\(\text{We}8\) winning the exchange;

B) 25.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{We}2\)

B1) 26.\(\text{Qf}2\) b5! 27.\(\text{W}xb5\) (if 27.\(\text{Wc}8+\) \(\text{We}8\) 28.\(\text{W}g4\) \(\text{Wx}g4\) 29.\(\text{hx}g4\) \(\text{Qxb}2\) and Black will have two passed pawns and much the superior position) 27...\(\text{Qe}3\) 28.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{Qxd}1\) 29.\(\text{Wxd}1\) \(\text{Qxa}2\);

B2) 26.\(\text{Qe}1\) b5! This fine rejoinder is necessary to dislodge the queen, which would otherwise, later on, draw the game by perpetual check.

B21) 27.\(\text{Wxb}5\) \(\text{Wx}g2+\) 28.\(\text{Wx}g2\) \(\text{Wx}g3+\) 29.\(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Wf}3+\) 30.\(\text{Q}g1\) \(\text{Qd}3\) 31.\(\text{Qf}1\) (White has no better resource)

B22) 27.\(\text{Wc}8+\) \(\text{Wh}7\) 28.\(\text{Qxe}2\) (28.\(\text{Qf}2\) \(\text{xf}2!\) 29.\(\text{Qxf}2\) \(\text{d}3+\) 30.\(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Qe}1\) 31.\(\text{Qxe}1\) \(\text{Qe}3+\)) 28...\(\text{Qxe}2\) 29.\(\text{Qf}2\) \(\text{Qxf}2\) 30.\(\text{Qxf}2\) \(\text{Wg}3+\) 31.\(\text{Qg}1\) \(\text{Qe}3\), forcing the game.

25...\(\text{fx}g3\)
26.f3

If 26.axb4, Black forces the game by 26...gx{f}x{f}2+:

A) 27.\(\texttt{Wh}1\) \(\texttt{W}c6+\);
B) 27.\(\texttt{Wh}2\) \(\texttt{W}d6+\) 28.\(\texttt{g}3\) \(\texttt{He}1\);
C) 27.\(\texttt{Wxf2}\) \(\texttt{He}2+\) 28.\(\texttt{Wxe2}\) \(\texttt{He}2+\) 29.\(\texttt{Wxe2}\) \(\texttt{W}x{g}2+\) etc;
D) 27.\(\texttt{Wf}1\) \(\texttt{He}1+\) 28.\(\texttt{W}x{e}1\) \(\texttt{fxe1}+\) 29.\(\texttt{W}x{e}1\) \(\texttt{Wf}5+\) and mates in a few more moves.

26...\(\texttt{W}4e6\) 27.axb4 \(\texttt{W}x{e}3\) 28.\(\texttt{W}c3\)

\(\texttt{W}x{d}1\) 29.\(\texttt{W}x{d}1\) \(\texttt{He}6\)

Much better than the showy coup 29...\(\texttt{Wc}2\), which would be met by 30.\(\texttt{Wf}1!\).

30.\(\texttt{W}d2\)

If 30.\(\texttt{W}c5\), Black wins by 30...\(\texttt{W}x{c}5\) 31.\(\texttt{W}x{c}5\) (31.\(\texttt{d}5\) \(\texttt{Wd}6\)) 31...\(\texttt{W}e6\) 32.\(\texttt{d}5\) \(\texttt{W}c2!\) 33.\(\texttt{W}f1\) \(\texttt{He}2\) 34.\(\texttt{W}x{c}2\) \(\texttt{W}x{c}2\) 35.\(\texttt{d}6\) \(\texttt{W}e2\) 36.\(\texttt{W}d1\) \(\texttt{W}x{g}2+\) 37.\(\texttt{W}h1\) \(\texttt{W}g2+\)

30.\(\texttt{W}c2\) 31.\(\texttt{W}f4\) \(\texttt{He}2\) 32.\(\texttt{d}5\) \(\texttt{W}x{g}2+\) 33.\(\texttt{W}h1\) \(\texttt{W}h2+\) 34.\(\texttt{W}g1\) \(\texttt{W}c2+\) 35.\(\texttt{W}f1\) \(\texttt{W}c2\)

White resigns.

156 Scotch Game

Blackburne

Zukertort

Simpson’s Divan tournament, April 1876

Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 \(\texttt{e}5\) 2.\(\texttt{f}3\) \(\texttt{c}6\) 3.d4 \(\texttt{exd}4\)

4.\(\texttt{W}x{d}4\) \(\texttt{W}f6\) 5.\(\texttt{W}x{c}6\) \(\texttt{bxc}6\) 6.\(\texttt{d}5\)

7.\(\texttt{W}e2\) \(\texttt{e}7\) 8.\(\texttt{c}3\)

Up to this move the play on both sides followed the track of the consultation game between Messrs Blackburne and Zukertort on one side, and Messrs Potter and Steinitz on the other (Game 141), but at this juncture White played in that game 8.\(\texttt{W}f4\), and afterwards brought out the knight to \(\texttt{d}2\). Whether the knight is better posted by the move in the text is difficult to decide. At any rate it appears, during the press of the game, that White obtains advantage from having the \(\texttt{f}5\) available for the attack.

8...\(\texttt{W}c8\) 9.\(\texttt{W}e1\) \(\texttt{He}8\) 10.\(\texttt{e}5\)

10...\(\texttt{W}g4\)

For the purpose of shutting the queen’s bishop out from immediate action on the king’s side, but, since Black’s queen’s bishop can now be placed in jeopardy, in sequence of White’s f-pawn being at once to advance, this manœuvre, though pretty, hardly seems advisable. Obviously it would be of no use for White to attack the bishop by \(\texttt{f}5\), for Black would retire the bishop and still the knight would be safe. In view of Black’s threatening to the queen by \(\texttt{W}c5+\), if White take knight with the pawn, Mr. Blackburne answered with a deep insight into the game, and is the correct answer given with a deep insight into the game, and is the correct answer to Black’s threatening move 10...\(\texttt{W}g4\). Black’s last three moves were forced and now he is also reduced to weakening his king’s side, as White threatens to win a piece by \(\texttt{h}3\) followed by \(\texttt{g}4\).

11.\(\texttt{W}d2\) \(\texttt{a}7\) 12.\(\texttt{f}4\) \(\texttt{c}5\) 13.\(\texttt{W}d3\) 14.\(\texttt{W}x{d}3\) \(\texttt{g}6\)

Black’s last three moves were forced and now he is also reduced to weakening his king’s side, as White threatens to win a piece by \(\texttt{h}3\) followed by \(\texttt{g}4\).

15.\(\texttt{W}f6\) \(\texttt{a}8\) 16.\(\texttt{W}g5\) \(\texttt{W}d7\) 17.\(\texttt{W}x{f}5\) \(\texttt{W}x{f}5\) 18.\(\texttt{W}d4\) \(\texttt{c}5\) 19.\(\texttt{W}x{h}4\)
19...\textit{d}d3!

This clever move blunts the effect of a sharp thrust which White had prepared; for Mr. Blackburne threatened here a fine sacrifice of the rook by capturing the h-pawn with the rook, e.g. supposing Black had played 19...\textit{c}xd4 instead, then the game might have gone thus: 20.\textit{h}xh7! (threatening \textit{wh}4 winning) 20...\textit{x}xh7 (best) 21.\textit{wh}4+ \textit{g}8 22.\textit{h}6, followed by \textit{xf}8 and eventually \textit{wh}6, and winning easily.

But all this fine combination is now baffled, for if White in the present situation take the h-pawn, Black would reply ...\textit{f}5, threatening mate at f1, and therefore forcing the exchange of queens, after which White’s advanced pawns must fall one by one.

20.\textit{g}3 \textit{cxd}4 21.\textit{Exd}4

21.\textit{Exd}3 was more to the purpose, unless White intended to pursue the course indicated in our next note, and would have tended to make White’s position impregnable, e.g. 21.\textit{Exd}3 \textit{dx}c3 22.\textit{Exc}3 \textit{f}5 23.\textit{Exf}4 and Black dare not advance 23...\textit{g}5, on account of the reply 24.\textit{g}3.

21...\textit{c}4 22.\textit{h}4

The bold plan was here the only safe one. He ought to have attacked the bishop by 22.b3, which would have left Black hardly any other option than to play for winning the exchange by 22...\textit{e}c5, which, though leading to many beautiful complications, left the issue in White’s favour hardly doubtful. Out of the mass of some of the fine and plausible variations to which this line of play might have given rise, we may just give the following. Supposing:

22.b3 \textit{c}c5 23.\textit{e}e3 \textit{Exd}4 24.\textit{Exd}4 \textit{a}6 25.\textit{wh}4 \textit{h}8 26.\textit{e}e1 \textit{f}5 27.\textit{wh}6 \textit{g}8 28.e6 \textit{ae}8 29.h3 \textit{c}5 30.\textit{fx}f8 \textit{exf}1+ 31.\textit{h}2 and wins either by \textit{g}7+ or \textit{fx}g8 \textit{h}+ or \textit{f}8\textit{w}.

22...\textit{f}5

This turns the aspect of the game completely, and the position is drifting back to Black’s advantage.

23.\textit{f}4 \textit{d}4 24.\textit{a}4

Had the knight retreated to d1, Black might have taken the e-pawn.

24.\textit{b}5 25.b3 \textit{axa}4 26.bxa4 \textit{ab}8 27.\textit{e}e1 \textit{b}1 28.\textit{c}c1 \textit{b}4 29.\textit{af}1

In answer to 29.d1, 29...\textit{d}2! would have easily won.

29...\textit{xf}1+!

A splendid conception, which immediately forces the game.

30.\textit{xf}1 \textit{xc}1+ 31.\textit{e}2 \textit{xe}5+!

Finesse style, though only a consistent consequence of the sacrifice of the queen.

32.\textit{xe}5

267
32. \( \text{d3} \) was of no more use, for Black would have then won just as easily by 32... \( \text{\texttt{c3+}} \).

32... \( \text{\texttt{e1+}} \) 33. \( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \)

34. \( \text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{d6}}} \)

The game was spun out to the 51st move, but, of course, could not present any more great features of interest, on account of Black's overwhelming superiority of forces.

Black won.

157 Old Indian Defence
Zukertort
Potter
Simpson's Divan tournament, April 1876
Notes by Steinitz
1.e3 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \)

We unhesitatingly disapprove of meeting a close opening in this manner. Though Morphy, and also the council of the Viennese in their match against London, have made the attempt, the progress of the examples on record does not justify the imitation.

2.c4 \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \)

Already the king’s bishop is shut out from the line where he is usually wanted, and apparently there is no better way of continuing the second player's game, which is a clear proof that the latter is labouring under greater difficulties of development than he would have done if he had answered \( \text{...e6} \) on the first move.

3. \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 4. \( \text{\texttt{d4 \texttt{e7}}} \)

We should have preferred \( \text{...\texttt{c6}} \). The card is now shown respecting the placement of the king's bishop, while Black might have kept in reserve to play \( \text{...g6} \) and to bring the bishop out the other way.

5. \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 6. \( \text{\texttt{e2 \texttt{0-0 \texttt{7.0-0 \texttt{d7}}} \texttt{8.d5}}} \)

Doubtful. It was of little import to drive the other knight back at once, while it might have been more useful to keep the threat hanging over, and to prepare arranging a row of formidable pawns on the queen's side, commencing with a3, followed by b4.

8... \( \text{\texttt{a8}} \) 9. \( \text{\texttt{d2 \texttt{e8}}} \) 10.f4

10... \( \text{\texttt{exf4}} \)

By this and the following move the door is opened to the enemy. The pawn at e5 ought to have been well preserved, and Black would have done much better now further to protect it by \( \text{...\texttt{f6}} \). At any rate, the exchange of pawns liberates the square at White's d4 for further occupation by the hostile pieces.

11. \( \text{\texttt{exf4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) 12. \( \text{\texttt{f3 \texttt{g6}}} \) 13. \( \text{\texttt{d2 \texttt{g7}}} \) 14. \( \text{\texttt{c2 \texttt{e8}}} \)

Eccentric style. 14... \( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) presented obviously greater facilities for Black's development.
15...\textit{f7} 16...\textit{f2} \textit{d7} 17...\textit{d3} \textit{e8} 18...\textit{fe2} \textit{f8}

Black's pieces are now packed together in one lump on the king side, while the other wing remains little protected.

19...\textit{b3}

Well played. White promptly directs the attack against the opponent's weakest flank.

19...\textit{b8} 20...\textit{e3} \textit{b6}

A necessary evil. He could not afford to give up the a-pawn, nor could he advance it to a6, on account of the rejoinder \textit{a7}, winning the b-pawn without difficulty.

21...\textit{d4} \textit{d7} 22...\textit{c6} \textit{a8}

Again compulsory. Had he played the rook to b7, White would have pushed the pawn to c5, and the rook would have had no escape when subsequently attacked by \textit{a6}.

23...\textit{b5}!

Fine play and much stronger than 23...\textit{xb6}. Black dare not now advance the a-pawn on the knight, for the latter would then capture the c-pawn, and after 23...\textit{a6} 24...\textit{xc7} \textit{xc7} 25...\textit{xb6}, play 26...\textit{xe7}.

23...\textit{f6} 24...\textit{bxa7} \textit{h6} 25...\textit{b5} \textit{h7} 26...\textit{d4} \textit{exe2} 27...\textit{exe2} \textit{xd4}+ 28...\textit{bxd4} \textit{e8} 29...\textit{exe8}

An error. By moving the queen to c2, he must have kept control over the only open file, and he could have easily won by pushing up the a-pawn to a5, supported first by b4.

29...\textit{xe8} 30...\textit{f2} \textit{h5} 31...\textit{b5} \textit{d7}

32...\textit{c2}

This part is carelessly played by White, and this move merely sets a trap, which, however deep, was not tempting enough for his shrewd opponent, who would not be induced to take the pawn at once, in which case White would have effected his purpose, e.g.

32...\textit{xf4} 33...\textit{xf5} \textit{gf5} 34...\textit{xf5}+ \textit{g6} 35...\textit{xc7} \textit{xf8} 36...\textit{xd7}, and, the bishop remaining pinned, White's king is exposed to no danger. But instead of choosing this plan, which was circuitous even if successful, White might have elected a straight road to victory by taking the c-pawn at once, e.g.

32...\textit{xc7} \textit{c8} 33...\textit{b5} \textit{c5} 34...\textit{c2} \textit{xf4} 35...\textit{f1}, with a winning game.

32...\textit{c5} 33...\textit{b4}

Another and worse version of the same error. Even now he ought to have captured the c-pawn, for the bishop had always a safe retreat at f1 when twice attacked. By the move in the text an opening is given to the enemy, of which the latter takes clever advantage.

33...\textit{xd3}+ 34...\textit{xd3} \textit{xf4} 35...\textit{f3}
Still feeble. By offering the exchange of queens at e3, he could keep victory in his grasp. Supposing: 35.\textit{w}e3 \textit{w}xe3+ 
 36.\textit{w}xe3 \textit{axg}2+ 37.\textit{w}f2 \textit{df}4 
 38.\textit{d}xc7, followed by the irresistible march of the a-pawn, while Black's pieces are easily kept aloof.

35... \textit{g}5 36.\textit{w}xc7 \textit{w}h8 37.\textit{w}b3 
 38.\textit{a}1 39.\textit{w}c2 \textit{wh}1

Finely conceived. Though White has the start with a series of checks, he can do no harm.

39.\textit{w}xf5+ \textit{g}6 40.\textit{w}d7+ \textit{h}8

Draw.

White is compelled to keep on checking, for he would lose if he attempted to cover the g-pawn with the queen, e.g. 41.\textit{w}g4 \textit{d}3+ 42.\textit{w}e3 (if 42.\textit{w}g3, Black answers ...\textit{w}e1+, winning the queen on the next move) 42...\textit{w}g1+ 43.\textit{d}2 \textit{wc}1+ 44.\textit{w}e2 
 45.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}2 mate.

158 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Dupré

12 board blindfold exhibition,
Rotterdam 1876
Notes by Steinitz

The following remarkably interesting game was played during Herr Zukertort's sojourn in Holland last Mid-
summer. The performer's opponent on this occasion is acknowledged one of the three strongest players in Holland.

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}f3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}c4
4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.c3 \textit{a}5 6.0-0

Only consistent with Herr Zukertort's often pronounced opinion, that the Compromised Defence cuts the ground under Anderssen's attack in the Evans Gambit, which is as is well known, commences by d4 at this point. It is now held by good authorities that the old line of play, as in the text, though does not introduce as violent a charge, yet leaves sufficient retentive power in the hands of the first player for keeping up a spirited lead.

6... \textit{f}6 7.d4 0-0 8.\textit{xe}5

Black's defence against the present form of attack was strongly recommended by Neumann, and for a long time considered quite satisfactory, until some doubt was thrown on its efficiency by the move in the text, first brought into notice in America.

8...\textit{xe}5

Palpably inferior to 8...\textit{xe}4. The latter leads generally to White's sacrificing the two minor pieces for the rook and f-pawn, with a vehement attack, which however, does not concede such immediate tangible advantages as the one open by the line of play adopted here.

9.\textit{dxe}5 \textit{xe}4 10.\textit{d}d5 \textit{x}c3
11.\textit{xc}3 \textit{xc}3 12.\textit{f}3!

Herr Zukertort considers this move superior to either \textit{d}d4 or \textit{d}d3 proposed by different authorities for this situation. At any rate, it is clear that White gains as much in time by hunting about Black's knight in the open as the two pawns which the opponent has taken are worth. We believe that Black's best chance consists now in advancing the
pawn to d5 at once, and before retreating the knight to a4.

12...\textit{Q}a4 13.\textit{W}g3

13...\textit{Q}b6

Again, ...d5 was the only move. White in that case would have replied \textit{Q}g5 just the same, and, upon Black's moving the queen to d7, would have captured the pawn with the bishop, threatening to win by \textit{Q}f6, followed by \textit{W}g5 if Black took the king's bishop. But then Black had just an escape by offering the exchange of queens at g4, and, though his position remained inferior, he had at least even chances. \textit{W}h8 would not have mended matters, as the following line, communicated to us by Zukertort, shows:

13...\textit{W}h8 14.\textit{Q}g5 \textit{W}e8 (best; for, if the pawn interpose, White wins the exchange, after taking 15.exf6, and maintains a terrible attack by seizing the e-file with the rook) 15.\textit{Q}ae1 \textit{Q}b6 16.\textit{Q}f6 \textit{Q}g8 (again best, for if 16...gx\textit{Q}f6, White, by simply retaking 17.exf6, forces Black to play the rook to g8, and then after taking the queen with the rook, wins easily by posting the other rook at e1) 17.\textit{Q}d3 (threatening 18.\textit{W}h4 etc.) 17...\textit{g}xf6 (best) 18.exf6 \textit{W}f8 (best; for if 18...\textit{Q}xg3 instead, White takes the queen, checking, and then doubles the rooks) 19.\textit{W}h4 \textit{W}g6 20.\textit{Q}xg6 \textit{fxg6} 21.\textit{W}h6 and wins.

14.\textit{Q}g5 \textit{Qxc4}

Black had nothing better now, and hence he fights with two minor pieces for the queen, having, however, the enormous odds in his favour by the adversary being handicapped to split the power of his memory amongst twelve games at the same time.

15.\textit{Q}xd8 \textit{Qxd8}

16.e6!

An excellent move, which enables the blindfold player to break into the hostile game with irresistible force. It will be easily seen that if Black take the pawn with either pawn, White wins a piece by \textit{W}xc7, e.g. 16...dxe6 17.\textit{W}xc7 \textit{Q}d4 18.\textit{Q}ad1 \textit{Q}d2 19.\textit{Q}c3 etc.

16...\textit{Q}d6 17.\textit{Q}xf7+ \textit{Qxf7} 18.\textit{Q}ac1

Another important and well-devised step towards victory. All Black's pieces are driven into the rear by manoeuvres executed with acute judgement on the part of the blindfold player.

18...\textit{Q}e8 19.\textit{Q}fe1 d6 20.\textit{Q}f4+

The immediate sequel shows the accurate reckoning of which this move is the product, for Black's next two moves are forced, since he is bound to keep off the hostile rook from occupying e7 as long as possible.

20...\textit{Q}f6 21.\textit{Q}xc7+ \textit{Q}d7 22.\textit{W}xd6 \textit{Q}g8 23.\textit{Q}xd7 \textit{Q}xd7 24.f4 \textit{Q}c6 25.\textit{Q}e7 \textit{Q}f8 26.\textit{Q}h3 \textit{Q}e8 27.\textit{Q}e6+
All this is very neat, and would not discredit a single encounter with open eyes over the board.

31...\textit{g}8 32.f5 \textit{f}3 33.\textit{f}2 \textit{c}6 34.\textit{f}8 a6 35.d8 \textit{d}5 36.xg8+ \textit{x}g8 37.d3

White's aim is clearly set out in some of the preceding moves. He intends to play the king to g4, which either gains the knight or forces Black's ...g6, after which the advance of White's f-pawn wins with consummate ease.

Black resigns.

159 King's Gambit

\textbf{Zukertort (without b1)}

\textbf{Ehrlich}

West End Chess Club 1876

Notes by Ranken

1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{c}4 \textit{e}7

Black chose this defence, having been embarrassed in previous games by the attacks springing from 3.d\textit{f}3 and 4.d\textit{e}2.

3.f4 \textit{exf}4 4.d\textit{f}3

The position is now that of the Cunningham Gambit. In answer to the check, White will of course select the more adventurous course of giving up the three pawns for the attack.

4...\textit{h}4+ 5.g3 f\textit{g}3 6.0-0 g\textit{x}h2--

7.h1 \textit{h}6

7...d5, and on 8.x\textit{d}5, \textit{f}6, is considered a satisfactory defence irrespective of the odds.

8.d4 \textit{d}5 9.x\textit{d}5 0-0 10.x\textit{h}6

\textit{g}x\textit{h}6 11.e5 \textit{c}6 12.xf7 \textit{f}7 13.xf7+ \textit{h}8 14.b3 \textit{e}7 15.h5 \textit{a}6

16.xh4!

Pretty. Mate follows the capture of the queen, in seven moves at most: Black could only have delayed it two moves by interposing the queen and the bishop.

16...\textit{x}h4 17.\textit{f}8+ \textit{g}7 18.g8+ \textit{f}6 19.\textit{f}1+ \textit{e}7 20.\textit{f}7+ \textit{d}6

21.e5

Mate.

160 Evans Gambit

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Wayte}

St George's Chess Club, 1876

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}5 4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}5 6.0-0 \textit{d}6

7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \textit{b}6 9.d5 \textit{c}5 10.b2 \textit{e}7 11.d3 0-0 12.c3 \textit{g}6 13.e2 \textit{c}5 14.b1 \textit{f}6

15.h1 \textit{c}7 16.g3

The usual continuation at this juncture is 16.d2 \textit{d}8 17.g3 b5 18.f5 c5-
Simpson's Divan Tournament and World Blindfold Record, London 1876

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}4 20.d4 c3 21.\textit{g}d1. The course adopted in the text is preferable, I think, although it allows Black to advance immediately his b-pawn, it saves White two moves with the queen.

16...b5 17.\textit{g}f5

White dare not capture the proffered pawn on account of the reply 17...\textit{b}b8, and if 18.\textit{e}e2, then 18...\textit{f}f4.

17...b4?

A very ill-advised trap (see next note). Black's best continuation was 17...c4 18.\textit{b}b1 b4.

18.\textit{g}g1

Black intended 18...c4 19.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 20.\textit{xc}4 a6. White's simple rejoinder not only preserves the attack, but prevents likewise any hostile advance on the queen's flank.

18...\textit{xf}5 19.exf5 \textit{e}5 20.\textit{xe}5 \textit{fxe}5 21.\textit{d}d2 \textit{b}7

If 21...\textit{h}6, White proceeds with 22.g4.

22.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}6

22...\textit{e}7 would be met with 23.\textit{xh}7;.

23.\textit{e}6 \textit{f}7 24.g4 \textit{h}4 25.\textit{g}3 \textit{d}8 26.\textit{cg}1 \textit{h}6 27.g5! \textit{xg}5 28.\textit{xc}5 \textit{hxg}5 29.\textit{g}4 \textit{h}5 30.\textit{f}3 \textit{af}8 31.\textit{ag}5 \textit{wh}6 32.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}8 33.\textit{h}5 \textit{f}4

Black's game is past redemption. Should he play 33...\textit{f}6, White forces the victory by 34.\textit{h}3 \textit{b}7 (best) 35.\textit{g}6 \textit{e}7 36.\textit{h}8+ \textit{f}7 37.\textit{xg}7+ \textit{e}8 (best) 38.\textit{xe}7+ \textit{e}7 (if 38...\textit{xe}7, then 39.\textit{b}5+) 39.\textit{h}4+.

34.\textit{h}3 \textit{f}6

34...\textit{b}7 would be equally fatal, as the following continuation shows:

34...\textit{b}7 35.\textit{h}8+ \textit{f}7 36.\textit{xg}7+ \textit{g}7 (36...\textit{f}6 37.\textit{xf}8+ \textit{f}7 38.\textit{g}6+ \textit{e}7 39.\textit{f}6+) 37.\textit{h}7+ \textit{f}6 38.\textit{xf}8+ \textit{f}7 (best) 39.\textit{h}8+ \textit{e}7 (best) 40.\textit{e}8+ \textit{d}7 41.\textit{x}d8+ and White mates in three moves if 41...\textit{c}7; in two moves if 41...\textit{e}7.

White announced mate in seven moves by 35.\textit{g}7+ \textit{g}7 36.\textit{h}7+ \textit{g}8 37.\textit{h}8+ \textit{f}7 38.\textit{h}7+ \textit{e}8 39.\textit{b}5+ \textit{c}6 40.\textit{xc}6+ \textit{d}8 41.\textit{d}7 mate.

161 King's Gambit

Martin

Zukertort

16 board blindfold exhibition,
West End Chess Club, December 1876
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{wh}4+ 4.\textit{f}1 \textit{c}6 5.d4 g5 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{wh}5 7.\textit{e}2 \textit{g}6?

Weak. Black could continue quite safely with 7...\textit{g}7. If then 8.\textit{e}5 \textit{wh}6 9.\textit{xc}6 dxc6, and Black has a well developed game. If 8.h4 g4 9.\textit{g}1 d6 10.c3 \textit{f}6.
8.d5 c7 9.e3 g7 10.d3
White could obtain here the superior game by 10.b5 d8 11.d6!
10..d6 11.c2 d7 12.b5 d8
13.c3 xb5?
An injudicious exchange, which loses a pawn. Black should play 13...f6.
14.xb5 xc3 15.xb7 xc8
16.bxc3 g4 17.d2 f6 18.b4

Well played. White dare not a-pawn, e.g. 24.xa7 g3+ (25.e2 xe4 26.e4 27.d2 xe4 etc.) 25...xc3 26.c1 xe4 27.f4 xd2 28.e5+ 29.f2 xd5 30.xg2
26...exd5! 27.xg2 (27.exd5 27...e3.
24...e5 25.xg2 d6 26.d6

18.g8
An important rejoinder, which prepares the attack against the adverse king's flank.
19.d4
If 19.a6. Black may proceed with 19...h6 20.xc8 f3! 21.d4 fxg2+ 22.xg2 h3+ 23.g1 xc8.
19...h6 20.e1 f3 21.a6
If 21.gxf3, then 21...g3!
21.fxg2 22.g1 xh2 23.xc8 xc8

24.e2

26.h5
Black would lose a piece, should he play 26...f4+, as White then captures the knight with the rook and attacks the queen with the other rook. The move in the text attempts to preserve the all-important g-pawn.
27.d1?
White conducted the game up to this point with good judgement, but he fails to grasp the opportunity to capture the adverse g-pawn, and so to obtain the superiority. After 27 xe4 gf4+ would prove but a blank shot, e.g. 28.f3 xg4 29.xg4 and Black has no means to punish the sortie of the hostile monarch.
27...xd4 28.cxd4 g4
29.h2?
White's best continuation consisted 29.gf2 g3 30.xf4 xf4 31.xf4 g2 32.f3 g1+ 33.xg1 xg1+ 34.e2 g7 35.f3 and he has a good chance to draw the game.
Simpson's Divan Tournament and World Blindfold Record, London 1876

29...g3 30...h4 g2 31...g1 gg3 32...h2 f6 33...f1
A desperate measure to free the game, but White has no means to save the day.
- If 33...e1, Black replies 33...d4 ++...xh7 ee3+ 35...d1 ef2++ 36...cl ed2++.
33...gxfl ++ 34...xf1

34...g4
The deciding coup, which must win the exchange, and leaves then Black with a clear piece ahead.
35...h2
If 35...xf4, then 35...xh2 36...xf7 h5 etc.
35...xf2++ 36...xf2 eg4 37...d2
g2 38...xg2 eg2 39...e2
d7 40...f2 dh4 41...g3 eg6
g4...e7 43...c4...f6 44...a4
e5++!
White resigns.

162 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Minchin
16 board blindfold exhibition.
West End Chess Club. 16 December 1876
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2...f3...c6 3...c4...c5
4.b4...xb4 5.c3...a5 6.0-0...f6
7.d4...x4
Castling first is the usual move here, but it leads mostly, by a transposition of moves, to the same position as the one arising in a few moves in this game.

8...exe5
The German Handbuch recommends here 8...e1, whereupon White gains a strong attack, whether Black reply 8...xc3 or 8...d5, in the former case by 9...xf7++, and in the latter instance by 9...b5. But the move in the text is quite as strong at least.

8...exe5
The Deutsche Schachzeitung points out that Black cannot reply here 8...d5, for then White might proceed by 9...xf7, followed by 10...h5++, and afterwards either by 11...xd5 or...e1, according to Black's reply.

9.dxe5 0-0 10...d5...xc3
11...xc3...xc3 12...f3...a4
13...g3 d5
Up to the last move the game is like the one played by Herr Zukertort against Mr. Dupré (Game 158); the latter moved at this point 13...d6.

14...h6
Better than 14...g5, as played by Herr Zukertort in the above mentioned game, for, in the present altered position, Black might reply 14...d7 followed by ...g4, even if White tempted him with the offer of a piece by 15...xd5. It is, however, remarkable that the performer, while playing six-
Johannes Zukertort

teen games blindfold, should retain such delicate discernment for the different exigencies on one single board.
14...g6 15.aad1 a6 16.d3 d7 17.xf8
Mr. Zukertort justly remarks that the capture was premature. He might have proceeded with the attack by 17.f4 at once, without stooping to gain the exchange, for Black could find no time to remove the rook.
17...xf8 18.h3 e7 19.f4 f5 20.xf5 gxf5 21.f3 e6 22.h5 g6 22...h6, with the view of passing the king over by degrees to the other side, was a better mode of facing the predicament.
23.h4 h6 24.hf3 c5 24...e8 is now too late, for White would reply 25.e6, which palpably cannot be taken by the queen, and then the latter would be shut out and the retreat of the king practically cut off.
25.g4 h8 26.hg3 fxg4 27.xg4 e6

28.f5!
To weigh fairly the merits of this beautiful move and the play preceding it, becomes almost impossible, when the fact is taken into consideration that the game is only one out of fourteen which Mr. Zukertort conducted on this occasion, as only two games had been finished before the adjournment of the first day.
28...xf5 Mr. Zukertort announced that if Black had taken the e-pawn he would have forced the game by the reply 29.e1.
29.xh6+ and mates in two moves.
Match with Blackburne and Tournaments at Leipzig and Cologne 1877

163 Vienna Gambit
Zukertort
Minchin
St. George's Chess Club, 1877
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.&c3 &c6 3.f4 exf4
4.&f3 g5 5.h4
White's opening should prove un­sound. He continues with a move which has the merit of novelty.

5...g4 6.&g5 h6 7.&xf7 &xf7
8.d4
5...c4+, Black answers 8...d5, and if then 9.exd5, Black proceeds with 9...&e5 10.&b3 &d6.

8...d6
8...f3 seems to constitute Black's best defence.

9.&xf4 &f6 10.&c4+ &g7 11.0-0
Ee7 12.&d2 &h5 13.&e3
Axh4?
Suicidal. 13...&f6 was best, I think, although not perfectly satisfactory.

14.&f7+ &g6 15.e5 &g3
16.&xf1!

A) 16...&f5 17.&xf5 &xf5 18.&xf5
&f8 (18...&xf5 19.&d3 mate) 19.&xf8
&xf8 20.d3+ &f7 (20...&h5
21.&e2) 21.&xh6 &h8 22.&f4+ &e8
23.&d5 and White has a winning position;

B) 16...&xf1 17.&d3+ &h5
18.&f5+ &g5 19.&f7+ &h4 20.&f2+ &g3 21.&e4+;

C) 16...&g5 17.&d3+ &h5 18.h7
&xe3+ 19.&xe3 &f8 (19...&xf1
20.&f7+ &h4 21.&f2+ &g3 22.&e4)
20.&xg5 &xf1+ 21.&xf1 dxe5
(21...d5 22.&d5; 21...&xd4 22.&e4)
22.&e2 &h4 23.&xe5+! &xe5
24.&f4 mate.

17.&d3+ &h5 18.&f7f5+! &xf5
If 18...&g5 19.&f7+ &h4 20.&f2.
White mates in two moves by 19.&f7+ &g6 20.&xg6 mate.

164 Queen's Gambit Accepted
Meier
Zukertort
12 board blindfold exhibition,
Athenaeum Chess Club, Manchester 1877
Notes by Steinitz
1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4
Whether the Queen's Gambit should be accepted or not has been a much disputed question. Morphy preferred declining it by 2...e6 in his match against Harrwitz, but confessedly obtained the inferior game, and ultimately decided avoiding the gambit altogether by replying...f5 on the first move in answer to d4.

3.e3 e5 4.&xc4 exd4 5.exd4
&f6 6.&f3 &e7
Preferable in this position to \( \text{d}d6 \). The chances of an attack against the isolated hostile d-pawn are increased by leaving the e-file open.

7.\( \text{e}3 \) 0-0 8.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 9.0-0 \( \text{g}4 \)

10.\( \text{e}2 \)

The retreat was bad policy. 10.d5 was the much better plan, and whether Black then proceeded by 10...\( \text{e}5 \) followed by ...\( \text{e}e5 \), or by transposing those moves, the d-pawn would be well maintained, or else ultimately exchanged for the c-pawn after directing a prospective attack against the latter by \( \text{c}c1 \).

10...\( \text{d}5 \) 11.\( \text{xd}5 \)

This exchange was ill advised, as it removes the only obstacle in the way of the opponent's heavier forces for attacking the d-pawn. 11.wb3 was vastly superior.

11...\( \text{xd}5 \) 12.b3 \( \text{f}6 \)

All this is only consistent with the spirit of this opening. The battle has to be decided in the centre, and White's position stands or falls with the d-pawn.

13.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 14.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 15.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

The blindfold performer exhibits excellent foresight in his manoeuvring, and he reserves the breaking into the opponent's game for the proper time. The next few moves evidence the wisdom of this retreat.

16.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 17.\( \text{gxf}3 \)

Had he retaken now with the Black would have replied 17...\( \text{xd}4 \), and it will be found though White had sufficient pieces to protect that point for ordinary purposes, he could not on this occasion continue taking to the last, as the rook on the open e-file did not permit ultimate exposure of White's first row.

17...\( \text{h}3 \) 18.\( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 19.\( \text{c}5 \)

19...\( \text{xd}4 \! \)

Capital with clear interest, for which the greatest credit is due. The blindfold player recovers his outlay with profit. We can only concentrate our praise on this game, bearing in mind, however, that the performer conducts eleven other games at the same time. It should be observed that White's 18th move was adopted in order to avoid the loss of the exchange by ...\( \text{e}e5 \).

20.\( \text{xd}4 \)

20.\( \text{xd}4 \) would have saved the exchange, but his game was already bad.

20...\( \text{xd}4 \) 21.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 22.\( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 23.\( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 24.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \)

White resigns.

The whole game on the blindfold player's part is a fine specimen of consistent strategy in the struggle for position, and well-executed tactics in consummating the advantage gained.
165 Spanish Game
MacDonnell and Zukertort
Blackburne and Potter
Consultation Game, Kensington,
29 March 1877
Notes by Zukertort
This game was played at a gathering at Mr. Eccles' house.
1.e4 e5 2.gf3 gc6 3.fc3 cf6
Mr. Steinitz here introduced the continuation 3...g6 and 4...gc7.
4.fc5 a6 5.ca4 b5
This advance was injudicious. Black should play at once ...hc5 or ...d6.
6.fc3 hc5
Black has no move which would equalize the game. If 6...gc7, then 7.cgc5; if 6...b4, White may proceed with 7.cgc5
and will get at least rook and two pawns and the superior position for two minor pieces.
7.cxe5

7...0-0?
...cfxf2+ 8.cfxf2 cxe5 9.d4 would leave White with a decisive advantage of position. The move in the text sacrifices a pawn for a short-lived attack.
...cxe5 8.d4 c6 was the best course.
8.cxc6 dxc6 9.0-0 a5
The beginning of an advance, the ultimate result of which is the total breaking up of Black's pawns on the queen's side. Black, however, had no continuity to compensate for the numerical loss. If 9...b4, White replies with 10.ca4 (10.e5 cg4 11.cge4 cd4)
10...cd6 (10...ca7 11.d3 cd6
12.cf3 cg4 13.cf4 11.f3 c5 12.d3
cd7 13.cge3 ce7 14.cf2 cc6
15.cf2 cd7 16.ca1 ch8 17.cf6 f6
and White is a pawn ahead and has a fine attacking position.
10.a3 a4 11.ca2 cg4
If 11...cd6, then 12.cf3.
12.cf1 cd7 13.d3 b4
13...h3 would not effect a draw on account of 14.gxh3 xh3 15.cf4 c6
16.ca2. White had, for a half dozen moves more, to guard against the consequences of this sacrifice.
14.axb4 xb4 15.cd2 a3
The time-limit was 15 moves in an hour, with 20 minutes grace once during the game.
16.bxa3 xa3

17.b11
A well calculated rejoinder which brings to an end Black's attack and leaves White with a superiority in forces and position. The showy coup
17.cd5 would lose a piece, e.g.
17.cd7 xd2 18.cfxf6+ gx6
19.xd2 d8 20.c3 (20.f3 cd4+
21.ch1 cd7 22.c3 c7 23.cf2 ce6)
20...ca8 21.tb2 ta6.
17...xd2 18.xd2 aa8
The rook must retire to his square on account of the threatened rejoinder \( \text{\textit{Ax}}f7+ \). Should Black play 18...\( \texttt{Bxe4} \), White gets an easily won endgame after 19.\( \texttt{dxe4} \) \( \texttt{Bxd2} \) 20.\( \texttt{Bxd2} \) \( \texttt{Bxa8} \) 21.\( \texttt{Bxf7}+ \) \( \texttt{Bxf7} \) 22.\( \texttt{Bxa3} \) \( \texttt{Bxa3} \) 23.f3 \( \texttt{Bxe6} \) 24.\( \texttt{Bxf2} \).

19.\( \texttt{Bxe3} \)

19.\( \texttt{Bc3} \) was bad on account of the answer 19...\( \texttt{Bd4} \). The following moves are played very accurately by White.

19...\( \texttt{Bf7} \) 20.\( \texttt{Bd2} \) \( \texttt{Bfd8} \) 21.f3 \( \texttt{Bd7} \) 22.\( \texttt{Bc4} \) \( \texttt{Bc8} \) 23.\( \texttt{Bb3} \) \( \texttt{Bd7} \) 24.\( \texttt{Bd4} \) \( \texttt{Bb6} \) 25.\( \texttt{Bd3} \) \( \texttt{Bb4} \) 26.\( \texttt{Bf1} \) \( \texttt{Bf7} \)

27.\( \texttt{Bxa8} \)
The right moment for the exchange. White can now advance rapidly in the centre, threatening a powerful attack on the king's side, whilst Black has no advantage by holding the open file with his rook.

27...\( \texttt{Bxa8} \) 28.\( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{Bd7} \) 29.\( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{Bb6} \) 30.\( \texttt{Bf4} \)

At this juncture the game was adjourned for supper. As Mr. MacDonnell could not stay, his place was taken by Mr. Phillip Hirschfield.

30...\( \texttt{g6} \) 31.\( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{Bd5} \) 32.\( \texttt{f6} \)

Messrs. Blackburn and Potter thought at the time that this move was premature, and improved their chances. I cannot agree with them. As White cannot carry the game by direct assault, they proceed to force the adverse pieces out of action.

32.\( \texttt{Bf8} \) 33.\( \texttt{Bc5} \)

Hastily played: 33.\( \texttt{Bh4} \), followed by 34.\( \texttt{Bc5} \) and 35.\( \texttt{e6} \), respectively. 35.\( \texttt{Bb1} \) would leave the adverse game in a helpless position.

33...\( \texttt{Bh6} \) 34.\( \texttt{Bc4} \) \( \texttt{Bd4} \)

If 34...\( \texttt{Bc3} \) 35.\( \texttt{Bxe3} \) \( \texttt{Bxe3} \) 36.\( \texttt{Bf4} \) 37.\( \texttt{h3} \) \( \texttt{Bh6} \) 38.\( \texttt{g4} \) and 39.\( \texttt{Bb1} \).

35.\( \texttt{Bb1} \) \( \texttt{Bd2} \) 36.\( \texttt{Bf2} \)

36.\( \texttt{Bf1} \) would force the exchange of queens, but after 36...\( \texttt{Bxe1} \) + 37.\( \texttt{Bxe1} \) \( \texttt{Bxd3} \) 38.\( \texttt{Bxd3} \) \( \texttt{Bd7} \), Black could prolong the contest considerably.

36...\( \texttt{Bf4} \)

If 36...\( \texttt{Bxe1} \), then 37.\( \texttt{Bxe1} \) \( \texttt{Bc2} \) 38.\( \texttt{Bf8} \) 39.\( \texttt{d6} \) \( \texttt{cxd6} \) 40.\( \texttt{exd6} \) \( \texttt{Bxd6} \) 41.\( \texttt{Bc4} \) \( \texttt{Bf4} \). If 36...\( \texttt{Bc3} \), then 37.\( \texttt{Bf4} \) \( \texttt{Bxe2} \) 38.\( \texttt{Bxe2} \) \( \texttt{Bb2} \) 39.\( \texttt{Bxd3} \) 39.\( \texttt{Bxd3} \) \( \texttt{Bc7} \) (best) 40.\( \texttt{Bc5} \) \( \texttt{Bf5} \) (40...\( \texttt{Bxf6} \) 41.\( \texttt{Bxe6} \) 41.\( \texttt{Bxe6} \) \( \texttt{Bxe6} \) 42.\( \texttt{Bf4} \) \( \texttt{Bb4} \) 43.\( \texttt{Bxh6} \) \( \texttt{Bxc7} \) 44.\( \texttt{Bf4} \) \( \texttt{Bxd5} \) 45.\( \texttt{Bxc4} \) \( \texttt{dxc4} \) 46.\( \texttt{Bf2} \) 41.\( \texttt{d5} \) and 42.\( \texttt{e6} \). The move in the text is the commencement of a very ingenious combination which threatens in the first instance to draw, and then to carry the day by violent assault.

37.\( \texttt{Be4} \)
The right reply. If 37.\( \texttt{Bxb4} \) Black draws by 37...\( \texttt{Bf1} \) + 38.\( \texttt{Bb1} \) (38.\( \texttt{Bb1} \) \( \texttt{Bxd4}+ \) ) 38...\( \texttt{Bxb1} \) + 39.\( \texttt{Bxb1} \) \( \texttt{Bxd4} \) 40.\( \texttt{Bf1} \) \( \texttt{Bd1}+ \).
Match with Blackburne and Tournaments at Leipzig and Cologne 1877

37...\texttt{a}2 38.\texttt{w}e1 \texttt{c}2 39.\texttt{g}3
39.\texttt{b}8 \texttt{h}5 40.\texttt{x}e8+ \texttt{h}7 would leave White but the choice to give up the queen.
39...\texttt{d}2 40.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{f}4
Black had no time at all for this move. 40...\texttt{a}5 would prevent the loss of a piece, but not save the day, e.g. 40...\texttt{a}5 +1.h3 \texttt{b}4 42.\texttt{c}3 \texttt{a}6 43.\texttt{x}a5 \texttt{xa}5 44.\texttt{x}a6 \texttt{xa}6 45.\texttt{b}8 \texttt{f}8 +6.c5 \texttt{a}1+ 47.\texttt{h}2 \texttt{a}6 48.h4 \texttt{h}6 +9.e6.
41.\texttt{b}3
Black resigns.

7.d3
Mr. Zukertort considers this much superior to the usual advance of d4, but we believe that the manner in which the defence is here conducted would, if improved upon, as suggested in our note to 8...\texttt{g}4, suffice to give the second player a satisfactory game. The previous moves on both sides did not require further comment, for they follow the usual order of development. White refrains from advancing the pawn to e5, on account of the well-known answer ...d5.
7...\texttt{e}5
A good move if well pursued, and undoubtedly superior to either 7...\texttt{h}5 at once, or after taking the knight: for in the former case White might reply \texttt{d}5, and in the latter case the game might proceed thus: 7...\texttt{xc}3 8.bxc3 \texttt{h}5 9.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{h}4 10.g3 \texttt{x}g3 (if 10...\texttt{fx}g3 instead, White takes the f-pawn, checking, followed by 12.\texttt{x}h5) 11.\texttt{xf}4 \texttt{g}5 12.\texttt{xf}7+ \texttt{d}8 13.\texttt{f}2, and Black's knight has no escape.
8.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{g}4
Since the pawn gained is just the bone of contention in all forms of the King's Gambit, it becomes a fair question whether it would not have been the wisest plan to protect it now by ...\texttt{g}6, followed by ...\texttt{h}5 if White answer \texttt{e}2; and if this plan should turn out effective, it would prove that Mr. Zukertort's experiment on the seventh move gives White no more advantage than the recommendations of the book authorities.
9.\texttt{x}f4 \texttt{xf}3?*
This is altogether wrong policy. White's centre becomes much strengthened and he obtains a free attacking file for his
rooks, in case Black castles on the king side.

10.gxf3 \( \text{h3} \) 11.g2 \( \text{d7} \)
12.g2 \( \text{c5} \) 13.d4 \( \text{b6} \) 14.h1 \( \text{e5} \) 15.e3 0-0

Black commits his defence too early to the king side. He might have played 15...c6, and, at any rate, left the opponent in the dark for some more moves about the side on which he was going to shelter his king, even if he finally determined to castle on the king side, for circumstances might have arisen to enable him to castle the other way.

16.d2 c6 17.c4

We should have preferred 17.c3. The whole position was indicative of a battle on the king side. The remote chance of an attack on the queen's side was hardly worth the weakening of the d-pawn.

17...h8 18.g1 f6

We see no reason why this pawn could not have advanced one step further. The hostile rook coming in to g5 would have done no harm, as the knight could retreat to f6.

19.f4 e6

Black could not now allow the bishop to be shut up by f5.

20.f5 \( \text{e7} \) 21.g2 \( \text{e8} \) 22.e2\( \text{c2} \)

To protect the pawn, either with the queen or with the knight at c3, would have withdrawn an active attacking piece from the assault for defensive purposes. Mr. Zukertort prefers keeping in hand the pressure of a most moment charge, at the sacrifice of a pawn.

22...xc4 23.g3 \( \text{g5} \)
24.xg3 \( \text{e7} \) 25.b3

The driving back of the bishop fits into White's plan. The bishop has better retreat than the one actually chosen, where he obstructs the action of the other pieces; for if he went to a1, White would soon direct his attack with the rooks against the h-pawn.

25...g8 26.g2

26.d5?

The crisis required the most minute and concentrated attention and we believe that Black had still strong defensive resources at his command had he now played 26...ff7 at once, threatening d5 with much greater effect, for White had then no time to withdraw the bishop as it would have been useless for him to give up the d-pawn. The precipitation of the advance of the d-pawn gives the adversary occasion for a brilliant manoeuvre.

27.h6l ff7 28.e5 fxe5 29.f6!

Black resigns.

The finish is very fine and in Mr. Zukertort's happiest style. If Black takes the pawn with the rook, the answer is 30.xg7+ etc.
167 Bishop's Opening
Zukertort (without \(\diamond b1\))

West End Chess Club, April 1877

Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{W}e2\) \(\text{c}5\)
4.f4 d6

We indicated some time ago the proper defence to this opening. Black should bring out the knight to \(c6\) immediately as answer to \(\text{W}e2\), which compels White to play \(c3\) or to abandon the whole plan of advancing the pawn to \(f5\). This gains the time for Black, which afterwards enables him to capture the knight with the bishop, followed by castling.

5.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 6.\(\text{c}3\)

6...exf4?

This capture might mark the quality of Black's play as normal with the odds he takes; for it is now generally known that the adverse f-pawn ought not to be taken when the bishop has already been brought out after the gambit has been refused, for the first player gains a double advantage in pushing the pawn to \(d4\), establishing his centre, and attacking the bishop. Yet in the match between Morphy and Löwenthal, the latter once defended the King's Gambit declined in the now justly prohibited fashion, and it is therefore not to be wondered that a knight's player, who apparently has not made the openings a study, should drop into the same error.

7.d4 \(\text{b}6\) 8.\(\text{x}f4\) 0-0 9.0-0-0 \(h6\)
10.e5 \(\text{h}7\) 11.\(h3\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 12.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{we7}\)
13.\(\text{we4}\) \(\text{f6}\) 14.\(\text{d}3\) \(f5\)
15.\(\text{we2}\) \(\text{wc}5\) 16.\(\text{h}f1\)

Obviously necessary to prevent the exchange of the queen at \(f2\).

16...a5 17.\(\text{b}1\) a4 18.\(\text{wc2}\) a3
19.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 20.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xe5}\)?

Costs a piece. He ought to have first played one of the rooks to \(e8\).

21.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 22.\(\text{fe1}\) \(\text{f6}\)
23.\(\text{xe6}\)\! \(\text{wh4}\) 24.\(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{g}5\)
25.\(\text{g}6\) \(\text{fe8}\) 26.\(\text{g}4\)!

The initiation of a fine combination well worked out, as the sequel shows.

26...\(\text{e}5\) 27.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{b}6\) 28.\(\text{xe6}\)\! \(\text{hxg5}\)
29.\(\text{b}3\) + \(\text{h}8\) 30.\(\text{f}7\)! \(\text{g}8\)

31.\(\text{w}xg7\)\!\!

The finish is most beautiful. On account of a similar combination, Black could not capture the queen at a previous stage.

31...\(\text{xe6}\) 32.\(\text{d}8\) + \(\text{h}7\)

It was of no more use to interpose the rook, for White would have taken 33.\(\text{dxg8}\)\+, followed by the check of the other rook at \(g7\), ultimately mating at \(h7\).

33.\(\text{h}6\) +\!

and White mates in two more moves.
168 Evans Gambit
Zukertort (without b1)
W.
St. George's Chess Club, 1877
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 a6 4.a4 f6 5.c3 b5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 b6 9.e1
A strong move in this opening when the odds of the knight has been given.
9...g4 10.a4 xf3
The better plan was to retreat the bishop to d7. If White then advanced the e-pawn, Black might answer ...d5, threatening ...xd4 with a good game. With a piece already behind, White could not venture to play the queen to b3 in order to institute the Fraser or Mortimer attack.
11.d5 g4 12.dxc6 bxc6 13.e5!
Excellent play. This was much stronger than 13.xc6+.
13...e7
The best way to avoid all the complications to which he was after this subjected, was to return the pawn gained, with an extra pawn profit, by advancing the pawn to d5, e.g. 13...d5 14.xc6+ f8 15.a3+ e7 16.xd5 c8 etc.
14.exd6 cxd6 15.g5 f6
16.xc6+ f8
17.xe7!
High class play. Black's reply is compulsory, and consequently White's two bishops obtain fine attacking range. White confines Black's king in a harnessing manner.
17...xe7 18.e1+ f8 19.c5 20.d5 e6
A piece was lost, but he ought to have given up the bishop at h5 after which he might have had some chance of developing all his pieces by ...c7, followed by ...d8, and afterwards ...d4. Black apparently relied upon the defensive defensive power of his next move, overlooking his opponent's brilliant answer.
21.xe6 e8 22.xf6+!
and White mates on the next move.

169 Spanish Game
Blackburne
Zukertort
2nd Match Game, London, 28 June 1877
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 a6 4.a4 f6 5.c3 b5 6.0-0 d6
Professor Anderssen suggests this ingenious retreat, which we had occasion to point out some time ago in the Four Knights Game where it would appear a good answer to the same sort of sacrifice of the knight for the pawn. But the analogy seems to fail in one important point – that, in the otherwise similar situation of the Four Knights opening,
the first player’s king’s bishop and the
second player’s king’s knight are at
home, and, as will be shown subse-
quently, White might have utilised that
difference to gain some advantage in
position.

8.dxe5 \( \text{Q}x e5 \) 9.e2
A fine move; for he prepares a sound at-
tack without the least risk, as Black can-
not capture the pawn on account of the
reply \( \text{W}d5 \).

9...c6 10.f4 \( \text{Q}c7 \) 11.Wd3?
Feeble in the extreme; for it may be re-
garded as tantamount to throwing away
the advantage of the first move. It was
manifestly stronger play to advance the
pawn to \( e5 \) at once, e.g. 11.e5 \( \text{Q}e4 \)
12.Wd4 f5 13.\( \text{Q}e3 \) 0-0 14.b3+ \( \text{Wh}8 \)
15.g3, followed by casting on the
queen’s side, with the superior game.

11...d5 12.e5
Strong as it would have been before, the
advance is quite unreliable now, for the
pawn at \( e5 \) is soon made an object of at-
tack after the opponent’s casting. The
best plan would have been now to cap-
ture the pawn and to endeavour to keep
the game even by exchanging queens.

12...\( \text{Q}e4 \) 13.\( \text{Q}e3 \) \( \text{Q}f5 \)
Better than 13...\( \text{Q}x e5 \), for though the
latter gained a pawn, it would have
equalised the game, the parties remain-
ing with bishops of opposite colours.

e.g. 13...\( \text{Q}x e5 \) 14.fx5 \( \text{W}a5+ \) 15.c3
\( \text{Q}xc3 \) 16.bxc6+ bxc6 17.\( \text{W}xc3 \) etc.

14.Wd4

14...0-0
White on the last move could not at-
tempt to prevent the casting by
14.\( \text{W}a3 \) on account of the reply
14...b5, driving back the bishop, fol-
lowed by 15...b4, which pawn obvi-
ously could not be captured by the
queen without subjecting the latter to
loss by ...\( \text{Q}a5 \). The queen would then
have been compelled to keep confined
at \( a4 \). Black, under the present circum-
stances, has obtained an excellent game,
and in our opinion acted wisely in not
yielding to the temptation of winning a
piece by the following manoeuvre:
14...b5 15.\( \text{b}3 \) c5 16.\( \text{W}xd5 \) c4
17.\( \text{W}c6+ \) \( \text{Q}f8 \) 18.\( \text{b}4 \) g6 19.\( \text{Q}xc4 \),
obtaining three pawns for the piece,
with an excellent game.

15.c3f6
Since Mr. Steinitz introduced this move
in a similar position in the Giuoco Pi-
ano, the force of thus breaking the
pawns has been recognised in almost all
cases where the adverse pawn has been
advanced to \( e5 \).

16.\( \text{Q}b3 \)
White’s position was already inferior;
but certainly the best recourse would
have been to give up the pawn at once
by advancing 16.e6, in order not to
give the opponent two open files for
the rooks.

16...\textit{e7}

Nor was this the best, for it still leaves
White the chance of diminishing his
disadvantage by giving up the pawn at
once as above, while taking the pawn
first, followed by ...\textit{e7}, would have
secured the gain of the pawn, and also
free action for both rooks.

17.exf6?

From this point White's game might be
reckoned as lost, for Black's attack is ir-
resistible.

17...\textit{xf6} 18.\textit{g3} \textit{g4} 19.d2
\textit{xe3} 20.ae1

This loses the exchange at least, but he
had hardly anything better. Had he
taken the knight at once, Black would
have obtained a winning position in a
simple manner, which left hardly any
room for an error on the part of the op-
ponent on account of complications,
e.g. 20.xe3 xe3+ 21.xe3 aae8+
22.f3 d3 etc.

20...\textit{h4} 21.xe3 xf4 22.xf5
\textit{xf5} 23.d3

\begin{center}
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23...c5!

Very fine play.

24.\textit{e4}

The best under the circumstances (bad
as it was anyhow) was to capture the
c-pawn with the queen and to
escape with the exchange

24.\textit{xd5+} was of no more use,
24.\textit{xd5+} \textit{h8} 25.\textit{e4}
26.\textit{xd5} d8 27.a8+ xe8.\textit{e8},
piece ahead.

24...c4+ 25.xc4 dxc4+ 26.\textit{e7}

Had he taken the c-pawn, checking
Black would have moved the king
to the corner, threatening 27...\textit{e7},
winning speedily.

26...\textit{f2}+ 27.e2 a5 28.b4
b8 29.d7

Taking the a-pawn would have been
immediately disastrous, on account of the
reply 29...\textit{f6}, attacking the queen
at the same time clearing the way for
the terrible check of Black's queen at f1
with the subsequent mate at b1.

29...\textit{b6} 30.b1

30...f7

Mr. Minchin, the hon. secretary of the
St. George's Chess Club — who, with
some other strong players, analysed
the game in another room of the estab-
ishment — pointed out that Black
would have won the game much quicker
by the following fine mode of pro-
dure: 30...\textit{e5} 31.\textit{c2} or \textit{g5}
(31.\textit{c2} would be fatal at once,
Black would exchange rooks, followed
by ...\textit{g1+} etc.) 31...\textit{b5} and wins.

31.d5 b5 32.e6 f5+
33.xf5 xf5 34.e4 \textit{g5}
If White was in hopes of his opponent committing a mistake, here was the last chance. But Black cautiously avoids 34...\( \text{\text{c}}_5 \), which would have cost a piece, owing to the reply 35 \( \text{g}^4 \), followed by 36 \( \text{h}^4 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
35.\text{h}^c^4 & \text{h}^f^2 36.\text{b}^3 & \text{x}^g^2 37.\text{h}^4 \\
\text{h}^f^6 & 38.\text{x}^c^6 & \text{d}^8 \\
\end{align*}
\]

As this enables Black ultimately to bring both rooks on the 7th file, White might as well have resigned here.

\[
\begin{align*}
39.\text{x}^a^6 & \text{x}^c^3 40.\text{f}^1 & \text{f}^6 41.\text{h}^5 \\
\text{b}^2 + & 42.\text{a}^1 & \text{f}^2 + \\
\end{align*}
\]

White resigns.

170 Four Knights Game
Zukertort
Englisch
Leipzig tournament, 19 July 1877
Notes by Schallopp

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{c}^3 \) c6 3.f3 \( \text{f}^6 \) 4.b5 b4
We prefer 4...\( \text{c}^5 \).

5.\( \text{d}^5 \) \( \text{c}^5 \) 6.d3 a6 7.c4 h6
8.c3 d6 9.b3 0-0 10.h3 \( \text{e}^6 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
11.\text{e}^3 & \text{d}^5 12.\text{exd}^5 & \text{xd}^5 \\
13.\text{xd}^5 & \text{xd}^5 14.0-0 & \text{xb}^3 \\
15.\text{xb}^3 & \text{xb}^8 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here, 15...\( \text{xd}^3 \) 16.\( \text{xb}^7 \) \( \text{b}^5 \) came into consideration.

16.\( \text{c}^2 \) \( \text{f}^6 \)

Black should rather first advance the f-pawn two squares.

17.\( \text{e}^3 \) \( \text{d}^6 \) 18.\( \text{d}^2 \) \( \text{e}^7 \)

18...\( \text{g}^6 \) is better, in order to move the bishop back to e7, if it should be attacked.

19.\( \text{e}^4 \) \( \text{w}^6 \) 20.d4 \( \text{f}^5 \) 21.\( \text{xd}^6 \) \( \text{xd}^6 \)

On 21...\( \text{xd}^6 \) 22.dxe5 \( \text{xe}^5 \) 23.\( \text{d}^4 \) the bishop is well placed.

22.\( \text{d}^2 \) \( \text{f}^8 \) 23.\( \text{f}^1 \) \( \text{bc}^8 \)
24.f3 \( \text{g}^6 \) 25.\( \text{f}^2 \) exd4

This exchange isolates the d6-pawn and it is seen how energetically White exploits this weakness in Black's position, right up to the ending of the game.

\[
\begin{align*}
26.\text{xd}^4 & \text{xd}^4 27.\text{xd}^4 & \text{e}^6 \\
28.\text{xe}^6 & \text{xe}^6 29.a3 & \text{e}^5 \\
30.\text{d}^1 & \text{xd}^4 + & 31.\text{xd}^4 & \text{e}^6 \\
32.\text{b}^4 & \text{b}^6 33.\text{f}^2 & \text{f}^8 34.\text{e}^3 \\
\text{e}^7 & 35.\text{a}^4 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The rook has a completely free operation line, which will be masterfully exploited.

35...\( \text{b}^5 \) 36.\( \text{g}^4 \) \( \text{f}^8 \) 37.\( \text{a}^4 \)

The same move would follow on ...\( \text{g}^6 \) or ...\( \text{g}^5 \).
37...\textit{c}5 38.\textit{d}3 \textit{f}6 39.\textit{axb}5 \textit{axb}5 40.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}5 41.\textit{e}4
Since White has also isolated the \textit{b}5-pawn, he can calmly offer an exchange of rooks.
41...\textit{f}5 42.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}5 43.\textit{g}4!
The exchange of rooks is now forced.

43...\textit{d}5+ 44.\textit{d}4 \textit{xd}4+
The White rook never abandoned the fourth rank, which has been so good to him.
45.\textit{xd}4 \textit{gx}f4
Black cannot avoid isolating all his pawns. On 45...\textit{e}7, immediately decisive is 46.\textit{f}5 \textit{d}8 47.\textit{c}4.
46.\textit{e}4 \textit{f}7 47.\textit{xf}4 \textit{e}6
48.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}5+ 49.\textit{f}4! \textit{d}4 50.\textit{cx}d4 \textit{d}5 51.\textit{e}5 \textit{c}4
Taking on \textit{d}4 produces the same position, only a move earlier.
52.\textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 53.\textit{xf}6 \textit{c}4 54.\textit{h}4 \textit{xb}4 55.\textit{g}5 \textit{hx}g5 56.\textit{hx}g5 \textit{c}3
57.\textit{g}6 \textit{b}4 58.\textit{g}7 \textit{b}3 59.\textit{g}8\textit{w} \textit{b}2 60.\textit{w}g6
Black resigns.

171 Evans Gambit
Paulsen
Zukertort
Leipzig tournament, 20 July 1877
Notes by Steinitz and Schallopp
1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}5
4.\textit{b}4 \textit{xb}4 5.c3 \textit{a}5 6.d4 \textit{ex}d4

7.0-0 \textit{d}c3 8.\textit{wb}3 \textit{w}f6 9.e5
10.\textit{xc}3 \textit{ge}7 11.\textit{a}3
Schallopp: Theory does not consider this move particularly strong and 11.\textit{e}2.
11...0-0 12.\textit{e}ad1
Steinitz: \textit{e}2 on the 11th move or a point has been held to give the player a fine attack, until the answer \textit{b}5 was introduced by Anderssen. We have once before remarked that 12...\textit{b}5 at the present juncture would prove impracticable on account of the rejoinder 12...\textit{d}x\textit{d}5, followed, in case White the rook, by 13...\textit{f}4 threatening. The move in the text is new, but certainly too quiet; and the same sort of counter attack as usually adopted against the main lines of play of the so-called Compromised Defence of the Evans Gambit soon shows it to be harmless.
12...\textit{b}5
Steinitz: The usual key move of the counter attack.
13.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}8

14.\textit{xe}7
Steinitz: This unhappy exchange would probably lead the initiated to examine the initials of the player, who thus Paulsen's style a flat contradiction. Paulsen - namely, Louis Paulsen - would have thought the matter twin...
over in any similar situation; and then, in nine cases out of ten, he would have decided not to exchange a bishop for a knight. Wilfried Paulsen is freer from prejudice than, but not so free from error as, his more successful brother. The two bishops are indispensable for the attack in this opening.

Schallopp: Instead of this exchange, 14.\texttt{Qf}d4 comes into consideration. If then 14...\texttt{Qxd}4 15.\texttt{Qxd}4 \texttt{Qb}7 is played, then White is not badly placed after 16.\texttt{Wh}3. On the other hand, upon 14...a6 could follow 15.\texttt{Qxc}6 \texttt{Qxc}6 16.\texttt{Qxf}8. \texttt{Qxf}8 (if 16...\texttt{axb}5 then 17.\texttt{Qd}3 and the bishop on f8 is saved) 17.\texttt{Qd}3 \texttt{Wh}5 18.\texttt{Qc}1 \texttt{axb}5 19.\texttt{Qxc}6 \texttt{dxc}6 20.\texttt{Wh}a3+ \texttt{Qg}8 21.\texttt{Wh}a5, since now 21...\texttt{Qxe}5 fails to 22.\texttt{Qe}1.

14...\texttt{Qxe}7 15.\texttt{Qa}3 \texttt{Qc}6 16.\texttt{Qbd}4

Schallopp: Here White should have simply taken the a7-pawn: we do not see how then Black can get the advantage. On 16.\texttt{Qxa}7 \texttt{Qb}4 17.\texttt{Wa}4 \texttt{Qxa}7 18.\texttt{Wxa}7 \texttt{Qb}7 would follow 19.\texttt{Wh}4 followed by 20.\texttt{Qd}4.

16...\texttt{Qb}4

Schallopp: Black has now held on to his pawn and obtained an attack.

17.\texttt{Qc}1 \texttt{Qb}7

Schallopp: Threatening 18...\texttt{Qxe}5!

Steinitz: The disaster of which this unlucky move is the forerunner was not perceptible on the surface; but its being overlooked by a player of Mr. Paulsen’s calibre in an important match game, is nevertheless strange.

Schallopp: A mistake which loses a piece. White could have still very well held the game with 18.\texttt{Qf}4.

18...\texttt{Qxd}4!

Steinitz: Finely conceived, and, as will be seen, it wins a piece by force. The answer of 19.\texttt{Wh}1 will be found on examination unavailable, e.g. 19.\texttt{Wh}1 \texttt{Qg}4 20.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{Wh}5, and White dare not recapture the knight on account of the impending ...\texttt{Wh}xh3+.

19.\texttt{Wh}4

Schallopp: On 19.\texttt{Qxg}6 naturally follows 19...\texttt{Qe}2++; on 19.\texttt{Wh}1, on the other hand, 19...\texttt{Qg}4 20.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{Wh}5.

19...\texttt{Qxd}3

Schallopp: Also 19...\texttt{Qg}4 would have led to the win, and indeed even more quickly.

20.\texttt{Qxd}3

Steinitz: After this the game presents little interest for players of a moderate strength, for, with a piece ahead, Black ought to have no difficulty to win. But we think it right to give the game in full, as Mr. Paulsen must have evidently thought that he had some chance of retrieving fortunes.

20...\texttt{Qe}2+ 21.\texttt{Wh}1 \texttt{Qxc}1 22.\texttt{Qxc}1 \texttt{Qc}6 23.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{Qf}8 24.f4 \texttt{Qg}6 25.\texttt{Qf}3 \texttt{Qa}5 26.\texttt{Qd}4 \texttt{Qe}4 27.\texttt{Qg}3 \texttt{Qb}2 28.\texttt{Qb}3 \texttt{Qxa}2 29.\texttt{Qxa}5 \texttt{Qxa}5 30.\texttt{Qxc}7 \texttt{Qc}6 31.\texttt{Qh}2 \texttt{Qa}2 32.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{Qf}2 33.\texttt{h}5 \texttt{Qxf}4

Steinitz: Black need do nothing more but to pick up pawns and exchange pieces, and the enemy must die of exhaustion.
34.h6 \h4+ 35.h3 \xh3+ 36.xh3 a5 37.g4 a4 38.g3 a3 39.a7 a8
White resigns.

172 Scotch Gambit
Metger
Zukertort
Leipzig tournament, 20 July 1877
Notes by Schallopp
1.e4 e5 2.\lxf3 \xc6 3.d4 exd4 4.c3 dxc3 5.\c4 \xc6
Anderssen preferred 5...\b4, with the continuation 6.0-0.d6. Whether rightly so, remains to be seen.
6.\g5
This attack seems premature; castling must be better.
6...\e5 7.\b3

7...d5
Black can here very well play 7...h6, since after 8.f4 hgx5 9.fxe5, he gains an important tempo by 9...\c2. If then 10.\xc2, there follows 10...\g4; on the other hand, if 10.\lxf3 is played, then follows 10...\xb1 11.xb1 \e7 and in both cases Black has the advantage.
8.exd5 \b4 9.0-0 0-0 10.\xc3 h6 11.\ge4 \xe4 12.\xe4 \h4 13.\l d4 \d6 14.f4 \g4 15.h3 \f6 16.\xf6+
Taking the bishop on d6 would be more careful, though the exchange on f6 does not seem to be a direct mistake.
The mistake lies in the first place White's next move.
16...\lxf6 17.\c2?
White overlooks Black's next move. The right move here is 17.\c3, and 17...b6, 18.e3 followed by \f3.
Deutsche Schachzeitung gives 17.\h5 18.\f3 \g6 19.f5 as best.

17...\xh3!
This sacrifice is completely correct, since it cannot be accepted by White. White takes the bishop 18.gxh3, then follows 18...\g3+ 19.\h1 \xh3- 20.\g1 \c5 21.\xc5 \g3+ 22.\xh8 23.\e3 \h4+ 24.\g2 \g5 25.\f3 \ae8 26.\xe8 \h3+ etc.
18.\l d3?
This costs a piece. The queen must go c3.
18...\c5+ 19.\e3 \f5! 20.\f3 \xe3+ 21.\xe3 \xc2 22.\f5 23.\af1 \g4 24.\g3 \f6 25.\f3 \w f6
White resigns.

173 Scotch Game
Zukertort
Schallopp
Leipzig tournament, 21 July 1877
Notes by Steinitz and Schallopp
1.e4 e5 2.\f3 \c6 3.d4 exd4 4.\xd4 \c5 5.\b3
Match with Blackburne and Tournaments at Leipzig and Cologne 1877

Steinitz: Suggested by Mr. Blackburne, but first played by Mr. Potter in last year's Divan tourney.

Schoellkopf: A novelty, which, on correct play however, hands over the attack to Black.

5...\textit{b}6 6.\textit{c}3 \textit{g}e7

Steinitz: Black does not hit upon the right move. With 6...\textit{f}6 7.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}e7, after which 8.\textit{c}4 is not good because of 8...\textit{e}5, Black seems to achieve the better game.

7.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}6 8.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}6 9.\textit{g}3 \textit{d}6

Steinitz: Black ought to have castled at once. He never gets another favourable opportunity.

Schoellkopf: If Black castles, then White attacks with the h-pawn.

11.\textit{c}4

12.\textit{w}d5 \textit{w}f6 13.0-0-0 \textit{h}4

Schoellkopf: Black hurries the attack too much; 13...\textit{d}7 was preferable.

14.\textit{e}5 \textit{dxe}5 15.\textit{fxe}5 \textit{w}g5+

Steinitz: Was it really so dangerous to play 15...\textit{e}3+, followed by ...\textit{exe}5? Supposing: 15...\textit{e}3+ 16.\textit{b}1 \textit{exe}5 17.\textit{exe}5 \textit{exe}5. If now 18.\textit{he}1, then follows 18...c6 and White must sacrifice the queen, for he cannot leave the bishop to be taken. He gets then two minor pieces for the queen, but hardly a long sustainable attack, e.g. 19.\textit{exe}5 cxd5 20.\textit{xd}5 g6, and we believe he will escape accordingly on the king side or queen side.

16.\textit{b}1 \textit{f}8 17.\textit{b}5 \textit{e}7

Schoellkopf: Better was 17...\textit{e}7 18.\textit{xc}6 \textit{e}6!.

18.\textit{w}d8+ \textit{f}7 19.\textit{c}4+ \textit{e}6

20.\textit{exe}6+\textit{exe}6

Schoellkopf: Leaving the white queen in a remarkable position!

21.\textit{d}7+ \textit{f}7 22.\textit{e}6+ \textit{g}6

23.\textit{xc}7

11...\textit{h}5

Steinitz: Having once precipitated his attack against the opponent's centre, it was the more consistent plan to capture the e-pawn, in which case the game might have proceeded thus: 11...\textit{fxe}4 12.\textit{wh}5 \textit{e}7 13.0-0-0 \textit{c}6 14.\textit{f}5 \textit{xf}5 15.\textit{fh}1 \textit{d}5 16.\textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 17.\textit{xf}5 \textit{w}f6 18.\textit{xf}6 gxf6 with the full equivalent of two pawns against the exchange.

Schoellkopf: So as to prevent 12.\textit{wh}5. However, better seems 11...\textit{a}5 12.\textit{xa}5 \textit{xa}5 13.\textit{wh}5 \textit{f}6.
Schallopp: Black had overlooked this move when he played 17...\(\text{Q}\)\text{ge7}.

23...\(\text{Q}\)\text{ad8}

Steinitz: The moves on both sides from the 15th were compulsory, but now Black tries to obtain some sort of attacking balance on the king side by sacrificing the exchange, having lost a clear pawn already, and being exposed to the disastrous 24.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xb6} followed by 25.\(\text{Q}\)\text{g1} if he were to capture the g-pawn at once. Had he removed the bishop to e3, White could have answered 24.g3 with an excellent game.

Schallopp: Black sacrifices the exchange, so as to be able to better utilise his king's side pawns, but these can no longer be seen to best advantage.

24.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xd8} \(\text{Q}\)\text{xd8} 25.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xb7} \(\text{Q}\)\text{g2}

Steinitz: The moves on both sides from the 15th were compulsory, but now Black tries to obtain some sort of attacking balance on the king side by sacrificing the exchange, having lost a clear pawn already, and being exposed to the disastrous 24.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xb6} followed by 25.\(\text{Q}\)\text{g1} if he were to capture the g-pawn at once. Had he removed the bishop to e3, White could have answered 24.g3 with an excellent game.

25.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xd8} \(\text{Q}\)\text{xd8} 26.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xd8} \(\text{Q}\)\text{h1+} 27.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d1} \(\text{Q}\)\text{h2} 28.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d7}

28...\(\text{Q}\)\text{b8}

Schallopp: 28...\(\text{Q}\)\text{c7} would not have changed the result, after 29.\(\text{Q}\)\text{e8+} and 30.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d7}.

Steinitz: That Black had adopted the best plan in sacrificing the exchange is shown by the progress of the game up to this point. But here he could have made matters more difficult by 28...\(\text{Q}\)\text{c7}. If White then exchanged or allowed the exchange, Black's pawns on the king side become formidable, and if 29.\(\text{Q}\)\text{e8+} \(\text{Q}\)\text{g5} 30.\(\text{Q}\)\text{f7} (better than 30.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d5} at once, for then Black might play 30...\(\text{Q}\)\text{d8}, while now he can answer 30...\(\text{Q}\)\text{g6} on account of 31.\(\text{Q}\)\text{gl+} 30...\(\text{Q}\)\text{d6} 31.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d5} 32.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xd5} \(\text{Q}\)\text{h3}, threatening 33.\(\text{Q}\)\text{g3} followed by ...\(\text{Q}\)\text{gl+} and ...\(\text{Q}\)\text{h2}. It follows therefore that White could not well in that case pursue the plan of exchanging one of the knights at d5, and therefore Black could have kept more defensive power at command than by the move in the text, which subjects him to the severest attack.

30.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d5} \(\text{Q}\)\text{xd5} 30.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xd5} \(\text{Q}\)\text{e5} 31.\(\text{Q}\)\text{b5}

Steinitz: White evidently overlooked that he could have won the game at once by 31.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xe5}, followed by 32...\(\text{Q}\)\text{e7}, threatening to queen checking, for he could cover any check of the queen by \(\text{Q}\)\text{c1}.

31...\(\text{Q}\)\text{a6} 32.\(\text{Q}\)\text{e2} \(\text{Q}\)\text{g4} 33.\(\text{Q}\)\text{e7} \(\text{Q}\)\text{e5} 34.\(\text{Q}\)\text{e6}

Steinitz: White threatens 35.\(\text{Q}\)\text{d8}. If the king moves to h6, then follows 35.\(\text{Q}\)\text{xf5}, threatening to capture the knight, and the queen must move to e8, abandoning the bishop.
In the above-named match, $\mathcal{Q}c3$ was played early, and the answer of $...\mathcal{b}4$ brought the leading players into such difficulties as to produce the impression with some strong players that $a3$ was an indispensable move in this opening. In the present instance the precaution seems to us, however, unnecessary, and the knight might have been developed at once, since a comfortable retreat was open for it at $e2$ in answer to $...\mathcal{b}4$, to be followed accordingly by $a3$ or $\mathcal{g}3$.

In any rate, $\mathcal{f}3$ could have been played first with advantage, for if then Black played $...d5$, the answer of $\mathcal{c}3$ became perfectly correct, the position being analogous with many others arising in the same opening where the doubling of White's pawns at $c3$ is even an advantage as consequence of the second player's pawn being already fixed.

$3...c5 4.f3 \mathcal{c}6 5.c3 a6$

One of those routine moves which imperceptibly damage the progress of the game when not carefully weighed in relation to the position in general. As the sequel shows, the advance of this pawn weakened the queen's wing considerably, and gave the opponents the advantage in the development.

$6.d4 d5 7.dxc5 \mathcal{x}c5 8.b4 \mathcal{d}6 9.c5$

In our opinion White has now the best of the game. White's far-advanced pawns on the queen's side are very menacing, while Black's centre pawns can easily be kept inoffensive.

$9...\mathcal{c}7 10.\mathcal{b}2 0-0 11.\mathcal{w}b3 \mathcal{w}e7$

$12.e2 \mathcal{d}7 13.0-0 \mathcal{e}ad8$

$14.\mathcal{f}d1 \mathcal{c}8 15.\mathcal{ac}1 h6$

Black play the waiting game, and as a matter of fact, they can do nothing else.

$16.a4 e5 17.b5$

Taking the $d$-pawn with the knight was obviously out of question on account of $...\mathcal{e}6$ after retaking first the knight.

$17.axb5 18.axb5 e4$

Black's $d$-pawn is now made still weaker, as it remains quite fixed now, and sufficient forces can be accumulated against it to win it ultimately, yet there was nothing better. Had they played for instance $18...\mathcal{a}5$, the game might have gone on $19.\mathcal{w}a2$ (threatening $b6$) $19...b6 20.cb6 \mathcal{xb}6 21.\mathcal{x}d5 \mathcal{xd}5$

$22.\mathcal{xd}5 \mathcal{e}6 23.\mathcal{xe}5$ etc.

$19.\mathcal{d}2 \mathcal{e}5 20.\mathcal{f}1$

Here $20.h3$ was a necessary precaution, and White's neglecting it seriously imperils their position. The queen could not take the $c$-pawn in reply to the move suggested, as White would then answer $\mathcal{d}xe4$.

$20...\mathcal{g}4!$

An excellent move, which gives Black a fine attack.

$21.\mathcal{xd}5$
White gets the worst of this capture; but, whatever they did, they could not recover from having allowed their opponent to egress with the bishop on the king's flank. Had they taken the bishop first, the game might have proceeded thus: 21.\textit{xg4} \textit{fxg4} 22.\textit{h3} (if 22.\textit{xd5} instead, then follows 22...\textit{h4}, and on the rook or queen defending the f-pawn, the answer of 23...\textit{f3+} would decide the game) 22...\textit{f3+} 23.\textit{xf3} \textit{exf3}. And, play as White may, they cannot prevent mate in a few moves, as Black will bring next the queen to h4, followed accordingly by ...\textit{h3} or ...\textit{h3} etc.

\textbf{21...\textit{xd5} 22.\textit{xg4} \textit{d3} 23.\textit{xd3}}

The sacrifice was unavoidable. Had they moved 23.\textit{c2}, the answer would have been 23...\textit{b4}, followed accordingly by ...\textit{xc5} or ...\textit{h4}.

\textbf{23...\textit{exd3} 24.\textit{xd3} \textit{e5} 25.\textit{b3} \textit{xb2} 26.\textit{xb2} \textit{f6} 27.\textit{f3} \textit{e4} 28.c6 \textit{bxc6} 29.bxc6 \textit{g5} 30.\textit{e2} \textit{b8} 31.\textit{c2} \textit{fc8} 32.\textit{g3} \textit{we5} 33.c7}

\textbf{33...\textit{b7}}

The play of the white allies, who had to defend an uphill battle, has been simply beyond praise. Whether Black were prepared for the beautiful manoeuvre which follows we cannot tell; but it will be seen that they would have done even worse in attempting to stop it either by ...\textit{b6}, as the following beautiful variations will show. In the first place, 33...\textit{b2} 34.\textit{f5} \textit{e6} (if Black exchanges queens, White, after regaining the knight, would threaten ...\textit{d6}, both of which cannot be defended) 35.\textit{h4} \textit{xe2} (best; for if the knight retreat to h7, White would exchange queens followed by \textit{a6}) 36.\textit{hxg5} \textit{xe3} 37.\textit{xe3+} \textit{h2} and wins, since Black's rook is also en prise. Secondly: 33...\textit{f5} \textit{b2} 35.\textit{e7+} \textit{h8} (it will be seen that if the king move to f8, White would proceed in the same way as in our following analysis; only in the last move of the variation they would play the knight to b6 instead of d6) 36.\textit{xc2} 37.\textit{xc2} \textit{e6} 38.d6 \textit{d6} (threatening to win the queen by \textit{xf7+}), and winning without difficulty, for Black must now check with the queen at a1, and on the bishop covering, sacrifice the knight for the pawn, leaving White three pieces and a pawn for the queen, which is more than enough to win.

\textbf{34.\textit{a6} \textit{bxc7} 35.\textit{xc8}}

This finely conceived sacrifice of the queen ought to have secured the game by rights, but White subsequently did not make the most of his defensive resources as will be seen hereafter.

\textbf{35...\textit{xc2} 36.\textit{xc2} \textit{a1+} 37.\textit{f1} \textit{g6} 38.f3 \textit{e1} 39.\textit{a6} \textit{h5} 40.\textit{e4} \textit{h4} 41.h3?}

Here is the lapsus. A weak spot is created where the knight can be settled ultimately, however long it may take to bring it to that square. The proper mode of defence was 41.\textit{f2}, letting the pawns come on further, e.g. 41...\textit{h3} 42.g3 \textit{dl} 43.\textit{e2} \textit{d5} 44.f4 \textit{e8} (if the knight retreat to e6, then...
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This master stroke decided one of the most difficult ending games that we ever came across within actual play.

58. hxg4! 59... c4+ 60... b5
60. a2 could not be done on account of 60... cxf1+, followed either by ... wa2 or ... g3+ etc.

60... h3!

A splendid termination. If the king takes the pawn, then Black would take the knight threatening mate next move. Whatever they may now do, they cannot save the game.

61. e3  fxe3  62. axh3  e2
63. a2  dxe2  dxe2

White resigns.

175 Scotch Game
Göring
Zukertort

Notes by Zukertort
Cologne, August 1877

1. e4  e5  2. f3  c6  3. d4  exd4
4. cxd4  c5  5. e3  f6  6. c3
gxe7  7. b5  dxe4  8. cxd4  b4+
9. f3  d6  10. d3

After 10. 0-0  e3  11. bxc3  fxe4
12. e1  f5, Black should be able, we think, to obtain a satisfactory position with a pawn ahead.

10... c6
Johannes Zukertort

11...c4 was preferable.

11...d5! 12.e5

If 12.exd5, Black would proceed with 12...g4 13.g3 (if 13.dxc6 then 13...b5 14... moves bxa4) 13...xd5.

12...0-0 13.0-0 g4 14...h6

To prevent the exchange of queens which White might offer at g5.

15...h1?

A weak move which gives Black the necessary time to institute a decisive attack.

15...f6 16.exf6 xf6 17...g3

Should White play at once 17...c7, then 17...d6 18...xb7 ...b8, and 19...f4 etc.

17...f5 18...c7 d6! 19...xb7

19...f3!

After 19...d8 20...xc6 f3 21.gxf3 ...h5, White would break the hostile attack with 22...xd5+ and 23.f4. The text move forces the mate.

20...xa8+ h7 21.gxf3

If 21...g1, then, of course, 21...h5.

21...h5 22.f4 f3+

White resigns.

11...g8

So far and up to the 15th move sides follow the pattern of one of the games in the match between Steinitz and Zukertort, where the former introduced the retreat of the knight for the defence. The object is to bring the knight round to d4 by way of e7-c6, and to keep free hand as regards castling on either side. It also prepares for the strong advance of the f-pawn at an early moment, and therefore compels the opponent to play which weakens the latter's wing.

12.g4 e7 13.c3 c6 14.d5
d4 15.xd4

White is compelled to exchange, for if he retreated the knight to h2, the answer of 15...h4 would have seriously embarrassed his game. Black, therefore, attained his object of shifting the c-pawn to the d-file, and he will be soon enabled, as will be seen, to undouble his pawns and get the better position.

15...cxd4 16.d5

Inferior to 16...e2, but anyhow Black was bound to gain ground.

16...c6 17.b4 b6 18.c2
18...d5
Operating with energy and decision to seal the sore point of Black's game, the doubled pawns on the d-file.
19.exd5 cxd5 20.cxd5 \( \texttt{\_b7} \)
21.0-0-0
This was a necessary precaution, for if he captures the pawn at once, White's rejoinder was 22.\( \texttt{\_xe5} \), followed by \( \texttt{\_e1} \) in case the bishop retook.
22.\( \texttt{\_ae1} \)
Certainly not as good as playing the king's rook to the same square. It was altogether fallacious to speculate on a prospective attack by advancing the d-pawn.
22...\( \texttt{\_fe8} \) 23.\( \texttt{\_b4} \) \( \texttt{\_bd8} \)
This fine move preserves the two bishops. Had he attacked the knight at once, White would have answered 24.\( \texttt{\_c6} \).
24.g5 h5 25.\( \texttt{\_h4} \) a5 26.\( \texttt{\_c2} \)
\( \texttt{\_xd5} \) 27.f3 \( \texttt{\_c8} \) 28.\( \texttt{\_f2} \)
It certainly threatens to take the d-pawn with the knight in case Black plays the rook to c3 at once; but then it is only a temporary relief, and the queen is soon obliged to go back again. White's game was already extremely difficult. 28.\( \texttt{\_a3} \) would have been answered by 28...\( \texttt{\_f8} \); and 28.\( \texttt{\_g2} \) was not feasible, on account of the rejoinder 28...\( \texttt{\_d8} \).
28...\( \texttt{\_e6} \) 29.\( \texttt{\_g2} \) \( \texttt{\_c3} \) 30.\( \texttt{\_d2} \)
\( \texttt{\_a6!} \) 31.\( \texttt{\_d1} \)

Black's last two moves were very fine, and are selected with studious care and precision.
32.\( \texttt{\_f2} \) \( \texttt{\_xh3+} \) 33.\( \texttt{\_h2} \) \( \texttt{\_d7} \)
It will be observed at a later stage that the retreat of the bishop to this square is well conceived to prevent the adverse knight from coming in at b5.
34.\( \texttt{\_a3} \) a4 35.\( \texttt{\_c4} \) axb3 36.\( \texttt{\_d6} \)
\( \texttt{\_b8} \) 37.\( \texttt{\_e4} \)
Obviously he could not take the rook, on account of the reply 37...\( \texttt{\_e4+} \) followed by 38...\( \texttt{\_e3} \), and then accordingly by 39...\( \texttt{\_c2} \) or 39...\( \texttt{\_xf2} \), winning a piece in either case.
37...\( \texttt{\_c2} \) 38.\( \texttt{\_e1} \) \( \texttt{\_xf2+} \)
38...\( \texttt{\_xa2} \) was manifestly more expeditious, and would have left Black with three pawns ahead and an easily won game.
39.\( \texttt{\_xf2} \) \( \texttt{\_c6} \) 40.\( \texttt{\_b1} \) \( \texttt{\_xa2} \)
41.\( \texttt{\_xa2} \) \( \texttt{\_d8} \) 42.\( \texttt{\_g1} \) \( \texttt{\_xe4} \)
43.fxe4 \( \texttt{\_a8} \) 44.\( \texttt{\_b3} \)
White plays this part in a more feeble manner than is excusable by the bad position and his difficulty to find an absolute good plan to save the game. Unquestionably he could more prolong the defence by 44.\( \texttt{\_e2} \), followed by 45.\( \texttt{\_f3} \).
44...\( \texttt{\_b8} \) 45.\( \texttt{\_d1} \) \( \texttt{\_a2+} \) 46.\( \texttt{\_g2} \)
\( \texttt{\_b1} \) 47.\( \texttt{\_f3} \) \( \texttt{\_c1} \) 48.\( \texttt{\_f2} \)
The counter attack is a desperate resource, but he had hardly anything
satisfactory. Had he played the rook to g3, Black would have checked with the rook at b2, followed, on the knight interposing, by ... \( \text{f8} \) etc.

48...\( \text{wxg5} \) 49.\( \text{wxf7+} \) \( \text{h7} \)
50.\( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 53.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{b5} \)
54.\( \text{e6} \) \( g5 \) 55.\( \text{h2} \) \( f7 \)
56.\( \text{d8+} \) \( e7 \) 57.\( \text{c6+} \) \( d7 \)

58.\( \text{c2} \)

The knight has no move, and consequently the rook is also fixed, and there is no hindrance to the slow advance of the pawns.

58...\( \text{g4} \)

White resigns.

Unostentatious as this move may appear, it is the result of deep judgment. Whether Black take the knight or his position is already unei which shows that the opening has been mismanaged.

8...0-0 9.\( \text{g5} \)

9...\( \text{h6} \)

The knight on f5 was pressing hard on the weak king's flank and there seemed to be nothing better than to capture once, in view of the threatened ...\( \text{e5} \).

However, in the game L.Paulsen-Zukertort, played at the Leipzig tournament, Black rapidly obtained a game after 9...\( \text{xf5} \) (9...\( \text{e7} \)? 10.\( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 11.\( \text{xe7+} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 12.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e8} \)) 13.\( \text{xd7} \) and wins) 10.\( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{d5} \) (to prevent 12.\( \text{xe7} \) 12.\( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 13.\( \text{a4}! \) \( \text{d6} \) (13...\( \text{e7} \)) 14.\( \text{xb6} \) and 15.\( \text{g4+} \). 13...\( \text{b6} \) 14.\( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{g4+} \) and 16.\( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 16.\( \text{h4} \).

10.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{h7} \)

As usual in a new form of the opening, different versions are tried before merit can be sufficiently tested. Here Zukertort having failed with his defence in the above mentioned game, the present defendants venture another experiment, which, however, does not appear more promising. But, at any rate, the
ought to have modified their action at this point. 10...\texttt{Qxf5}, followed by 11...\texttt{gx5}, was apparently here the best plan, and would not have subjected them to any loss, as the following continuation, which most likely would have arisen, may show, e.g. 10...\texttt{Qxf5} 11.exf5 \texttt{gx5} 12.f\texttt{xg6} fxg6 13.\texttt{Qxf6} 14.\texttt{Wd5+} \texttt{h7} 15.\texttt{Qxc6} \texttt{Qxf2+} 16.\texttt{Qh1} bxc6 17.\texttt{Wxc6} \texttt{Wg7} etc.

\texttt{11.\texttt{Qxg7!}}

A very fine sacrifice. White recovers the piece speedily with interest in position.

\texttt{11...\texttt{Qxg7} 12.\texttt{Qd5} \texttt{Qd4} 13.c3}

Here we should have preferred to proceed in a more simple manner by \texttt{Qxc6}, which we believe would have sooner established White's superiority in an unmistakable manner. Supposing: 13.\texttt{Qxc6} bxc6 14.\texttt{Wd4} exd5 15.exd5, and we do not see how Black can possibly avoid the effect of \texttt{Qae1} followed by \texttt{Qe3}.

\texttt{13...\texttt{Qe7} 14.\texttt{Qxd7}}

Best apparently: \texttt{Wxd4} would have only led to a general exchange with not so much advantage as White now maintains, e.g. 14.\texttt{Wd4} \texttt{Qxd5} 15.\texttt{Qxd7} \texttt{Wxd7} 16.exd5 \texttt{Wf5} etc.

\texttt{14...\texttt{Qxc3} 15.\texttt{Qxe7} \texttt{Wxe7} 16.\texttt{Qf5} \texttt{Qxb2} 17.\texttt{Qb1} \texttt{Wb5} 18.\texttt{Wc2} \texttt{Qd4} 19.\texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Qh5}?}

Entirely a lost move, as White's answer demonstrates; 19...\texttt{g8} was the only resource.

\texttt{20.\texttt{Wd1} \texttt{Qf6} 21.\texttt{Qg3+} \texttt{Qh8} 22.\texttt{Qc1} \texttt{Qg8} 23.\texttt{Qd1} \texttt{Qae8} 24.\texttt{Qdd3} \texttt{Qe6}}

This was forced. White's fine manoeuvre in the last few moves made the sacrifice necessary, for, otherwise, White would have captured the knight with the rook, checking, followed by \texttt{Qg3+}.

\texttt{25.\texttt{Qxe6} \texttt{fxe6} 26.\texttt{Qdf3} \texttt{Qxf3} 27.gxf3 c5}

The number of passed pawns which Black threatens to march ahead on the queen's side make the game highly interesting, and it required the greatest exactitude on White's part to counteract their pressure.

\texttt{28.\texttt{Qc4} a6 29.\texttt{Qg6} d5 30.\texttt{Qa4} \texttt{Wb8} 31.\texttt{Qd7} dxe4 32.fxe4 b5 33.\texttt{Qxe6} c4 34.\texttt{Qg3} \texttt{Wf8} 35.e5 c3?}

The game was not to be saved; but the black allies evidently overlooked the neat and well-reckoned finish which the opponent now executes; 35...\texttt{c5} was the best resource for prolonging the fight.

\texttt{36.\texttt{Qxg8+} \texttt{Qxg8} 37.\texttt{Qh6+} \texttt{Qh7} 38.\texttt{Qf6+} \texttt{Qg7} 39.\texttt{Qd8+} \texttt{Qg8} 40.\texttt{Wxd4}}

Black resigns.
178 Bishop’s Opening
Zukertort (without \(b1\))
S.
Simpson’s Divan, November 1877
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\(\&c4\) ef6 3.\(\&e2\) c5
An unpromising development. 3...\(\&c5\) may be played safely, apart from the odds, for if then 4.\(\&xf7+\) \(\&xf7\) 5.\(\&c4+\) d5 6.\(\&xc5\) \(\&xe4\) with good central pawns. But the best move is 3...\(\&c6\), compelling 4.c3, and then 4...\(\&c5\).

4.f4 \(\&c6\) 5.c3 g6 6.\(\&f3\) d6 7.d3 \(\&g4\) 8.0-0 \(\&g7\) 9.fxe5 \(\&xf3\) 10.gxf3 \(\&xe5\) 11.\(\&b5+\) \(\&fd7\) 12.f4 \(\&c6\) 13.\(\&h1\) b6 14.\(\&c4\) 0-0-0 15.\(\&e3\) \(\&wa5\) 16.\(\&fc1\) \(\&b8\)

17.b4
This mode of attack may be expected as a matter of course in a game at odds, when the opponent has castled on the queen’s side. Black, however, defends himself with soundness and solidity for some time longer.

17...\(\&xb4\) 18.cxb4 \(\&xb4\) 19.\(\&ab1\) \(\&c6\) 20.\(\&bb5\) \(\&c7\) 21.\(\&cb1\) b6 22.\(\&f2\) \(\&c5\) 23.\(\&e5\) \(\&c8\) 24.exd6 \(\&xd6\) 25.\(\&xc5!\)? \(\text{bxc5}\) 26.\(\&xc5\)

26...\(\&f6\)?
26...\(\&d4\)! at this point would have turned the tables completely, e.g.

27.\(\&a6+\) \(\&d7\) 28.\(\&b7+\) 29.\(\&e2+\) \(\&e6\); now if 30.\(\&b5\), the reply is not 30...\(\&xe2\), but 30...\(\&f5\) and the attack is exhausted. This was a course foreseen by Dr. Zukertort when he sacrificed the exchange, but such risks must be run if the odds are to be given at all.

27.\(\&a6+\) \(\&d7\) 28.\(\&b7+\) 29.\(\&e2+\) \(\&e6\) 30.\(\&b5!\)
Pretty and conclusive.
Black has no better reply than that he makes, for if 30...\(\&xe2\), he is mated in two moves; and if 30...\(\&c8\), 31.\(\&e7\) wins easily.

30...\(\&e5\) 31.\(\&xe5\) \(\&xe5\) 32.\(\&xc6+\) \(\&d7\) 33.\(\&xe5\) Black resigns.

179 Pirc Defence
F.H.
Zukertort (without f7-pawn)
Simpson’s Divan. December 1877
Notes by Wayte

1.e4 \(\&d6\) 2.d4 \(\&f6\) 3.\(\&c3\) \(\&c6\) 4.\(\&e3e5\)

5.d5
We do not think this move usually answers in games where the pawn is given. 5.\(\&f3\) is preferable.

5...\(\&e7\) 6.f4 \(\&xf4\) 7.\(\&xf4\) \(\&g6\) 8.\(\&e3\)
301
Johannes Zukertort

Paris 1878

180 Italian Game
Greenhough
Zukertort
10 board blindfold exhibition, Old Change Chess Club, London, 15 January 1878
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3..f3 c6 4.c4 c5 5.0-0 d6 6.h3
The attack by c3 at once has been demolished by Anderssen, who answers by 6...g4, followed, in reply to 7..b3, by 7..xf3, obtaining a powerful attack in spite of White's being enabled to recover his pawn, and to ruin Black's castling by 8..xf7+.

6...f6 7.c3 fxe4 8..e1
8.cxd4 was stronger, though, by best play, namely by answering 8...d5, Black could retain his pawn plus.

8...d5 9..d3f5 10.cxd4

10...e7
Correct. The performer saw, no doubt, clearly that he could not take the pawn with either piece, for White would have replied by exchanging with the knight, followed accordingly either by f3 or w4+, winning a piece in either case.

11.e5 0-0 12.f3 xe5 13.dxe5 c5+ 14.e3

Had he moved 14..h2 he would have been subjected to a vehement assault by 14...h4, e.g. 15.fxe4 fxe4 16..xh4 (16..xe4 would be useless, for Black would simply retake, and then cover with the rook the check of the queen at d5 leaving White no time to capture the bishop, as his rook remains attacked) 16...f2, threatening ...g3+ and ...xh3 with a strong attack.

14...g5 15..xc5 ecx5 16..c3 c6 17..e2 f4 18..h2 e5
19..g1 w5
The performer evidently could have won simply by 19...xe5, but he was quite justified in trying the experiment to puzzle the adversary by attempting this attack, whereby he had nothing to lose, since the hostile e-pawn could not escape, while he had the chance of effecting his purpose sooner, though not so easily.

20.g4 fxg3+ 21.xg3 g5 22.h4

23..d3
This was his best resource, apparently. Taking the knight with the pawn was clearly out of question on account of the immediate reply 23...f2+, followed ac-
acordingly by ...\( \text{fxg3} \) or ...\( \text{fxh3} + \). For a similar reason he could not take the knight with the rook, since White would then have simply captured the f-pawn with the rook, threatening ...\( \text{f2} + \), to which there was no satisfactory defence; and the only plausible retreat of the rook ...\( g3 \) could well be answered by ...\( \text{g}xh3 \), which must have speedily won. Herr Zukertort evidently must have foreseen all these contingencies; and the accuracy of his reckoning strikingly illustrates the mindfold performer's reflective powers, which do not seem much affected by the severe tension of having to conduct ten games simultaneously without sight of either board or men.

23\( \text{Exf4} \) 24\( \text{Hf1} \) 25\( \text{d1} \) 26\( \text{xf4} \) 26\( \text{Exg5} \)

He had nothing better, for Black threatened 26 ...\( \text{g}xh3 \), and White was then unable to retake twice, on account of the impending check with the rook at ...\( f4 + \).

26 ...\( \text{Wxg5} \) 27\( \text{xf3} \) 28\( \text{xf3} \) 8\( \text{xf4} + \)

White resigns.

181 Vienna Gambit
Herr Zukertort
Webber
Board blindfold exhibition, Old Change Chess Club, London, 15 January 1878
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.d\( \text{f3} \) 3.e4 e5 4.d\( \text{f4} \)

This continuation is rarely adopted in the Vienna opening, for the first player is thereby restricted in his further choice of variations, at any rate, so far that he must avoid any position resembling the Muzio Gambit. It is one of the main features of Paulsen's defence of the Muzio, which has practically given the death blow to the attack, that the queen's knight is brought out to c6 for the second player, and, as this has already been done here, the defence has the resource at his disposal of turning the game into Paulsen's variation by a transposition of moves.

4...\( g5 \) 5.h4

White therefore wisely determines to combine the opening with a form of attack known as the Allgaier. He, two moves later on, sacrifices a piece, and the only difference between the position then and the one arising from the Allgaier proper is that both parties have already brought out the queen's knight. The balance of advantage of this alteration seems to weigh strongly in favour of the attack, as far as we can judge from the progress of the present game.

5...\( g4 \) 6.d\( g5 \) 6.h6 7.dxf7 8.xf7

Mr. Thorold's suggestion in the real Allgaier Gambit, where, however, it can be successfully repelled by the answer of ...d5. This reply is not feasible now, and Mr. Thorold's idea is here, therefore, turned to better account.

8...d6

8...f3 is perhaps the best resource. To allow the attacking player to capture the f-pawn, and thus to leave the f-file practically open for White's rook after cas-
tling, involves giving a number of additional chances to the first player.

9...xf4  g7 10...c4+  e8
11.e3 f6 12.0-0 we7

The queen is not well posted on this square. 12...e7 was more congenial to the spirit of the defence, but it is doubtful whether it would have been sufficient to render Black's game safe against White's assault.

12...e7 was more congenial to the spirit of the defence, but it is doubtful whether it would have been sufficient to render Black's game safe against White's assault.

13.d2 g3 14.e1 Ag4

15.d5

The blindfold player selects the right moment for forcing his onslaught, having first arranged all his pieces in scientific battle order.

15...xd5

He had nothing better, and apparently he obtains thereby a counter attack against White's exposed king by afterwards taking the h-pawn, which is, however, made innocuous by the performer's careful calculations. Had he captured the e-pawn with the knight, attacking the queen, White could reply wd3, and the knight could not be saved. Again, if he retreated the queen to d8, White might have replied either f4 or wd3, threatening in either case the powerful e5.

16.exd5 e5

This was obviously necessary, as White would otherwise win the queen by withdrawing the queen's bishop and unmasking the rook.

17.dxe5 wh4 18.f4 xe5
19.d4

Good as it looks, it is quite a deceptive resource, and gives the blindfold performer a fine opportunity of displaying his powers. His only chance was to obtain an escape with the king at d7. We believe that White had then nothing better than to check with the rook at f7, for he could not afford to let the hostile queen's rook oppose him at f8, and then Black could draw by returning with the king to e8...c6 would have been useless, e.g. 19...c6 20.dxc6 bxc6 21.f7+ (if now the king move to f7, White would proceed with e6 etc; if Black move 21...e7, then follows 22.e5+, which cannot be taken by the pawn, on account of impending c5 mate; again, if Black reply 21...d8, then White would also proceed with e5) and the game might further go on, thus: 21...c7 22.e5 dxe5 23.e5+ c8 24.e6+ and wins.

20.b5 e7

Had he interposed the pawn, White could have simply captured with the e-pawn, the rook at f4 remaining sufficiently defended, for, practically, it w
only attacked once by the hostile rook which might always be safely retaken by the queen, as Black's king's bishop remains pinned; nor could Black hope to gain anything by checking with the queen at h2, for the white king would move to f1, relying on his bishop from d4 covering next move at g1, if the queen check at h1. All this must have been clearly seen through by the blindfold player, who evidently deliberately braved his complicated counter-attack.

Black throws away an important pawn, overlooking that White's reply on the 8th move will prevent him from taking the f-pawn with the knight. White's queen's bishop protecting the same, while Black's e-pawn remains pinned.

21...dxe5
A fine termination, and all the more remarkable, as it forms only one item in the splendid feat of conducting ten games simultaneously without sight of board or men.  
21...dxe5 22.\( \text{c} \)c5+ \( \text{d} \)d8 23.\( \text{A} \)xf8
Mate.

182 Bishop's Opening
Zukertort (without \( \text{b} \)b1)
Str.
Simpson's Divan 1878
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{c} \)c4 \( \text{c} \)c6 3.\( \text{w} \)e2
A favourite move of Herr Zukertort when giving the odds of the queen's knight. Very few odds receivers know how to meet it properly.
3...\( \text{c} \)c6 4.c3 \( \text{c} \)c5 5.f4 \( \text{x} \)xg1
6.\( \text{x} \)xg1 d5

In true odds giving style, White affords the opponent's obvious scheme some assistance, holding the proof of its fallacy in reserve. He had well calculated that the result of Black's advancing the b-pawn, which was clearly the latter's object, would ultimately be the loss of another pawn.

15...b4 16.\( \text{w} \)e4 f5 17.\( \text{e} \)xf6 \( \text{e} \)xf6
18.\( \text{w} \)e6+ \( \text{h} \)h8 19.\( \text{c} \)xb4 \( \text{c} \)c8
20.\( \text{w} \)e2 \( \text{e} \)ed5 21.g5 \( \text{e} \)d7
22.\( \text{w} \)h5 g6 23.\( \text{c} \)xg6 \( \text{w} \)e7
24.\( \text{c} \)c2 \( \text{e} \)xf4

He may well be excused for not seeing through the adversary's magnificent design, more especially as he had a lost game otherwise. Apparently this was the best way to stop the fatal advance of g6, or else f5. Had he moved the knight from d7 to b6, the game might have proceeded thus:
24...\( \text{d} \)7b6 25.g6 \( \text{g} \)g8 (25...\( \text{f} \)f6
Johannes Zukertort would be answered by 26.\( c3 \))
26.\( dxe1 \) and wins, for if the bishop interpose, 27.\( e5+ \) gains a piece; if the queen move to \( g7 \), White would answer 27.gxh7, attacking the rook; and if the queen move anywhere else on the second row, keeping the immediate mate protected, White may answer 27.g7+, followed by 28.e8+, mating in a few moves.

25.\( c3+g8 \)

26.g6!
A masterly coup, which forces the game.

26...\( dxe5 \) 27.gxh7+ \( f7 \)
28.g6+ \( e6 \) 29.e1+ \( e5 \)
30.e5

Beautifully worked out in detail. The mate is now absolutely inevitable, though Black is a clear queen ahead.

30...\( h4 \)

30...\( f6 \) was of no more use, e.g.,
31.\( c3+e5 \) 32.e5+ \( f6 \)
33.d6+ interposes (best)
34.dxe6+ moves 35.x5+ \( h6 \) interposes 36.xf6 and mates in a few more moves.

31.d6+
and mates in three more moves.

White's next move is 32.g3+, and Black has nothing left but to interpose the queen at e4 and then the bishop at e6.

183 Evans Gambit
Zukertort (without \( b1 \))
Strauss
Simpson's Divan 1878
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\( f3 \) \( c6 \) 3.\( c4 \) \( c5 \) 4.b4 \( x4 \) 5.c3 \( a5 \) 6.0-0 d6
6...\( f6 \) is the strongest move. Black may also adopt the normal defense proceeding with 6...\( b6 \).

7.d4 exd4 8.wb3
This constitutes Waller's attack. Notwithstanding the adverse opinion of the leading chess writers of the past, we not only consider it sound, but cannot recommend any of the known defenses as perfectly satisfactory.

8...\( f6 \) 9.e5 dxe5 10.e1

10...\( xc3 \)

The Handbuch gives here as best
10...\( h6 \) 11.g5 \( f5 \) with the remark that the game is in Black's favor. Steinitz, however, in his review Wormald's Chess Openings in the Citizen, London Chess Magazine, states that White obtains now a fine attack with 12.\( e8 \).

Considering the odds given, Black could safely proceed with 10...\( a7 \). White was not in the position to choose the continuation which would give him the superiority, in an even game, i.e.,
11.g5 \( f5 \) 12.xb7 \( c8 \) 13.h4
\( b8 \) 14.xe5+ \( xe5 \) 15.xf7+ \( d8 \)
16. \( \text{w} \times \text{b}8 + \) \( \text{a} \times \text{b}8 \) 17. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 \ \text{d} \times \text{c}3 \)
18. \( \text{d}3 \ \text{e} \times \text{c}7 \) 19. \( \text{c} \times \text{c}4 \) etc.

11. \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
If 11... \( \text{w} \times \text{f}5 \), then 12. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 \)
12. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 \) 13. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}5 + \) \( \text{f} \times \text{f}8 \)

14. \( \text{a} \times \text{f}7! \)
This sacrifice decided the game at once.

14... \( \text{a} \times \text{f}7 \)
Mate being threatened and the queen attacked, Black must either capture the bishop or reply 14... \( \text{a} \times \text{e}6 \). White would then win with 15 \( \text{a} \times \text{e}6 \) (but not 15 \( \text{a} \times \text{e}6 \) \( \text{w} \times \text{g}5! \)) 15... \( \text{c}5 \) (if 15... \( \text{a} \times \text{x}1 \), then 16 \( \text{w} \times \text{b}4 + \); 15... \( \text{b}5 \), then 16 \( \text{w} \times \text{d}5 \); 15... \( \text{e}8 \), then 16 \( \text{a} \times \text{a}3 + \) \( \text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{d}1 \) and 18 \( \text{f}5 + \) ) 16 \( \text{d}5 \) (he may capture the knight, as Black could not venture to retake either rook or bishop) 16... \( \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{w} \times \text{c}5 + \) \( \text{e}7 \) 18 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{x}1 \) 19. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}7 \) etc.

15. \( \text{a} \times \text{a}3 + \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}7 \) \( \text{a} \times \text{a}1 \)
17. \( \text{d} \times \text{d}7 + \)
Black resigns.

With due respect for the following handling of the fianchetto, recommended by Steinitz, we still prefer 4. \( \text{a} \times \text{e}2 \) here.

4... \( \text{f}6 \) 5. \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 6. \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 7. \( \text{e}3 \)

cxd4
Black should keep this exchange in reserve and for the present play the bishop to e7.

8.cxd4 \( \text{b}4 + \) 9. \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \)
Black provokes the advance of the pawns. Castling was preferable.

10. \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 11. \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12.0-0

13. \( \text{x} \times \text{c}3 \)
If Black does not exchange, but provides a retreat square for the bishop by 12... \( \text{g}6 \), then White obtains a strong attack by 13. \( \text{h}5 \).

13. \( \text{b} \times \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 14. \( \text{d}2 \)
We would prefer to play the bishop to f2; therefore first 14. \( \text{c}1 \) or \( \text{e}1 \).

14... \( \text{g}6 \) 15. \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 16. \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \)
17. \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 18. \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 19. \( \text{c}2 \)
\( \text{b} \times \text{c}6 \) 20. \( \text{w} \) \( \text{g}5 \)

20... \( \text{a} \times \text{d}4 ? \)
On 20...0-0 would follow 21. \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{f}5 ! \) 22. \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 23. \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 24. \( \text{h}4 \) with a good attack. 20... \( \text{g}8 \) seems better. The move in the text is based on the error that, after 21.cxd4 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{w} \times \text{c}2 \), only 23. \( \text{b}4 \) is threatened, which fails to 23... \( \text{b}1 + \), whereas 23 \( \text{w} \times \text{e}7 + \) secures an extra piece.

21.cxd4 0-0 22. \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
The game is lost. On 22...\(\text{e8}\) follows 23...\(\text{d6} \) \(\text{b7/d7}\) 24...\(\text{f5}\) threatening 25...\(\text{a4}\).

23...\(\text{xf8} \) \(\text{xf8}\)

If 23...\(\text{xd4}\), then 24...\(\text{h6}\).

24...\(\text{d2} \) \(\text{h6}\) 25...\(\text{f6} \) \(\text{a3}\) 26...\(\text{d8+} \) \(\text{h7}\) 27...\(\text{xc7} \) \(\text{xc1+}\) 28...\(\text{d1}\)

\(\text{e3+} 29...\(\text{f2} \) \(\text{xd4}\) 30...\(\text{xf7+}\)

Black resigns.

31...\(\text{xg6}\) follows and Black cannot avoid mate.

185 Italian Game

Bird

Zukertort

Paris tournament, 25 June 1878

Notes by Potter and Schallopp

1...\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 2...\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3...\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 4...\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 5...\(\text{b4}\)

Potter: This is one of the novelties introduced in Mr. Bird’s new work, The Chess Openings. He states therein that he frequently adopted the same in 1873 and 1874 against Messrs. Boden and MacDonnell, but he admits that those gentlemen, with other fine players, prefer the second player’s position. Mr. Bird himself, however, considers that the variation affords a good game, and an enduring, though not very powerful attack. It certainly tends to make an otherwise dull opening interesting, and I should say must be at least as good for the first player as the other forms of the Giuoco.

5...\(\text{eb6}\) 6...\(\text{b3}\) 0-0 7...\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 8...\(\text{g5}\)

Potter: Mr. Bird diverges here from his book. He therein gives 8...\(\text{a4}\), a continuation which I should imagine ought to be pretty fair; and as to the end game, why that has been already compromised.
20...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}f3}} 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}xg6}}}}
Schallopp: This is insufficient, as the sequel shows. With 21.gxf3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}h4}}} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}xh1}}, followed by 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}e4}}, his game is still quite defensible.
21...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}h6}} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}d3}} \texttt{\texttt{e}e4} 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}c4+}} \texttt{\texttt{h}h8}

24.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}e1}}
Schallopp: It is seen that both 24.gxf3 and 24.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}h1}} \texttt{\texttt{xf}g2+} 25.\texttt{\texttt{w}xg2} lead to immediate mate because of ...\texttt{\texttt{w}g5+} and ...\texttt{\texttt{g}g6}. A similar result comes from 24.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}xf4}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}h}4}x\texttt{f}4} 25.\texttt{\texttt{g}xh3} because of 25...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}g}5+} 26.\texttt{\texttt{h}h1} \texttt{\texttt{xf}3} 27.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}g}1} \texttt{\texttt{w}h}5 followed by ...\texttt{\texttt{h}h4}.
24...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}g6}} 25.\texttt{\texttt{g}g3} \texttt{\texttt{w}h}4 26.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}xf4}}
Schallopp: Necessary, as 26...\texttt{\texttt{f}fxg3} followed by 27.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}x}g3+} was threatened.
26...\texttt{\texttt{w}xf4} 27.\texttt{\texttt{a}a}ab1 \texttt{\texttt{c}c7} 28.\texttt{\texttt{d}d}5
\texttt{\texttt{w}f7} 29.\texttt{\texttt{b}b}4 \texttt{\texttt{w}d}7
White resigns.
Schallopp: On 30.\texttt{\texttt{w}xb7}, decisive is 30...\texttt{\texttt{w}h}3; on 30.\texttt{\texttt{c}c4} follows 30...\texttt{\texttt{c}cxd5}, and Black’s material advantage guarantees an easy win.

186 French Defence
Zukertort
Mason
Paris tournament, 27 June 1878
Notes by Potter and Schallopp
1.e4 \texttt{\texttt{e}e6} 2.d4 \texttt{\texttt{d}d5} 3.\texttt{\texttt{c}c}3 \texttt{\texttt{f}f6} 4.exd5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}e}xd5} 5.\texttt{\texttt{d}d}3 \texttt{\texttt{c}c6}

Potter: The deities that preside over the French Defence are iron-willed and their immutable law is that the second player must prepare to castle as speedily as possible on the king’s side, or incur the penalty of finding himself with an inferior game.

6.\texttt{\texttt{f}f3} \texttt{\texttt{g}g4}
Schallopp: Not good! Black, in this opening, must develop his king’s side and castle.

7.e3 \texttt{\texttt{d}d6} 8.a3 0-0 9.\texttt{\texttt{w}d}2
Schallopp: Through this and the next move, White, in masterly fashion, refutes the opponent’s 6th move. If Black exchanges on f3, then White castles on the queen’s side and exploits the open g-file for a king’s side attack.

9...a6 10.\texttt{\texttt{h}h3} \texttt{\texttt{e}e6} 11.0-0 \texttt{\texttt{w}d}7
Schallopp: The position is now symmetrical; however, White has won a tempo (h3) and retains the advantage of the first move, resp. attack.

12.\texttt{\texttt{f}f4} \texttt{\texttt{f}fe8}
Schallopp: We would prefer 12...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}h}5} 13.\texttt{\texttt{e}e2} \texttt{\texttt{f}f5}.

13.\texttt{\texttt{e}e5} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}c}8}

14.\texttt{\texttt{c}c6}
Schallopp: White exchanges twice, so as to weaken Black’s pawn formation and to busy the opponent with its security.
14...bxc6 15.AXBd6 cxd6 16.Wf4 Wb8

Schallopp: Simpler and more rational was, in any event, 16...Wc7.

17.b4 Wc8 18.Ab1 Wc7 19.De2 Aa6

Schallopp: We would prefer 19...c5 20.c3 c4 21.Ac2 a5 22.Aa1 Aa6, followed by ...

20.Wh4Af8 21.f4

Schallopp: A decisive strengthening of the attack!

21...f6

Schallopp: 21...f5 would follow 22.g4.

22.f5 Aa7 23.Bc3 We7 24.Bg3 Wh8 25.Bf1 c5 26.Df4 c4

27.Ae2 We4 28.c3

Schallopp: d5 is now a decisive weakness in Black's game. If, for example, 28...Ba7 which seems best is played, then follows 29.Ag4 Ag8 30.f3 and wins a pawn.

28...Wxf5?

Schallopp: A mistake which allows an elegant and rapid decision.

29.Ag7! Ag7

Schallopp: On 29...Ag8, 30.Ag3 followed by 31.Ag6+ wins the queen; 29...Ac7, 30.Ag4 followed by 31.Ag6 leads equally to a speedy win.

Potter: If 29...d7, then of course 30.Wxf6.

30.Ac5+ Ah5 31.Xf5 Xxg7 32.Wxf6+ Ah8 33.Ac5+ Ag8 34.We6+ Ag7 35.Wxe2

Black resigns.

Potter: I consider the whole of this a fine piece of play on the part of Zukertort. While admiring move 39, which undoubtedly was not the inspiration of the moment, I respect still more his opening dispositions than which nothing could be more masterly.
A serious weakening of his position.

15.\(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{g7}}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{h6}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\)
17.\(\text{\textit{g5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xg5}}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{xg5}}\) \(f6\)
19.\(\text{\textit{h4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f8}}\) 20.\(\text{\textit{w3}}\) \(\text{\textit{h8}}\)

21.\(\text{\textit{e5!}}\) \(g5\) 22.\(\text{\textit{exf6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf6}}\)

It would be slightly better to take the bishop.

23.\(\text{\textit{xg5}}\) \(\text{\textit{g8}}\) 24.\(\text{\textit{h4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\)
25.\(\text{\textit{xe6!}}\)

Black resigns.

For if 25...\(\text{\textit{xe6}}\), then 26.\(\text{\textit{xf5}}\).

188 Spanish Game
Blackburne
Zukertort
Paris tournament, 8 July 1878
Notes by Potter and Schallopp

1.\(\text{\textit{e4}}\) \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 2.\(\text{\textit{f3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c6}}\) 3.\(\text{\textit{b5}}\) \(a6\)
4.\(\text{\textit{a4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 5.\(\text{\textit{c3}}\)

Potter: This move, which transforms the Ruy Lopez into a variation of the Four Knights Game, owes its introduction to Mr. Blackburne.

5...\(\text{\textit{b4}}\)

Potter: No better reply than this appears to have been at present discovered.

Schallopp: We prefer 5...\(\text{\textit{c5}}\).

6.0-0

Schallopp: Usually 6.\(\text{\textit{d5}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 7.d3 is played here. The deviation from this, in order to be able to play d4, does not turn out well.

6...\(\text{\textit{0-0}}\) 7.\(\text{\textit{d5}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 8.\(\text{\textit{d4}}\)

Potter: A specious, but unfortunate continuation.

8...\(\text{\textit{xd4}}\)

Schallopp: Not 8...\(\text{\textit{exd4}}\) because of 9.\(\text{\textit{g5}}\) \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) 10.\(\text{\textit{xe7+}}\) \(\text{\textit{xe7}}\) 11.\(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) and 12.\(\text{\textit{e5}}\).

9.\(\text{\textit{xd4}}\)

9...\(\text{\textit{xd5!}}\)

Schallopp: Upon this fine move, the combination fails. If White now plays 10.\(\text{\textit{b3}}\), then follows 10...\(\text{\textit{b6}}\) 11.\(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) \(d6\) and Black retains the pawn.

10.\(\text{\textit{f5}}\) \(\text{\textit{e7}}\)

Schallopp: Probably, 10...\(\text{\textit{b6}}\) is even stronger, since upon the retreat of the bishop, ...\(d5\) can follow at once, and 11.\(\text{\textit{g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 12.\(\text{\textit{h6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xa4}}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{xg7}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) \(f6\) is not dangerous for Black.

11.\(\text{\textit{g5}}\) \(f6\) 12.\(\text{\textit{b3+}}\) \(\text{\textit{h8}}\)

13.\(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(d6\) 14.\(\text{\textit{g4}}\)?

Schallopp: White should continue with 14.\(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf5}}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{xf5}}\) \(\text{\textit{dxc5}}\); the position was then not bad for him. 14.\(\text{\textit{g4}}\) dangerously exposes the king.

14...\(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{w3}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{ad1}}\)

Potter: After this and the next move, Black has a manifest superiority in position as well as in force.

17.\(\text{\textit{xf5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xe3}}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{xe3}}\)
Schallopp: Black now has a good attacking position and exploits this in excellent style.

18...g6! 19.fxg6 \textit{wxg6+} 20.\textit{h1 c6 21.f3}

Schallopp: If \textit{21.d5}, then \textit{21...xd5 22.exd5 g8 23.f3 af8} with a good attack.

21...\textit{g5 22.e2 f5 23.g1}

Potter: 23...\textit{f4} at once was stronger. Black seems to be a little casual.

23...\textit{h6}

Schallopp: 23...\textit{f4} at once was stronger. Black seems to be a little casual.

24.g3\textit{fxe4 25.fxe4 f4}

Schallopp: Now the bishop should make its way at once, via e8 and g6, to h5. The text move could be stamped as a loss of tempo by 26.g4.

26.e1

Potter: 26.g4 is possibly better.

26...\textit{e8 27.c4}

Potter: Mr. Blackburne's only resource here is \textit{27.c4}. However, his defeat seems to be in any case certain enough.

27.g6 28.b4 c6 29.ge3 d5!

Potter: And wins. The game is a good illustration of that delicate adroitness and effective accuracy which in a special manner characterise Zukertort's style of play when he is at his best.

30.c3 \textit{exe4+ 31..exe4 f3+}

White resigns.

189 Spanish Game

Rosenthal

Zukertort

Paris tournament, 11 July 1878

Notes by Steinitz, Potter and Schallopp

1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.b5

4.a4 f6 5.c3 c5

Potter: This defence is inferior.

6.0-0

Potter: 6\textit{xe5} is the correct reply, and yields a decided advantage, e.g. 6...\textit{xe5 7.d4 d6} (if \textit{7...b4 8.dxe5}, followed after 8...\textit{xe4 9.f4}, or 0-0, threatening and I suppose no one would like handicapped with Black's position.

6...b5

Steinitz: The disposition of Black's pawn on the extreme queen's wing is not satisfactory after this advance, which, however, seems necessary to secure the moving of the d-pawn without subjecting him to the greater danger of White's impinging d4 at once or \textit{even} after capturing the knight with a check. Black's pawn would then become still weaker.

7.g3 d6 8.d3 g4

Steinitz: This counterattack belongs to the open questions for analysis. In our opinion the progress of the present game does not show conclusively that it can be safely applied.

9.h3 g5
10.\textit{g4}

After: Between strong players a move of this kind is insulting. I imagine Bukertort was pleased to be so insulted.

\textit{Schallopp}: This exposes the king in a dubious way. Admittedly it prompts the opponent to later castle on the queen's side, where Black's pawn formation is not much better.

10...\textit{g6}

\textit{Steinitz}: The sacrifice of the knight for the g-pawn would not have been sound, for White would have replied \textit{d5}, and, whether the king or queen protected the queen's knight, White would have taken the latter, and then captured the other knight, whereupon the bishop could not retake the pawn on account of the reply \textit{xe5}, which then gave either a check, or attacked the adverse queen.

11.\textit{d5} \textit{d7} 12.\textit{e3} \textit{xe3}

\textit{Schallopp}: An immediate advance of the \textit{e}-pawn might deserve the preference.

13.\textit{fxe3 h5}

\textit{Steinitz}: Ill-judged. He ought to have stopped the opponent as early as possible from opening the h-file, and the natural reply 14.\textit{g5} was the correct one. Black could not answer with 14...\textit{w}xh3, for his knight could then be taken safely, and the queen had only two checks afterwards, the last one at h3 being capable of the perfectly secure cover by \textit{h2}. For the same reason, he gained nothing by taking the knight first, since White could retake with the bishop or pawn, menacing the other knight. Otherwise White could follow up by \textit{h}h2 with a good game.

14...\textit{xd5} 15.\textit{xd5} 0-0-0

16.\textit{gxg6 fxg6} 17.\textit{c4} \textit{e7} 18.\textit{f7}

\textit{Steinitz}: 18.\textit{f7} looked stronger, but Black had a good answer by 18...\textit{hxg4} which could not be retaken with the Pawn, on account of the harassing rejoinder ...\textit{h}h4. If, however, the queen took the pawn, Black could exchange queen and bishop, followed by ...\textit{h}h3, with the superior game.

18...\textit{hxg4}

19.\textit{cxb5}

\textit{Schallopp}: An interesting counterattack!

\textit{Steinitz}: For the ending game his position was already much inferior, and if he hoped to succeed in the middle the preservation of the bishop was indispensable.

19...\textit{hxh}3 20.\textit{bxa6 g3}

\textit{Steinitz}: Who comes in first? Each party has directed his attack against the adverse king, regardless apparently of his own safety; and this is the crisis which
will decide the superiority of either player's calculations. In the meanwhile White has to provide against the immediate danger by the fine sacrifice of the rook at \( a1 \), followed by \( \ldots \) \( \text{Wh}3 + \).

21. \( \text{Af}5 ! \)

Schallopp: Extremely cleverly played! If White plays at once 21. \( \text{Ab}3 \), then he would be mated in a few moves by 21. \( \text{Ah}1 + \). If instead 21. \( \text{Af}3 \), then Black doubles his rooks, winning again.

Steinitz: Though compulsory at this moment it is a fine resource if previously reckoned upon.

21. \( \ldots \) \( \text{Af}5 ! \)

Steinitz: Which shows clearly that he was fully prepared for White's next move and its most important consequence. The actual reply would have left him without resource, had he taken with the pawn.

Schallopp: Wrong was 21. \( \ldots \) \( \text{g}x \text{f}5 \), after which White would obtain the advantage with 22. \( \text{Bb}3 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 23. \( \text{Be}6 + \) \( \text{C}d7 \) 24. \( \text{a}7 \) \( \text{Wh}7 \) 25. \( \text{Ad}7 + \).

22. \( \text{Bb}3 \) \( \text{Dh}8 \)

23. \( \text{Be}6 \)

Steinitz: His calculation, if not strictly sound, was, at any rate, feasible if he had not precipitated the onslaught by this ruinous move, which clearly shows that his reckoning lacked finish even from his own point of view, besides a deficiency of judgement. With his king being liable to be driven by two hostile rooks, while the adversary had also the support of a pawn and a knight, he could not expect to escape disaster. His proper only plan was therefore to get the knight, which was also the protection of Black's advanced pawn. If Black then checked twice with the rooks he had nothing more to draw by perpetual check, as long as White carefully abstained from crossing to the f-file. The most probable continuation was the following: 23. \( \text{ex} \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Ah}1 + \) 24. \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Ah}2 + \) 25. \( \text{Gg}1 \) (if 25. \( \text{Gx} \text{g}3 \) the other would check, and, wherever the then goes, the adverse queen capture the pawn, checking) 25. \( \ldots \) 26. \( \text{Ad}5 \) \( \text{Cc}5 \) 27. \( \text{Ee}1 \), with some prospect of prolonging the fight.

Schallopp: Zukertort gave already at Paris directly after the game was played, the winning continuation: 23. \( \text{ex} \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Ah}1 + \) 24. \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Ah}2 + \) 25. \( \text{Gg}1 \) (best) 25. \( \text{ex} \text{g}3 \) \( \text{Bh}3 + \) 26. \( \text{G} \) moves \( \text{xf}5 \) 25. \( \ldots \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 26. \( \text{Ad}5 \) (best) 26. \( \ldots \) 27. \( \text{Ee}1 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) and White has no satisfactory move - e.g. 28. \( \text{Bb}7 + \) \( \text{Dd}8 \) 29. \( \text{Cc}2 \) etc.

23. \( \text{Ah}1 + \) 24. \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Ah}2 + \) 25. \( \text{Ff}3 \) \( \text{Ff}2 + \) 26. \( \text{Gg}4 \)
26...\textit{\textbf{h}4+}
Steinitz: 26...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe3+ at once was immediately decisive. If 27.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xg3 in reply, the position was actually the same as arose two moves later on. If, on the other hand, the white king advanced upwards, the rook could pursue him twice, at h5 and h6, until the bishop was won.

27.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g5 \textit{\textbf{h}5}+ 28.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g4
Steinitz: He sees that he would lose the bishop by ...\textit{\textbf{Q}}h6+ if he took the pawn, and runs into a hopeless mating position.

28...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe3+ 29.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xg3 \textit{\textbf{Q}g2+}
30.\textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{Q}h3}+ 31.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xh3 \textit{\textbf{Q}xh3}
Mate.

190 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Rosenthal

Paris tournament, 12 July 1878
Notes by Steinitz, Potter and Schallopp

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c6 3.b5 a6
4.\textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 5.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c5 6.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe5
Steinitz: Herr Zukertort considers Rosenthal's 10th move, ...\textit{\textbf{Q}}b8, a sufficient refutation of the attack which is initiated here by 6.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe5.

6...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe5 7.d4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d6
Schallopp: 7...\textit{\textbf{Q}}b4, then 8.dxe5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe4 + \textit{\textbf{Q}}d4.

8.dxe5
Schallopp: On 8.0-0, Black gets out of all danger by 8...\textit{\textbf{Q}}g6 9.e5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e7. On 8.f4 follows 8...\textit{\textbf{Q}}b4!. If then 9.dxe5, Black retains an advantage after 9...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe4 10.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xc3+ 11.bxc3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h4+ 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g3+ 13.hxg3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xh1 14.\textit{\textbf{Q}}a3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xg2+ 15.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xg3 16.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h4 17.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xc7 b5 18.\textit{\textbf{Q}}b3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h1+ 19.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c6; White better takes with the f-pawn 9.fxe5 on which Black, after 9...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe4 10.0-0 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xc3 11.\textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 0-0 12.bxc3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e7, or 10...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xc3 11.bxc3 0-0, has a cramped game.

8...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xe5 9.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2 c6
Potter: A good and useful move, for it allows of the retreat of the bishop to a capital situation, gives the queen egress, if it be required, and also unpins the d-pawn.

10.f4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b8!

Steinitz: A fine defensive move, which practically prevents later on the otherwise powerful attack by e5, followed by \textit{\textbf{Q}}d4 in answer to Black's playing the knight to e4; for in the latter case Black has now the good answer ...f5, threatening ...\textit{\textbf{Q}}a7, which cannot then be hindered by \textit{\textbf{Q}}e3, as in the case when Black has retreated the bishop to c7. The bishop is also better placed now to
leave room for the sortie of the queen at a5+, in some cases. It obvious that Black on the previous move could not capture the e-pawn, on account of the rejoinder \( \text{Wd4!} \).

11. e5 \( \text{e4} \) 12. \( \text{e3} \)

Steinitz: See our last note. The attack by \( \text{Wd4} \) would now be useless.

12...d5

Steinitz: We should have preferred 12...d6 and we believe the defence would then have obtained quite an even game.

13.0-0-0 14. \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e6} \)

Steinitz: He could have played 14... \( \text{g4} \) at once. The answer of 15.c4, which Rosenthal seemed to fear, could then have been defeated by 15...d4, which pawn could not be taken without loss of the exchange at least. Nor could the bishop be driven off by h3, on account of the reply ... \( \text{xe2} \), followed by ... \( \text{g3} \).

Schallopp: A trap in that after 15.f5 \( \text{c8} \) the seemingly strong White pawns become weak; even so, 15... \( \text{g4} \) was decidedly better.

15.c3 \( \text{c7} \) 16. \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{g4} \)

Steinitz: He has now lost a move evidently.

17. \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 18. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g3} \)+

19. \( \text{w} \) \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{e6} \)

Schallopp: Far better is 19... \( \text{f5} \), both for warding off the attack and obtaining a counterattack.

20. \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{fxe5} \) 21. \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{w7} \)

22. \( \text{g5} \)

Potter: Which is calculated to annoy Black considerably.

22... \( \text{xf1} \) + 23. \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{f8} \)

Potter: Very ophthalmic brilliancy this. Schallopp: Fails to the following move. 23... \( \text{d7} \) (before or after the exchange of rooks) was in place.

24. \( \text{hxh7} \) + \( \text{h8} \)

Steinitz: The bishop could not be taken for White would then answer \( \text{d3} \), protecting the rook, and still menacing the adverse queen.

25. \( \text{xf8} \) + ?

Steinitz: Failing to make the most of his advantage. He ought to have played 25... \( \text{f5} \), threatening check at h3. Black had then nothing better than to capture with the rook, whereupon White's rook would retake, keeping the exchange ahead.

25... \( \text{xf8} \) 26. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 27. \( \text{h3} \)

Steinitz: He had nothing to gain from 27. \( \text{h4} \)+, followed by \( \text{h7} \)+, for the adverse queen could ultimately interpose at the g8-square.

27... \( \text{g8} \) 28. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 29. \( \text{f5} \)

\( \text{d1} \)+ 30. \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{f7} \) 31. \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{b6} \)

32. \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 33. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e1} ? \)

Steinitz: By this weak move Rosenthal lost his best chance of drawing the game. He ought to have played the queen to e2 at once, threatening the b-pawn and also the advance of his pawn to c5, in order to deprive the adverse middle pawn at e5 of double protection. By the move in the text he allows the adversary to concentrate his forces.

34. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e2} \)

Steinitz: Perhaps it was better to exchange queens, and to sacrifice the c-pawn at
c5 in order to gain the e-pawn. White's two pawns against one on the king's side would not have won so easily in the ending.

35. \textit{d}3 \textit{d}2

Schallopp: Not 35...\textit{x}b2 because of 36.\textit{g}4!.

36.\textit{b}4 \textit{b}6 37.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5

Steinitz: Again failing to find the best resource. He ought to have attacked once more the e-pawn by 37...\textit{g}5. If White then offered an exchange of queens at f5, Black could safely accept it, followed by ...c5, which would gain the adverse e-pawn with a check, and afterwards the-c-pawn.

38.\textit{f}5!

Steinitz: This move now becomes formidable.

38...g6 39.\textit{c}8+ \textit{g}7 40.\textit{x}c7 \textit{f}4+ 41.\textit{h}1 \textit{xd}4 42.\textit{xd}4 \textit{d}2

Paris 1878

Steinitz: Finely played. It was most essential to give up that pawn to free the diagonal on which the king stood, so as to escape from ultimate molestation by perpetual check. He must have calculated very deeply indeed to make certain of his advancing the a-pawn without hindrance.

Schallopp: A superfluous sacrifice, instead of which an immediate 43.\textit{xa}6 \textit{xd}4 44.e6, or 43...\textit{xb}4 44.\textit{c}8 etc. should be played. There is in fact no question of perpetual check.

43.\textit{e}1+ 44.\textit{h}2 \textit{xe}6 45.\textit{xa}6 \textit{e}4 46.a4 \textit{xd}4 47.\textit{a}5 \textit{bxa}5 48.\textit{bxa}5 \textit{f}2 49.\textit{c}8 \textit{d}4 50.a6 \textit{h}6 51.\textit{b}7

Steinitz: Necessary for many objects, but chiefly to prevent the adverse bishop from gaining the point at d5.

51...d3 52.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}2 53.\textit{xf}7 \textit{d}1 54.\textit{f}8+

Steinitz: It wins in a roundabout way, which Zukertort might take credit for having reckoned out to a nicety. But he could have won much more simply by 54.\textit{f}4+, e.g. 54...\textit{h}7 or \textit{g}7 (54...g5 instead would certainly be no better, for then the queen would check at f6, followed by \textit{e}4+ and mate in a few moves) 55.\textit{c}7+ \textit{f} moves 56.\textit{xd}1 and Black has no check, and remains a piece behind, while White's other pawn must queen.

54...\textit{h}7 55.\textit{e}7+ \textit{h}6 56.\textit{xd}1 \textit{f}4+ 57.\textit{g}1 \textit{d}4+ 58.\textit{h}1 \textit{xd}1+ 59.\textit{h}2 \textit{d}4 60.\textit{c}7

Black resigns.

191 King's Gambit

Zukertort

Winawer

Paris tournament, 16 July 1878

Notes by Potter and Schallopp

1.e4 e5 2.f4 \textit{exf}4 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{d}5 4.\textit{xd}5 \textit{h}4+ 5.\textit{f}1 g5 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{h}5 7.h4.\textit{g}7 8.\textit{c}3 \textit{h}6

Schallopp: The alternative is to play 8...\textit{e}7.

9.d4\textit{c}6

Schallopp: The premature attack on the bishop on d5 by the c-pawn was better
left out of the defence; it weakens the d6-square, on which White subsequently directs his attack. 9...\(\text{Qe7}\) was still more correct.

10.\(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 11.\(\text{Qg1}\) \(g4\) 12.\(\text{Qh2}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 13.\(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Wxh4}\) 14.\(\text{e5}\)

Potter: It is upon this move, which threatens \(\text{Qe4}\), that the strength of the attack in this variation rests.

14...\(f3\) 15.\(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Wd8}\) 16.\(\text{Qh2}\) \(f5\)

Potter: To prevent the effects of \(\text{Qe4}\), but his king will obviously be seriously exposed. Something is to be said for 16...\(c5\), dangerous as it looks.

17.\(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\) 18.\(\text{Qe3}\) \(h5\) 19.\(\text{Wd2}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 20.\(\text{Qf1}\)

Potter: 20.\(\text{Qe1}\) would seem to be rather stronger.

20...\(\text{Qd7}\) 21.\(\text{Qg3}\) \(h4?\)

Potter: His only resource here is to castle as speedily as possible on the queen's side, even though no doubt the g-pawn as well as the h-pawn will fall. To carry out this purpose he should move the queen to e7, c7 or a5. The latter seems at once the most hazardous and the most promising, if a statement apparently so self-contradictory be permissible.

\(\text{Wf3}\) \(\text{Wg7}\) 31.\(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 31.\(\text{Qxd8}\)

Potter: He could win a clear piece by 31.\(\text{Qxf5}\), and practically so he could by 31.\(\text{Qd6+}\); but to score this game is of vital importance to him, and he naturally shirked what seemed to be risks attending the greater gain – risks which, however, appear to be insubstantial.

31...\(\text{Qxd8}\) 32.\(\text{Qxd8}\) \(\text{Wxg8}\) 33.\(\text{Qe7}\) \(\text{Wf4}\) \(\text{Wg7}\) 35.\(\text{Qf2}\)

36.\(\text{Qc5}\) \(\text{Qxc5}\) 37.\(\text{Qxc5}\) \(\text{Wd6}\) 39.\(\text{Qh4}\)

Potter: After this there remains not the remotest semblance of a chance for Black.

39...\(\text{b5}\) 40.\(\text{AXB6}\) \(\text{AXB6}\) 41.\(\text{Qc4}\)

42.\(\text{Qf8}\)

Black resigns.

192 Spanish Game

Anderssen

Zukertort

Paris tournament, 18 July 1878

Notes by Potter and Schallopp

1.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 2.\(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qc6}\) 3.\(\text{Qb5}\) \(\text{Qf6}\)

4.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 5.\(\text{Qxc6+}\) \(\text{Bxc6}\) 6.\(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\)

7.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 8.\(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{c5}\) 9.\(\text{g4}\)

Schallopp: With the open position on the queen's side, this exposing of the king's flank is not good.

9...\(\text{h5}\)

Potter: It is curious to find Zukertort adopting a move which he would like to see tried against himself, is he quite playing against the board in doing or expecting something from the idiosyncrasies of his opponent?

10.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 11.\(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 12.\(\text{Qxe6}\)

13.\(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 14.\(\text{Qh4}\)

15.\(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Zb8}\) 16.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{Wa5}\) 17.\(\text{Qe6}\)

0-0 18.\(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{Qfd8}\) 19.0-0

20.\(\text{d4}\)

Schallopp: This opens lines for the attack, but, unfortunately, to his opponent's advantage. White should have left the pawns untouched.
Potter: His position does not look strong enough for an attack of this kind. However, Anderssen is the Rupert of Chess, and is nothing if not a charger.

20...cxd4 21.cxd4 \(\text{\#b6} 22.\text{\#d3} \text{exd4} 23.\text{\#xd4} \text{\#xd4} 24.\text{\#xd4} \text{c5} 25.\text{c2} \text{c6} 26.f4 d5 27.\text{\#b1} d4 28.f5 gxf5 29.exf5 \text{\#d5} 30.\text{\#e4}

30...\text{\#e5!}

Potter: This remarkably fine move, both parries and thrusts.

Schallopp: A very fine move, surely not taken into account by the opponent.

31.\text{\#g3}

Potter: If 31.\text{\#f6+}, Black takes off with the queen, and after that wins the adverse queen in exchange and remains with the advantage, for White’s doubled pawns will be weak.

31...\text{\#g4} 32.\text{\#f4}

Potter: If 32.\text{\#xb8}, the queen retakes with a most powerful attack, e.g. 33.\text{\#d2} \text{\#e7} 34.\text{\#e1} \text{\#f4}.

32...\text{\#xe4} 33.\text{\#xe4} \text{\#b7}?

Schallopp: 33...d3 and, if 34.\text{\#xg4}, 34...\text{\#d4} seems best to us. White could now obtain a good game with an exchange sacrifice on g4.

34.\text{\#f6}

Potter: 34.\text{\#xg4} would of course lose the exchange, but is his best resource, and not a bad one either.

34...\text{\#e3} 35.\text{\#d2} \text{\#xe4} 36.\text{\#xe4}

36.\text{\#bd8}?

Potter: Herr Zukertort plays faultily. 36...\text{\#bb7} is the correct move. It is true White could check at e8, and afterwards go to c8, but ...\text{\#d5} would protect the pawn, and he ought certainly to win with such a position.

37.\text{\#f2}?

Potter: Missing the opportunity of despatching that dangerous knight, which desirable murder could be effected by 37.\text{\#c7!} (37...\text{\#xc7} 38.\text{\#xe3}!), after which all fear of losing would be over.

37...\text{\#d5} 38.\text{\#e5} a5 39.\text{\#e2} d3 40.\text{\#d2} \text{\#c3} 41.\text{\#e1}

Schallopp: Not 41...\text{\#xc5} because of 41...\text{\#b1} 42.\text{\#d1} d2 followed by 43.\text{\#c3}.

41...\text{\#d5} 42.\text{\#g2} \text{\#b7} 43.\text{\#g3} a4 44.\text{\#c7} \text{\#b8} 45.\text{\#a5} \text{\#e2} 46.\text{\#d1} axb3 47.axb3 \text{\#c4} 48.\text{\#f2} \text{\#f1}+ 49.\text{\#g2} \text{\#xa5}

White resigns.

193 Sicilian Defence

Zukertort

Anderssen

Paris tournament, 19 July 1878

Notes by Potter and Schallopp

1.e4 c5 2.\text{\#c3} \text{e6} 3.\text{\#f3} \text{\#c6} 4.d4 cxd4 5.\text{\#xd4} a6 6.\text{\#e2}

Schallopp: A novelty suggested by J. Berger of Graz, the value of which is to try to keep open the d-file.

6...\text{\#f6} 7.\text{\#xc6}
Schallopp: This otherwise not advisable exchange, followed by the advance of the e-pawn, now after 6...\(\text{e}2\) instead of \(\text{e}3\) followed by \(\text{d}3\) is quite playable. 7...\(\text{bxc6}\) 8.e5 Potter: \(\text{xc6}\) and e5 are of course far from new, but in conjunction with \(\text{e}2\) would seem to constitute a diversion from the ordinary lines of play.

8...\(\text{d}5\) 9.e4 f5

10.\(\text{h}5+!\) Schallopp: This pretty combination must, on correct counterplay, turn out to be mistaken. Simpler and better was 10.\(\text{d}6+\) \(\text{x}d6\) 11.exd6 and the c-pawn soon advances to protect the d6-pawn.

Potter: The question arises whether 10.\(\text{d}6+\) would be good. I have no doubts. True, the pawn at d6 could be won, and could soon be maintained by the c-pawn, but the latter would be itself weak, nor could rely upon supported by the b-pawn; but assuming the latter contingency is realised, the b-pawn would be a point of. And with reference to all this, it must be remembered that Black has a whereas White would not have most important point to be considered in the endgame. Moreover, d-pawn, though much in his way, could not be looked upon as at all weak. However, there is no doubt Zukertort's was to go in for the specious, very sound attack which now ensues.

10...\(\text{g}6\) 11.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{a}5+\) 12.\(\text{e}7\) 13.\(\text{x}e7\) \(\text{x}e7\)

14.\(\text{o}0\) Schallopp: There seems to be nothing better for White.

14...\(\text{gxh5}\) Potter: I would much prefer the capture of the pawn, e.g. 14...\(\text{x}e5\) 15.\(\text{d}5\) 16.\(\text{d}6+\) \(\text{f}8\), and what White for the lost pawn? Simply

15.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}5\)
Potter: 15...d8 is perhaps better as thereby afterwards ...h4. However, White could in that case play 16.xh5+, obtaining a perpetual check if the knight refused to cover; and suppose it did cover, then 17.h6, which would prevent the exchange of queens.

16.d6+ f8 17.xh5 g6
18.h6+ g8 19.Ke1 xe5
20.ad1 xf2+l

Potter: Which happy stroke ensures the draw.

21.‘h1 f7 22.xf7 xf7
23.h5+ e7 24.g5+ f7
25.h5+

Draw.

194 Spanish Game
Zukertort
Winawer
3rd tie-match game, Paris tournament, 30 July 1878
Notes by Steinitz, Potter and Schallopp
1.e4 e5 2.d4 c6 3.b5 a6
4.a4 d5 5.c3 c5 6.0-0 b5
7.b3 d6 8.a4 b4

Steinitz: A diversion from the defence in the first game of the present tie match, where 8...b8 was played, and sound enough as far as the further progress of the game affords a proof.

9.e2 g4 10.d3 xf3 11.gxf3
d4 12.xd4 xd4

13.f4

Steinitz: Black has simplified the position and broken up the king side, at the same time hindering the development of the adverse queen's bishop by the threat on the hostile b-pawn. If he gains time for ...h5, he secures a draw at least, for he then blocks White's doubled f-pawn still more. In this predicament, White gives up a pawn, which appears to us an error either way, whether he speculated on the attack or for defensive purposes. The proper move was 13.e1, attacking the b-pawn, which Black could hardly afford to lose for the prospective attack by ...h5. If, on the other hand, Black supported the pawn by ...a5, then White maintained a slight advantage—for instance: 13.e1 a5 14.c3 bxc3 15.bxc3 a7 16.f4 g4 17.g2 (the only move, but quite good enough) 17...h4 18.h3, followed at the earliest opportunity by f3, and we prefer White's game.

Potter: Very injudicious. 13.e1 would have been good, but better still is 13.c3 bxc3 14.bxc3 cxb3 15.c4 h5 16.f3 0-0 17.e1 c7

13.exf4 14.exf4 xb2 15.b1
d4 16.f3 0-0 17.h1 d7

18.g2 c5 19.d5 b8
20.g5 d7 21.g1 c6

Schallopp: On 21...h8 follows 22.e3 and White saves the a4-pawn.

22.b3 h8 23.d2 a5 24.bf1
g6

Potter: It is possible that this move may be necessary, for players often see things that easily escape the eye of an analyst, but to my mind 24.c5 with the object of first getting rid of that bishop, and then pushing the f-pawn two squares, is a sound and promising line of play.
25.\textit{h}6 \textit{g}7 26.\textit{e}3

26...\textit{f}5?

\textbf{Potter:} This advance while the adverse king's bishop remains on the board must be bad.

\textbf{Steinitz:} So far Winawer had still the advantage, albeit he had not increased his superiority by prompter measures, for which he had occasion. But by this untimely advance he compromises his game. The proper move was 26...\textit{e}7, to prevent the knight being taken at any time with an attack on the queen, and then the game would probably have proceeded thus: 26...\textit{e}7 27.\textit{f}4 \textit{d}4 28.\textit{x}d4+ (if 28.\textit{x}e6, then Black too captures the queen's bishop, winning the exchange) 28...\textit{xd}4 29.\textit{f}5 \textit{h}4, and we see no prospect of an attack for White, which will equalise the disadvantage of his being a pawn behind.

27.\textit{c}h3 \textit{e}8

\textbf{Steinitz:} The only move to protect the menaced g-pawn. Had he supported the latter by ...\textit{f}6, White would have doubled rooks by \textit{f}g1, still further pressing on the g-pawn, and also threatening \textit{ex}f5; whereupon the pawn could not retake, on pain of a piece being lost by \textit{xe}6.

28.\textit{g}2 \textit{f}4 29.\textit{a}7f3?

\textbf{Potter:} At all which Zukertort rejoices.

\textbf{Steinitz:} He does not realise the subtle weakness of his position, and he forces the adversary to a good move. His pawn would have stood better and he ought to have played 29...\textit{e}5 at once forcing the exchange of the dangerous bishops, with a sure draw in hand.

30.\textit{g}4 \textit{b}7 31.\textit{e}3 \textit{f}6 32.\textit{g}5 \textit{c}5 33.\textit{h}4

33...\textit{h}5

\textbf{Potter:} Which also, and very much yields pleasure to the enemy.

\textbf{Steinitz:} Winawer's middle play does not match his exceptionally fine conduct of endings. On no account ought he have thus weakened his g-pawn - the key of his position. He ought to have treated the bishop \textit{to} \textit{f}8, and released \textit{d}4 whenever the adverse queen bishop moved to \textit{b}2 by way of \textit{c}1. Of course he had no more than a draw then, for White could then remain with bishops of opposite colours, but was the most he could expect if he had fully valued the strength of the adverse attack.

\textbf{Schallopp:} Not 33...\textit{f}8 because 34.\textit{g}5.

34.\textit{c}1 \textit{e}7

\textbf{Schallopp:} On 34...\textit{d}4 could follow 35.\textit{x}g6 \textit{xb}3 36.\textit{x}h5+ \textit{g}8 37.\textit{h}8+ \textit{f}7 38.\textit{xf}6+.

35.\textit{xe}6 \textit{exe}6?
The tourney ophthalmia has evidently set in.

Steinitz: Still sticking to his pawn with fatal obstinacy. The other rook ought to have taken, and he had still a fair game, though White recovered the pawn.

36...\texttt{b2}

36...\texttt{d}7?
Potter: And still he cannot see. Of course his only resource now is to sacrifice the exchange. If the reader cannot find out why he may refer to Zukertort's next move, the merit of which consists not in its being now made, for I know many a third-class player who would be certain not to miss it at this point, but Zukertort has undoubtedly seen it before, and has been hoping for it to come.

Steinitz: Entirely overlooking the opponent's brilliant design. His only chance now was to give up the exchange at once by 36...\texttt{e}5. 36...\texttt{f}8 was also of no use, e.g. 37.\texttt{x}xh5+ g\texttt{x}h5 38.\texttt{x}xg7+ \texttt{h}8 (if 38...\texttt{h}7, then White takes the rook, remaining a piece ahead) 39.\texttt{f}6+ \texttt{f}7 (if 39...\texttt{h}7, White checks at f5) 40.\texttt{x}xh5+ \texttt{f}6 41.\texttt{g}5+, and mates next move.

37.\texttt{x}xg6!

Steinitz: The termination is most beautiful, and in Zukertort's finest style.

37...\texttt{Exg6} 38.\texttt{Exh5+} \texttt{g}8 39.\texttt{h}8+ and mates next move.

195 Spanish Game

Winawer

Zukertort

4th tie-match game, Paris tournament, 31 July 1878

Notes by Steinitz and Potter

1.\texttt{e}4 \texttt{e}5 2.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}6 3.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{f}6

Potter: Blackburne and Kolisch, no mean authorities it will be admitted, have come to the conclusion that 3...a6 is bad, and consequently that in future 3...\texttt{f}6 must be looked upon as the only defence. I am afraid that this announcement will sorely grieve many an amateur, as he recalls the years during which he has studied and practised 3...a6. I sympathise with him deeply, and can only advise him henceforth to hold fast by the grand maxim that in chess 'there is nothing new, and nothing true, and it doesn't signify.'

4.0-0 \texttt{e}4 5.d4 \texttt{e}7 6.\texttt{We}2 \texttt{d}6 7.\texttt{xc}6 bxc6 8.dxe5 \texttt{b}7

9.\texttt{d}4

Steinitz: This and the next move are a new alteration of the usual attack. In the games between Anderssen and Neumann the first player, in this form of opening, placed at once the rook on
d1, followed by c4. Winawer's new move deserves special consideration, for the knight comes in strongly at f5, and forces at last the exchange for the king's bishop, which is so important for the defence.

9...0-0 10.\(\text{c}_3\)

Potter: I doubt this being a good continuation, in any case 10.\(\text{b}_3\), intending of course \(\text{b}_2\), strikes me as being far superior.

10...\(\text{c}_5\) 11.\(\text{d}_d_1\)

Potter: The best place for the king's rook is where it stood, and he would not be forced to move it had the course suggested in the last note been adopted. No doubt White will still have some advantage, and so he ought to have, for whether or not Blackburne and Kolisch are right about 3...a6, I am of opinion that 3...\(\text{b}_6\) does not afford a comfortable defence to the Ruy Lopez.

11...\(\text{e}_8\) 12.\(\text{f}_5\) \(\text{f}_6\)

Steinitz: Zukertort has profited by the teachings of our analysis of openings of this character. Anderssen and Neumann usually advanced ...f5 at the earliest moment. We have, however, often proved the superiority of ...f6, when the adverse pawn stands at e5, which usually breaks up the centre, and gives the defence the majority of pawns on the queen's side.

13.\(\text{g}_4\) \(\text{e}_6\) 14.\(\text{h}_6\) \(\text{f}_7\)

15.\(\text{e}_3\) \(\text{h}_8\)

Steinitz: The turning-point. He ought never to have allowed the adverse e-pawn to be fortified by f4, and the exchange would not have been too heavy a price to pay for gaining the centre, and obtaining a counter attack, e.g. 15...\(\text{f}_5\) 16.\(\text{h}_6+\) \(\text{h}_8\) 17.\(\text{x}_f_7+\) \(\text{f}_7\) 18.\(\text{c}_4\) \(\text{e}_8\) 19.\(\text{f}_4\) \(\text{e}_4\) 20.\(\text{x}_f_4\) \(\text{d}_5\) 21.\(\text{x}_d_5\) (this is Zukertort's suggested answer to our proposed play) 21...\(\text{c}_xd_5\) 22.\(\text{x}_d_5\) \(\text{b}_8\) followed in most cases by ...\(\text{f}_6\), excellent game in our opinion. Zukertort does not adopt that view.

16.\(\text{x}_e_7\)

Steinitz: So far the game is identical with the second game of the tie. Zukertort tells me that if Winawer had again played 16.\(\text{f}_4\), he intended answer 16...\(\text{f}_5\), followed by 17...\(\text{d}_e_7\) which would have kept the e-pawn isolated, and also soon have subjected the hostile knight to double attack.

16...\(\text{f}_7\) 17.\(\text{x}_f_6\)

Potter: 17.\(\text{f}_4\) would be well met 17...\(\text{b}_4\).

17.\(\text{x}_f_6\)

\(\text{h}_4?\)

Steinitz: Another instance in support of our observation that the middle game is not Winawer's forte. Clearly 18.\(\text{d}_5\) was the move, for it hinders the advance of the e-pawn two squares for a while, since even if the black queen treated to e8 in support, the pawn still not advance to d5 without being captured by the knight.

18...\(\text{d}_5\) 19.\(\text{e}_1\) \(\text{f}_7\) 20.\(\text{e}_2\)

Potter: 20 \(\text{d}_d_1\) seems preferable.

20...\(\text{c}_5\) 21.\(\text{c}_3\) \(\text{a}_6\)

Steinitz: Zukertort maintains now that this was a weak move, and he ought
have played the bishop simply to d7, so as to keep his knight supported.

22.\textdaggerdbl g3 d4 23.\textdaggerdbl g5 \textdaggerdbl xf2

Steinitz: This amounts to a sacrifice of a knight for a pawn. Contrary to Zukertort's view — who thinks that he always had a draw in hand after this — I am sorry to say, after careful examination, that it was totally unsound, and ought to have cost the game. He ought to have played the rook to g6.

Penter: As to the merits of this very daring sacrifice, there seems to be a difference of opinion. Zukertort informs me that he was at the time, and still is, of opinion that the opponent could make nothing more than a draw out of it, under which circumstances, and as it would require to be met with the best play to effect that result, and as Winawer was extremely short of time, it was a justifiable and promising speculation.

24.\textdaggerdbl xe6 \textdaggerdbl b7

25.\textdaggerdbl e4?

Penter: He has three moves to choose from, and he selects the worst. I have heard talk about the complications of the position, but I do not see them anywhere about. A glance ought to have shown him the disastrous futility of \textdaggerdbl e4. 25.\textdaggerdbl e2 requires a certain amount of examination, no doubt, to see all its effects, but no necessity to see them if, as obviously is the case, it is perceptibly as well as really superior to the text move. Some think 25.\textdaggerdbl e2 would yield a win for White, and other some believe in a draw as its consequence, but no one considers that it would lose. However, he had a better reply still, viz: 25.\textdaggerdbl e4. So natural and simple is this resource, that it is one to be made in a second of time if necessary. I believe that move ought to win. Zukertort thinks otherwise. But in any case he could hope for no more than a barely-secured draw afterwards.

Steinitz: What a singular infatuation to think that he could preserve in such a manner the advantage he had gained. In complications with a great number of pieces on the board, Winawer seems to get muddled. He had actually two ways of defending himself against the coming assault, and in both cases he must have won the game. In the first place the natural move, 25.\textdaggerdbl e2; and if Black answered 25...\textdaggerdbl f8, as proposed by Zukertort, the game would go on thus: 25.\textdaggerdbl e2 \textdaggerdbl f8 26.cxd4 \textdaggerdbl xg2 27.\textdaggerdbl e7 \textdaggerdbl xe2 28.\textdaggerdbl xe2 \textdaggerdbl e8 29.\textdaggerdbl xg2 \textdaggerdbl xe7 30.\textdaggerdbl g3.

With a piece ahead and an easy game for the second place, he might have moved 25.\textdaggerdbl e4; and if Black replied 25...\textdaggerdbl f8, the answer 26.\textdaggerdbl e7 was sufficient to win, for if then Black sacrificed the rook by taking the g-pawn, check, White need not have been satisfied with the draw, and could boldly move ultimately (in answer to \textdaggerdbl f3+) \textdaggerdbl h3, and then interpose the queen in reply to the further check of the bishop at c8, coming out with three pieces for the queen and a fine game. It is singular that both players should have overlooked those
resources. They must have played under the influence of great excitement.

25...hxg2+ 26.fxg2 hxg6
27.e1 e8 28.f3 h6

Steinitz: Though the h-pawn is pinned, the clear loss of a piece is threatened thereby, for he may check at f5; and, if then the queen interpose, he would capture the bishop for nothing, the knight remaining pinned.

29.d2

POtter: The object of this quiet but effective continuation will be seen when move 32 is reached.

Steinitz: A beautiful quiet coup, which leaves White the onus of moving, the main object is to prevent the adverse queen from occupying the defensive post at f4.

30.h3?

Steinitz: Another error. His only chance was to enter on a retreat with the king to g2, giving up the piece at once. With bishops of opposite colours he might hope for a draw, albeit Black was pawns ahead, since the majority of pawns was not compact, and separated on both wings, while one of Black’s pawns was doubled.

30...f5+ 31.f4
32.f2 f8 33.xf8+
34.f4 f5

White resigns.
Matches with Owen 1878 and Minchin 1879

196 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
Owen
1st Match Game, Chislehurst 1878
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 c5 2.£c3 £c6 3.£f3 a6
4.d4 cxd4 5.£xd4 e6 6.£e2
Herr Zukertort prefers this move to g3, which is more generally adopted. His object is apparently to reserve the post at d3 for the king's bishop, with the view of an attack against the adverse king side, while g3, with the natural consequence of £g2 would confine the action of that bishop against the opposite queen side.
6...£b4 7.0-0 £f6 8.£xc6
We do not consider this capture advisable, for it forms a more compact centre for the opponent. The proper move was, we believe, 8...£f3.
8...bxc6 9.e5 £xc3?

John Owen

Weak judgement. The preservation of the king's bishop forms generally a necessary element for the defence of the conduct of the opening. The second player ought to keep his active pieces as long as possible, since he already suffers from the blocking of his queen's side. The exchange is here in detail as well as on principle to be rejected, for it opens an important file for the adverse queen's bishop at a3, which bears all the stronger against Black's weak spot at d6. 9...£d5 was superior, e.g. 10.£d4 £e7 etc.

10.bxc3 £d5 11.£d4

11...a5
As usual, when the adverse pawn is already advanced to e5, we find ...£f6 the strongest continuation. If White then defended the pawn by f4, Black could castle, having made room for his rook at f7 whenever the opponent attacked it by £a3. In most other cases he might have proceeded by ...fxe5, followed by ...£f6; and, besides, he had some fair prospect of utilising the point at a5 for the queen some time or other, if he had not now blocked the square by the move in the text.
Johannes Zukertort

12...a3f5
12...f6 was again superior, for he threatened ...fxe5 followed by ...Wf6.

13...ab1 g7 14...c4...b4
Well played under the circumstances, but it does not sufficiently cover the faults of the position.

15...b2 Wf7 16...c5 17...e3 fxe5
Again well done, but clever tactics rarely indemnify strategical weakness.

18...d2
An escape is now provided for the bishop, and he threatens now to capture the knight safely. He also prepares for the slow pressure of his rooks into the adverse positions which is commenced on the next move.

18...a6 19...d6 h8c8 20...fd1

21...f3!
A very good move. There is nothing showy in this offer of exchanging at the outside; but the manner in which the sequence is worked out shortly by Herr Zukertort, is evidence that its importance for the attack has been clearly foreseen.

21...xf3
He had nothing better but to take, for if he allowed the opponent to take, he must have left either his knight or c-pawn exposed to capture.

22...xf3 Wd8 23...b1!
Also very strong, and the answer compulsory, for White now threatens 24...bb6, winning a piece.

23...d8 24...c1 g6
He accelerates his defeat by this advance, which clearly weakens his side still more; yet he had not much to do, the only tolerable move we can for him was 23...g8, but then would have equally advanced g-pawn with a strong attack, for Black took it he dropped into a similar situation, as actually arose; and in the former alternative White would remain with the queen, having a choice of continuations which it would have difficult to provide against all round namely ...bb6, followed after the retreats to b8, by ...xe6+; again, or else ...h6.

25...g4 Wb8 26...h3...g8 27...xf5

28...bb6!
Excellent play. The proper moment chosen for this fine attack, for he threatens now 29...xg6+.

28...c6 29...bxc6 dxc6 30...h6
If the queen moves to b7, there was a direct mate, as follows: 30...d8+...g7 (to prolong by move) 32...h6+...f7 33...xh7+...
Matches with Owen 1878 and Minchin 1879

34. \( \text{Ke}8+ \) \( \text{Ke}7 \) 35. \( \text{Kxe}7+ \) and mates next move.

31. \( \text{Exg}6+ \)

White's answer was the most precise and much stronger than winning the queen by 31. \( \text{Ed}8+ \); for if Black now move 31... \( \text{Kf}7 \), White would reply 32. \( \text{e}6+ \), and the rook cannot be taken on account of mate ensuing immediately by \( \text{Kxh}6+ \). Again if the rook interpose, White would take it off followed by \( \text{Kxh}6+ \), then \( \text{Kh}7+ \), and either mate at once at \( \text{e}7 \), or a move later on by the help of \( \text{e}6 \), if the king has ultimately retreated to \( \text{f}8 \). Black resigns.

197 Queen’s Fianchetto Opening

Owen
Zukertort
2nd Match Game. Chislehurst.
12 December 1878
Notes by Steinitz

1.e3

Mr. Owen’s predilection for the close opening is sufficiently well known, and it will occasion no surprise to inform readers that throughout his series of games with Herr Zukertort not a single open game occurred.

1...d5 2.b3 \( \text{c}6 \) 3.\( \text{b}2 \) e6 4.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 5.\( \text{c}3 \) 0-0

6.g4!?

Some attacking position is obtained by this sacrifice, which might have alarmed a timid opponent. But, though White's open file for the rook and the bishop lurking behind the knight are bearing dangerously against Black's king side, Herr Zukertort bravely challenges action, and proves himself correct in accepting the pawn for the trouble of the defence.

6...\( \text{Exg}4! \) 7.\( \text{Eg}1 \text{f}5 \)

Much better than retreating the knight at once. He has now made room for his rook at \( \text{f}7 \) for defensive purposes.

8.h3

Too early, for the black knight was bound to retreat sooner or later. 8.\( \text{We}2 \) with the view of castling, was preferable, as he had nothing to fear from the reply 8...\( \text{h}4 \), which could be well defended by 9.\( \text{Eg}2 \), since White also threatened then 10.\( \text{h}3 \), followed by 11.\( \text{xd}5 \).

8...\( \text{f}6 \) 9.\( \text{e}5 \)

Again he only helps the opponent to develop the pieces on the queen's side, without increasing the attack.

9...\( \text{bd}7 \) 10.\( \text{d}3 \) e5

Promptly shutting out the adverse queen's bishop, which was always a source of danger, though at present concealed behind the knight.

11.\( \text{f}4 \) e4 12.\( \text{e}5 \) c6

It was necessary to protect the d-pawn for the purpose of carrying out his intention of exchanging the knight; for, otherwise, he would have been afterwards restricted to the retreat of the king's knight to \( \text{e}8 \), which was by no means as favourable as the plan he had in view.

13.\( \text{We}2 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 14.\( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

15.0-0-0 \( \text{xe}5 \)
Quite a surprise, but not for a Zukertort. The mistake of the calculation lay deeply hidden in a variety of promising attacks. No doubt 16...\textit{xe}4 was, under the circumstances, the soundest play; but then Black would have retaken with the f-pawn, followed by \ldots \textit{xe}5 in answer to \textit{xe}5, with an excellent game, being already one pawn ahead, with the prospect of gaining the adverse weak h-pawn in the end.

16...\textit{xd}5 17.\textit{g}2 \textit{g}6!

That this clever refutation is the only one, pleads an excuse for White's rash sacrifice. Had he now moved 17...\textit{xf}6, White would have answered 18...\textit{c}4, and, if the adverse knight took, would have first proceeded 19...\textit{xf}6. The same reply would have been given to 17...\textit{f}7; for 18...\textit{xc}4, the only move to save the pawn and the mate, could be successfiully met by 19...\textit{g}7.

18.\textit{h}4

18...\textit{xh}4

Not to be intimidated, The assurance which Zukertort displays in accepting all fair offers is remarkable. He evidently follows Anderssen's precepts, who, to say in such cases, "What I do not I must have shown to me."

19.\textbf{w}2 \textit{f}6 20.\textbf{h}1 \textit{f}7 21.\textbf{g}4 22.\textbf{f}4 \textit{e}6 23.\textbf{c}4

24.\textit{d}5 \textit{cxd}5 25.\textit{cxd}5

26.\textit{xf}6

Had he pinned the bishop by 26...\textit{xe}5, Black would have answered 26...\textit{xb}2+, followed either 27...\textit{f}6+, or 27...\textit{f}6, quite in either way.

26...\textit{xf}6 27.\textit{b}1 \textit{c}7 28.\textit{c}8 29.\textit{h}3 \textit{e}5 30.\textit{d}4

31.\textbf{b}2

Perhaps Zukertort might not see the loss of the queen is threatened by 32.\textit{d}8+.

31...\textit{d}5 32.\textit{f}1

White's efforts would create sympathy if they were not so obviously useless against the overwhelming superiority of force, handled with such consummate skill.

32...\textit{d}7 33.\textit{c}4 \textit{xe}3 34.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xb}2+ 35.\textit{xb}2 \textit{xc}4+

Clear proof that the opponent has fallen into his own trap. The bishop is unpinned, and a piece and four pawns ahead in the ending carry conviction.

36.bxc4 \textit{xd}7

White resigns.

198 Queen's Fianchetto Opening

Owen

Zukertort

Match Game, Chislehurst, December 15

Notes by Steinitz

1.e3 d5 2.b3 \textit{f}6 3.\textit{b}2 \textit{e}6

4.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}7 5.\textit{a}3 0-0 6.c3
Mr. Bird is responsible for the introduction of the manoeuvre comprised in the present and preceding move. Its object is apparently to make room for the queen’s knight at c2, but we doubt whether this little convenience is worth the blocking up of the queen’s bishop.

6...c5

7...d3

We have seen this move adopted in close games, when the queen’s knight is given to a much weaker adversary, and should say that this eccentric mode of development amounts in itself to such odds as Mr. Owen could not afford to give his opponent. The cluster of pieces on the queen’s side must come in conflict with each other in their future action. 7...d4 as a preliminary was unquestionably superior.

7...a6 8.c4 c6 9.b1 d4

This advance is now correct. Black has already the superior development, and with energetic decision crosses the Rubicon of the fourth row.

10.0-0 e5 11.e4

A sorry position for the first player; his king’s bishop blocked by his own pawns, and his queen’s bishop obstructed by the closed phalanx of the adverse centre. Rather than submit to such a humiliating confinement, we should have advanced the pawn to d3, with some prospect of opening the game by exd4 when opportune. This course was also preferable for the purpose of keeping the usually tender spot at f4 guarded.

11...g4 12.e2 d6 13.h3

With fine perception of the requirements of the situation, Herr Zukertort has previously protected the e-pawn with the queen, instead of with the bishop, which enables him to bring the queen’s knight to the king side without loss of time.

15.c2 e6

16.g3

Whether White overlooked the effect of Black’s reply, which costs a pawn, or whether he meant to sacrifice the h-pawn, speculating on an attack with his rook on the open file, is not quite clear. The latter supposition is, however, probable, for White would have been subjected to an equally strong attack if he allowed the knight to come in at f4 unchallenged, e.g. 16...c1 d4 17.d1 w6, (threatening the powerful sacrifice of 18...xh3+, followed, if accepted, by 19...xh3. White has then nothing better than 18.g5 [for he cannot afford to wait until the opponent plays ...g4, and then brings one of his rooks to the king side without
hindrance by way of d8 and d6], whereupon Black may capture the rook with the queen, and he afterwards wins another pawn, coming out with three pawns for the exchange) 18.\textit{W}c2 (to liberate the knight for retreating to h7 in case Black attempts the sacrifice. This is better than 18.\textit{Q}g5, in which case Black might retreat the queen to d7, which compels the same knight to go back again, on account of ...h6 being threatened. Again, if White now adopt 18.\textit{W}h2, Black would institute a strong attack by ...h6 and ...g5) 18...\textit{Q}g6, and Black will proceed with exchanging the bishop, and afterwards win the e-pawn with a very fine game.

16...\textit{Q}g5 17.\textit{Q}ce1 \textit{Q}xh3+
18.\textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}g4 19.\textit{h}h1 \textit{W}e6
20.\textit{W}f1 \textit{Q}h5 21.\textit{h}h2 f5!
The object of this excellent move, as a preliminary for the beautiful sacrifice which follows, is made clear later on.

22.\textit{W}xf5

22...\textit{Q}f4+! 23.gxf4 \textit{Q}xf4+
24.\textit{h}h1

The king could not move to g3, for Black would then simply capture the f-pawn with the bishop, threatening ...\textit{W}g6+, with an irresistible attack. 24.\textit{Q}g1 was just a little better, but even then there was no satisfactory line of defence in answer to 24...\textit{Q}xf5, e.g. 24.\textit{Q}g1 \textit{Q}xf5 25.\textit{Q}xf5 (we see nothing better 25.\textit{Q}xf5 26.d3 e4; and if White now takes the pawn, the queen threatening ...\textit{Q}e2+; if, on the other hand, the knight moves to h4, Black would take the knight with the bishop, followed either by ...exd3, or by doubling the rooks. Lastly, if White retreat the knight to d2, the game might go on thus: 17.\textit{Q}d2 e3 (threatening ...e2) 28.\textit{W}xe3 \textit{W}xe3+ 29.\textit{h}h1 (if queen interpose instead, the answer ...\textit{Q}h3+) 29...\textit{Q}h5 (threatening ...\textit{Q}g3+) 30.\textit{Q}xh5 \textit{Q}xh5+ and wins.

24...\textit{W}c6!

With fine judgement, the sacrifice the knight had been adopted after forcing the removal of White's e-pawn; this excellent coup is one of the consequences of Zukertort's foresight.

25.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}xe2 26.\textit{W}xe2
27.\textit{W}d3 \textit{Q}xf3+ 28.\textit{Q}xf3
29.\textit{Q}xd4 cxd4 30.\textit{W}xd4

The game was lost, but another piece was thrown away by this capture.

30...\textit{Q}f6 31.\textit{W}e3 \textit{Q}xb2 32.\textit{g}g3
33.e3!

Settling the affair in the simplest and most expeditious manner.

34.\textit{f}xe3 \textit{Q}xe3+ 35.\textit{Q}g2
He was bound to offer the exchange of queens, for had he interposed either
the queen's knight has little prospect of active operation from this square and is generally reduced to a retreat to c7 after \( \text{c5} \), where it creates an impediment to the queen; \( \text{5...c5} \) at once followed by \( \text{dxc6} \), would be the natural line of development for the second player, who, however, can hardly expect to obtain a satisfactory position in this opening against the best play on the other side.

\begin{align*}
6. & \text{c3} \text{c5} 7.0-0 \text{cxd4} 8.\text{cxd4} \text{cxb4} \\
9. & \text{a2} \text{dxc8} 10.\text{e3} \text{e7} 11.\text{h1}
\end{align*}

More than an ordinary coup de repose; there is a hidden object in this move, which strongly supports the preparation of White's attack.

11...0-0

and Black does not see it; it was the highest time to advance \( \text{d5} \), in order to gain a safe retreat for the knight at c6.

12.\text{a3} \text{dxa6} \\
He had nothing better now; had he retreated the knight to c6, White's d-pawn would have marched straight to \( \text{d6} \) by way of \( \text{d5} \), winning a piece. White's 11th move is now exploited; it provided against the check of the bishop at c5, which would have released that piece from embarrassment, and might have therefore enabled Black's queen's knight to gain the more advantageous post at c6.

13.\text{a4} \text{b8} \\

14.\text{waxa7}!?

Bold at any rate; even if he calculated all the consequences, and found his way to secure the queen from the embarrassment to which she is subject, it was venturesome to undergo such trouble for the sake of this pawn, and very few players would have had the pluck and endurance to conceive and work out such a long and difficult defence for such small gains.

14...\text{c6} 15.\text{b5} \text{d5} 16.\text{e5} \text{dxe7} 17.\text{xc6} \text{xc6} 18.\text{e3}

The queen could not at once retreat from her confined position to a4, as Black could then have obtained a good game by \( \text{...f6} \), which would have broken White's centre and opened his f-file; for White was then bound to capture the pawn, and obviously could not defend by \( \text{f4} \), on account of his king's rook being undefended, which would enable Black to capture twice the pawn at e5.
18...e4?
Aiming too high. By trying to shut out the queen, he loses his chance of smaller advantages, upon which he had more right to speculate. 18...c8 was better, for if then White answered 19.acl, the reply 19..f6 opened more prospect for Black. If, however, White's queen retreated to a4, she would be attacked by 19...c4, followed by ...a6 and ...fc8, Black gaining thus a strong position on the queen's side, which might have compensated for the loss of the pawn.

19.acl c8

20.a8!
A curious and subtle resource. He virtually turns the tables, and keeps not alone Black's queen, but also his queen's knight, confined; for Black cannot afford to exchange pieces. Nor can he now hope to release himself by 20...f6, on account of White's answer 21.xd5!

20...h6 21.g1
White's clever tactics have not alone freed his game from all danger, but he has succeeded in throwing the onus of waiting on the opponent, who is already a pawn behind, and can little afford to look on while White brings up the reserve from the king side to strengthen his other wing.

21..d8 22.ge2 f8 23.e6 c6 24.a4 d7 25.b4 c2 g6
He had little to do, but it was certain unwise to bring his knight into the thick of the attack, which White evidently meant to pursue with his pawns on the kingside.

27.f4 h4 28.g4 c6 29.e4 c4 30.f2 c6 31.\-h3 e6
32.f5 exf5 33.gxf5 g5 34.e3
Sound enough; but there seems no reason why he should not seize the opportunity for winning a piece by 34.e6!, followed 35.fxg6.

34..xe3 35.xe3

35..h4?
Bad judgement. If his game was at all tenable, 35..f8 gave him the chance of keeping a defensive position, for the ruinous advance of the hostile e-pawn had to be prevented at all hazards.

36.e6! fxe6 37.fxe6 d6 38.g6 g6 39.f7+ h7 40.g1 e7
41.xg6!
Herr Zukertort finishes in his wonted vigorous style.

41..xg6 42.g1
43.xg6+ h8 44.xd5 f3 45.g2
Black resigns.
200 Franco-Sicilian Defence

Minchin

Zukertort (without f7-pawn)

1st Match Game, St. George's Chess Club, January 1879

Notes by Minchin

This game and the following, played in a match, are two charming specimens of play at odds of pawn and two moves.

1.e4 - 2.d4 e6 3.d3 c5 4.dxc5

The attack gained by 4.e5 breaks down against the best defence; by capturing the pawn, White goes in for material gains rather than strong attack.

4...c6 5.e3 f6 6.f3 e7

7.c3 0-0 8.a3 g4 9.wb2 wa5

10.0-0 xe3 11.wxe3

11.b4, before taking the knight, was better, as, unless Black sacrificed the queen's knight for three pawns, White has an undeniable superiority.

11...xc5 12.wd2 b6 13.b4

14...xf3!? 15.gxf3 e5 16.wf4

17.g2 d5 18.g1 ad7

19.g3

20...d8+ would lose by 20...xf3+ 21.wxf3 xf3 22.g2, and by playing ...c6 Black would speedily win.

20...h6 21.f4 xd3 22.cxd3 dxe4 23.dxe4 xf4 24.xf4

25.f3 b5+ 26.xf2 xf6

27.e3 e5 28.xc1 c6 29.cc3

g6 30.d1 w8 31.wd3?

Here White missed an opportunity; 31.wh3 would have prevented Black's next move, and would shortly have resulted in a winning position.

31...h6 32.d8+ f7 33.wf2

Again an error; by returning the king to e3, Black could only have drawn by playing back ...wh6.
34...\textit{Ex}e4+ 35.f2 f4 36.d3 \textit{W}f5 37.g2 e4 38.d7+ \textit{Ex}d7 39.\textit{Ex}d7+ e6 40.\textit{Ex}h7 \textit{Ex}f3+ 41.h1

41...f2?
A slip, though it did not signify, as White played. By checking at e3 on the next move, it would have been difficult for Black to win. Dr. Zukertort pointed out that he should have played 41...\textit{W}bl + 42.g1 \textit{e}4 43.f2 \textit{g}4.

42.b3+ \textit{d}5+
White resigns.

201 King's Fianchetto
\textit{Minchin}
\textit{Zukertort (without f7-pawn)}
2nd Match Game, St. George's Chess Club.
January 1879
Notes by Minchin
1.e4 - 2.d4 g6 3.d3 \textit{g}7 4.c3
This is certainly weak. This defence was, I believe, first tried successfully by Dr. Zukertort in the City of London Handicap, some years back, and Mr. Wisker considered that 4.h4 at an early stage would prove irresistible, but, like most precipitate attacks in the pawn and two game, it broke down against Dr. Zukertort's accurate defence. Probably 4.f3 is best.

4...d5 5.e5
Owing to the pawn at c3 blocking the square for the knight, the pawn cannot be taken advantageously, and the advance is forced.

5.c5 6.f4?
Decidedly bad; the king's knight should have been played to f3.

6...\textit{xc}d4 7.cxd4 \textit{c}6 8.e3 \textit{c}5
9.h3
The necessity for this move shows the badness of the advance of the f-pawn.

9...0-0 10.e2 f5 11.f2 \textit{d}5
12.b3 f5 xd4

This position was analysed by Dr. Zukertort and Steinitz, and this hazardous move was supposed to be sound, but such is not the case.

13.0-0?
This at once makes it plain sailing for Black. The following is the best variation: 13.\textit{xd}4 \textit{ex}d4 14.\textit{d}2! (any move would lose the game) 14...d5 15.b5 and wins a piece at least; therefore if 14...\textit{h}6 15.\textit{d}5 \textit{e}5 16.f4 \textit{xf}4 17.\textit{xf}4 \textit{e}5 18.\textit{xd}4 \textit{e}1 (if 18...\textit{xf}4 19.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 20.\textit{xd}5 \textit{e}6 21.e3 and then moves the other bishop) 19.e2 saving the piece.

13...\textit{xe}2+ 14.\textit{xe}2 d4 15.d5
15.e4 is clearly better.

15...\textit{d}8 16.e4?
Having thrown away his fine opportunities, he falls from bad to worse. The
Knight cannot be taken on the move, but this sacrifices it without the slightest compensation.

1.e6 17.f5 \( \text{dx}5 \) 18.f\( x \)g6 \( \text{xe}5 \) 19.\( \text{gxh} \)7+ \( \text{h} \)8 20.\( \text{xf} \)8+ \( \text{xf} \)8 21.\( \text{e} \)f1 \( \text{e} \)8 22.\( \text{e} \)f5 \( \text{xd} \)3 23.\( \text{xd} \)3 \( \text{c} \)6 24.\( \text{g} \)g5 \( \text{c} \)1+

White resigns.

202 Evans Gambit

Zukertort

Minchin

5th March Game, St. George’s Chess Club, January 1879

Notes by Minchin

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{c} \)f3 \( \text{c} \)6 3.\( \text{c} \)c4 \( \text{c} \)5 4.b4 \( \text{xb} \)4

Having lost two games to one in the games at odds, Mr. Minchin regarded this match as lost, and accepted this gambit against the master best acquainted with that opening for amusement and instruction.

5.c3 \( \text{a} \)5 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 dx\( \text{c} \)3 8.\( \text{b} \)b3 \( \text{f} \)6 9.e5 \( \text{g} \)6 10.\( \text{xc} \)3 \( \text{ge} \)7 11.\( \text{a} \)a3 0-0 12.\( \text{ad} \)1

The 11th and 12th moves are the strongest against the Compromised Defence.

12...a6

12...b5 is the only chance left of developing the queen’s side pieces and leads to the most interesting struggle. 12...a6 is mere waste of time, and White carries out the old attack of \( \text{d} \)d5, with immense advantage of having the queen’s rook in play.

13.\( \text{d} \)d5 \( \text{xd} \)5 14.\( \text{xd} \)5 d6 15.exd6 cxd6 16.\( \text{xd} \)6 \( \text{g} \)d8 17.\( \text{xc} \)6 bxc6 18.\( \text{e} \)e5 \( \text{f} \)6

All these appear to be the best moves left for the defence, and now Dr. Zukertort ingeniously wins the exchange by force.

19.\( \text{e} \)e7! \( \text{xe} \)5

19...\( \text{xe} \)7 is obviously worse e.g.

20.\( \text{xc} \)6 \( \text{g} \)5 21.\( \text{xd} \)8 \( \text{xd} \)8 22.\( \text{fe} \)1 \( \text{e} \)6 23.\( \text{bb} \)7 \( \text{c} \)8 24.\( \text{xc} \)8! \( \text{xc} \)8 25.\( \text{e} \)e8 mate.

20.\( \text{xd} \)8 \( \text{e} \)6 21.\( \text{d} \)d3 \( \text{f} \)5 22.\( \text{g} \)3!

A decisive continuation of the 19th move. Black must now remain the exchange behind. By changing queens, however, he expedited his fate, as, after the loss of his queen’s bishop, the queen’s side pawns cannot be long preserved.

22...\( \text{xg} \)3 23.fxg3! \( \text{xd} \)8 24.\( \text{xf} \)5 \( \text{g} \)6 25.\( \text{e} \)e5 \( \text{g} \)7 26.\( \text{f} \)1 \( \text{b} \)6 27.\( \text{e} \)e7 \( \text{d} \)d8

In no other way can the fatal doubling of the rooks be prevented. The game is obviously lost.

28.\( \text{xd} \)8 \( \text{xd} \)8 29.\( \text{d} \)d7 \( \text{b} \)6 30.\( \text{d} \)d6

and after a few useless moves Black resigned.

203 Spanish Game

Zukertort

Lewis

12 board blindfold exhibition, Dublin, 1 February 1879

Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{c} \)c3 \( \text{c} \)6 3.\( \text{f} \)f3 \( \text{f} \)6 4.\( \text{b} \)b5 a6 5.\( \text{a} \)a4 \( \text{c} \)5 6.\( \text{xe} \)5 \( \text{xe} \)5 7.d4 \( \text{b} \)4
In a game of the Grand Tournament at Paris between Zukertort and Rosenthal, the latter obtained a sufficiently defensible position by 7...\textit{d}d\textit{d} 8.dxe5 \textit{x}xe5 9.Ee2 c6 followed by ...\textit{b}b8.

\begin{center}
\textbf{8.dxe5 \textit{xe}4 9.0-0}
\end{center}

Very ingenious. This seems very solid and offers the advantage of creating complications more brilliant than 9.\textit{d}d4, although this last move would be equally good: 9.\textit{d}d4 \textit{xc}3+ 10.bxc3 \textit{f}5 11.\textit{a}a3 \textit{b}6 12.e6! and White wins at least the g-pawn and the king's rook, which cannot be defended by 12...\textit{g}8 because of 13.\textit{d}d5.

\begin{center}
\textbf{9...\textit{xc}3}
\end{center}

Winning the pawn the other way would have been better, but he would equally have had to withstand a very vigorous attack: 9...\textit{xc}3 10.bxc3 \textit{xc}3 11.\textit{a}a3 \textit{xa}1 (best; if 11...b5 12.\textit{f}3 attacks rook and bishop) 12.\textit{xa}1 \textit{b}5 13.\textit{b}b3 \textit{g}5 (against any other defence, White would reply 14.e6) 14.d5 \textit{c}6 15.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}6 16.\textit{f}3 with an excellent attack which compensates for the loss of the exchange and the pawn minus.

\begin{center}
\textbf{10.bxc3 \textit{xc}3 11.\textit{g}4!}
\end{center}

An excellent move.

\begin{center}
\textbf{11...0-0}
\end{center}

The capture of the bishop would be disastrous: 11...\textit{xa}4 12.\textit{x}g7 \textit{f}8 13.\textit{g}5 and wins.

\begin{center}
\textbf{12.\textit{h}6g6}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{13.\textit{b}3!}
\end{center}

More finely played than to have taken the rook.

\begin{center}
\textbf{13...\textit{e}8?}
\end{center}

An error; he ought to submit to the inevitable loss of the exchange by 13...d5, but all the same White would have won.

\begin{center}
\textbf{14.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}7 15.\textit{xc}3 \textit{h}5 16.\textit{xf}7! \textit{xe}5 17.\textit{ae}1}
\end{center}

Black resigns.

204 Vienna Gambit

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Hirschfield}

St. George's Chess Club, autumn 1879

Notes by Zukertort

\begin{center}
\textbf{1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5 3.f4 \textit{g}4 4.\textit{f}3 g5 5.h4 g4 6.g5 h6}
\end{center}

Should Black try to prevent White from obtaining the attack by the sacrifice of the knight, and play now 6...\textit{e}6, White proceeds best with 7.d4 \textit{h}5 8.\textit{xf}4 (8.dxe5 \textit{hxg}5 9.\textit{x}g4 \textit{d}6, and 10...dxe5 with the better game) 8...\textit{g}6 9.\textit{xf}7 \textit{xf}7 10.\textit{c}4+ \textit{d}5 11.\textit{xd}5 etc.

\begin{center}
\textbf{7.\textit{xf}7 \textit{xf}7 8.d4 d6 9.\textit{xf}4 \textit{g}7}
\end{center}

For 9...\textit{f}6, see Game 163.

\begin{center}
\textbf{10.\textit{c}4+ \textit{g}6}
\end{center}

For 10...\textit{e}8, see Game 181.
Matches with Owen 1878 and Minchin 1879

11. \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{g}e7 \) 12.0-0 \( \text{hf}8 \)

13. \( \text{wd}2 \) \( \text{vh}7 \)

Another Zukertort-Hirschfield game continued 13... \( \text{d}7 \) 14. \( \text{xf}8 \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 15. \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 16. \( \text{d}5! \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 17. \( \text{ex}d5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 18. \( \text{d}3+ \) \( \text{h}5 \) 19. \( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{f}8 \)

20. \( \text{hx}h6! \) \( \text{g}8 \) (20... \( \text{x}h6 \) 21. \( \text{xf}8 \), Black resigns.

14. \( \text{xf}8 \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 15. \( \text{ le}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

Of course, if at once 15... \( \text{h}8 \), then 16. \( \text{f}7 \), threatening 17. \( \text{x}h6 \).

16. \( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{h}8 \)

17. \( \text{d}5 \)

The only move which maintains the attack and refutes, we think, the manoeuvre executed by Black with his two queen moves. Very tempting, but futile, would be the immediate advance of the e-pawn, e.g. 17.e5 \( \text{f}5 \) 18. \( \text{xf}5 \) (if anything else, Black will further proceed with the development of his pieces and then easily decide matters by his bigger battalions) 18... \( \text{xf}5 \) 19. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 20.e6 \( \text{d}7 \) 21. \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{h}8 \!)

17... \( \text{d}7 \)

We failed in searching a satisfactory continuation for Black. Even the attempt to break the hostile attack by giving up the extra piece with 17... \( \text{xd}4 \) would bring but temporary relief, e.g. 17... \( \text{xd}4 \) 18. \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4+ \) 19. \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 20. \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{e}6 \) (White threatened force the game with 21. \( \text{g}6+ \) and

22. \( \text{h}7 \) 21. \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 22. \( \text{f}7+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 23. \( \text{f}6 \) (he might also play 23. \( \text{g}6+ \) and 24. \( \text{e}7 \) 23... \( \text{c}5 \) 24. \( \text{hx}h6+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 25. \( \text{f}5+ \) and White will come out with two pawns ahead.

18.e5 \( \text{f}5 \)

If 18... \( \text{f}5 \), then 19. \( \text{d}3 \). Making room for the king with 18... \( \text{d}8 \) would prove equally insufficient, viz: 18... \( \text{d}8 \) 19. \( \text{d}3+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 20. \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 21. \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 22. \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 23. \( \text{g}8 \) \( \text{xg}8 \) 24. \( \text{xh}6+ \) \( \text{h}7 \) 25.f7.

19. \( \text{xe}7 \)

Better than sacrificing the exchange at once, for White avoids thereby all complications, which might arise after 19. \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 20. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 21.e6 \( \text{xd}4 \).

19... \( \text{xe}7 \) 20. \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 21. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \)

Considering Black's next move, this appears as a loss of time, but 21... \( \text{d}8 \) would not avail more, for White must win then after 22. \( \text{xf}5+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 23. \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 24.e6 \( \text{g}3 \) 25.c3 and 26. \( \text{g}5 \). 21... \( \text{f}8 \) was, perhaps, Black's best move, but even then, we think, White should win, e.g. 21... \( \text{h}8 \) 22.e6 \( \text{h}8 \) 23. \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 24. \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 25. \( \text{f}5 \) and 26.g4.

22.e6 \( \text{d}8 \) 23. \( \text{xf}5+ \) \( \text{h}8 \)

24. \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 25.c3 \( \text{f}8 \)

26. \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{xg}5 \) 27. \( \text{hxg}5 \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 28. \( \text{xf}7 \) \( \text{xf}7 \)
29. \textit{Wh}3+

Too deep?: White overlooks the simple continuation 29. g6 \textit{H}f6 30. \textit{W}c8+ \textit{X}f6 31. \textit{Wh}3+ etc.

29...\textit{G}g8 30. \textit{We}6 \textit{W}f8 31. g6 \textit{H}f6

If 31...\textit{G}e7, then 32. \textit{W}c8+ \textit{X}f6 33. \textit{W}f5+ etc.

32. \textit{W}c8+ \textit{G}e7 33. \textit{W}xc7+

Black resigns. The loss of a piece mate are unavoidable.
Match with Rosenthal 1880

205 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Carr
12 board blindfold exhibition, Cambridge, 13 February 1880
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Nf3 Nc6 3.Bc4 Bc5
4.b4 Bxb4 5.c3 a6 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 d6
7...dxc3 we consider best; 7...e6, leading to the normal position, feasible,
but neither the text move nor 7...c6 in any way satisfactory.
8.Qb3 Qf6 9.e5!
This and the next move form the strongest continuation.
9...dxe5 10.Bxe1 Bb6
10...Qd7 or 10...Qh6 are preferable.
11.Qg5 Qg6
If 11...Qf5, the usual move at this juncture, White proceeds with 12.Qxe5!
Qxe5 13.f4 dxc3+ 14.Qf1 Qd4
15.Qxc3 etc., like in a game between Morphy and Kipping.
12.Qxe5Qxe5 13.Qxe5+ Qf8

14.Qd2!
This position is, so far as our knowledge of chess literature goes, original.
White’s quiet development, notwithstanding the threatened fork, is perfectly sound and better than any immediate continuation of the attack.

14...f6
To no purpose. We do not think, however, that Black has any satisfactory move, e.g.
14...dx6c3 (or 14...Qf6 15.Qf3 and 16.Qh4; or 14...d7 15.Qe4, threatening
16.Qa3+) 15.Qae1 Qd7 (if 15...Qe6,
then 16.Qa3+ c5 17.Qxc5 Qxc5
18.Qxc5+ Qe8 19.Qb5 checkmate)
16.Qxf7! Qxf7 17.Qa3+c5 18.Qxc5 etc.
15.Qa3+ c5 16.Qxc5 Qxc5
17.Qxc5+ Qe7 18.Qe1 We8
19.Qf4 b6 20.Qa3

20...a6 21.Qd6 Qa7 22.Qf3 Qd7
22...d3 23.Qxd3 (23.Qd4 d2) 23...b5
(to prepare 24...Qf7), would be successfully met with 24.Qc5.

23.Qxd4 Qxd6
There is nothing to be done: the entry of the White knight at c6, resp. e6, must prove decisive.

24.Qxd6 Qd7
24...Qd7 would but postpone Black’s dissolution.

341
White announced here the concluding moves for both sides:

25...\( \text{e8} \) 26.\( \text{xg7} + \text{d8} \) 27.\( \text{xf6}! \)

Not so brilliant, but just as effective as the continuation 27.\( \text{xb6} + \text{c7} \) 28.\( \text{d1} + \text{d7} \) 29.\( \text{e6} + \text{etc.} \)

Black resigns.

206 Four Knights Game

Zukertort

Rosenthal

3rd Match Game, St. George's Chess Club,
7 May 1880
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 3.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d4} \) 5.0-0 0-0 6.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 7.d3 d6

After 7...\( \text{xd5} \) 8.exd5 \( \text{xd4} \) 9.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{exd4} \), White intended to proceed with 10.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f6} \) or 11.d6!.

8.\( \text{e3} \)

The text move enables Black to improve his game considerably; White should play 8.c3. Black would then derive no advantage from capturing the knight, e.g. 8.c3 \( \text{xd5} \) 9.exd5 \( \text{xd4} \) 10.d4 \( \text{e4} \) (if 10...\( \text{exd4} \), then 11.\( \text{xd4} \) 11.d2 \( \text{f5} \) 12.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 13.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 14.\( \text{f3} \), with the superior game. Should Black, however, in answer to 8.c3, play 8...\( \text{d6} \) or 9.\( \text{g4} \), White continues then with 9.\( \text{e3} \).

8...\( \text{d4} \) 9.\( \text{c4} \)

9.\( \text{a4} \) was preferable—see next note.

9...\( \text{c6} \) 10.c3 \( \text{xf3} + \text{11.\text{xxf3} \text{e6} \text{12.b3} \text{}} \)

White cannot advance now the d-pawn, as the following continuation shows:

12.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 13.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 14.\( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 15.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 16.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 17.\( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{f6} \), and White's isolated pawn would probably fall in the end.

12...\( \text{d7} \)

13.\( \text{e2} \)

White decided on the following modus operandi after long and careful deliberation—he took over twenty minutes to concede to the opponent some attack which, in White's opinion, would result in naught, for the price of isolating his d-pawn, so securing for the endgame a deciding superiority.

13...\( \text{d5} \) 14.exd5 \( \text{cxd5} \) 15.f4 \( \text{xf4} \) 16.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 17.\( \text{b1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 18.\( \text{c4} \)

19.\( \text{g7} \)

If instead of the text move, 18...\( \text{e4} \). White replies 19.\( \text{f3} \), and if 19...\( \text{c7} \), as advocated by \text{The Field}, he continues with 20.\( \text{f5} \) g6 21.\( \text{h6} \) \( \text{g7} \) 22.g4, with a good attacking position.

19.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h3} \)？

Certainly weak: we do not think, however, that Black has any line of play which would compensate for the weakness of his d-pawn.

20.\( \text{xf6}! \)

Upon this resource White relied when opening his rook's file on the 15th move.

20...\( \text{xf6} \) 21.\( \text{h5} \) \( \text{e6} \)

Best; if 21...\( \text{d7} \), White can recover the sacrificed exchange with an excellent game by 22.g4 \( \text{xe3} \) 23.\( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{gxf4} \) 24.\( \text{xex5} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 25.\( \text{h3} \).
The position is very difficult, and we do not think that it admits of any satisfactory defence. We submit three lines of play which we have seen proposed:

A) $22...\text{xd5}$ (this move was advocated by Mr. Rosenthal immediately after the conclusion of the game) 23.$\text{xf5} \text{xd8}$ 24.$\text{h6} \text{f8}$ (or 24...$\text{h8}$ 25.$\text{xf7} \text{g8}$ 26.$\text{xf6} \text{e7}$ 27.$\text{xe7} \text{xe7}$ 28.$\text{exg8}$, remaining three pawns ahead) 25.$\text{xf8} \text{xf8}$ (if 25...$\text{xd8}$ 26.$\text{h6+}$ etc.) 26.$\text{f1} \text{f5}$ 27.$\text{xf5} \text{f6}$ (if 27...$\text{g7}$ White forces the game with 28.$\text{xf6} \text{h8}$ 29.$\text{d7}$) 28.$\text{xf6}+\text{etc.}$

B) $22...\text{e7}$ 23.$\text{d2}$

B1) 23...$\text{ab8}$ 24.$\text{e4} \text{f5}$ 25.$\text{xf5} \text{f6}$ 26.$\text{xf5} \text{f6}$ 27.$\text{e1} \text{exe1}$ (27...$\text{xf7}$ 28.$\text{xf6+}$) 28.$\text{xf8}$ $\text{xe1}+\text{etc.}$

B2) 23...$\text{f8}$ 24.$\text{xb7} \text{ab8}$ 25.$\text{e4} \text{g7}$ 26.$\text{xf5} \text{xf5}$ 27.$\text{xf5} \text{f8}$

B3) 22...$\text{f8}$! 23.$\text{e4} \text{f5}$ 24.$\text{xf5} \text{f6}$ (if 24...$\text{xf5}$, then 25.$\text{xf5} \text{f6}$ 26.$\text{d5}+\text{h8}$ (26...$\text{g7}$ 27.$\text{h6+}$) 27.$\text{xf6+}$) 25.$\text{f4} \text{d7}$, 'with a satisfactory game', as The Field says, from which we take the above variation. A few additional moves seem to disprove this assertion: 26.$\text{e3} \text{xa2}$ (or 26...$\text{c4} 27.\text{f3} \text{a6}$ 28.$\text{d5}$, winning the exchange at least) 27.$\text{f3} \text{f7}$ 28.$\text{xb7}$, and Black cannot save the exchange and ultimately the game.

23.$\text{xf5} \text{xf5}$

White threatens mate in two moves: if 23...$\text{h8}$, then 24.$\text{xd6} \text{xd6}$ 25.$\text{e4} \text{f5}$ 26.$\text{xf4} \text{d7}$ 27.$\text{e5}+\text{g8}$ 28.$\text{g5}+\text{f8}$ 29.$\text{f1}$. If 23...$\text{f8}$, then 24.$\text{g5}+\text{h8} 25.$\text{xf4}$

24.$\text{xf5} \text{e1}+

If now 24...$\text{f8}$, then 25.$\text{f4} \text{e7}$ 26.$\text{f1} \text{g7} 27.$\text{g5}$

25.$\text{f2} \text{ae8}$

After 25...$\text{xc1} 26.\text{xc1} \text{e8}$ (there is nothing better) 27.$\text{f1} \text{e7} 28.$\text{g1}$. White has an easy won game either by 29.$\text{e4}$ or 29.$\text{f6}$ and 30.$\text{f5}$

26.$\text{h6}! \text{be2+}$

26...$\text{e6} 27.$\text{xe6} \text{xe6}$ would but postpone the defeat.

27.$\text{f3} \text{f8} 28.\text{xe1} \text{xe1}$

29.$\text{g4+} \text{h8} 30.\text{xf8}$

Black resigns.
Johannes Zukertort

numerical superiority on the queen's flank to the fore.

17.g4
If 17.b4, Black rejoins with 17...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}7}\) 18.a3 a5 etc.

17...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}4}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}h4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}h4}\) 19.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}2}\) cxb3 20.axb3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}7}\) 21.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}4}\)

21...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}d8}\)
We quite agree with Mr. Steinitz that 21...a5! was the stronger move. Black could double with advantage his rooks on the a-file after forcing its opening, while the hostile rooks were to not much purpose occupying the centre files – compare also White's 26th move.

22.f3 c5 23.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}6}\)
To prevent the advance of the hostile b-pawn.

23...a5 24.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}4}\)
If 24.c4, Black obtains considerable advantage with 24...a4.

24...c4!
24...a4 was not advisable now, as White would reply with 25.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}d8+}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}d8}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}1}\).

25.bxc4 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}4}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}}8+}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}}8}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}6}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}6}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}3}\) a4 29.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}4}\) a3 30.f4 a2
Black could here gain a move with 30...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}4}\).

31.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}1}\)
The right reply: if 31.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\), Black rejoins with 31...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}4}\) 32.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}1}\) a1 b5.

31...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}3}\)
The straightforward course, 31...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}4}\), should speedily win, we think. 32.f5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}7}\) (32...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}4}\) 33.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}4}\) 34.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xa}}2}\) would be in White's favour) 33.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}2}\) (White dare not play here nor on the following move \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\), on account of the decisive reply 33...b5 34.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}1}\) b4 etc.) 33...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}7}\) 34.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) f6:

A) 35.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\) b5 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}3}\) bxc4 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}6}\) 38.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}2}\) fxe5 39.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}4}\) 40.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xa}}2}\) c3+! 41.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}3}\) e4 42.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}2}\) + 43.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}6}\) 44.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}6}\) 45.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}4}\) etc;

B) 35.e6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}6}\) (35...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}6}\) 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}6}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}}6}\) 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\) b5 or \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}}4}\) wins likewise) 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}4}\) (or 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}7}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}8}\) 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xf}}7}\) 38.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{exf}}7}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xf}}7}\) 39.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\) b5 etc.) 36...b5 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}2}\) (if 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}3}\), then 37...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}3}\) + or likewise...) 37...b4 38.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}3}\) 39.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}3}\) and must in any case win a piece.

32.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}3}\)
The text move was severely blamed and considered as reason of White's defeat, but it is equal to 32.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}2}\) – see next note. Black would then, we think, come out with a winning advantage: 32.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}7}\) 33.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) b5 34.f5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}7}\) 35.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}6}\) 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}4}\) (if 36.e6, Black wins with 36...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}6}\), similarly as the preceding note) 36...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}3}\) 37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}5}\) 38.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{fxe}}5}\) 39.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{fxf}}5}\) 40.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}2}\) (if 40.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xf}}5}\), then 40...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe}}5}\) 41.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xa}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{fxf}}5}\) 40...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}1}\).
If 33.f5, Black proceeds with 33...h6 and 34...e2.c7 etc., as given in the notes to White's 32nd move. The tempting course 33...g5 is far less advantageous, e.g. 34.fxg5

A) 34...xg5 35.xe4! fxe6 (If 35...c1, then, of course, 36.e7.) 36.b5.h3 37.xa2 etc.;
B) 34...xg5 35.xg2! fxe6 35...e2+ 36.xf3 xc2 37.exf7+ xf8 38.xe4) 36.xa2 h4 37.h6.xe5 38.xb6.xe2+ 39.xf3 xe3+ 40.xg2 xg3+ 41.xf1! (best) 41...xh3 42.c5,

and it is very doubtful whether Black will effect more than a draw.

33...xh3 34.b5

Black threatened to imprison the rook with ...f1, ...d3, and ...b1.

34.a4 35.c3 xc4 36.xa2

36...b5!

The forces are equal, Black has, however, a passed pawn and two bishops which now are in an unfavourable position.

37.g3

Making matters worse, but he had no rejoinder which would avert final defeat. If 37.c1, then 37...a4 38.c3 b4 (threatening 38...b3 and 39...b4) 39.b1 xb1 40.xb1 b4 41.d2 e6 42.d4 f8, and Black's king will advance to the support of the pawn via e8, d7, c6 etc.

37...e6 38.d1

If 38.b1, Black wins a piece with 38...e4 39.f3 xa2 40.xb5 a4 41.b8 a8 42.xa8 d5+ etc.

38...a5!

The deciding coup: after 38...e4 39.xf3 xe3+ 40.xe3 b6+ 41.f3 xa2 42.c8+ h7 43.b8, and 44.xb5, Black would only draw.

39.xf2 b4 40.xc4

Forced, as Black threatened 40...b3. If 40.d2, then 40...b3 41.xa5 (41.xc4 bxa2 42.a4 or 42.c1 xd2) 41...xc1 42.xc1 b2.

40...xc4 41.c1 b3 42.d4 d2

Of course, not 42...b6?, on account of the reply 43.xb3!.

43.e2

If 43.b2, then 43...xf4 44.xf3 g5 45.xe4 h7! 46.d4 e6 47.xc3 h6 48.xb3 xh5, and Black will win easily.

43.xe2 44.xe2 xf4

45.d3

Nothing can save White's game: if 45.b2, Black wins with 45...f8 46.f3 h6 47.e4 e7:
A) 48.f5 d7 49.a3 e3! 50.e4 (or 50.b2 d2 51.e4 e6 etc.) 50...g5! 51.f5 h6! 52.b2 d2 53.e4 e6 54.d3 g5 55.e4 f6 56.c3 fxe5 57.xe5 (57.f3 or d3,
... $\text{g}5$ or $57. \text{b}2 \text{f}4 58. \text{a}3 \text{f}6$ etc.)
57... $\text{f}6$ and wins;
B) $48. \text{d}5 \text{d}7 49. \text{a}3 \text{g}5! 50. \text{b}2 \text{d}2! 51. \text{c}4 \text{e}6 52. \text{xb}3 \text{f}4 53. \text{c}4 \text{xe}5 54. \text{c}1 \text{f}5 55. \text{d}5$ (if 55. $\text{h}6$, then 55... $\text{g}5$ 56. $\text{d}5$ $\text{g}4$, or 56... $\text{f}6$ and 57... $\text{g}6$) 55... $\text{f}4$ 56. $\text{b}2 \text{h}6$ 57.$\text{d}6 \text{g}4 58. \text{e}7$ f5 etc.
45... $\text{c}1$
The simplest continuation: Black would equally win with 45... $\text{f}8$ 46. $\text{c}3$ ($46. \text{b}2 \text{e}7 47. \text{e}4 \text{h}6$ etc., as in the previous note) 46... $\text{f}7$ 47. $\text{xb}3 \text{e}6$ etc.
46.$\text{c}3 \text{b}2 47. \text{c}2 \text{h}7 48. \text{c}5 \text{h}6 49. \text{f}8$
Equally futile would be $49. \text{d}4 \text{h}5 50. \text{e}6 \text{fxe}6 51. \text{xg}7 \text{g}4 52. \text{d}4 \text{f}4 53. \text{gl} \text{e}5$ etc.
49... $\text{f}4$ 50.e6
If 50.$\text{d}6$, then 50... $\text{h}5 51. \text{xb}2 \text{g}5 52. \text{c}2 \text{f}6$.
50... $\text{fxe}6 51. \text{xb}2 \text{e}5+ 52. \text{c}2 \text{h}5 53. \text{d}3$
Playing, we suppose, for the very remote chance of sacrificing the bishop for one pawn and getting the other with his king.
53... $\text{g}5 54. \text{e}4 \text{f}6 55. \text{f}3 \text{h}4 56. \text{c}5 \text{h}3 57. \text{b}6 \text{g}4+ 58. \text{f}4 \text{c}3 59. \text{f}2 \text{e}5+ 60. \text{f}5 \text{g}3$
White resigns.
Anderssen, the originator of the Lopez-variation, d3, used to develop the queen's bishop at e3 and the queen at d2, but then the queen's knight was brought to c3 which square is here occupied by the pawn. It seems, therefore, that in the Steinitz-form of Anderssen Variation the development of the queen's knight and queen's bishop conflict with the development of the queen's knight.
8... $\text{h}6$
If 8...0-0, White could reply 9. $\text{e}4$ with advantage. 8... $\text{e}7$ appears best move at this juncture.
9.$\text{bd}2 \text{e}7$
Better than 9...0-0, which would be met with 10. $\text{g}4$.
10. $\text{f}1$
10.$\text{e}2$, as played by Mr. Rosenthal in the 16th game of the match, is preferable. Then 10... $\text{e}6$ could be met by 11.$\text{d}4$; 10... $\text{d}7$ is better.

208 Spanish Game
Rosenthal
Zukertort
14th Match Game, St. George's Chess Club,
7 June 1880
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 $\text{e}5$ 2.$\text{f}3 \text{c}6$ 3.$\text{b}5 \text{f}6$
4.$\text{d}3 \text{d}6 5.$\text{c}3 \text{a}6$ 6.$\text{a}4 \text{g}6$ 7.$\text{h}3 \text{g}78. \text{e}3$
10... $\text{e}6$
This and the three next moves of Black give him a great superiority of position.
11.$\text{g}3 \text{b}5$ 12.$\text{b}3 \text{d}5$ 13.0-0
0-0 14.$\text{h}2$
The wisdom of this move is very doubtful. It is difficult, however, to suggest =
satisfactory rejoinder: 14.a4 would be met with 14...b4; 14...d2? with 14...d4 15.cxd4 exd4 16...f4 g5.

14...ad8 15...e2 a5
Forcing the exchange of a knight against a hostile bishop.

16.exd5
If 16...c2?, then 16...dxe4 17.dxe4 e4 etc.

16...cxd5 17...xd5 xd5! 18.f4?
This move opens the diagonal of the adverse king's bishop; it should have been postponed until forced by the advance of the hostile f-pawn.

18...exf4 19...xf4 fd8
19...b4 is advocated in The Field, as weakening the adverse king, but surely it cuts both ways, e.g. 19...b4 20.cxb4 c6 (if 20...xb4, then 21...xc7) 21.a3 fd8 22.ad1.

20.b4
Weakening still more his position which already before had very little cohesion. If 20.d4, then 20...c5, with decided superiority of position.

20...ab7?
At this instance, we entirely agree with Mr. Steinitz, and can do no better than copy his note: 'Feeble. The proper answer was 20...c6, which would have gained at least one important pawn on the queen's side, for White could not then advance the d-pawn and allow the opponent to sacrifice the knight, e.g. 20...c6 21.d4 cxd4 22.cxd4 ad4+ 23...d1 axa1 24...xa1 xb4, and White can take neither the h-pawn nor the c-pawn, on account of the immediately winning reply 25...c3, attacking two pieces. Consequently Black remains with three strong pawns and a rook for two minor pieces; besides that the adverse a-pawn is weak and defensible in the long run...'

21.d4 5d7 22...e1 h4
23...e3?
23...f3 is proposed in The Field instead of the text move, which proves, as the sequel shows, that White had not seen through the contingencies arising out of Black's reply. 23...f3 was decidedly better, but it would lead to no more than an even game.

23...xd4!

24...xc7?
The text move is fatal: White should strive for a draw with 24...f3 xf4 25.cxd4 xe3+ 26...xe3 xd4 (if 26...xd4, then 27...xe6) 27.cxd4 xd4 28.a3 a5 29.bxa5 cxa5 30.e4 etc.

24...d3! 25...b6
25.cxd8 has no better result, e.g. 25...xd8 xd8 26...f2 (if 26...e4, then 26...g3 27.bxb7 d5
28 \text{e8}+! \text{xe8} 29. \text{xd5 \xc3} etc.; if 26. \text{f4}, then 26...\text{g5}; 27. \text{f2} and then likewise... 26...\text{xc3} 27. \text{d3} (Black threatened 27...\text{d4}) 27...\text{xe1} 28. \text{xe1 \d6}, with a fine position and a pawn ahead.

25. \text{exg3} 26. \text{xe6}
Absolutely necessary, as 26. \text{xh7}? would lose at once by the reply 26...\text{d5}.

26...\text{fxe6} 27. \text{exg3} \text{wxg3} 28. \text{xf6 \text{d2}}!
The deciding coup: White's king's flank is seriously menaced and his pawns on the queen's flank are at the opponent's mercy.

29. \text{g4 \text{h5} 30. \text{h2}}
After 30. \text{f7}+ \text{h8} 31. \text{f2}, Black wins with 31...\text{xc3}:
A) 32. \text{xe6} \text{xb4} 33. \text{xa6} (if 33. \text{e8}+, then 33...\text{g7}) 33...\text{d6} 34. \text{wxa8}+ \text{b8}! (if 34...\text{h7}, White may reply 35. \text{g4}) 35. \text{g4} (or 35. \text{a4} \text{xf2}+ 36. \text{h1 \text{g3}} etc.) 35...\text{xc4} 36. \text{f8}+ \text{g7};
B) 32. \text{f8}+ \text{h7} 33. \text{e7}+ \text{h6} 34. \text{h4} (if 34. \text{xe6}, then 34...\text{e5}) 34...\text{xa2} 35. \text{xe6 \text{e5} 36. \text{g4}+ \text{yg4} 37. \text{xa2 \text{d4}+ 38. \text{xf2} \text{xf4} 39. \text{d2}+ \text{g5}, and must win easily.

30...\text{xa2} 31. \text{h1}
If 31. \text{f3}, Black changes queens and wins then White's pawns on the queen's side with...\text{a3}.

31...\text{e2}+ 32. \text{wa8}+ \text{h7} 33. \text{d7} \text{e1}+ 34. \text{f1 \text{xc3} 35. \text{xa6}}
White's position is past redemption; if 35. \text{b7}, then 35...\text{h6}.

35...\text{c4}! 36. \text{g1 \text{xf1}+!}
37. \text{xf1 \text{d4}+}
White resigns.
Of course, if 38. \text{f2}, then 38...\text{c1}+ etc.

209 Queen's Gambit
Zukertort
Rosenthal
15th Match Game, St. George's Chess Club
12 June 1880
Notes by Zukertort
1. \text{c3 \d5 2. \d4 \f5 3. \e3 \e6 4. \f4}
The course chosen by Black in opening the game gives additional strength to his king's flank at the cost of weakening the queen's side. White might, therefore, develop his forces on the queen's side at once, to be ready to take immediate advantage of the said weakness.

4...\text{f6}

5. \text{a3}
Not a routine move, but necessary to confine the range of the hostile pieces. After 5. \text{c3 \b4 6.a3 \xc3 7.bxc3 \d4}, Black has got the lead, while White cannot make use of the b-file for his rooks on account of the position of the adverse bishop. Besides, the exchange of a knight for a bishop is favourable from a general point of view, but this rule does not hold good in the early part of close openings, which may lead to cramped positions, where the issue depends frequently upon close fighting. In such cases the knight will be found always superior to a bishop. Anderssen, whose finest qualities of play never
shone more than in conducting close games, was well aware of this principle, and the student of his games will find that the great master acted invariably upon it.

5...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{6}\)

5...\(c6\) or 5...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{7}\) were better continuations; the text move challenges the advance of the adverse c-pawn, which Black certainly should not invite.

6...\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{3}\)

6...\(c5\) \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{7}\) 7...\(b4\) and 8...\(b2\), as pointed out by Mr. Steinitz in \textit{The Field}, was much stronger.

6...\(c6\) 7...\(b4\) \(\text{\textit{a}}\text{6}\)

The \textit{Schachzeitung} proposes here: 7...\(dxc4\) 8...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{c4}\) \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{e}4\) 9...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{e4}\) \(\text{\textit{xe4}}\) 10...\(0-0\) 0-0; White acquires then, however, a great superiority of position with 11...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{2}\) \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{6}\) 12...\(\text{\textit{b}}\text{2}\) \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{7/c7}\) 13...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{4}\) \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{7}\) 14...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{3}\) and 15...\(e4\).

8...\(\text{\textit{b}}\text{2}\) \(\text{\textit{bd}}\text{7}\) 9...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{2}\) \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{4}\) 10...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{e4}\) \(\text{\textit{xe4}}\) 11...\(c5\) \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{7}\) 12...0-0

Mr. Steinitz remarks here: 'he could have equalised the game now by 12...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{f}3\), followed by...\(e5\).' After 12...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{f}3\) 13...\(\text{\textit{x}}\text{f}3\) \(e5\), White gets an open attacking position backed up by two bishops with 14...\(e4\)! \(\text{\textit{dxe4}}\).

13...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{2}\) \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{6}\) 14...\(\text{\textit{a}}\text{4}\)

We read in \textit{The Field}: 'at any risk, we should have preferred attempting a diversion in the centre by...\(e5\) at this point.' This advance would lose a piece, e.g. 14...\(e5\) 15...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe5}\) \(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) (if 15...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe5}\) 16...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe5}\) \(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) 17...\(f4\) etc.) 16...\(f4\) \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{3}\) 17...\(\text{\textit{a}}\text{4}\) \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{3}\), which leaves Black the resource of 17...\(d4\) 17...\(\text{\textit{b}}\text{4}\) (Black has nothing better: if 17...\(e4\) or \(f5\), then 18...\(b3\); if 17...\(\text{\textit{h}}\text{4}\), then 18...\(f3\)) 18...\(f5\), and Black gets but two pawns for a piece, while his knight is entirely out of play.

15...\(f3\) \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{8}\) 16...\(f4\) \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{4}\)

If 16...\(b5\), as recommended in \textit{The Field}, White obtains a fine attack on the queen's flank with 17...\(b3\), 18...\(a3\) and 19...\(f1\). It is evident that Black cannot exchange pawns in the meantime, without hopelessly weakening his a-pawn and c-pawn.

17...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{4}\) \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{4}\) 18...\(d2\) \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{d8}\) 19...\(b5\) \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{5}\) 20...\(b5\) \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{7}\)

Black's 19th move was certainly weak, but having once taken he should go on, notwithstanding that he isolated thereby his b-pawn. The text move must prove suicidal in the end.

21...\(b6\) \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{1}\) 22...\(\text{\textit{a}}\text{1}\) \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{8}\)

Forced: if 22...\(d8\), White wins with 23...\(a8\) \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{7}\) (f6) 24...\(a5\) \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{8}\) 25...\(x\text{xc8}\) \(\text{\textit{xc8}}\) 26...\(w\text{a7}\) and 27...\(a6\).

23...\(c3\)!

The first move of a manoeuvre by which White effects a complete change of front in the shortest possible time.

23...\(e7\) 24...\(b2\) \(h6\)

24...\(g5\) was a much stronger resource.

25...\(e1\) \(\text{\textit{h}}\text{7}\) 26...\(g3\) \(f5\) 27...\(f1\)

28...\(f2\)!

This completes the manoeuvre referred to in the note to White's 23rd move. White must now bring matters to a set-
tement on the king's flank, and then can proceed to a final onslaught on the queen's side.

28...\textit{ef8}

If 28...g5, White wins with 29.fxg5 \textit{\textbf{xf6}} (29...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 30.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 31.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} etc.) 30.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 31.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 32.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 33.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 34.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} h5 35.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

29.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 30.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

A useless trap: wanting to incite the opponent to the sally 30...\textit{\textbf{xf6}}? which would lose by 31.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 32.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 33.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} - otherwise White plays 34.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 34.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

30...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 31.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 32.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

33.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

With the intention of throwing the lead in the opponent's hand and hereby making him change the position of queen or rook, for White can advance then his h-pawn with greater advantage. 33.h5 could be played, however, at once, e.g. 33.h5 g5 34.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 35.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 36.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 37.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} and 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

33...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 34.h5 \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 35.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 36.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 37.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

If now 35...g5, then 36.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} (36...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 37.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}) 37.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} followed by 38.d1; \textit{\textbf{xf6}} and \textit{\textbf{xf6}}.

36.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 37.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

After 37...g5 38.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 41.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 42.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} etc., or

(1) 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 41.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

(2) 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

Should Black persist in moving his rook, White wins, as follows: 38...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 41.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

39.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

41.g3 \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 42.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

42.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 43.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}

Black cannot save the day: if 42...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} then:
A) 43.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{h}3\) 44.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{g}4\) 45...\(\text{xf}1\) (after 45.\(\text{ex}g4\) \(\text{fx}g4\) 46.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 47.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{d}7\) 48.\(\text{a}7?\) \(\text{xa}7\) 49.\(\text{bx}a7\) \(\text{c}7\) 50.\(\text{e}7\), Black would turn the tables with 50...\(\text{b}5\) (50...\(\text{b}6+?\) 51.\(\text{cx}b6+\) \(\text{b}7\)) 45...\(\text{h}5\) 46.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{ex}g6\) 47.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 48.\(\text{a}7\) \(\text{xa}7\) 49.\(\text{bx}a7\) \(\text{d}7\) 50.\(\text{e}6\) \(\text{e}8\) 51.\(\text{bx}b6\) \(\text{c}7+\) 52.\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{c}8\) 53.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{a}8\) 54.\(\text{b}7\) \(\text{xa}7\) 55.\(\text{e}7\) 56.\(\text{e}7\)

B) or White can also proceed with 43...\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{h}3\) (43...\(\text{fx}g4\) 44.\(\text{ex}g4\) \(\text{e}8\) 45.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xe}6\) 46.\(\text{xb}8+\) \(\text{e}8\) 47.\(\text{xb}7\)) 44.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{hx}g5\) 45.\(\text{ex}g5\) \(\text{g}4\) 46.\(\text{ex}g4\) \(\text{fx}g4\) 47.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{e}8\) (47...\(\text{g}3+\) 48.\(\text{f}3!\) 48.\(\text{a}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 49.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{g}8\) 50.\(\text{h}7\) \(\text{e}8\) 51.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{f}8\) 52.\(\text{ex}g4\) \(\text{e}8\) 53.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{xf}5+\) 54.\(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{g}3\) 54...\(\text{d}7\) 55.\(\text{f}6\)) 55.\(\text{e}6\), followed by 56.\(\text{h}1\) and 57.\(\text{a}1\).

43.\(\text{d}2\)

At once 43.\(\text{a}6\), Black would, after 43...\(\text{d}7\) 44.\(\text{xb}7\) \(\text{e}8\) 45.\(\text{d}2\), gain two moves with 45...\(\text{f}3!\) 46.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{h}5\). By keeping the bishop on \(\text{e}2\), White compels the adverse bishop to reach \(\text{h}5\) in a roundabout way.

43...\(\text{g}2\)

If 43...\(\text{d}7\), White wins with: 44.\(\text{f}6!\) \(\text{xf}6\) 45.\(\text{g}7\) \(\text{e}8\) (or 45...\(\text{e}7\)) 46.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{e}7\) (to prevent 47.\(\text{f}7\). If 46...\(\text{c}8\), then 47.\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{g}7\) 48.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{d}8\) 49.\(\text{xb}8+\) etc.) 47.\(\text{a}7!\) (47.\(\text{g}6\) would be met with 47...\(\text{ex}g7\) 48.\(\text{xb}8\) \(\text{e}6\) 49.\(\text{xb}7+\) \(\text{e}8\) 50.\(\text{b}7\), 47...\(\text{a}7\), then 48.\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{xa}7\) 47...\(\text{xa}7\), then 48.\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{e}7\) 50.\(\text{a}7\), if 47...\(\text{f}8\), then 48.\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{e}8\) 49.\(\text{f}7\) 48.\(\text{b}7\) \(\text{a}3\) (or 48...\(\text{a}8\); nothing can stop White from queening) 49.\(\text{g}6\) \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{h}7\), and wins.

44.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{h}3\) 45.\(\text{a}6!\) \(\text{d}7\)

If 45...\(\text{b}6\), the winning continuation is 46.\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{f}6\) (best) 47.\(\text{bxc}8\) \(\text{bxc}8\) 48.\(\text{f}6!\) \(\text{b}7\) 49.\(\text{xb}8+\) \(\text{xb}8\) 50.\(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{g}4\) 51.\(\text{e}5+\) and 52.\(\text{g}7\).

46.\(\text{xb}7\) \(\text{e}8\) 47.\(\text{f}4!\)

47.\(\text{a}7\) would not avail more, as Black would not take the rook at once, and White had then no better continuation than \(\text{b}4\).

47...\(\text{g}4\) 48.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{h}5\) 49.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{xe}6\) 50.\(\text{a}7+\)!

Which wins a piece and the game.

50...\(\text{xa}7\) 51.\(\text{bx}a7\) \(\text{c}7\) 52.\(\text{e}7!\)
53.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{d}6+\) 54.\(\text{d}8\) \(\text{e}8\)
55.\(\text{b}7\) \(\text{xa}7\) 56.\(\text{xa}7\) \(\text{g}5\)
57.\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{g}4\) 58.\(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{f}7\)
If 58...\(\text{xc}6\), then 59.\(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{h}5\) 59.\(\text{xc}8\) \(\text{c}6\) 61.\(\text{c}6\) etc; if 58...\(\text{h}5\), then 59.\(\text{xc}8\) \(\text{h}4\) 60.\(\text{b}7\) \(\text{h}3\) 61.\(\text{c}7+\).

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

Black resigns.

210 King's Gambit

Bird, Winawer and Blackburne

LPaulsen, W.Paulsen and Zukertort

Consultation Game, Wiesbaden, 6 July 1880

Notes by Steinitz

1.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 2.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{ex}f4\) 3.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}5\)
4.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{g}4\) 5.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{h}4+\) 6.\(\text{f}1\)
7.\(\text{h}6\) 7.\(\text{d}4\) 8.\(\text{f}4\)

8.\(\text{c}3\), as played by Steinitz in his match against Zukertort in 1872, is here much to be preferred.
It is scarcely possible to play a good consultation game at the quick rate of twenty moves an hour, and it is, therefore, no wonder that the game is early conducted in a shallow manner. The object of this attack was apparently to induce the opponents to give a check at h3, which would have been a completely lost move, as $\text{f}4$, winning the queen, was afterwards threatened by White. It was much more solid play to leave the adverse queen at her outpost, whence she must have retreated ultimately with loss of time, and to withdraw the knight at once to $f2$. The queen's bishop could then once more protect the d-pawn at e3 if necessary, and the great object was gained of being enabled to bring out the queen's knight to the most favourable attacking square at c3.

11...$\text{w}e7$ 12.$\text{gf}2$ $\text{g}7$ 13.$\text{c}3$ $\text{d}7$

This attack is premature, and even hazardous, in face of the adverse counter-attack on the king side. The better plan of development was 15.$\text{w}c2$, and then to post the queen's rook at $e1$ and the king's rook at $f1$.

15...$\text{f}5$ 16.$\text{b}5$ $\text{a}5$

An error of judgement, which we do not think either of the players who acted in concert would have committed when playing separately. They allow thereby one of their most important pieces to be exchanged for the inactive adverse knight. 17.$\text{d}3$ was the natural and the best move, and the game might have proceeded thus: 17.$\text{d}3$ $\text{h}f8$ (if 17...$\text{f}7$, White may answer 18.$\text{gf}1$, and if then the pawn advances further to f4 the knight would withdraw to $h1$. ...$f3+$ could afterwards do no farther harm, and we believe White would ultimately obtain the best of the game, on the queen's side mostly, by $\text{b}3$ done in proper time, and after guarding against the entrance of the adverse knight at $c5$, 18.exf5 $\text{xf}5$ 19.$\text{el}$; and 19...$\text{e}3+$ is of no use, for the king would retreat to $g1$ with a safe game.

17...$\text{xc}4$ 18.$\text{xc}4$ $\text{xb}5$ 19.$\text{e}5$

All this could have been easily foreseen, and was only the natural continuance of the error pointed out in our last note. Black is now a clear pawn ahead, and has a formidable attack besides against White's exposed king with the combined two rooks and two bishops.
24. \( \text{e3} \) h4 25. \( \text{f2} \)

25... \( \text{d8} \)!

This is very fine play. They apparently afterwards lose time with this rook, but in reality gain an important move. It was of great importance to keep the h-pawn defended. Had they played the other rook to g8, the game might have proceeded thus: 25... \( \text{h8} \) 26. \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 27. \( \text{xh4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 28. \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 29. \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 30. \( \text{g3} \), and White could make a good fight for a draw with bishops of opposite colours.

26. \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 27. \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{h8} \) 28. \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{h6} \) 29. \( \text{d5} \)

Their position was now compromised, and there was no means of extrication. Had they played 29. \( \text{d5} \), the game might have gone on thus: 29... \( \text{c4} \) 30. \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{d7} \) 31. \( \text{e3} \) (best; if 31. \( \text{d5} \), Black attacks by 31... \( \text{g7} \), and the answer 32. \( \text{d4} \) would not save the piece, as Black would reply 32... \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 32. \( \text{xexe3} \) \( \text{g7} \), followed by 33... \( \text{e8} \) if the other rook defends, with a winning game, as ... \( \text{d5} \) remains threatened whenever the knight moves.

29... \( \text{f3} \) 30. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xg1} \) + 31. \( \text{xg1} \) \( \text{xexe3} \) 32. \( \text{g8} \) + \( \text{d7} \) 33. \( \text{d4g4} \)

If they took the pawn, they lost a rook to 33... \( \text{f1} \) +, followed by 34... \( \text{g1} \) +.

33... \( \text{f1} \) + 34. \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f2} \) + 35. \( \text{h1} \)

Best. If 35. \( \text{h3} \) then followed 35... \( \text{f1} \) + 36. \( \text{g2} \) (if 36. \( \text{xh4} \), Black mates in two moves by 36... \( \text{h2} \) + and 37. \( \text{h3} \)) 36... \( \text{h6} \), and wins.

35... \( \text{e7} \) 36. \( \text{c4} \)

The White allies are defending themselves remarkably well, and give their opponents great trouble.

36... \( \text{a4} \)

The safest plan. Had the bishop taken the pawn, White could retake, and afterwards would attack the hostile bishop at e3 with the king, after... \( \text{f1} \) + and... \( \text{g1} \) +. Again, 36... \( \text{d7} \) gave the opponents drawn chances, for the rook at g8 would check at g7, and either draw by perpetual check or else take the queen's bishop whenever the latter interferes e8, followed by \( \text{e4} \) +. For a similar reason, 36... \( \text{h3} \) would have failed, for White would first check with the rook at e4, and then withdraw the other rook to g1.

37. \( \text{e4} \) +

Better than to attack the h-pawn at once, e.g. 37. \( \text{h8} \) \( \text{h3} \) 38. \( \text{xh3} \) \( \text{f1} \) + 39. \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{g1} \) + 40. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d1} \) + 41. \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 42. \( \text{h7} \) + \( \text{f6} \) 43. \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{g7} \) and wins.

37... \( \text{f7} \) 38. \( \text{h8} \) \( \text{g5} \) 39. \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{xa2} \) 40. \( \text{h7} \) + \( \text{g6} \) 41. \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{h3} \)!

After this excellent move, White's resistance can only be prolonged without hope of altering the result.
Threatening both $55...\text{d}d1+$ and $55...\text{d}d5+$.
White resigns.

18...\text{g}g2
Fatal, but White has no saving move.
18...\text{d}d2, then, of course, 18...\text{xd}d2+.
18...\text{g}g2, then 18...\text{d}d3+. 18...\text{e}e2 was tried at the conclusion of the game and led to the following ending: 18...\text{d}d3+ 19...\text{xd}d3 \text{w}xe3+ 20...\text{g}g2 \text{e}e4 21...\text{f}f1 (Black threatened mate at 21...\text{xc}c3 22...\text{xc}c3 \text{d}d5+ 23...\text{h}h2+ \text{f}f2 \text{h}h3+) and White abandoned, for if 25...\text{h}h3, then, of course.
25...\text{w}xf2; if 25...\text{g}g1, Black mates in two moves; if 25...\text{f}f3, then 25...\text{d}d3+ etc.
18...\text{d}d1 19...\text{g}g1...\text{h}h3+
White resigns.

18...\text{d}d1 19...\text{g}g1...\text{h}h3+
White resigns.

211 Scotch Game
X.
Zukertort

Wiesbaden, July 1880
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2...\text{f}f3 \text{c}c6 3.d4 \text{exc}4
4...\text{xc}c4\text{e}e5 5...\text{c}c5 \text{w}f6 6...\text{ge}7\text{d}2

This move was played a few days previously for the first time by L. Paulsen against Englich.

7...d5 8...\text{exc}d5
Very weak: L. Paulsen played against Zukertort in their tournament game, Berlin 1881, 8...\text{b}b5, and the continuation was 8...\text{xe}e3, 9...f3 0-0 10...\text{xb}b8\text{b}b8 11...\text{exc}5 \text{w}h4+ 12.g3 \text{w}xe4 etc.

8...\text{xc}d5 9...\text{b}b5...\text{xe}e3! 10...\text{f}f3...\text{e}e6 11...\text{c}c4
Of course, if 11.e4, then 11...\text{w}e5.
11...\text{db}d4 12...\text{xc}c7+
If 12.a3, then 12...\text{d}d8.
12...\text{e}e7 13...\text{xa}a8...\text{d}d8 14...\text{c}c3
White has nothing else: if 14...\text{f}f2, then 14...\text{d}d1+; if 14...\text{e}e2, then 14...\text{d}d3+.
14...\text{w}h4+ 15.g3...\text{e}e4 16...\text{g}g1 \text{c}c2+ 17...\text{f}f2
If 17...\text{e}e2, Black mates in two moves.
17...\text{e}e5!
Again the strongest continuation: Black have now a clear superiority of position.

12. \( \square c6 ? \)

An unsound reply which enables Black to carry the day by a few energetic strokes.

12...bxc6! 13. \( \square x c5 \) \( \square d5 \)

White must provide for the threatening coup, 14...\( \square f4 \). If 14.\( \square h1 \), then 14...\( \square f4 \) 15.gxh3 (forced) 15...\( \square x d1 \) 16.\( \square x d1 \) \( \square x f3 \) etc.; if 14.\( \square x d5 \) \( \square x d5 \), winning the queen or mating.

14...\( \square x f3+ \) 15.\( \square x f3 \) \( \square f4 \) 16.\( \square a3 \)

There is nothing to be done: if 16.g3, Black win with 16...\( \square x f1 \) 17.\( \square x f4 \) \( d1 \).

16...\( \square d3 ! \) 17.\( \square e3 \) \( \square e2+ ! \) 18.\( \square h1 \) \( \square g4 ! \)

White resigns.

213 French Defence
Hammacher, Schottländer and Zukertort
Bier, Schwarz and Dr. Schwede
Brunswick, 20 July 1880
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 \( e6 \) 2.d4 \( d5 \) 3.\( \square c3 \) \( \square f6 \)
4.exd5 exd5 5.\( \square f3 \) \( \square d6 \) 6.\( \square d3 \)
0-0 7.0-0 \( c6 \) 8.\( \square e2 \) \( g4 \) 9.\( g3 \)
\( \square c7 \) 10.h3 \( \square x f3 \)

Mr. Potter continued here, in the eighth match game against Zukertort, with

10...\( \square x h3 \) 11.gxh3 \( \square x g3 \) 12.fxg3
\( \square x g3+ \) 13.\( \square h1 \) \( \square x h3+ \) 14.\( \square h2 \) \( \square e4 \).

The sacrifice is, however, unsound, we think, notwithstanding the result of the game in question, which ended in a draw. The text move is very weak: 10...\( \square e6 \) is the best continuation.

11.\( \square x f3 \) \( \square e8 ? \)

11...\( \square x g3 \) 12.fxg3 \( \square d7 \) 13.g4 leaves White with two bishops and the superior position; nevertheless it was better than to permit the entry of the hostile knight.

12.\( \square f5 ! \)

White threatens 13.\( \square x g7 ? ! \) \( \square x g7 \) 14.\( \square h6 + \) \( g8 \) (14...\( \square x h6 \) 15.\( \square x f6+ \) \( h5 \) 16.g4 mate) 15.\( \square x f6 \) \( \square f8 \)
16.\( \square f4 \) \( \square e7 \) 17.\( \square f5 \) \( \square g7 \) (or 17...\( f6 \))
18.\( \square e1 \) \( \square x e1 \) 19.\( \square x h7+ \) \( \square f8 \)
20.\( \square d6+ \).

12...\( \square d7 \) 13.\( \square e3 \) \( \square f8 \) 14.\( \square f1 \)
\( \square g6 \)

If 14...\( \square e6 \), then again 15.\( \square x g7 ? ! \).

15.g3 \( \square e6 \) 16.h4 \( h5 ? \) 17.\( \square g5 ! \)
\( \square x e1+ \)

Black dare not play at once 17...\( \square g4 \), as White would then win a piece with 18.\( \square x e6 \) \( fxe6 \) 19.\( \square x d6 \) \( \square x d6 \)
20.\( \square x g6 \).

18.\( \square x e1 \) \( \square g4 \)

19.c4!

The first move of a long combination which opens a direct attack against the
adverse king's quarters. White get, by
the exchange of pawns, another diagno-
sal for the bishop and a fine square for
their queen. They are then enabled to
force the retreat of the hostile king's
knight, which must prove fatal – cf. the
following note.

19...dxc4 20.\textit{xc4} \textit{f8} 21.\textit{we4}
\textit{g7}

22.\textit{ag2}

Better than to attack the knight at once,
which would enable Black to obtain a
fine position by the sacrifice of two
minor pieces for rook and pawn, e.g.
22.f3 \textit{ag3} (immediately disastrous
would be 22...\textit{af6} (or 22...\textit{ah6})
23.\textit{axf6} (or 23.\textit{axh6}) and 24.\textit{we3})
23.\textit{fxg4} \textit{ag1} 24.\textit{gxh5} \textit{a5} 25.\textit{hxg6+}
\textit{fxg6}.

22...\textit{ab4}!

The first move of a very fine defensive
manoeuvre which but for the abso-
lutely desperate state of Black's game,
would have saved the day.

23.\textit{we2} 24.\textit{ac1}

If 24.\textit{ad3}, Black reply 24...\textit{wf7}. The
capture of the bishop would lose at
once, as the following continuation
shows: 24.\textit{ad3} \textit{fxg5} 25.\textit{ae7} \textit{axe7} (if
25...\textit{af6}, then 26.\textit{gxg6+} \textit{ah8}
27.\textit{hxg5} \textit{axe7} 28.\textit{gxg6+} \textit{ag8}
27.\textit{wh7+} \textit{af7} 28.\textit{wh5+} \textit{ag8}
29.\textit{ac4+}.

24...c5 25.f3 \textit{xd4}

If 25...\textit{ah6}, White force the game with:
26.\textit{xh6} \textit{gxh6} 27.\textit{we3}.

26.\textit{fxg4} \textit{xc4} 27.\textit{gxh5} \textit{ag8}

If 27...\textit{xc1}, White wins with:
28.\textit{hxg6+} \textit{ah8} (28...\textit{ag6} 29.\textit{we4}–
29.\textit{xb7} \textit{ag8} 30.\textit{xb4}. If 27...\textit{ae5} then
28.\textit{d6+} \textit{f5} 29.\textit{xc4} \textit{fxe}–
30.\textit{xe5} \textit{d3} 31.\textit{xe4} \textit{d2} 32.\textit{xc6}–
\textit{xd2} 33.\textit{g6}, with two pawns ahead
and the better position.

28.\textit{ec2}!

The winning reply: very tempting but
unsound was 28.\textit{ag7+} (28...\textit{ag7} 29.\textit{wh6+}
and White mates in three moves) 29.\textit{xf5} \textit{xc1} 30.\textit{we1}.

28...\textit{wf7} 29.a3 \textit{aa5}

Black must lose a piece: if 29...\textit{ae7} then
30.\textit{we3} \textit{d5+} 31.\textit{ah2} \textit{ae}–
32.\textit{af2} \textit{ae1} 33.\textit{ad6} \textit{axf2} 34.\textit{xe7+}
and wins at least the bishop: if
29...\textit{ae1}, then 30.\textit{xd4+} \textit{f5} 31.\textit{we6}–
\textit{d5+} 32.\textit{af3}.

30.\textit{ec5} \textit{ag8}

Wherever the bishop moves White
carry the day by 31.\textit{ag7+}: 30...\textit{bt}–
31.\textit{ag7+} \textit{g6} (or 31...\textit{f5} 32.\textit{xf5}–
32.\textit{hxg6+} \textit{ag6} 33.\textit{h5+} \textit{ag}–
34.\textit{h6+} and mates in three moves.

31.\textit{ag7+}

Black resigns.
To 31...f5, then 32.exf5 exf7 33.f6+ g8 34.hxg6+ h7; 35.fxe5+ (32...g6, then 32.hxg6+ h7 33.e5+ (33.g6, if 31...g6, then 32.hxg6+ h7 33.e5+ (33...g8 34.e5+ (34...g7 35.e5+ (35...g8 36.e5+ (36...h6+).)

214. Spanish Game
Frank, L. Paulsen and Schallopp
Niemeyer, Schottlander and
Zukertort
Brunswick, 26-27 July 1880
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 c5 4.d3 d6 5.c3
This occurred in a game from the Paris
Tournament between Englisch (White)
and Zukertort (Black).
5...g6
Zukertort played in the game just re­
tended to 5...d7; the text move is
better, however.
6.h3 g7 7.e3 h6 8.d2 a6
9.xc6+ bxc6 10.0-0-
Dreadful in face of the open b-file,
and under any circumstances premis-
cial.
10...c5 11.h2
The first move of a complicated ma­
neuvre by which the white allies
endeavour to break through in the cen­
tre. The game gets now interesting, as
both parties combine attack and de­
dence in their movements.
11.g8 12.f4 exf4 13.xf4 e7
14.f3 c6 15.de1 e6
16.d5
16.e5, then 16...d5.
16...b8 17.c4
Superior in principle to 17.c3, albeit the
latter move would not enable White to
advance in the centre, e.g. 17.c3 d7
18.d4? cxd4 19.cxd4 xxd5 20.exd5
b4, winning a pawn and keeping a
good position.
17...d7
With this move Black obtain a decided
superiority: their king being in perfect
safety, they can concentrate all their
forces on a very promising attack.
18.c3 b4 19.e5
19.g5
A very important rejoinder: it frees the
rook from the protection of the
h-pawn, enables Black to occupy with
their bishop — ...f5 — another diago­
al, without giving to the opponents
the opportunity to drive the bishop
back with g4, and lastly it prepares the
general advance on the king's flank.
20.h2 ab8 21.e2 53
Forcing White to bring matters to an is­sue in the centre — Black threatens ...
g4 or ...f4, according to circumstances
and thus opening again the diagonal for
Black's king's bishop.
22.exd6
We have pointed out previously, whenever we had the occasion, that, the
number of pawns being the same, the
numerical superiority of pawns on the
queen's side is frequently decisive in
the end-game, and should be always
aimed at. This axiom holds good, of
course, when both kings remain on
their original flanks. Here, however, the kings having changed quarters, the pawns on the king's side must be of greater importance. 22.exf6 would not have diminished the prospects of Black's attack, but would obviate Black's additional advantage for the ending.

**22...cxd6 23.\(\text{He1}\) \(\text{He8}\)** 24.\(\text{b1}\) Black threatened to continue with 24...\(\text{a5}\).

**24...g4! 25.hxg4**

This increases the freedom of action for Black's pieces; 25.\(\text{h4}\) at once was much better.

**25...fxg4 26.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{xd2+}\)**

The first in a series of moves which leave to the opponents no choice in replying, and lead to a clear win for Black.

**27.\(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{b4}\) 28.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\)**

**30.\(\text{e4}\)**

A very fine rejoinder, which threatens a powerful counterattack. After 30.\(\text{xe8}\) \(\text{xe8}\) 31.\(\text{f4}\) Black win with 31...\(\text{e1+}\):

A) 32.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{xc3}\) (Black may play also 32...\(\text{xd3}\)+ 33.\(\text{xd3}\) \(\text{xd1+}\)) 33.\(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{xa2+}\) 34.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{xd1+}\) 35.\(\text{xd1}\) \(\text{xc3+}\) 36.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{xa2}\);

B) 32.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{g5}\) (much stronger than 32...\(\text{xa2+}\)) 33.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{xf4}\) 34.\(\text{gxf4}\) \(\text{xd3+}\) 35.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{f2+}\) 36.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{e4}\) 37.\(\text{g2}\) h5.

**30...\(\text{d4}\)**

The safest reply: after 30...\(\text{xe8}\) 31.\(\text{exe4}\) \(\text{xe6}\) White would win with 32.\(\text{xd6+}\) \(\text{e7}\) 33.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) (33...\(\text{g8}\) 34.\(\text{xf1}\)) 34.\(\text{f1}\)+; after 30...\(\text{xb2}\)+ 31.\(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{xd3}\)+ 32.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 33.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) White would have a fair chance to draw by continuing with 34.\(\text{f4}\), while the tempting move 34.\(\text{xd3}\) would lose speedily on account of 34...\(\text{xd3}\) 35.\(\text{xd3}\) \(\text{b5}\) etc.

**31.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{xa2+}\) 32.\(\text{d1}\)**

If 32.\(\text{b1}\), then 32...\(\text{c3}\)+ 33...\(\text{xe4}\) if 32.\(\text{c2}\), then 32...\(\text{b4}\)+, and 33...\(\text{xd3}\).

**32.\(\text{xb2}\) 33.\(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 34.\(\text{dxe4}\) \(\text{c3+}\)**

**36.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{d5}\) 37.\(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{b4}\)**

**38.\(\text{d1}\) d5! 39.\(\text{xd5}\)**

If 39.cxd5, then 39...\(\text{xe4}\) 40.\(\text{xd5}\).

**39...\(\text{e2+}\) 40.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{xe2}\) 41.\(\text{g1}\) \(\text{g3+}\) 42.\(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d3}\) 43.\(\text{b1}\) \(\text{b2}\)+ 44.\(\text{a5}\)**

After 44.\(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{xe1}\) 45.\(\text{b6}\), Black win with 45...\(\text{g3}\).

**44...\(\text{a3+}\) 45.\(\text{b6}\) \(\text{xc4+}\)**

**46.\(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{d6}\)**

Making the action of the hostile rook innocuous.

**47.\(\text{b8}\) \(\text{a1}\) 48.\(\text{e3}\) h5**

By 48...\(\text{a5}\)+ 49.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{b5}\)+ 50.\(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 51.\(\text{xe6}\) 52.\(\text{c4}\) or \(\text{a5}\), Black would render the issue of the game doubtful.

**49.\(\text{a8}\) \(\text{a5}\)+ 50.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{f5}\)+**

**51.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{xe3}\) 52.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e5}\)**

**53.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{f5}\) 54.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{f1}\)**

**55.\(\text{g6}\)**

The only move which postpones defeat: if 55.\(\text{h6}\), then 55...\(\text{g3}\).

**55...\(\text{e7}\) 56.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{f7}\) 57.\(\text{g5}\)**

**\(\text{h1}\) 58.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f6}\) 59.\(\text{g8}\)!**
Black conducted the endgame well up to this point, but here the allies waste time: they should play at once ...

Black's 64th move.

65...\text{\texttt{f8}}, Black win with 65...\text{\texttt{g6}}

66...\text{\texttt{g8+}} \text{\texttt{h7}} 67...\text{\texttt{g5}} \text{\texttt{h6}} 68...\text{\texttt{g8}}

63+ 69...\text{\texttt{e4}} \text{\texttt{h7}} 70...\text{\texttt{g3}} \text{\texttt{e7}}.

65...g3 66...\text{\texttt{f3}} h4 67...\text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{h2}}

68...\text{\texttt{e3}} \text{\texttt{g5}}

A nearly identical position occurred between Labourdonnais and MacDonnell.

69...\text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{d5}} 70...\text{\texttt{g8}} \text{\texttt{d4}} 71...\text{\texttt{g7}}

\text{\texttt{d3}} 72...\text{\texttt{g8}} \text{\texttt{d2}} 73...\text{\texttt{g8}}+

74...\text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{h2}} 75...\text{\texttt{e1}} \text{\texttt{h3}}. Black win with

77...\text{\texttt{h3}} 78...\text{\texttt{h2}} \text{\texttt{h3}}! 79...\text{\texttt{xh3}}

79...\text{\texttt{e2}} 71...\text{\texttt{e8}}.

73...\text{\texttt{e1}} 74...\text{\texttt{e8}} \text{\texttt{f2}}+ 75...\text{\texttt{g4}}

\text{\texttt{g1}} 76...\text{\texttt{h4}} \text{\texttt{g2}} 77...\text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{h2}}

78...\text{\texttt{e8}} \text{\texttt{h4}}+ 79...\text{\texttt{f5}} \text{\texttt{f2}}

White resigns.

The time limit was 15 moves an hour.

A reversal of the order of moves is usually of little consequence in the close openings, and by such a process we have arrived now at a Fianchetto position.

3...\text{\texttt{d3}} \text{\texttt{b7}} 4...\text{\texttt{h3}}

We prefer 4...\text{\texttt{e2}}, whence the knight may sometimes sooner be made available on the other wing.

4...\text{\texttt{c6}} 5...\text{\texttt{c3}} \text{\texttt{f6}} 6...0-0 \text{\texttt{e7}}

This move shuts out the king's bishop for some time. This mode of development is, however, occasionally resorted to in close games; but in positions widely different from the present, for instance -- by the first player in positions arising from the opening \texttt{1.f4}.

7.f4 \text{\texttt{g6}} 8...\text{\texttt{e3}} \text{\texttt{g7}} 9...\text{\texttt{d2}} \text{\texttt{h5}}

10...\text{\texttt{f2}} 0-0-0

Too bold. The adverse pawns on that wing were too well posted for immediate advance to make castling on that side advisable.

11.b4 \text{\texttt{w8}} 12.a4 \text{\texttt{e7}} 13.a5

13...\text{\texttt{g4}}

He gives up a pawn for some show of counter-attack, which does not not the least intimidate the blindfold player, who seizes the material advantage, albeit he opens the adverse rook file against his king's side.

14...\text{\texttt{xg4}} \text{\texttt{hxg4}} 15...\text{\texttt{xg4}} \text{\texttt{f5}}

16...\text{\texttt{e2}} \text{\texttt{b8}} 17.axb6 \text{\texttt{axb6}}

18...\text{\texttt{a6}} \text{\texttt{c6}}

Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e6 2.d4 b6
18...\textit{\texttt{xa8}} was the proper move, and would threaten 19...\textit{\texttt{fxe4}}. Of course, he cannot do this now, on account of the reply 19.\textit{\texttt{xb7}}, followed by 20.\textit{\texttt{a6+}}; nor can he take with the bishop, for Black would exchange, followed by 20.\textit{\texttt{xa2}}.

19.\textit{\texttt{b5 b7}}
The opponent has now gained an important move. Taking the pawn was bad, for reasons similar to those above; and 19...\textit{\texttt{xa8}} was now useless, and even dangerous, for White might answer 20.\textit{\texttt{xd7}}, and if Black took, then might follow \textit{\texttt{xa8+}}, \textit{\texttt{a6+}}, and \textit{\texttt{a1}}.

20.\textit{\texttt{f31?}}
This move is very difficult to judge. It appears brilliant by the light of actual events and the final result, but there is a flaw in the calculation, which, however, a blindfold player, who is taxed with the conduct of seven other games, might be pardoned for overlooking.

20...\textit{\texttt{fxe4}} 21.\textit{\texttt{a2}}
Only a consistent part of the bold plan on which he entered by giving up the e-pawn. It is very difficult to defend; but, as will be seen, his opponent selects his line of play with good judgement up to the point which would have called for high capacity to answer exactly.

21...\textit{\texttt{c6}} 22.\textit{\texttt{a7+ c7}}

23.d5!?
The turning point. He had nothing better to pursue the attack, and at all hazard he was bound to maintain it, for entering on the defence with two pieces in danger was ruinous.

23...\textit{\texttt{c8?}}
Mr. Tinsley has conducted his defence in a remarkably clever manner, and he has actually a won game at this point but he fails at the deciding moment: 23...\textit{\texttt{xd5}} was the right move which would have made the adverse sacrifice of the bishop useless (see next note). The move in the text was, however, tempting enough.

24.\textit{\texttt{xb6+ b6}} 25.\textit{\texttt{dxc6}}
Which makes all the difference, as White's next brilliant move will show and wherefore the pawn should have been taken.

25...\textit{\texttt{dxc6}} 26.\textit{\texttt{a6 cxb5}}
If now the knight removes, the answer 27.\textit{\texttt{xc6+}} would also settle the game in a few moves.

27.\textit{\texttt{xb6+}}

27...\textit{\texttt{b8}}
Wrong. He had still a good chance if relieving himself by 27...\textit{\texttt{c8}}, whereupon the game might have proceeded thus: 28.\textit{\texttt{fa1 d6}} 29.\textit{\texttt{a8+ xa8}} 30.\textit{\texttt{xa8+ d7}} 31.\textit{\texttt{a7+ e6}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xb5+ f8}} and Black should win.
... stronger here is 27...\textit{c}8 28.\textit{a}7!...
28...\textit{w}e7 29.\textit{f}a1 \textit{exf}3 30.\textit{a}8+... 31.\textit{xa}8+ \textit{d}7 32.\textit{xb}5+! \textit{d}6 \textit{xc}5+ \textit{d}7 34.\textit{a}a7+ etc.
28.\textit{f}a1 \textit{c}8
where Zukertort announced a forced win, giving the following variations:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{c}a8+:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item 29...\textit{xa}8 30.\textit{xa}8+ \textit{d}7 \textit{a}7+ \textit{e}8 32.\textit{xe}6+ \textit{e}7 \textit{xe}7 mate;
      \item 29...\textit{d}7 30.\textit{xb}7+ \textit{e}8 \textit{xd}8+ \textit{xd}8 32.\textit{a}8 mate.
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
The announcement to make for a grand player who conducts eight games simultaneously without sight of his opponent.

216 King's Gambit
Zukertort (without \textit{b}1)
A.B.
St. George's Chess Club, November 1880
Notes by Steinitz
\begin{enumerate}
\item 1.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{f}4 \textit{exf}4 3.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}5
\item 4.\textit{c}4 \textit{d}6
\end{enumerate}
 \textit{c}44 is not recommended to receivers of the odds of a knight for it is too difficult to defend even with two pieces ahead.
- the move in the text is disadvantageous under any circumstances, and \textit{g}7 instead is the proper play.
\begin{enumerate}
\item 5.\textit{h}4 \textit{g}4 6.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 7.\textit{d}4 \textit{w}f6
\item 8.0-0f3
\end{enumerate}
 \textit{g}7, compelling the adversary to protect the d-pawn or to advance the pawn, would clearly have gained an important move and brought a piece on the king side preparatory to taking.
9.\textit{gxf}3 \textit{g}3?
This pawn is now lost too. The proper move was 9...\textit{g}6.
\begin{enumerate}
\item 10.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}4 11.\textit{d}3 \textit{e}6
\item A move wasted. It was much better to develop the queen's knight.
\item 12.\textit{d}5 \textit{d}4 13.\textit{d}2 \textit{g}6
\item 14.\textit{w}xg3 \textit{f}5?
\item Weak. He only helps the opponent to establish a formidable centre.
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 15.\textit{e}5 \textit{d}7 16.\textit{e}6 \textit{c}5 17.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}4
\item 18.\textit{b}5+ \textit{e}7
\item The correct play was 18...\textit{d}8, though it blocked out the rook for a time. Of course 18...\textit{c}6 would not do, for White could leave his queen en prise by 19.\textit{dxc}6, threatening to win the rook, and make a new queen by 20.\textit{cxb}7+.
\end{enumerate}

19.\textit{d}xe4!
The initiation of a most beautiful combination.
\begin{enumerate}
\item 19...\textit{f}xe4 20.\textit{f}5! \textit{xf}5 21.\textit{xf}5! \textit{f}6
\item Nothing less than mate in three moves threatened if 21...\textit{xf}5, for the slashing answer would be 22.\textit{g}5+.
\item 22.\textit{f}7+ \textit{d}8 23.\textit{f}3!
\item Very curious and ingenious as well. He can afford to expose himself to the apparently dangerous discovered check.
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 23...\textit{xe}6+ 24.\textit{g}5+ \textit{e}7
\item 25.\textit{w}xh8+
\item Black resigns.
Match with Blackburne and Berlin Tournament 1881

217 Vienna Gambit

Wayte
Zukertort
St. George's Chess Club 1881
Notes by Wayte

1. e4 e5 2. d3 c6 3. f4 exf4
4. d4 ♦h4+ 5. ♔e2 d5 6. exd5
7. ♔f3 0-0-0 8. dxc6 ♔c5

9. ♙xb7+ ♔b8 10. ♔b5 a6

The treatment of the Steinitz Gambit in the Handbuch is by no means adequate. This simple move, which at once recovers the piece (since White cannot suffer his d-pawn to be taken) and which is now usually played, is not noticed.

10. ♔c3 ♙xf3+

This is now necessary, for if 11... axb5
12. gxf3 axb5 13. ♔d3

The best move, according to Steinitz, Rosenthal, and other authorities. White has, however, two other alternatives:

13. ♔b3 and 13 a4.

13... ♔f6 14. ♔d2 ♔e8+ 15. ♔d1

15... ♔d5

Instead of this move, 15... b4 has lately been suggested: then follows 16. ♔c2 ♔d5, and White's next move is a problem of which Mr. Steinitz possesses the key, but it is not yet published.

16. ♔xb5 ♔a7

Rosenthal has here suggested 16... ♔f2, and thinks that Black has a good game, in which we fully agree. The straightforward play in the text is also perfectly satisfactory; the game, we may observe, was played experimentally, with a view to instruction for the defence.

17. ♔e2?

We now prefer 17. ♔c4, a move which proves useful in several variations. The bishop at e2 soon becomes hampered, and is ultimately lost; but in any case the freedom of Black's rooks is in striking contrast with the confinement of White, for which a slight superiority in pawns does not appear to afford sufficient compensation.

17... ♔e3+

18. ♔xe3 ♔xe3
19. ♔c2 ♔f2 20. ♔ae1 ♔de8
21. ♔d1 g5 22. h3 f5 23. ♔c4

The deadly advance of the hostile pawns cannot be stopped.

23... h5 24. a4 g4 25. hxg4 fxg4

If 25... hxg4, the reply 26. ♔h7 affords White a little resource.
Match with Blackburne and Berlin Tournament 1881

26.\text{hx}5  \text{gx}f3  27.\text{xe}5  \text{hx}e5  
28.\text{dxe}5  \text{fxe}2+  29.\text{axe}2  \text{xf}1+  
30.\text{cc}2  f3  31.\text{e}4  \text{xc}4  
32.\text{xc}4f2  33.\text{f}4  \text{xe}5  
White resigns.

218 Sicilian Defence
Zukertort
Blackburne
St. George’s Chess Club v City of London match, 24 March 1881
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.e4 \text{c}5  2.\text{c}3  \text{e}6  3.\text{f}3  \text{c}6  
4.d4 \text{cxd}4  5.\text{d}4  \text{b}6  6.\text{b}5  
\text{gf}6  7.a3
Steinitz: We thought well of this move, which was introduced by Englisch against L. Paulsen in the Leipzig tournament 1879. We understand that the latter, with his usual predilection for the two bishops, retreated his king’s bishop to e7, and White thus obtained the superiority of position. But the mode of defence adopted by Blackburne in the present game and in his match with Gunsberg seems to give the second player at least an equal position in the opening.  

7...\text{xc}3+  8.\text{xc}3  0-0
Steinitz: Here we prefer ...d5 at once, which will most probably lead to the same kind of game as the one actually obtained.

9.\text{e}2
Steinitz: White might have altered the whole aspect of the situation by f4, with the object of advancing e5, and placing the king’s bishop in an attacking post against the adverse king’s side pawn.  

9...d5 10.\text{exd}5 \text{exd}5
Zukertort: If 10...\text{xd}5, then 11.\text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 12.\text{xd}5 \text{exd}5 13.\text{f}4, with the superior game on account of White’s two bishops and the weakness of Black’s isolated pawn.

11.\text{g}5  \text{e}8
Steinitz: A good move in Mr. Blackburne’s usual attacking style. He might have also equalised the game by ...d4, whereupon the game might have proceeded thus: 11...d4  12.\text{e}4  \text{a}5+  13.\text{d}2 (best; for if 13.b4, Black will obtain the advantage by 13...\text{e}5, which compels the exchange of knights, and enables him to stop the adverse castling by ...\text{e}8)  13...\text{e}5, even game.
Zukertort: Well played; if 11...d4, White would rejoin with 12.\text{e}4; if 11...\text{e}6, with 12.0-0 and 13.\text{f}3. 

12.0-0
Steinitz: He could not win the pawn, without subjecting himself to a strong attack. In reference to the course of exchanging the knight followed by \text{xd}5, which apparently leaves Black exposed to the loss of the exchange, Mr. Blackburne communicates to us the following fine variation: 12.\text{xf}6  \text{xf}6  13.\text{xd}5  \text{xb}2  14.\text{c}7  \text{c}3+  15.\text{f}1  \text{xe}2  16.\text{xe}2  \text{d}4+  17.\text{f}1  \text{f}5, and wins, for the knight has no escape, and if 18.\text{xa}8 then follows 18...\text{xc}2  19.\text{e}1  \text{d}3+  20.\text{g}1  \text{e}2+  21.\text{f}1  \text{c}1+, and mates.
Johannes Zukertort

Zukertort: White dare not capture the d-pawn after taking the knight, e.g. 12.\textit{xf6} \textit{xxf6} 13.\textit{xd5} (after 13.\textit{xd5} \textit{xb2} 14.\textit{c7}, Black would win with 14...\textit{xe2}+ 15.\textit{xe2} \textit{e5}+ and 16...\textit{xc7}) 13...\textit{g4} (13...\textit{d4} would be bad, for White replies 14.0-0-0!) 14.f3 \textit{ad8} 15.\textit{c4} \textit{e5} with an overpowering attack.

12...\textit{d4}

Zukertort: Best: if 12...\textit{e6}, then 13.\textit{f3} \textit{d4} 14.\textit{e4} etc.

13.\textit{xf6}

Zukertort: The exchange of the bishop against the knight cannot be avoided, for after 13.\textit{b1} Black may continue with 13...\textit{h6} 14.\textit{h4} \textit{g5} 15.\textit{d3} \textit{e4}.

13...\textit{xf6} 14.\textit{d5} \textit{d6}

Steinitz: We prefer 14...\textit{d8}, which would enable Black at any time to take the c-pawn in passing, whenever it advanced in support of the knight.

15.\textit{f3} \textit{e6} 16.\textit{c4}

Steinitz: While now the numerical superiority of White's pawns on the queen's wing is established, for the pawn cannot be captured in passing, on pain of the queen being lost by \textit{xf6}+.

16...\textit{ad8} 17.\textit{e1} \textit{c5}

Steinitz: Doubtful. 17...\textit{a6} at once seems better, for the queen is not well placed at her present post.

Zukertort: The move is not to much purpose, but Black has hardly anything better: all his pieces must be kept in their present position to prevent the loss of his advanced d-pawn.

18.\textit{c1} \textit{a6}

Steinitz: Necessary, in order not to allow the adverse b-pawn to come up to b5 unchallenged, and thus to compel the removal of the knight which supports Black's d-pawn.

19.\textit{b4}?

Steinitz: Mr. Zukertort rightly considers this precipitate advance the source of his later difficulties. As the adverse queen could not well stop at her present post, it was injudicious to drive her across to a square whence she could support the entrance of the knight at e5 by \textit{g3} was better at this juncture.

Zukertort: Hastily played: White has in our opinion a decided advantage, and instead of driving the hostile queen into better position, he should first secure his king's flank by the process he adopts a move later, viz., \textit{g3} and \textit{g2}, which Black would then have no means to disturb.

19...\textit{d6} 20.\textit{g3} \textit{e5}

Steinitz: Compare the previous note with this and the next move Black forces the opponent to proceed to immediate action, and prevents him thus by quiet preparations to obtain a decisive superiority.

21.\textit{g2} \textit{b5}!

Steinitz: Mr. Blackburne shows excellent judgement in this advance, which liberates an apparently formidable hostile pawn. He had well calculated that his own d-pawn, though isolated, ought to be a very good match for White's passed c-pawn. The failure of his strategy is caused by subsequent shortcomings in tactics.
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22.c5 \( \text{wb8} \)

23.c6

Zukertort: The first move of a complicated combination which should have resulted in a speedy draw, but contained most difficult and also very promising lines of play. It is obvious that White dare not capture the pawn, for Black would win with 23...\text{xd5} 24.\text{xd5 e}3+.

Steinitz: Mr. Zukertort's boldness apparently increases in danger. His course was most perplexing in play over the board, though we have no doubt it will not stand analysis. There was, however, no other satisfactory plan. The retreat of the knight to f4 would have left the adversary with the better game after posting his bishop at c4; and 23.\text{xd4} would have lost clearly, for the bishop would take the knight, followed by f3+, if the bishop retook.

23...\text{xd5}

Steinitz: Best, and good enough for winning purposes if properly continued. It may be observed that he could not evade the responsibility of capturing the piece by 23...\text{d6}; for White would then equally advance the c-pawn to the seventh, followed by f4, whereupon the white rook could enter at c6, for Black could not take, on account of the impending \text{e7+}.

24.c7 \text{wc8}

Steinitz: The only move again. The queen could not attempt to protect the rook on the white diagonal, for White would then capture the knight with the rook.

25.f4

Steinitz: White makes the most of the complication he has purposely created; but he evidently could not take the rook at once, as the adverse knight would afterwards threaten the terrible check at f3.

Zukertort: The resource upon which White relied when entering the line of action on his 22nd move; 25.\text{xd5} would be fatal on account of 25...\text{xd5} 26.\text{xe5} (26.f4 \text{f}3+ 27.\text{xf3} \text{xe1+ etc.}) 26...\text{xe5} 27.\text{xd4 wc7+}.

25...\text{xc4?}

Zukertort: In his desire to keep the numerical superiority, he overlooks the crushing effect of White's rejoinder. After 25...\text{d7} 26.\text{xe5 xc7} 27.\text{xc7 wc7} 28.\text{xd4}, the game would be about even, albeit Black's pawns on the queen's side are rather weak. A most interesting line of play would result from 25...\text{g4}, but ultimately, we think, lead to a draw, e.g. 25...\text{g4} 26.\text{d2} (the sacrifice of the queen by 26.\text{xd5} would fail on account of the continuation 26...\text{xd1} 27.\text{xe5 ef8+}.

365
26...\(\text{\textit{W}}xg4\), then 26...\(\text{Qxg4}\) (26...\(\text{W}xg4\) 27.\(\text{A}xh5\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 28.\(\text{Axe5}\) etc.) 27.\(\text{Axe8}\) \(\text{W}xg4\) 28.\(\text{A}c8\) \(\text{Q}d8\) winning. After 26.\(\text{W}b3\) \(\text{Qd7}\), Black would remain a pawn ahead) 26...\(\text{Qf3}\) + 27.\(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Axe1}\) + 28.\(\text{Axe1}\) \(\text{Qx3}\) 29.\(\text{W}c1\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 30.\(\text{W}c6\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 31.\(\text{W}xf5\) 32.\(\text{W}b6\) \(\text{g6}\) (best: 32...\(\text{W}f8\) would lose by 33.\(\text{A}xe6\) and 34.\(\text{W}b8\); if 32...\(\text{Qd7}\), then 33.\(\text{Qe7}\) 33.\(\text{W}b8\) \(\text{W}g7\)! 34.\(\text{W}c8\) \(\text{A}xf3\) 35.\(\text{Qe8}\) \(\text{W}g7\) and wins, for the bishop dare not take the queen or mate follows in a few moves; and if 35...\(\text{A}f6\) 36.\(\text{A}x8\) \(\text{Qc6}\) 37.\(\text{Qf2}\) etc.) 36.\(\text{A}d8\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 37.\(\text{Qe8}\), and draws.

\textit{Steinitz:} This changes the issue entirely, while, by offering to give up the piece in most variations, Black would maintain sufficient superiority to insure winning in the end. 25...\(\text{Qg4}\) was the correct play, and we can only give the principal variations, which, as far as we can judge, comprise the most difficult lines of play on either side. Supposing 25...\(\text{Qg4}\):

A) 26.\(\text{W}b3\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 27.\(\text{A}xe5\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 28.\(\text{W}b7\) (if 28.\(\text{fxe5}\) Black evidently has the superiority with his passed d-pawn, after taking the c-pawn) 28...\(\text{A}xc7\) and wins, for the bishop dare not take the queen or mate follows in a few moves; and if 29.\(\text{A}xc7\), Black first gives two checks with his rook at \(\text{e1}\) and \(\text{e2}\);

B) 26.\(\text{A}xd5\) \(\text{A}xd1\) 27.\(\text{A}xe5\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) (Black might also win by removing the rook to \(\text{f8}\)) 28.\(\text{A}b7\) \(\text{Qe1}\) + 29.\(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Qf3}\) 30.\(\text{A}xe8\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) 31.\(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qxc7}\) 32.\(\text{A}xa6\) \(\text{Qa7}\) 33.\(\text{A}xb5\) \(\text{Qxa3}\) + 34.\(\text{Qe4}\) \(\text{b3}\) and should win;

C) 26.\(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Qf3}\) + 27.\(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) +:

C1) 28.\(\text{W}xe1\) \(\text{Qxf3}\) 29.\(\text{W}e7\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 30.\(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 31.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 32.\(\text{W}g5\) \(\text{f6}\) and wins;

C2) 28.\(\text{A}xe1\) \(\text{Qxf3}\) 29.\(\text{Qcl}\) \(\text{d3}\) 30.\(\text{Qe8}\) + (if 30.\(\text{W}c6\), the answer is 30...\(\text{Qe5}\)! 30...\(\text{W}xe8\) 31.\(\text{c}8\) \(\text{W}d8\) followed by ...\(\text{d2}\), gaining one of the queens, and remaining with a clear piece ahead.

We may also observe that 25...\(\text{Qg4}\) instead of the move in the text, would also have lost, for White would first take the rook, followed by \(\text{W}xg4\) at once, if the bishop retook.

26.\(\text{A}xd5\) \(\text{A}xd5\)

\textit{Zukertort:} If 26...\(\text{Qe3}\), then 27.\(\text{W}d5\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 28.\(\text{W}xd5\) winning.

27.\(\text{W}e8\) + \(\text{W}e8\) 28.\(\text{W}xd4\)

28.\(\text{Qb7}\)

\textit{Steinitz:} 28...\(\text{Qe6}\) would not have saved the game either, e.g. 28...\(\text{Qe6}\) 29.\(\text{W}d5\) \(\text{W}f8\) (if 29...\(\text{Qf8}\), White replies 30.\(\text{Qe6}\), threatening 31.\(\text{A}xe6\) and also 31.\(\text{f5}\)) 30.\(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qb6}\) (there seems nothing better; if for 30...\(\text{g6}\), the answer is 31.\(\text{Qe6}\); and if then the knight attempts to cover at \(\text{d6}\), the rook may take it off followed by \(\text{c8}\) \(\text{W}\)) 31.\(\text{W}b8\) \(\text{Qd5}\) 32.\(\text{W}b7\) and wins.

29.\(\text{W}d8\) \(\text{W}f8\)

\textit{Steinitz:} If 29...\(\text{Wf8}\), White won by 30.\(\text{Qe1}\).

30.\(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qd6}\) 31.\(\text{Qe7}\)

Black resigns.

\textit{Zukertort:} White will capture the knight and then return with the queen to \(\text{d8}\).

\textit{Steinitz:} Mr. Zukertort made a shrewd guess of the chances of success in actual play, when he entered on his sacrificing policy on the 23rd move; and he has
supported his good luck with exact scientific calculations since the adversary let his opportunity slip on the 25th move.

2.19 Two Knights Defence
Steel
Zukertort
Simpson's Divan, April 1881
Notes by Steinitz
1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.c4 d6
4.g5 d5 5.exd5 a5 6.b5+
Morphy's favourite continuation by 6.d3 is not often played now, and the move in the text, which Anderssen almost invariably adopted, is more in vogue.

6...c6 7.dxc6 bxc6 8.e2 h6
9.f3 e4 10.e5 d4 11.f4 c5
12.f1 d6 13.c3 d5

14.b4
This wins a piece, but White is afterwards exposed to a troublesome attack.
Yet White is bound to pursue this plan, unless he chooses to develop with d4, which would not maintain his advantage, e.g. 14.d4 exd3 15.f3 (if 15.xd3, Black answers 15...xe5, followed by 16.xc3+ if 16.xd5)
15.e6 16.b4 xe5 17.fxe5 e4, and regains his pawn with a fair game.

14...xe5

Obviously, if the knight retreats, the queen is lost by 15.c4.

15.fxe5 xxe5 16.bxa5 xh2
17.a4
White evidently plays to win, and most probably on that ground rejected the tempting move 17.a3, which prevented Black's castling, but gave him an opportunity to draw at once, thus:
17.a3 h4+ 18.f2 g4 19.xg4 xg4 20.a4 h1+ and draws by perpetual check. The move in the text is good, yet 17.d4 would have been more to our taste; for if Black replied 17...g3+, the king could walk out to d2, and then obtain refuge at c2 in answer to e3+.

17...0-0 18.a4
18.xf6, followed by 19.xe4, looks well, but, as Herr Zukertort pointed out to us, it would have been disastrous, for Black would subsequently check with the queen at g1, followed by ...a6 winning.

18.xg2

19.d1?
Weak. The proper plan was to attack the queen with the rook at g1, and then to offer the exchange of queens at f2, which, if accepted, would leave White's king near enough to the adverse passed pawns to be soon made useful in the ending.
19...\( \text{g4} \) 20.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{xe2+} \)
21.\( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 22.\( \text{a3} \) \( \text{d5} \)
23.\( \text{c2?} \)
This costs valuable time. 23.\( \text{c4} \) was better, for if then Black answered in the same way, the king could safely come out to \( \text{e2} \), and he had nothing to fear from the e-pawn advancing, discovering check.

23...\( \text{ad8} \) 24.\( \text{e1} \)
Nothing better. 24...\( \text{xc3} \) being threatened.

24...\( \text{f5} \) 25.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 26.\( \text{dxe3} \)
\( \text{d3} \) 27.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{fd8} \) 28.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e6} \)

Black has well manoeuvred through his greatest difficulties, and, with a piece behind, he has now a won game if he wished to confine himself to sweeping off the adverse pawns on the queen's side, commencing with ...\( \text{xa2} \).

29.\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h7} \)
We believe the plan indicated in our last note was the surest, but, having determined upon working his pawns on the king's side, Mr. Zukertort moves his king to safer quarters with true chess instinct, seeing that White cannot extricate himself in the meantime.

30.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g5} \) 31.\( \text{e2} \)
White makes a stout defence, perceiving that the loss of a piece, owing to the advance of the adverse f-pawn, is inevitable.

31...\( \text{f4} \) 32.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 33.\( \text{fxg5} \)
If 33.\( \text{f5} \), Black could also take the bishop with the rook, threatening mate.
The move in the text is his best defence, and it will now be seen that Black acted with proper caution in removing his king out of the way before instituting his attack with the pawns on the king-side, for otherwise he would now be threatened with a dangerous discovered check, which would not leave him time for finessing moves.

33...\( \text{xd2} \) 34.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{exd2} \)
35.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f5} \)

36.\( \text{g6+} \)
We thought at first that 36.\( \text{e4} \) would give White some chance of drawing, but Herr Zukertort calls our attention to the following fine variation, which we believe comprises the best play on both sides, and which is evidently in Black's favour: 36.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 37.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{hxg5} \)
38.\( \text{e6} \) (this seems best, for as soon as Black's king is allowed to come near his pawn, he will win easily) 38...\( \text{d3} \)
39.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 40.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g3} \) 41.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f1} \)
42.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 43.\( \text{g7} \) \( \text{h4} \) 44.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{c4} \)
45.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 46.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xa5} \) 47.\( \text{f4} \)
\( \text{a4+} \) 48.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{a3+} \) 49.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h3} \) and wins.

36...\( \text{g8} \)
Of course he dare not take, or the queen would be lost by 37.\( \text{e7} \).
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37.\textit{He4}
He has now nothing better. If 37.\textit{Ax}d2, Black would first check at \textit{b1}, followed by ...\textit{Ax}d2+, and then winning the queen by ...\textit{Wxa}2+.

37...\textit{Wb}5 38.\textit{Hb}4 \textit{We}5
Black's series of manoeuvres with the queen are exceedingly fine.

39.\textit{W}h1
Best; if 39.\textit{We}4, Black would win by 39...\textit{W}h5+, followed by checking at

39...\textit{Wxc}3 40.\textit{Hb}1 \textit{We}8
White resigns.
Game in a few moves is unavoidable.

220 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Rayner
8 board blindfold exhibition,
Huddersfield, 23 April 1881
Notes by Wayte

1.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2.f4 \textit{exf}4 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{Wh}4+
4.\textit{f}1 \textit{g}5
Black should play ...d5 either now or better still before the check. It is useless try to keep the surplus pawn; and giving up the d-pawn at once affords the best chance of coming out with an equal or superior position.

5.\textit{c}c3

5...\textit{g}7 is here necessary, anticipating the attack which follows by \textit{c}e5. The fault becomes evident at the 7th move, where it is seen that Black cannot prevent the break-up of his pawns.

6.\textit{f}3 \textit{Wh}5 7.h4 \textit{h}6 8.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{Wh}7 9.\textit{e}5 \textit{g}7 10.\textit{h}5+ \textit{e}7
11.\textit{g}6+ \textit{d}8 12.\textit{h}8 \textit{Wxh}8 13.\textit{hxg}5
The gambit pawn cannot now be saved and White gets rather the better game with rook and two pawns against the two minor pieces.

13...\textit{W}e5 14.\textit{Wf}7 \textit{Wg}7 15.\textit{Wxg}7
\textit{Wxg}7 16.\textit{gxh}6 \textit{Wxh}6 17.d3 \textit{Wd}7
18.g3 \textit{d}6 19.\textit{gx}f4 \textit{We}6 20.f5
\textit{Wxc}1 21.\textit{Wxc}1 \textit{f}7 22.d4 \textit{d}7
23.\textit{He}1 \textit{d}6 24.\textit{tf}2 \textit{Wd}8 25.\textit{Wf}3
\textit{d}5 26.\textit{Wf}4 \textit{dxe}4 27.\textit{He}4+

27...\textit{He}4+
Black defends himself ingeniously enough; but his opponent, in giving back the exchange, takes care to select the variation which gives him the strongest pawns. From the moment that he obtained the superiority in the opening, White's play is marked by the simplicity of perfect art, and leaves little room for comment.

28.\textit{He}4 \textit{d}5 29.\textit{Wh}7 \textit{He}4
30.\textit{Wxd}7 \textit{Wxf}5 31.\textit{Wxb}7 \textit{Wxc}2
32.\textit{Wxa}7 \textit{We}7 33.a4 \textit{d}5+ 34.\textit{Wf}3
\textit{We}6 35.\textit{We}2 \textit{d}6 36.\textit{Wd}2 \textit{He}4
37. a5 c7 38. b7 d7 39. b6 c6 40. a6 c8 41. e3 d5 42. f4 c7 43. e5 c5

It can hardly be said that this helps him. The advance of the a-pawn is stopped for the moment; but it is only another way of losing. Black, however, deserves credit for the gallant struggle he sustains in his last thirty moves.

44. dxc5 g2 45. b4 c8 46. g6 f3 47. d6 b8 48. b5

Black resigns.

It can hardly be said that this helps him. The advance of the a-pawn is stopped for the moment; but it is only another way of losing. Black, however, deserves credit for the gallant struggle he sustains in his last thirty moves.

44. dxc5 g2 45. b4 c8 46. g6 f3 47. d6 b8 48. b5

Black resigns.

Mr. Zukertort now begins an attack which is admirably sustained throughout. The weakness of White's previous operations is pretty well evidenced by the fact that he is even thus early thrown upon the defensive and compelled to look at home.

12. d1 f7 13. e3

Castling would not have been good, so this was in a measure forced. Black threatened 13... xh3 14. gxh3 f3+, bringing his adversary under a mate, and gaining, at least, the exchange.

13. xh3 14. gxh3 f3+ 15. e2 d6 16. c3 e8 17. f1

A wretched situation is White's now, truly!

17... h7 18. d1 h8 19. e2

19... d4!

A deadly thrust. No matter how White may play, he cannot prevent the breach of his lines of defence consequent on this advance.

20. d2 dxc3 21. xc3 c4 22. e4+

22. xh4, followed by 23. e4, was also to be considered just here. It would, perhaps, have enabled him to have held out longer, but the result should have been the same.

22... h8 23. f1 c5 24. d2 c4 25. ad1 cxd3 26. xd3 c5
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27.b3 \(\text{\textit{d}8}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{g}4}\) \(\text{\textit{x}b3+}\)
29.\(\text{\textit{c}2}\) \(\text{\textit{d}4+}\) 30.\(\text{\textit{b}2}\) \(\text{\textit{c}4}\)
31.\(\text{\textit{d}2}\) \(\text{\textit{a}3+}\) 32.\(\text{\textit{b}1}\)
32...\(\text{\textit{x}a3}\) then 32...\(\text{\textit{xc}3+}\) 33...\(\text{\textit{t}t\textit{a}4}\)
32...\(\text{\textit{xc}3}\) 33.\(\text{\textit{d}1}\) \(\text{\textit{f}3}\)

Sicilian Defence

Zukertort
Blackburne

3rd Match Game, St. George's Chess Club, July 1881
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.\(\text{\textit{e}4}\) \(\text{\textit{c}5}\) 2.\(\text{\textit{c}3}\) \(\text{\textit{g}6}\)

Steinitz: First introduced by Paulsen in a game against Steinitz in the London International Tournament of 1862, but the move has since fallen into disuse.

3.\(\text{\textit{f}4}\)

Steinitz: We prefer reserving this move, as in the fifth game of the match. If played at once, it should be with the intention of developing the king's knight to \(\text{f3}\), and not to \(\text{e}2\).

Zukertort: Premature at least: compare the opening moves in the fifth match game.

3...\(\text{\textit{c}6}\) 4.\(\text{\textit{g}3}\) \(\text{\textit{g}7}\) 5.\(\text{\textit{g}2}\) \(\text{\textit{b}6}\)
6.\(\text{\textit{ge}2}\) \(\text{\textit{b}7}\) 7.\(\text{\textit{d}3}\) \(\text{\textit{h}6}\) 8.0-0 \(\text{\textit{f}5}\)

Steinitz: A good move, though it allows White to block in the king's bishop, for Black ought to be able to effect its liberation by the advance of the d-pawn to \(\text{f6}\) sooner or later.

9.\(\text{\textit{e}5}\) \(\text{\textit{a}5}\)

Zukertort: 9...\(\text{\textit{d}6}\) would be met with \(\text{\textit{d}4}\); and if then 10...\(\text{\textit{xd}4}\), then, of course, 11.\(\text{\textit{xd}4}\); if on the other hand \(\text{\textit{dxe}5}\), then 11.\(\text{\textit{d}5}\) \(\text{\textit{d}4}\) 12.\(\text{\textit{fxe}5}\).

10.\(\text{\textit{xb}7}\) \(\text{\textit{xb}7}\) 11.\(\text{\textit{d}4}\) \(\text{\textit{xd}4}\)

12.\(\text{\textit{xd}4}\) \(\text{\textit{e}6}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{f}3}\) \(\text{\textit{c}8}\)

Zukertort: The best defence: if 13...\(\text{\textit{b}8}\), White would proceed with 14.\(\text{\textit{d}1}\), threatening the capture of the e-pawn, while 13...\(\text{\textit{c}7}\) would obviously lose a piece by 14.\(\text{\textit{db}5}\) and 15.\(\text{\textit{xb}7}\)!

14.\(\text{\textit{d}1}\) 0-0 15.\(\text{\textit{h}3}\)

Zukertort: Necessary before posting the bishop at \(\text{e}3\), for otherwise the hostile knight would enter \(\text{g}4\).

15...\(\text{\textit{f}7}\)?

Steinitz: A most awkward development for the rook. 15...\(\text{\textit{f}7}\) was the natural move, and he had nothing to fear from the reply 16.\(\text{\textit{g}4}\), for he would then capture, and White would be bound to recapture with the queen, or else he would lose a pawn by 16.\(\text{\textit{xe}5}\), leaving the knight at \(\text{f6}\) with a view to occupying \(\text{f5}\). This plan also gave him facilities for breaking through by \(\text{d}6\) after due preparation.

Zukertort: It was very important to bring the king's bishop into play at once over \(\text{f8}\), but the rook should have been played to \(\text{e}8\), leaving \(\text{f7}\) open for the king's knight.

16.\(\text{\textit{e}3}\) \(\text{\textit{f}8}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{d}3}\)

Steinitz: Finely played. Though he apparently loses a move and lets the adverse knight in, he has gained more in position than if he had played \(\text{\textit{d}2}\) at once.
to which Black might have answered ...\(\texttt{Q}b4\), while now the latter move would not be good, as White might answer 18.\(\texttt{a}3\).

Zukertort: The right square for the rook; if 17.\(\texttt{d}2\), Black would reply with advantage 17.\(\texttt{Q}b4\), and if 18.\(\texttt{d}3\), then 18.\(\texttt{c}5\).

17...\(\texttt{Q}c5\) 18.\(\texttt{d}2\) \(\texttt{b}8\) 19.\(\texttt{ad}1\) \(\texttt{W}b7\) 20.\(\texttt{xb}7\) \(\texttt{xb}7\)

21.\(\texttt{f}3\)

Steinitz: The same knight to e2 was preferable. It would have obviated the necessity of exchanging pieces which liberated Black's bishop and made room for the king to come to the rescue. He also then threatened to attack the adverse knight, which could not then enter at e4 without a pawn being ultimately lost.

21...\(\texttt{g}7\)

Zukertort: After 21...\(\texttt{e}4\) 22.\(\texttt{xe}4\) \(\texttt{fxe}4\), White would win a pawn with 23.\(\texttt{g}5\).

22.\(\texttt{xc}5\)

Steinitz: Black now threatened ...\(\texttt{Q}e4\), followed by ...\(\texttt{f}5\), and afterwards by ...\(\texttt{c}5\), if White exchanged and then entered at g5 with the knight.

22...\(\texttt{xc}5+\) 23.\(\texttt{f}1\) \(\texttt{f}8\) 24.\(\texttt{a}3!\)

Zukertort: White begins herewith on the queen's side an attack which finally carries the day.

24...\(\texttt{e}8\) 25.\(\texttt{b}4\) \(\texttt{e}7\) 26.\(\texttt{b}5\) \(\texttt{f}7\) 27.\(\texttt{c}4\) \(\texttt{g}5\) 28.\(\texttt{f}2\) \(\texttt{h}6\) 29.\(\texttt{d}6+\) \(\texttt{xd}6\) 30.\(\texttt{exd}6\) \(\texttt{d}8\) 31.\(\texttt{d}4\) \(\texttt{c}6\)

32.\(\texttt{b}3!\)

Zukertort: The right continuation of course, 32.\(\texttt{xc}6\) would greatly improve the opponent's game by bringing his rooks into cooperation, while White's advanced passed pawn would be very weak.

32...\(\texttt{a}6\) 33.\(\texttt{c}1\)

Steinitz: Playing the other rook would have left the d2-square open for the immediate action of the knight which might have been wanted in case Black adopted a different and better defence.

33...\(\texttt{f}7\)

Steinitz: 33...\(\texttt{b}8\) was the correct move and, if we mistake not, it would have been almost sufficient to deter White from the immediate advance of the b-pawn, for Black might then bring the knight to b7 via d8; and whenever White's rook entered at c7, the answer ...\(\texttt{d}8\) would immediately threaten ...\(\texttt{xd}6\), while Black's rook had also some good prospects of being made available at a8.

Zukertort: This move was criticised severely by different experts and considered as the reason of Black's defeat, but Black has, in our opinion, no escape out.
of his difficulties, and we submit three plausible lines of play:

A) 33...\(\Box\)b8 (this move is recommended in *The Field* as best) 34.b5 axb5 35.cxb5 \(\Box\)d8 36.\(\Box\)c2:

A1) 36...\(\Box\)b7 37.\(\Box\)c8+ \(\Box\)xc8 38.\(\Box\)xc8+ \(\Box\)d8 (if 38...\(\Box\)f7, then 39.\(\Box\)c7, winning easily) 39.\(\Box\)c5 (39.a4 followed by 40.a5 wins equally) 39...\(\Box\)xc5 40.b6, winning;

A2) 36...gx4 37.gxf4 \(\Box\)a8 (as given later by Steinitz) 38.\(\Box\)c8 \(\Box\)a3 (38...\(\Box\)xc8 39.\(\Box\)xc8 \(\Box\)g8 40.a4 (or 40.\(\Box\)d2 and 41.\(\Box\)c4) 40...\(\Box\)f7 41.\(\Box\)c5 bxc5 42.a5 etc.) 39.\(\Box\)e1! \(\Box\)xal (if 39...\(\Box\)xb3, then 40.\(\Box\)xd8+ \(\Box\)f7 41.\(\Box\)xd7+ \(\Box\) moves 42.\(\Box\)xg7 \(\Box\)xg7 43.\(\Box\)d1 and wins) 40.\(\Box\)xal \(\Box\)g8 41.\(\Box\)b3 \(\Box\)f7 42.\(\Box\)b8 \(\Box\)g7 43.\(\Box\)xb6 \(\Box\)f7 44.\(\Box\)a5 e5 (or 44...\(\Box\)c8 45.\(\Box\)b7 \(\Box\)xd6 (45...\(\Box\)d8 46.\(\Box\)c4) 46.\(\Box\)xd7+ \(\Box\)f7 47.\(\Box\)b6 \(\Box\)g6 48.\(\Box\)xf7 \(\Box\)xf7 49.\(\Box\)c6) 46.\(\Box\)xg7+ \(\Box\)f7 47.fxe5 \(\Box\)xe5 47...\(\Box\)c6; if 47...\(\Box\)e8, then 48.fxe5 \(\Box\)xe5 49.\(\Box\)b6 and wins.

B) 33...\(\Box\)d8 34.b5 axb5 (or 34...\(\Box\)b8 35.\(\Box\)d4 \(\Box\)a7 36.\(\Box\)xc2, followed up by 37.a4 and 38.c5) 35.cxb5 \(\Box\)a7 36.\(\Box\)xc2 \(\Box\)b8 37.\(\Box\)d4 \(\Box\)c8 38.\(\Box\)c7 \(\Box\)g6 39.\(\Box\)c6+ \(\Box\)xc6 40.\(\Box\)xc6 \(\Box\)xd6 (best) 41.\(\Box\)d7+ \(\Box\)e8 42.\(\Box\)xd6 \(\Box\)e7 43.\(\Box\)d7+ \(\Box\)e8 44.\(\Box\)c7 \(\Box\)c8 45.\(\Box\)c1 forcing the game;

C) 33...a5 34.b5 \(\Box\)a7 35.a4 \(\Box\)b8 36.c5 bxc5 37.\(\Box\)xc5, followed by 38.\(\Box\)xa5 etc.

34.b5 axb5 35.cxb5 \(\Box\)a7 36.a4 gx4

Steinitz: Right enough if done with the view of retreating the king's rook to g8, and bringing the same to the queen's side; for otherwise White would exchange the f-pawn for the g-pawn, and then obtain a dangerous passed pawn on the h-file by h4.

37.gxf4

37...\(\Box\)e6

Steinitz: All with the object of supporting a very inferior defence.

Zukertort: 37...\(\Box\)g8, followed by 38.\(\Box\)b8, proposed in *The Field*, would prove equally disastrous, as the following variation shows: 37...\(\Box\)g8 38.\(\Box\)d2 \(\Box\)b8 39.\(\Box\)e3:

A) 39...\(\Box\)e8 (or 39...\(\Box\)g8 40.\(\Box\)d4 which will lead to the same position. It is evident, and also in accordance with Mr. Steinitz's expose, that Black has to play a waiting game) 40.\(\Box\)d4 \(\Box\)f7 (after 40...\(\Box\)d8, White would force the game with 41.\(\Box\)g1 \(\Box\)e8 42.\(\Box\)e5 and 43.\(\Box\)c2) 41.\(\Box\)e5 \(\Box\)g8 (if 41...\(\Box\)e8 or \(\Box\)f8, then 42.\(\Box\)d6, winning easily) 42.\(\Box\)c7 \(\Box\)b8 43.\(\Box\)d2 h5 (nothing else can serve: the rooks must not be exchanged, and the king has to remain within reach of e8, f8 and f7, as Mr. Steinitz points out distinctly) 44.\(\Box\)b7 (White might force Black to action with 44.h4, but the exchange of both rooks wins easily) 44...\(\Box\)xb7 45.\(\Box\)c7 \(\Box\)xc7 46.dxc7 \(\Box\)e7 (if 46...d5, then 47.\(\Box\)d6; if 46...\(\Box\)c8, then equally 47.\(\Box\)c4) 47.\(\Box\)c4 \(\Box\)b8 48.a5 d6+ 49.\(\Box\)d4 and wins;
B) 39...\textit{f}6 40.d4 \textit{g}8 (there is nothing better: if 40...\textit{f}7, then 41.d2 \textit{f}6 42.d3, threatening 43.f5 and 44.g2 or \textit{e}7 according to circumstances) 41.c7 \textit{xc}7 42.c7 \textit{c}8 43.gd7 \textit{g}3 44.d2, winning easily, for if 44...\textit{xb}3, then 45.f7+ and 46.d7; if on the other hand 44...\textit{g}2, then 45.c4 etc.

38.d2 \textit{b}8

\textit{Steinitz:} If there was any chance of retrieving the game it was only by 38...\textit{g}8, and then the same rook to \textit{b}8. If White then pursued the plan of bringing his knight to \textit{c}4, Black would ultimately defend by ...\textit{c}8, while otherwise Black, after returning with the king to \textit{e}8, would probably be able to relieve himself by ...\textit{x}c7. The defence actually adopted leaves him almost no hope.

39.c7\textit{a}8

40.d2!

\textit{Steinitz:} The winning coup.

40...e5

\textit{Steinitz:} Desperate, but he had nothing better, as White threatened to occupy e5 with the knight, via \textit{c}4 or f3 accordingly.

\textit{Zukertort:} Necessary to prevent the consequences of the threatened continuation 41.f3 and 42.e5.

41.fxe5+ e6

\textit{Zukertort:} If 41...\textit{xe}5, White wins easily with 42.c4+ \textit{e}6 43.xb6 \textit{b}5 44.c4 (or 44.exd7 \textit{xd}7 45.xd7 46.c7+ etc.) 44...c5 45.\textit{e}8+ \textit{f}6 (best) 46.a5.

42.g1

\textit{Steinitz:} Good enough, but he might have settled the affair more quickly by 42.c4, which would win a piece soon, while Black would not obtain perpetual check with his two rooks, even if he sacrificed the knight, for the white king would be able to make good his escape to the queen's side.

42...\textit{x}g1 43.xg1 \textit{c}8 44.c4 h5 45.f2 h4

46.f3

\textit{Steinitz:} Mr. Zukertort afterwards pointed out that he ought to have played 46.e3, which brought him nearer to the queen's side, with the same option of occupying f4 if necessary.

\textit{Zukertort:} Inferior to 46.e3, as pointed out by White immediately after the conclusion of the game - compare note to White's 51st move.

46.xd6

\textit{Steinitz:} What else could he do? His position was too confined.

\textit{Zukertort:} Compulsory: if 46...f7, then 47.exd7+ \textit{e}6 48.d8; if 46...b8, then 47.f4 a8 48.a5 (or 48.g5...
etc.) 48...bxa5 49.b6 \textit{b}b8 50.b7 \textit{a}a7
51.\textit{b}6 and 52.\textit{c}xd7 etc.

47.exd6

Steinitz: 47.\textit{c}xb6, followed by 48.\textit{c}xd7,
\textit{a} reply to 47...\textit{b}8, would have left him with an easier game to win; for Black's h-pawn would subsequently fall soon.

47...\textit{xa}4 48.\textit{xb}6 \textit{a}a3+ 49.\textit{f}4
\textit{h}3 50.\textit{xd}7 \textit{b}3

51.\textit{e}7+

Steinitz: The initiation of an ingenious and surprising manoeuvre.

Zukertort: The only way to win: had White played on his 46th move \textit{e}3, and then on the 49th \textit{d}4, he would now win at once with 51.\textit{e}7+ \textit{f}6
51...\textit{xd}6 52.\textit{c}8 mates) 52.\textit{d}5+ and 53.\textit{d}7.

51...\textit{xd}6 52.\textit{c}8+ \textit{c}5
53.\textit{e}5+ \textit{d}4 54.\textit{xf}5

Zukertort: After 54.\textit{xf}5? Black would now with 54...\textit{h}3 55.\textit{b}6 \textit{a}2 56.\textit{e}4+ \textit{g}5 57.\textit{h}4 \textit{b}2 58.\textit{f}4 \textit{c}6 59.\textit{g}3 \textit{b}7 etc.

54...\textit{h}3 55.\textit{b}6 \textit{h}2 56.\textit{h}5 \textit{b}1

Steinitz: He could not save the pawn by 56...\textit{b}2, for the answer 57.\textit{g}3 would still prevent the king from crossing; while, whenever the knight is attacked, the b-pawn would advance, followed by \textit{d}6, and ultimately \textit{h}8, after getting rid of the pawn.

58.\textit{h}7! \textit{b}4+

Zukertort: If 58...\textit{c}6, then 59.\textit{c}7+ \textit{d}5 (59...\textit{b}5 60.\textit{b}7 \textit{a}6 61.\textit{d}6 \textit{a}7 62.\textit{c}8) 60.\textit{f}5 \textit{f}1+ 61.\textit{g}6 \textit{e}6 62.\textit{b}7 \textit{b}1 63.\textit{g}7 \textit{b}3 64.\textit{f}8 \textit{b}1 65.\textit{e}8 \textit{b}2 66.\textit{c}6+ and 67.\textit{b}6.

59.\textit{e}5 \textit{b}5 60.\textit{d}6 \textit{b}1
61.\textit{c}7\textit{a}6 62.\textit{b}8 \textit{d}1 63.\textit{b}7

Black resigns.

Zukertort: Black's game was past recovery from the 30th move, when the entry of the white pawn at d6 stopped all communications between the two wings. Mr. Blackburne, in his attempts to break through, chose to die fighting, and declined, as he was advised in \textit{The Field}, to be smoked out, to use one of Anderssen's favourite expressions.

223 Sicilian Defence

Zukertort
Blackburne
5th Match Game. St. George's Chess Club,
4 July 1881
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz
1.e4 c5 2.d4 g6 3.d3

Steinitz: Better than 3.f4, adopted in the third game of the match.
8...\textit{\texttt{Bb8}}

Steinitz: We do not like Black's last three moves: he should have aimed at developing his king's side. He was, however, wise now in not attempting 8...\textit{\texttt{Bg4}}, for Black might then have safely retreated the king's knight to g1, and would afterwards have gained time by h3.

Zukertort: Premature at least: Black should develop his king's knight. If 8...\textit{\texttt{Bg4}}, White intended to reply with 9.\textit{\texttt{Bd2}}, followed by 10.\textit{\texttt{h3}}, 11.\textit{\texttt{c3}}, and 12.\textit{\texttt{e3}}.

9.\textit{\texttt{h3}} h5 10.\textit{\texttt{d1}} \textit{\texttt{c6}} 11.\textit{\texttt{c3}} \textit{\texttt{xe2}}
12.\textit{\texttt{axe2}} 13.\textit{\texttt{f6}} 14.\textit{\texttt{f2}}

Steinitz: Loss of time. He should have endeavoured to post his knight at e3 after removing his bishop.

Zukertort: Necessary to defend the e-pawn for two reasons: firstly, to counteract the advance of the hostile c-pawn; secondly, to be able to proceed with d4.

14...\textit{\texttt{b5}} 15.0-0 \textit{\texttt{d7}} 16.\textit{\texttt{d4}} c4
17.\textit{\texttt{d1}} \textit{\texttt{b6}} 18.\textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{d7}}
19.\textit{\texttt{e3}}

Zukertort: With the direct object of advancing the f-pawn.

19...\textit{\texttt{c8}} 20.\textit{\texttt{f5}} g5

\textit{\texttt{21.d1}}

Steinitz: For the third time this knight moved to the same square, but now with a more tangible object, for forces his opponent to block in the king's bishop with his own pawn, as he cannot defend the g-pawn with the bishop, on account of the reply e5, now prepared by the removal of the knight.

21...f6 22.\textit{\texttt{f3}} h4 23.g4

Zukertort: White declines justly, we think, to gain a pawn with 23.\textit{\texttt{gxf4}} \textit{\texttt{gxh4}} (23...\textit{\texttt{xh4}} 24.\textit{\texttt{h5+}} \textit{\texttt{d8}} 25.\textit{\texttt{e4}} \textit{\texttt{xh3}} 26.\textit{\texttt{g2}} \textit{\texttt{d3}} 27.\textit{\texttt{f2}}) 24.\textit{\texttt{h5+}} \textit{\texttt{d8}} 25.\textit{\texttt{e1}}, for Black would obtain then a fine attacking position after 25...\textit{\texttt{c7}} by bringing his pieces round on the king's flank.

23...0-0 24.\textit{\texttt{e3}}

Steinitz: We should have decidedly preferred 24.\textit{\texttt{d5}}, which would have made Black's king's bishop perfectly useless. White's pieces could be well placed in all directions, and he could well afford to leave a weak spot open at e5 for the entrance of the adverse knight, for he had plenty of scope for operation on the queen's side.

Zukertort: We are surprised to read in \textit{\texttt{The Field}}: 'We should have decidedly preferred 24.\textit{\texttt{d5}}, which would have made Black's king's bishop perfectly useless'. 24.\textit{\texttt{d5}} must be condemned for several reasons: it blocks the centre a
thus prevents any direct attack, it opens the squares e5 and c5 to the hostile knight and it makes White's king's bishop as much useless as the Black one.

24...e5 25.fxe6 $\text{dx}e6$ 26.$\text{e}1$ $\text{D}e8$

27.$\text{W}g2!$

Zukertort: The queen's move prepares the manoeuvre by which White's king's bishop gets a commanding position. 27...$\text{W}d8$ 28.$\text{h}1!$

Zukertort: The king's move does the same for the queen's bishop. 28.$\text{d}7$ 29.$\text{f}2$ $\text{f}8$ 30.$\text{g}1$ $\text{g}6$ 31.$\text{h}2$

Steinitz: The movement of this bishop to this important post, where it attacks a weak adverse pawn, was beautifully worked out.

31...$\text{f}8$ 32.$\text{d}1$ $\text{c}8$ 33.$\text{c}2$

Steinitz: By another clever manoeuvre he has now posted his king's bishop more favourably. Black could do nothing in the meanwhile.

33...$\text{b}7$ 34.$\text{f}5!$ $\text{g}7$ 35.$\text{g}1$

Steinitz: Also marked with great foresight. Evidently he will have to advance the e-pawn sooner or later for the purpose of attack, and he now moves the king at once from the pinning action of the adverse bishop, reserving an option of several places for the queen.

Zukertort: As the advance of the e-pawn will form a part of the coming onslaught, the king must be moved, which is now accomplished without loss of time, for White threatens 36.$\text{x}b5$, and if 36...$\text{x}e4?$, then 37.$\text{x}b8$, gaining a piece.

35...$\text{a}6$ 36.$\text{a}f1$

36...$\text{e}7$

Steinitz: Almost unpardonable carelessness in a match game. It was obvious that White aimed at breaking through in the king's quarter, and he could, without great difficulty, have reckoned that the opponent would obtain a clearly won game after the sacrifice of the exchange. 36...$\text{f}8$ was the proper defence.

Zukertort: This move was severely blamed as 'almost unpardonable carelessness in a match game'. It matters little, however, what Black plays, for White's attack must prove crushing anyhow, e.g. 36...$\text{f}8$ 37.$\text{x}d5$ $\text{c}8$ (if 37...$\text{x}d5$ 38.$\text{x}d5$ $\text{b}6$ 39.$\text{e}5$ $\text{e}7$ 40.$\text{x}d6$ $\text{d}6$ 41.$\text{ex}d6$ $\text{c}8$ 42.$\text{f}5+$ $\text{h}8$ 43.$\text{f}5$ etc.) 38.$\text{f}3$ $\text{e}6$ 39.$\text{b}1$ $\text{b}7$ (after 39...$\text{x}d5$ 40.$\text{ex}d5$ $\text{e}7$, White would win with 41.$\text{c}2$) 40.$\text{c}2$ $\text{f}7$ 41.$\text{x}f6+$ $\text{g}6$ 42.$\text{x}f6$ $\text{x}f6$ 43.$\text{e}5!$ $\text{f}8$ (White threatened the capture of two pieces) 44.$\text{x}f6$, with a winning advantage in numbers and position.
Zukertort: Should Black not defend the pawn, White wins equally, e.g. 38...\textit{xf8} 39.\textit{x}d6 \textit{w}c8 (if 39...\textit{we}8, then 40.\textit{b}6) 40.\textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 41.\textit{gx}f5 \textit{xf}5 42.\textit{g}4 \textit{f}7 43.\textit{w}xg5+ \textit{g}7 44.\textit{g}6, forcing the game.

\textbf{39.\textit{h}6!}

Steinitz: Most probably this very fine move must have been overlooked by Black in his forecast of the position. It wins by force.

\textbf{39...\textit{xf}8 40.\textit{f}5 \textit{f}6 41.\textit{h}5 \textit{g}6 42.\textit{w}f2}

Steinitz: Mr. Zukertort pursues his attack with his usual vigour and energy.

Zukertort: Threatening 43.\textit{h}6+.

\textbf{42...\textit{w}f8}

Zukertort: If 42...\textit{w}f6, the e-pawn would also have advanced, and as soon as the bishop entered at e5 White would threaten \textit{e}7+, followed by \textit{h}8 mate.

\textbf{43.e}5 \textit{b}6 44.exd6 \textit{d}5 45.\textit{e}5

Steinitz: The finishing stroke.

Zukertort: 45.\textit{xe}7+ would equally win, for after 45...\textit{xe}7 46.\textit{w}xf8+ \textit{xf}8 47.dxe7, White must remain a piece ahead.

\textbf{45...\textit{f}4 46.\textit{h}8+ \textit{f}7 47.\textit{x}f8+ \textit{xf}8 48.\textit{x}f4 \textit{g}xf4 49.\textit{w}xh4}

Black resigns.

Zukertort: Mate in three or the loss of a rook are unavoidable.

\textbf{224 Queen's Indian Defence}

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Blackburne}

11th Match Game, St. George's Chess Club:

22 July 1881

Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.c4 \textit{e}6 2.e3 \textit{f}6 3.\textit{f}3 \textit{b}6 4.a3 \textit{b}7 5.\textit{c}3 d5 6.d4 \textit{bd}7 7.b3

Steinitz: 7.\textit{b}4 would be premature, on account of the reply 7...\textit{a}5.

\textbf{7...\textit{d}6}

Steinitz: We think that the king's bishop should in this opening be placed at \textit{c}3 for the attack, and at \textit{e}7 for the defence. The respective positions of the bishops were reversed in this game.

\textbf{8.\textit{b}2 0-0 9.\textit{e}2}

Steinitz: He might have gained a move here by 9.\textit{b}4, which would have compelled the adversary to capture the c-pawn.

\textbf{9...\textit{e}8}

Steinitz: In conjunction with the pursuance of the plan of advancing the e-pawn after exchanging c-pawn for d-pawn, this would be feasible. But his subsequent hesitation to adopt that measure makes the move of the rook useless.
Zukertort: Under any circumstances, at least premature; we would prefer 9...c5 and 10...dxc8.

10.0-0

Steinitz: The manoeuvring of this knight to the king's side has no object in this opening, where the battle is usually fought on the other wing. Consistent with his previous placement of the king's rook, he would have taken the c-pawn with the a-pawn, followed by ...e5.

Zukertort: Wrong in principle; the knight should remain on the queen's side, where the battle is certain to be fought. After 10...dxc4 11.bxc4 e5 — a continuation recommended in The Field — White would get the superior game with 12.d5.

11...c1 c6

Steinitz: Worse than unnecessary. We fail to see any object in blocking up the bishop.

12.b4

Steinitz: Promptly getting the best of the position. Black must now capture the c-pawn, which threatens to advance to e5 with a powerful attack on the queen's side.

12...dxc4 13...xc4 g6 14.d3 e7

Steinitz: Even now we should have preferred an attempt to open the game by ...e5. If White then took the knight, and drew the rook in the centre by subsequent exchanges, it would only lead to an exchange of queens; and Black would suffer no inconvenience from the withdrawal of the adverse queen's knight, though it unmasked the bishop.

Zukertort: 14...e5, again advocated in The Field, would be decidedly better.

15...e4 xe4 16...xe4 ac8

17...b3

Steinitz: This is high-class judgement, besides a clever finesse. He spots the weak point on the other side, and prevents the advance of the c-pawn, against which he means to direct his attack. It is obvious that, if Black were now to push the c-pawn, White would exchange bishops first, followed by bxc5, winning a clear pawn.

Zukertort: Preventing both adverse bishop's pawns from advancing.

17...f8

Zukertort: 17...h4 would be probably better. It is obvious that White would lose a pawn, if he captured the knight.

18...e5 xe5

Steinitz: Which causes him loss of important time. 18...xe5, followed by ...c7, was the proper play. If White then protected the e-pawn, without capturing the knight with the bishop,
the knight could be brought into good play immediately, via e1. In the other alternative, bishops of opposite colours remained, with an even game.

Zukertort: It would be far better to take with the bishop, albeit even then White would have some superiority after 18...\textit{xe}5 19.dxe5 \textit{c}7 20.f4 \textit{e}7 21.\textit{f}d1.

\textbf{19.dxe5 \textit{b}8 20.\textit{f}d1 \textit{f}d8}

Steinitz: This costs a pawn under any circumstances.

Zukertort: This causes the loss of a pawn, but it is difficult to suggest any better move for Black: White threatens to double rooks on the open d-file.

\textbf{21.\textit{xd}8+}

Steinitz: A gross miscalculation apparently. Retaking with the rook would have given up the inevitably lost pawn in a much less dangerous way, and he would have had a fair prospect in playing subsequently for a draw by ...\textit{d}7, followed by ...\textit{d}2 in reply to the rook retreating to c1. The move in the text enables White to fix a passed pawn at c6.

Zukertort: With this move the fate of the day is decided. Black should give up the pawn at once by taking with the rook: he had then a fair chance of drawing the game notwithstanding his numerical superiority, e.g. 21...\textit{xd}8 22.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 23.\textit{xc}6 \textit{d}7 24.\textit{c}1 \textit{d}2 25.\textit{c}3 \textit{xc}3 26.\textit{xc}3 \textit{c}8 27.\textit{f}4 \textit{f}8 etc.

\textbf{22.\textit{b}5!}

\textbf{22...\textit{we}8}

Steinitz: In all probability he had previously speculated on now capturing the b-pawn, followed by exchanging rooks and ...\textit{c}7. On discovering that White will in that case retain the piece by the ultimate answer \textit{d}1, he injudiciously desists from that course, which, in our opinion, was still the best under the circumstances, e.g. 22...\textit{xb}5 23.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xc}1+ 24.\textit{xc}1 \textit{c}7 25.\textit{d}1 f6 (better than 25.f5 in some contingencies where the king requires room to come out at g6, via f7) 26.\textit{a}6 \textit{xe}5 27.f4 \textit{c}5, and with two pawns for the piece, he ought to have been able to make a much better fight for a draw than he did in the actual game, which was hopeless after White's pawn entered at c6.

Zukertort: If 22...\textit{d}7, White forces the gain of the pawn with 23.\textit{d}1 \textit{xd}1 24.\textit{xd}1 \textit{f}8 25.\textit{c}1 \textit{e}7 26.bxc6 After 22...\textit{xb}5 23.\textit{xb}7 \textit{xc}1+ 24.\textit{xc}1 \textit{c}7 25.\textit{d}1 f6 (given as best in \textit{The Field}) 26.\textit{a}6 \textit{xe}5 27.f4 \textit{c}5 28.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}5 29.\textit{d}8+ \textit{f}7 30.\textit{xb}8 \textit{e}2 (if 30...\textit{c}5, then...
31. \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{a} 7 + \) \( \text{c} \text{g} 6 \) 32. \( \text{Q} \text{d} 2 \) \( \text{W} \text{d} 5 \) 
\( \) (32. \( \text{W} \text{c} 2 \) 33. \( \text{W} \text{d} 7 \) 33. \( \text{Q} \text{e} 1 \) or 
33. \( \text{Q} \text{b} 4 \) etc. If 30... \( \text{W} \text{d} 3 \) or \( \text{W} \text{b} 1 \), then 
31. \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{a} 7 + \) and 32. \( \text{W} \text{c} 7 \) 31. \( \text{W} \text{c} 7 + \) 
\( \text{g} 6 \) 32. \( \text{W} \text{c} 3 \), White wins with the 
crushing superiority of a piece against 
one pawn.

23. \( \text{W} \text{d} 1 \)
Steinitz: Correct and precise. To prevent 
Black from relieving himself by 
23... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \), in which case White would 
still capture the pawn, and Black could 
not capture thrice on account of the im­
pending mate by \( \text{W} \text{d} 8 \).
Zukertort: Threatening to capture the 
pawn with pawn, and if Black retake, to 
exchange bishops and rooks and then 
mate at \( \text{d} 8 \).

23... \( \text{h} 6 \)
Steinitz: 23... \( \text{g} 6 \) would have served his 
object better, for he would then obtain 
two passed pawns for the piece by 
... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \), as will be explained in our next 
note.
Zukertort: 23... \( \text{g} 6 \) would be met with 
24. \( \text{h} 3 \) \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \) 25. \( \text{W} \text{f} 3 \), and Black cannot 
avoid the decisive entry of the white 
pawn at \( \text{c} 6 \).

24. \( \text{h} 3 \)
Zukertort: After 24. \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 25. \( \text{x} \text{x} 6 \) 
\( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 26. \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 27. \( \text{W} \text{d} 8 + \) \( \text{h} 7 \) 
28. \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{b} 8 \), Black would recover the 
piece with 28... \( \text{W} \text{c} 2 \).

24... \( \text{d} 8 \)
Steinitz: White's last move was, we be­
lieve, also best against 23... \( \text{g} 6 \) proposed 
in our last note, and he could then ob­
tain some compensation at this juncture 
by 24... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \), while, as it stands, this 
plan is not available, as \( \text{W} \text{h} 7 \) will 
ultimately win another pawn, either on the 
king's side or on the queen's side; e.g. 
24... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \) 25. \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 26. \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 
27. \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 28. \( \text{W} \text{d} 8 + \) \( \text{h} 7 \)

25... \( \text{c} 8 \)
Steinitz: 25... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \) would have gained a 
move which might have been of some 
importance.
Zukertort: The only move which forces 
White to capture the pawn at once: if 
25... \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 \), then 26. \( \text{f} 4 \):
A) 26... \( \text{a} 5 \) 27. \( \text{a} 4 \), and Black has not 
gained a move, as asserted in \text{The Field};
B) 26... \( \text{a} 6 \) (Steinitz's later suggestion) 
27. \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) (27. \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) would equally win 
as it did in actual play) 27... \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \)
28. \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 29. \( \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{b} 8 \) (if 
29... \( \text{c} 8 \), then 30. \( \text{d} 4 \); if 29... \( \text{d} 7 \), 
30. \( \text{x} \text{a} 6 \) 30. \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{a} 6 \) \( \text{a} 7 \) 31. \( \text{d} 4 \) (Or 
31. \( \text{c} 7 \) \( \text{a} 8 \) 32. \( \text{d} 4 \) etc.) 31... \( \text{b} 8 \)
32. \( \text{a} 4 \) wins.

26. \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{c} \text{c} 7 27. \text{f} 4 ! \)
Zukertort: With this and the two next 
moves White brings his queen's bishop 
into commanding position, which set­
tles matters absolutely.

27... \( \text{a} 5 \) 28. \( \text{a} 4 \) \( \text{a} 6 \) 29. \( \text{a} 3 \) \( \text{b} 5 \)
30. \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b} 5 \) \( \text{x} \text{b} 5 \) 31. \( \text{d} 6 ! \) \( \text{b} 6 \)
Steinitz: Obviously he could not take 
twice, for \( \text{W} \text{b} 7 \) would advance the 
pawn to \( \text{c} 7 \), followed afterwards by 
\( \text{b} 7 \), in case the queen tried to stop the 
pawn at \( \text{c} 8 \).
Zukertort: After 31...\(\text{\&}xd6\) 32.exd6 \(\text{\&}xd6\) 33.c7 \(\text{\&}d7\) 34.c8\(\text{\&}\) \(\text{\&}xc8\) 35.\(\text{\&}\)xc8 \(\text{\&}d8\) 36.\(\text{\&}\)a6, White would win the a-pawn, and thus remain a clear piece ahead.

32.\(\text{\&}b3\)

32...f5

Steinitz: 32...a4 might have led to the following fine variation: 32...a4 33.\(\text{\&}\)xb5 \(\text{\&}xe3+\) 34.\(\text{\&}\)h1 \(\text{\&}xc1\) 35.c7 \(\text{\&}c8\) 36.\(\text{\&}\)c6 and wins the queen.

Zukertort: If 32...a4, White would win with 33.\(\text{\&}\)xb5 \(\text{\&}xe3+\) 34.\(\text{\&}\)h1 \(\text{\&}xc1\) 35.c7! \(\text{\&}h8\) (to avoid the loss of the queen, which was threatened with 36.\(\text{\&}\)c6) 36.\(\text{\&}\)c6 \(\text{\&}g8\) 37.\(\text{\&}\)xa4 \(\text{\&}c8\) 38.g3 (threatening to win the bishop with 39.\(\text{\&}\)c3) 38...\(\text{\&}e3\) (if 38...g5, White forces the game with 39.\(\text{\&}\)e7 \(\text{\&}g6\) 40.\(\text{\&}\)f6+ \(\text{\&}g8\) (40...\(\text{\&}\)h7 41.\(\text{\&}\)el) 41.\(\text{\&}\)a6 etc.) 39.\(\text{\&}\)d7, winning the rook for the passed pawn, and forcing then easily the exchange of queens.

33.\(\text{\&}\)xf5 a4

Zukertort: After 33...\(\text{\&}xe3+\) 34.\(\text{\&}\)xe3 exf5, White would win a piece with 35.\(\text{\&}\)b3+.

34.\(\text{\&}\)xe6+ \(\text{\&}h8\) 35.\(\text{\&}\)xe8+ \(\text{\&}xe8\) 36.\(\text{\&}\)f2 g5 37.fxg5 a3 38.c7 \(\text{\&}a6\) 39.\(\text{\&}\)c8\(\text{\&}\) \(\text{\&}xc8\) 40.\(\text{\&}\)xc8
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Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{\&}\)f3 \(\text{\&}c6\) 3.d4 exd4 4.\(\text{\&}\)xd4 \(\text{\&}f6\) 5.\(\text{\&}\)xc6 bxc6 6.e5 \(\text{\&}e7\) \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}d5\)

8.c4

Steinitz: It seems that White could gain a move here by 8.b3, but the answer 8...\(\text{\&}\)b4+, followed, if the bishop interposes, by 9...\(\text{\&}\)b6, would prevent White from advancing the pawn to c5.
immediately, on account of the rejoinder 10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{w}}d4.

8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}6}

Zukertort: The \textit{Handbuch} proceeds here with 8...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{Q}}b6 9.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{f}}4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{a}}6 10.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}2 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{w}}b4 11.0-0-0 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}}8 12.a3 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{w}}a4. We may add, however, that some of the moves for White show more valour than discretion.

9.b3 0-0-0 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{b}}2

Steinitz: We suggested this move in our notes to the 12th game. As regards the other alternative 10.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}}2, which we proposed, the following is a likely continuation: 10.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}}2 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}}6 11.c5 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}f1 12.cxb6 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}g2 13.bxa7 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}}7 14.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{g}}1 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}5 15.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{e}}3; and the pawn at a7 will be somewhat troublesome in the middle game, though for the ending it, no doubt, stands weak. But then, even if Black wins this pawn, he will only have a doubled pawn plus in the queen centre, while White will remain with a passed pawn on the a-file. On the whole, we are, however, inclined to pronounce in favour of the move in the text, which seems to leave more initiative to the first player.

10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}5}

Steinitz: Best under the circumstances. We still question whether Black’s defence is right on principle, but he evidently makes the most of the position in detail.

Zukertort: Probably best: 10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}4} would be bad on account of the reply 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}3}.

11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}4}

Steinitz: Again too early, though one move later than on the previous occasion in the 12th game. 11.h4 at once was better, for, in reply to the check of the bishop, the king could move; and if then Black’s queen retreated to g6, White could oppose his queen with advantage at c2.

Zukertort: If 11.h4, Black answers best 11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}6}.

11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}4+} 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}7}!

13.h4

Zukertort: The only move, we think, which parries the consequences of the threatened rejoinder 13...\textit{d}5. The plausible continuation 13.f4 would be far inferior, viz: 13.f4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}5 14.cxd5 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{g}}4+ 15.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{f}}3 (best) 15...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}f3+ (15...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{e}}xd5+ 16.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}2, winning a piece) 16.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}f3 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}f1 17.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}f1 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}xd5 etc.

13...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}6}

Steinitz: This seems to have been his best course. In order to avoid the exchange, he must have retreated to h6, where the queen would have stood badly. White would then gain time for development by 14.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}2, since Black could not answer 14...\textit{d}5, on account of the reply 15.exd6, followed if rook retakes, by c5.

Zukertort: If now 13...\textit{d}5, then 14.exd6 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{h}}5+ 15.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{g}}4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{e}}xd6+ 16.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}2 winning.

14.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}}g6 hxg6 15.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}2

Steinitz: There was no necessity for this, and he should have first attended to the danger of the adverse knight entering at f5. 15.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}3 was safe enough, for if Black replied 15...\textit{d}5, he could take en passant, followed by \textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}2 and \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}1.
Johannes Zukertort

Zukertort: If 15 \( \text{d}3 \), as recommended in *The Field*, Black proceeds with 15...g5.

15...\( \text{d}f5 \)

16 \( \text{d}2 \)

Steinitz: It was now best to give up the h-pawn, and any attempt at saving it by \text{g}3 would have involved him in difficulties and in the loss of the centre pawn — e.g. 16.g3 \( \text{c}5 \) 17.\( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{d}4+ \) 18.\( \text{d}1 \) (if 18.\( \text{xd}4 \), of course the e-pawn is lost at once) 18...\( \text{f}3 \) 19.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) etc.

Zukertort: Best: 16.g3 would involve White into difficulties without averting the loss of a pawn, e.g. 16.g3 \( \text{c}5 \) 17.\( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{d}4+ \) 18.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 19.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 21.\( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) etc.

16...\( \text{x}h4 \)

Zukertort: Taking with the rook would avoid many complications, and was, therefore, preferable.

17.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

Zukertort: White threatened 18.c5 or 18.\( \text{g}5 \).

18.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{b}8 \)?

Steinitz: This was clearly a slip, which subjected him to the loss of the pawn gained, with inferiority of position. He should have first advanced pawn to g5, to gain a retreat for the knight at g6.

19.\( \text{h}3 \)?

Steinitz: Strangely enough, White also overlooks that he could now recover his material force with advantage by 19.\( \text{g}1 \) followed by exchanging rooks, \( \text{xd}7 \).

19...\( \text{c}8 \) 20.\( \text{eh}3 \)

Zukertort: It is obvious that rook or knight must move, as Black threatens to attack both with ...d5.

20...g5 21.b4

Steinitz: 21.c5 with the object of blocking the adverse d-pawn still more would not have given him a good game if Black answered immediately 21...\( \text{a}6 \), though he might recover his pawn — e.g. 21.c5 \( \text{a}6 \) 22.\( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{x}c5 \) 23.\( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{xf}1 \) 24.\( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{x}e7 \) 25.\( \text{d}xg5 \) \( \text{d}5 \); and should White now capture the f-pawn, the answer 26.\( \text{g}5 \) will give Black the opportunity of recovering it with the better game, for would be useless to support the knight by 27.e6, on account of the reply 27...\( \text{f}5 \).

21...\( \text{g}6 \)

Steinitz: 21...\( \text{f}5 \), for the purpose of preparing the advance of the pawn to d5 was now the correct play; the move in the text gives the opponent another chance of recovering the pawn.

Zukertort: 21...\( \text{f}5 \) would be very inferior: White might attack at any moment with g4, and the knight may enter the game at f4, or may be played with advantage over f8 to e6.
22.g3?
Steinitz: 22...g3, with the object of equalising forces, was preferable to this advance, which, though it prevented the adverse knight from coming in at f4, was not advisable, as it subjected the f-pawn to the attack of the hostile rook.

Zukertort: This move is not good, as the opponent's powerful reply shows, but 22...g3, proposed in the Field as 'equalising forces', would not effect that object. 22...g3 g4 23...e2 (of course, not 23...xg4, on account of the reply 23...d5) 23...h4 24...e3 (if 24...a3, Black may continue with 24...de8) 24...d4 25...xg4...g2 26...ed3 (if 26...f3, Black wins a piece with 26...d5) 26...d5 27...xc8...xc8 28...xd5...xd5 29...xd5...xd5 30...xg2...f2 31...d1...e1+ moves 32...d1...h4, maintaining the pawn with a satisfactory position, e.g. 33...e2...d8!

Steinitz only gave 33...g5 34...d1...g2 (34...c2 35...a3] 35...f3...f4 36...e6...e8 (best, to prevent e7, followed by 37...e6) 37...g7...h8 38...g4 and recovers the pawn, for if the knight protects at c6, the answer is 34...d4 g5! 34...c2? 35...d6+ was given by Steinitz) 35...e3 (if 35...xa7, then 35...xd2+ 36...xd2...f3+ and 37...xe5, with two united passed pawns. If 35...c5, then 35...g2) 35...g4 (Black may also continue with 35...e8 36...d5...c2 etc.) 36...xd8+...xd8 37...g5+ (if 37...xa7, then 37...c3) 37...xg5 38...xg5 (if 38...xe1, then 38...d4) 38...c2 39...xf7+...e7 40...h6...xb4 41...xg4 (if 41...a4 g3 42...f3...e6 43...g4...d3 etc.) 41...xa2 42...d3...e6 43...c4...c1 etc.

22...h2!

23...d4
Steinitz: White is still bent on his useless attack on the queen's side, and he most likely overlooks the line of the defence with the c-pawn, which his opponent subsequently adopts. 23...b3 was the proper move now to keep everything well defended, and retain the pressure against the adverse d-pawn, the advance of which he should have hindered as long as possible, in order to keep Black's pieces confined.

Zukertort: The Field says '23...b3 was the proper move now to keep everything well defended and retain the pressure against the adverse d-pawn, the advance of which he should have hindered as long as possible, in order to keep Black's pieces confined.' The object in view should be certainly of paramount importance to White, but the proposed move does not fulfil it at all, for Black would answer with the dreaded ...d5, e.g. 23...b3 d5 24...xd6 (this seems best: after 24...xd5...xd5, White dare not capture the pawn, for he would lose then the exchange. If 24...c5, then 24...d6!) 24...cxd6 25...xg7 (or 25...xd6...xd6 27...xd6...f2 28...d3 [28...d1...f3+ or ...f6] 28...c7 29...d4...f3 etc.) 25...d5 26...xd5...d5 27...c3...xf2 28...d5...e6 29...c4 f6 winning.
23...d5 24.exd6 cxd6 25.Aa3 c5
26.bxc5

Steinitz: He could not retreat the bishop at once to e3, on account of the reply ...\_f5, followed by ...\_e5, if the bishop defended at d3, Black then threatened ultimately to break through with ...d5.

26...dxc5

Steinitz: Now, of course, he could not protect the pawn any longer, for he was bound to guard against the ultimate entrance of the adverse knight to e5, as he had no other defence for his own knight, excepting by \_d3 when attacked by ...\_f5.

27...\_a1+?

Steinitz: By this ill-considered check he compromises his game. The proper move now was 27.\_e3. It should be observed, however, that he could neither take the c-pawn with the bishop nor with the knight; for in the former case he would lose a piece by ...f5, and in the second alternative by ...\_xd4.

Zukertort: If 27.\_xc5, then, of course, 27...\_xd4; if 27.\_xc5, then 27...\_xc5 28.\_b1+(28.\_xc5 \_xf2+ 29.\_c1 \_xd1 + 30.\_xd1 \_xf1+; or 28.\_b3+ \_c7 etc.) 28...\_b6 29.c5 \_b7 30.\_d3 \_e5 etc. The text move is blamed in The Field, and rightly too, we think, for it weakens White's game in the centre, without affording any advantage on the wing. 27.\_e3 seems best, but Black would maintain even then his numerical superiority with a good position by continuing with 27...\_xd1 28.\_xd1 \_h1 29.\_d2 (29.\_e2 \_g4+ 30.f3 \_xf3+) 29...\_e5.

27...\_a8 28.\_c3

Steinitz: An error. He should have concentrated fire by \_ab3.

Zukertort: Black's numbers should carry the day now, whatever White plays:

31.\_ab3, then 31...\_c6.

31...\_xd3!

Steinitz: Taking advantage in master style.

32.\_xd3

Steinitz: 32.\_xd3 was of no use, for Black would answer 32...\_e5+, and the king would have to retreat to c2; for if he moved to any black square, the answer was 33...\_xd2.

Zukertort: After 32.\_xd3, Black with 32...\_e5+ 33.\_c2 (or 33.\_c3 \_e3 \_xd2, and if 34 \_ or \_xc2 \_xc4+ and 35...\_xa3) 33...\_e4+ 34.\_c1 \_xb1 35.\_xb1 f4.

32...\_e4 33.\_c7 a6 34.\_b6 \_f6 35.\_e6 \_b7!
Steinitz: This gains an important move, and is much stronger than 35...\(\text{d}e2\) at once.

Zukertort: The first move of a final manoeuvre by which Black threatens a series of exchanges which leave White absolutely helpless — compare the next note.

36.\(\text{d}6 \text{e}2!\) 37.\(\text{x}e4\)

Steinitz: His most promising defensive resource, 37.\(\text{d}1\), would have lost, without affording any chances of complication, e.g. 37.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{xd}3\) 38.\(\text{x}e2\) \(\text{x}e2+\) 39.\(\text{c}e2\) \(\text{c}6\) 40.\(\text{b}8 \text{g}8\) 41.\(\text{g}4\), and Black may even take off the pawn, and would win.

Zukertort: If 37.\(\text{d}1\) — the only move which avoids the loss of a piece — Black would proceed with 37...\(\text{xd}3\) 38.\(\text{x}e2\) \(\text{x}e2+\) 39.\(\text{x}e2\) \(\text{c}6\) 40.\(\text{b}8 \text{g}8\) 41.\(\text{g}4\) (best) 41...\(\text{d}7\) 42.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{f}4\) 43.\(\text{f}3\) (otherwise Black plays 43...\(\text{e}5\)) 43...\(\text{b}6\) 44.\(\text{g}1\) (if 44.\(\text{d}3\) then 44...\(\text{e}5+\)) 44...\(\text{a}5\) 45...\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}4\), winning easily.

37...\(\text{fxe}4\) 38.\(\text{b}3+\) \(\text{c}6\) 39.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{xd}2\+\) 40.\(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{xd}6\) 41.\(\text{b}6+\) \(\text{e}5\)

42.\(\text{x}a6\)

Steinitz: 42.\(\text{e}3\) was his best chance. The only winning move for Black was then 42...\(\text{f}5\), threatening check with the bishop at d4, followed by ...\(\text{e}5\); for if ...\(\text{e}7\), the g-pawn would advance, and the knight would be stopped from checking. In any case, he had time to capture the a-pawn later on.

Zukertort: If 42.\(\text{e}3\), recommended in The Field as White's 'best chance', Black wins with 42...\(\text{g}4\)! (not 42...\(\text{f}5\), which is given by the same authority as 'the only winning move for Black'):

A) 43.\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{a}6\) 44.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{f}5\)+ 45.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{d}4\) 46.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{d}3\) 47.\(\text{x}f6\) (White cannot stop the decisive advance of the hostile e-pawn. If 47.\(\text{e}6\), then 47...\(\text{e}3\)+ 48.\(\text{g}2\) (48.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{xg}3\+) 49.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}4\) etc.) 48...\(\text{e}2\) 49.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{e}3\)+ 50.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}4\) 51.\(\text{a}7\) \(\text{x}c\)+ 52.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}3\)+ 53.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{e}1\)+ 54.\(\text{x}e1\) \(\text{f}6\)+ 55.\(\text{x}e1\) \(\text{e}6\) 47...\(\text{g}6\) 48.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{e}3\)+ 49.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{d}4\) 50.\(\text{a}7\) \(\text{f}3\)+ etc.;

B) 43.\(\text{c}6\) (this move was later given by Mr. Steinitz as demolishing our variation) 43...\(\text{g}5\)+ 44.\(\text{e}2\) (Mr. Steinitz proceeds now with 44...\(\text{f}5\), adding that 'the move is clearly a part of his own idea'. We shall not dispute his copyright but decline to make any use of his property. We may continue instead with the winning rejoinder...)

44...\(\text{d}4\)+! 45.\(\text{g}4\)+ (of course, should White not capture the knight, then 45...\(\text{d}3\), winning easily) 45...\(\text{x}f4\):

B1) 46.\(\text{c}8\) (this illustrates best any other continuation than (b) or (c)), then 46...\(\text{g}3\) 47.\(\text{e}8\) \(\text{e}3\) 48.\(\text{x}e3\) \(\text{g}2\) 49.\(\text{f}3\)+ \(\text{g}4\)+ etc.;

B2) 46.\(\text{x}c5\) \(\text{g}3\) 47.\(\text{d}5\) (if 47.\(\text{c}8\), then 47...\(\text{e}3\)) 47...\(\text{h}4\) 48.\(\text{c}5\) (if 48.\(\text{f}1\), then 48...\(\text{e}3\) (threatening 49...\(\text{g}2\)+ and 50...\(\text{e}2\)) 49.\(\text{d}4\)+ 50.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{c}5\)+ 51.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}3\) (or 50.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{d}8\) etc.) 50...\(\text{h}2\) 51.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{g}1\)+ 52.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{x}g1\) \(\text{x}g1\) 53.\(\text{f}5\) 53...\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{f}2\) 54.\(\text{e}6\)
Johannes Zukertort

\[ \text{Wf3 Sd7 g5 etc.} \]
\[ \text{55 We2 Sxg7 Wd4 S6.c6 Sg3 S7.f7 Wd5 wins;} \]

B3) 46.\text{xa6 g3 47 \text{b6} (if 47.\text{g6}, then 47...e3 48.\text{hxg5 }Sxg5 49.\text{xe3 Wg4 etc.}) 47...e3 48.a4 (or 48.\text{f1 f3} 49.\text{b2 d8 S0.a4 S5.a5 S5.e2 Sd2 52.\text{g2} \text{e1} 53.\text{xe1 Sxg2} S4.a5 Wf3 etc.) 48...g2 49.\text{b1 Sd8} S0.\text{g1} (if 50.\text{d3}, then 50...f3 and S1...g5) 50...Sg3 S1.\text{xe3 Sh2} S2.\text{d1 g1\text{\#} + S3.\text{xe1 Sxg1} S4.e4 Wf2 S5.c5 (or 55.\text{d5 g5 etc.) S5...e3 S6.e5 g5 wins.} \]

42...\text{d4 43.\text{\#d6+}}

Steinitz: Not to give him time to fetch the pawn with the knight via e5.

43...\text{xc4} 44.\text{xe3 S\text{e7!}}

45.\text{xe4 \text{b5} 46.\text{d7 c4} 47.\text{eb7+ \text{a4!} }}

48.\text{c7}

Steinitz: He could gain nothing by keeping on checking - e.g. 48.\text{a7+ b4} 49.\text{b7+ a3 S0.\text{a7}+ \text{b2} S1.a4 \text{b3} S2.a5 \text{b4}, and Black will be enabled to stop the adverse a-pawn, while his own c-pawn will ultimately win.

Zukertort: 48.\text{a7+} might have led to the following continuation: 48...\text{b4} 49.\text{b7+ a3 S0.\text{a7}+ \text{b2} S1.a4 c3 S2.a5 \text{c6} S3.\text{b7+ a3} S4.a6 c2 S5.a7 \text{xa7} S6.\text{xa7+ b2} S7.\text{b7+ \text{a2} 58.\text{c7 b1} S9.\text{b7+ \text{b2} \text{c5 wins.} } \]

48...c3 49.\text{d3 \text{d5} 50.\text{b7 a3}}

Steinitz: This wins without difficulty; Black has conducted the ending in the highest style.

Zukertort: Best if 50...\text{b4+}, \text{White would reply} 51.\text{c4!}. 51.\text{c2}

Zukertort: After 51.\text{a7+ b2} S2.a: Black wins with 52...\text{e7} S3.\text{b7-} (S3.\text{d7 c2 S4.\text{b7+ b4}) S3...\text{c5} S4.\text{f7 \text{xa3 etc.} } \]

51...\text{b4+} 52.\text{b1}

Steinitz: This is equal to resignation; but of course 52.\text{c1} would have only put Black to the trouble of taking the a-pawn checking; for he could not advance the c-pawn at once, on account of the rejoinder \text{a7+}. 52...\text{a4} 53.\text{c2} S4...\text{c2+ or \text{b3 accordingly.} } \]

52...c2+

White resigns.

226 Spanish Game

Wittek

Zukertort

Berlin tournament. 2 September 1881

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\text{f3 \text{c6} 3.\text{c3 \text{f6} 4.\text{b5 a6 5.\text{c4}} \]

Or 5.\text{xex6 dxe6 6.\text{xe5 \text{xe4 7.\text{xe4 \text{d4} S0.0-0 \text{xe4 9.\text{e1 \text{e6 10.c1 \text{f5! with an even game.} } \]

5...\text{c56.d3} \]

The well-known continuation 6.\text{xe6! \text{xe5 7.d4 \text{d6! is not advantageous;}: White: and should he play 8.f4, Black would reply} 8...\text{c6 9.e5 \text{b4 10.exf6 \text{xf6, with a better game.} } \]

6...\text{b5 7.\text{c3 d6 8.h3 h6 9.0-0?} } \]
Castling at this stage is rather premature, as will be seen in a few moves.

9...g5! 10.h2 d4 11.e2

11...g4

Very tempting in an off-hand game, but too risky in a tournament game is the following variation: 11...hx3 12.axb3 g4 13.h4 h5 14.g3 hxg3 15.Hxg3 Hxh4 etc., and Black has two pawns for the sacrificed piece and a good attack.

12.Hxh3 Hxh3 13.b3 fb6 14.hxg4 Kg8 15.g5

If instead of this 15...Hf3 then 15...Hf7. Should White play then 16.Hd5, Black might sacrifice the rook. Supposing:

16.Hf3 Hxg4 17.Hxa8 Hxh2 18.Hxh2 Hh4+ 19.Hg1 .g4. Decidedly bad would be 15...Hxh6 because of 15...Hxg4, with an overwhelming attack.

15...hxg5 16.Hf3 g4 17.g3 Wf7 18.Hh6 cxb6 19.f4 gxf3 20.Kxf3

If 20.Wxf3, then 20...Hg6 21.Hf2 Hh3, with a fine attack.

20...Hh3 21.Wf2 Hg6 22.Wf2

Very tempting looked here 22.Wf2, but it would only confine the king in his dangerous position. Black would reply with 22...Hb8, followed by ...Hd7 and Hc7 thus putting the king into safety, and afterwards by doubling the rooks, decide the game very speedily.

22...0-0-0 23.Hg1 d5 24.Hxd5 Hxh5 25.exd5 26.Kg3?

A very bad move! 26.Kf1 is much better, but even then Black would have the best of it by 26...Hxd5.

26...f4! 27.Kf1?

A blunder which accelerates the loss; though there is no move on the board which could prevent the ultimate fate, e.g. 27.Kgx4 Wh4+ etc., or 27.Hxe5 fxe5+ 28.Hxe5 (28.Kf1 gxh2 etc.) 28...Wh4 29 Wh or He3 Hf8+ etc. The best move under the circumstances is 27.Kf3, and Black’s answer is 27...Kf8 or ...Hd8.

27...f5

White resigns.

White abandons the game too early. 28.Kf5 wins a piece back, but, of course, the ultimate loss of the game was almost certain.

22.7 Spanish Game

Zukertort

Chigorin

Berlin tournament, 14 September 1881

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Kf3 Hc6 3.Hb5 Hf6 4.d4 exd4 5.0-0 He7 6.e5 Hf6 7.Kxd4 0-0

We have advocated on several previous occasions the continuation 7...Hxd4 8.Wxd4 Hc5.
8.\textit{Qf5} d5 9.\textit{Qxe7}+ \textit{Qxe7} 10.f3 \textit{Qc5}

Up to this point the play is identical with the 13th match game between
Zukertort (White) and Rosenthal (Black). The latter continued with
10...c6. The course chosen by Mr. Chigorin is decidedly no improvement.
11.b4 \textit{Qe6} 12.f4

12...f5

This establishes a powerful adverse passed pawn, but it seems compulsory
to prevent the further advance of the hostile f-pawn. If 12...\textit{Qf5}, then
13.\textit{Qd3} \textit{Qed4} 14.c3 \textit{Qc6} 15.b5 \textit{Qce7}
16.g4, with a powerful attack.
13.\textit{Qa4} c6 14.\textit{Qb3} a5

After 14...\textit{Qb6}+ 15.\textit{Qh1} \textit{Qd4}
(15...\textit{Qxb4}? 16.\textit{Qa3}), White would
avoid the exchange of queens with
16.\textit{Qd2}!
15.bxa5 \textit{Qxa5} 16.\textit{Qe3} \textit{Qc5}
17.\textit{Qd2} b6?

After 17...\textit{Qxb3} 18.axb3 \textit{Qxa1}
19.\textit{Qxal} \textit{Qxa1} 20.\textit{Qxa1}, White would
have the better game on account of his rook occupying the only open file, his
bishop threatening to be posted at c5 and the knight at d4, besides having a
passed pawn. Instead of the text move, however, which is not quite intelligible,
we would propose 17...\textit{Qc3}.
18.c4 \textit{Qe6} 19.cxd5 cxd5?

Very feeble: he should retake with the knight.
20.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qh8}

To provide for 21.\textit{Qg5}. If 20...\textit{Qxe4},
then 21.\textit{Qxb3} b5 22.\textit{Qc5} \textit{Qxe4}
23.\textit{Qg5}, winning at least a pawn.
21.\textit{Qd4} \textit{Qg8} 22.\textit{Qd2} \textit{Qa6}

Of course, if 22...\textit{Qa3}, then 23.\textit{Qc1}
winning the exchange.
23.\textit{Qb4}! \textit{Rfc8} 24.\textit{Qc2}

White has now obtained a commanding position with his bishops, and we
doubt whether Black has any satisfactory defence.
24...\textit{Qc4} 25.a3

25...\textit{Qe6}

This abandons a pawn, which, however,
could not be protected without extreme
danger, e.g. 25...g6 26.\textit{Qc1} \textit{Qa6} 27.\textit{Qh6}
28.\textit{Qxf5} \textit{Qxf5} (if 28...\textit{Qxf5}, then
29.\textit{Qd4}+ \textit{Qh7} 30.\textit{Qf6}) 29.\textit{Qxf5} \textit{gxf6}
30.\textit{Qd4}+ \textit{Qh7} 31.\textit{Qc3}, winning
force; for if 31...\textit{Qxe6} or 31...\textit{Qg6}
\textit{Qa7}, then 32.\textit{Qh8}+ \textit{Qg6} 33.\textit{Qf5}+
\textit{Qh5} 34.\textit{Qxf5}+ etc.
26.\textit{Qxf5} \textit{Qxf5}

If 26...\textit{Qxc2}, then 27.\textit{Qxe7}, winning
the-pawn.
27.\textit{Qxf5} \textit{g6}?
Making bad worse.
28.\textit{Qg4} \textit{Qe8}

White threatened 29.\textit{Qe7}.
29.\textit{Qc1} \textit{Qb5} 30.\textit{Qd2} \textit{Qa7} 31.\textit{Qf3}
\textit{Qc5}
The pawn could not be defended: if 31...\( \text{d}d8 \) or \( \text{d}d7 \), then 32...\( \text{d}d6 \); if 31...\( \text{c}c7 \), then 32...\( \text{f}d6 \) \( \text{c}a8 \) 33...\( \text{d}d1 \); if 31...\( \text{g}g7 \), then at once 32...\( \text{f}d1 \).

**32...\( \text{xd}d5 \)**

32...\( \text{d}d7? \)

Black had two other plausible continuations, neither of which would have altered the final result, although they were better than the text move, which accelerates the defeat.

A) 32...\( \text{d}d8 \) 33...\( \text{c}c4 \) (inferior would be 33...\( \text{c}c6 \) \( \text{xf}1+ \)):

A1) 34...\( \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{xd}d2 \) 35...\( \text{xd}d2 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 36...\( \text{b}b4 \) \( \text{a}a2 \) 37...\( \text{xc}x5 \) \( \text{bxc}5 \) 38...\( \text{c}c1 \) \( \text{c}c4 \) 39...\( \text{b}b5 \) \( \text{d}d5 \) etc.

A2) 34...\( \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{xd}d2 \) 35...\( \text{xd}d2 \) \( \text{b}b3 \) 36...\( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 37...\( \text{e}e8 \) 34...\( \text{c}c3 \), with two pawns ahead and a good position;

B) 32...\( \text{b}b3 \) 33...\( \text{xb}b3 \) \( \text{xb}3 \), and although the bishops are of different colours, White's numerical superiority must decide the contest early, as it is backed up by a fine attacking position. White might continue 34...\( \text{f}5 \).

**33...\( \text{e}e6 \) \( \text{xe}e6 \)**

Best under the circumstances: if 33...\( \text{xe}e6 \), then 34...\( \text{c}c3+ \) \( \text{g}g8 \) 35...\( \text{d}d4 \) \( \text{e}e7 \) (if 35...\( \text{xd}d5 \), White mates in three moves) 36...\( \text{h}h8+ \) \( \text{f}f7 \) 37...\( \text{xh}xh7+ \) \( \text{f}f6 \) moves 38...\( \text{h}h8+ \) \( \text{f}f7 \) 39...\( \text{f}f5+ \), forcing the mate.

34...\( \text{c}c3+ \) \( \text{g}g7 \) 35...\( \text{c}c6 \)

Black resigns.

After 35...\( \text{w}f5 \) 36...\( \text{f}f7 \) \( \text{xf6} \) 37...\( \text{x}d1 \) \( \text{wh}6 \) 38...\( \text{f}d6 \), Black can but prolong the defence for a few moves.

**228 Evans Gambit**

**Hirschfield**

**Zukertort**

Mr. Hirschfield's house, 5 October 1881

Notes by Zukertort

1...\( \text{e}e4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 2...\( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{c}c6 \) 3...\( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{c}c5 \)

4...\( \text{b}b4 \) \( \text{b}b4 \) 5...\( \text{c}b5 \) \( \text{f}f6 \) 6...\( \text{d}d4 \) \( \text{exd}4 \)

7...0...8...\( \text{f}f6 \) 9...\( \text{b}b3 \) \( \text{h}h8 \) 10...\( \text{x}e5 \)

**11...\( \text{a}a3 \)**

The oldest continuation was 11...\( \text{d}d6 \). The counter gambit, 11...\( \text{b}b5 \), destroyed the confidence in its efficacy. 11...\( \text{e}e1 \) was then proposed, but also refuted by Zukertort, and shortly afterwards 11...\( \text{a}a3 \) came into general favour. The move was known and already practised in 1851, but the late Mr. Löwenthal has the merit of directing again the attention to it in his notes to the match games, Anderssen-Zukertort, played in 1871, and republished in the chess column of *Land and Water*. The present editor of this column, Mr. Potter, proposed and analysed here \( \text{d}d1 \). The move is not new, nor has it, in our opinion, any claims to special attention. In the first in-

---

Match with Blackburne and Berlin Tournament 1881
stance, it is against the first principle of a well-conducted attack, viz, the quick development of all forces previous to the attempt of a direct onslaught. It must be, therefore, condemned, if it does not yield immediate advantage. Secondly, it does not require deep analysis to show its inferiority to the continuation in the text. After 11.\texttt{d}d1 0-0 12.\texttt{a}a3 – one of the two main lines of play given by Mr. Potter – the position is identical with the position in the text after White's 12th move, but for the important difference that in the latter both rooks are developed. We must recommend, however, as best reply to 11.\texttt{d}d1

the counter gambit 11...\texttt{b}5, for if 11...0-0, White should continue not with 12.\texttt{a}a3 or 12.\texttt{d}d3, but 12.\texttt{d}d5, and if 12...\texttt{xd}d5, then 13.\texttt{xd}d5, to be followed by 14.\texttt{xd}3.

11...0-0 12.\texttt{ad}1 \texttt{b}5 13.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{g}4

The text move was latterly adopted in the games between Messrs. Hirschfield and Zukertort instead of 13...\texttt{h}5, under the supposition that an attack against the queen with 14.\texttt{h}3 would be but favourable to Black, for it would permit him to retire the queen to e6 without being exposed to the decisive onslaught illustrated in the game Zukertort-Payne, Boston 1884.

14.\texttt{h}3

The attack usually proceeded with 14.\texttt{d}e4.

14...\texttt{e}6

If 14...\texttt{h}5, then 15.\texttt{e}e4, threatening to continue with 16.\texttt{g}g3 \texttt{h}6 17.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{g}5 18.\texttt{x}g5 \texttt{g}7 19.\texttt{f}f6 \texttt{h}6 20.\texttt{g}g5 \texttt{g}6 21.\texttt{f}f5 etc.

15.\texttt{x}h7+ \texttt{h}8 16.\texttt{d}d5 \texttt{b}4

17.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{xd}5 18.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{e}7 19.\texttt{e}4

He cannot proceed here as in Zukertort-Payne, with 19.\texttt{g}g5, for the white queen is debarred from entering the h-file, viz: 19.\texttt{g}g5 \texttt{xd}5 20.\texttt{g}g3 \texttt{g}6 (the only resource which prevents the immediate disaster threatened by 21.\texttt{h}h4 or 21.\texttt{e}e4) 21.\texttt{h}h4 = 21.\texttt{x}g6, then, of course, 21...\texttt{x}g6 21...\texttt{f}f5.

19...\texttt{b}7

A game, Hirschfield-Zukertort, played October 1884, continued 19...\texttt{xd}5 (played without due examination of position. Black thought he could imprison and win the hostile bishop – the next two notes) 20.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{g}6 = 20...\texttt{b}6, White would continue with 21.\texttt{e}e3!, and if 21...\texttt{b}8, with 22.\texttt{c}c4, forcing the game) 21.\texttt{xa}6 \texttt{a}6 (the attempt to imprison the king’s bishop with 21...\texttt{c}6 would be futile, for White proceeds with 22.\texttt{e}e5; and if 22...\texttt{e}e6 then 23.\texttt{a}a4) 22.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{xf}f1 23.\texttt{xf}f1 \texttt{b}6 (a weak move which, however, only hastens Black's defeat, for White's superiority of force and position must carry the day against any play) 24.\texttt{xb}b4 \texttt{d}d3+ 25.\texttt{g}g1 \texttt{c}c6 26.\texttt{h}h4+ and wins. (For if 26...\texttt{g}g8 then 27.\texttt{e}e4; if, on the other hand, 26...\texttt{h}7, then 27.\texttt{e}e7 \texttt{g}g8 (27...\texttt{g}g8 or \texttt{e}e moves, 28.\texttt{g}g5) 28.e6 \texttt{f}f6 29.\texttt{xd}d6 and 30.\texttt{e}e7+.)
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20...<br>

An ingenious attempt to keep up the attack was made in the game, Hirschfield-Zukertort, played 5 October 1884, with 20.\texttt{Af1d} \texttt{Qxd5} (after 20...\texttt{Qxd5} 21.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qxd5} [if 21...\texttt{Qb6}, then 22.\texttt{Qg5]} 22.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qb6} [or 22...\texttt{Qg6} 23.\texttt{Qxa8} \texttt{Qxa8} 24.\texttt{Qd5}]) 23.\texttt{Qxa8} \texttt{Qxa8}. White proceeds with 24.\texttt{Qxf7} \texttt{Qc5} 25.\texttt{Qe3} \texttt{Qf8} 26.\texttt{Qg6} \texttt{Qe8} 27.\texttt{Qe4} \texttt{Qb8} 28.\texttt{Qg5}) 21.\texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qxe5} 22.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qxd5} 23.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qe1+} 24.\texttt{Qh2} \texttt{Qxc1} (if 24...\texttt{Qb6}, White would force the game with 25.\texttt{Qf3} \texttt{g6} 26.\texttt{Qf6}+ \texttt{Qg8} 27.\texttt{Qb2}) 25.\texttt{Qd4} \texttt{g6} (the only move which offers a satisfactory defence. Any attempt of a defence by moving the queen would but lead to a draw, e.g., 25...\texttt{Qc2} 26.\texttt{Qxf7} (if 26.\texttt{Qf5}, then 26...\texttt{Qf8}) 26...\texttt{Qg8} 27.\texttt{Qh5} \texttt{Qxf7} 28.\texttt{Qxa8+} \texttt{Qf8} 29.\texttt{Qd5}+ \texttt{Qf7} 30.\texttt{Qa8+} \texttt{Qe7} or 25...\texttt{Qc6} 26.\texttt{Qh5}+ \texttt{Qh6} 27.\texttt{Qxf7+} \texttt{Qxf7} 28.\texttt{Qxf7} \texttt{g6} 29.\texttt{Qxa5} \texttt{Qxa5}) 26.\texttt{Qg4} (an unsound continuation; compare the following note. White had a very fair chance of drawing after 26...\texttt{Qxa5}) 26...\texttt{Qg7} (but Black omits to take advantage of White's mistake. He should secure his decisive superiority at numbers with 26...\texttt{Qb6}, for after 27.\texttt{Qh4}+ \texttt{Qg7} 28.\texttt{Qxd7} (28.\texttt{Qh7}+ \texttt{Qxh6} 29.\texttt{Qh4}+ 29...\texttt{Qf6}+ \texttt{Qe6} -- \texttt{Qh8}) 28...\texttt{Qxf2}, White's attack must soon collapse whether he proceed with 29.\texttt{Qe6}+ or 29.\texttt{Qh7+}) 27.\texttt{Qd4}+ \texttt{Qg8} (forced, for if 27...\texttt{f6}, White wins with 28.\texttt{Qxd7+}) 28.\texttt{Qh4} \texttt{Qg7} 29.\texttt{Qd4}+ \texttt{Qg8} 30.\texttt{Qh4} draw.

20...\texttt{Qxd5}

21.\texttt{Qd1}

White might continue with 21.\texttt{Qg3} \texttt{Qh6} (if 21...\texttt{Qxe4}, White gets the superiority with 22.\texttt{Qxe6} \texttt{fxe6} 23.\texttt{Qh4}+ and 24.\texttt{Qxe4} or \texttt{Qxe7} accordingly) 22.\texttt{Qxd5} (better than 22.\texttt{Qxf7+} \texttt{Qxf7} 23.\texttt{Qh6} \texttt{Qxe4}) 22...\texttt{Qxd5} 23.\texttt{Qxf7+} \texttt{Qxf7} 24.\texttt{Qh6} \texttt{gxh6} 25.\texttt{Qg6} \texttt{Qaf8} and Black's superior forces must finally carry the day.

21...\texttt{Qxe4} 22.\texttt{Qh5+}

After 22.\texttt{Qxe6} \texttt{fxe6} 23.\texttt{Qh5+}, Black would continue with 23...\texttt{Qh7}.

22...\texttt{Qg8}

Probably good enough, but Black could get here two more pieces for his queen with 22...\texttt{Qh6} 23.\texttt{Qxf7+} \texttt{Qxf7} 24.\texttt{Qh6} \texttt{Qg6}.

23.\texttt{Qxe6} \texttt{fxe6} 24.\texttt{Qh4} \texttt{Qd3}

25.\texttt{Qxe7}

If 25.\texttt{Qd1}, then of course 25...\texttt{Qf5} and 26...\texttt{Qb5}.

25...\texttt{Qxf1} 26.\texttt{Qxf1} \texttt{Qf7} 27.\texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qaf8} 28.\texttt{Qe3} \texttt{Qb6} 29.\texttt{Qxb6}

The exchange is forced: if 29.f3, then 29...\texttt{Qf5}.

29...\texttt{axb6} 30.f3 c5 31.\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qc8}

White resigns.
229 Vienna Gambit
Zukertort
Hirschfield
London 1881
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{\textit{d}3}\) \(\text{\textit{d}6}\) 3.f4 exf4
4.\(\text{\textit{f}3}\) g5 5.h4 g4 6.\(\text{\textit{g}5}\) h6
7.\(\text{\textit{x}f7}\) \(\text{\textit{x}f7}\) 8.d4 d6 9.\(\text{\textit{x}f4}\) \(\text{\textit{g}7}\)
10.\(\text{\textit{c}4+}\) \(\text{\textit{g}6}\) 11.\(\text{\textit{e}3}\) \(\text{\textit{h}7}\)

Up to here the moves for attack and defense are the outcome of innumerable games played between Messrs. Hirschfield and Zukertort in the 1870s. The established continuation was 11...\(\text{\textit{g}7}\) 12.0-0 \(\text{\textit{f}8}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{d}2}\) or \(\text{\textit{d}3}\). The two different queen moves constituted the two leading variations of the opening. The object of the text move, which was recently adopted by Zukertort, is to postpone the hostile castling, which, of course, would be met with 12...\(\text{\textit{w}xh4}\).

12.\(\text{\textit{w}d3}\)

12.\(\text{\textit{d}5}\), as played in another Hirschfield-Zukertort game, is rather premature, we think. Black might repel the attack with 12...\(\text{\textit{e}e7}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{w}d3}\) \(\text{\textit{c}6}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{f}4}\) d5 15.\(\text{\textit{e}x}d5+\) \(\text{\textit{f}5}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{d}xc6}\) \(\text{\textit{d}6}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{w}d2}\) \(\text{\textit{c}xc6}\) with a well developed game. But not 12...\(\text{\textit{g}e7}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{w}d3}\) \(\text{\textit{f}5}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{d}5}\) (Hirschfield-Zukertort) 14...\(\text{\textit{h}xg5}\) when strongest would have been 15.e5+ \(\text{\textit{f}5}\) (best) 16.\(\text{\textit{x}g5}\) \(\text{\textit{c}6}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{f}4}\) \(\text{\textit{x}g5}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{w}d2}\), winning at once due to the double threat of \(\text{\textit{e}6}\) mate and \(\text{\textit{d}6}\)+.
12...\(\text{\textit{g}e7}\)

Of course not 12...\(\text{\textit{b}4}\), for \(\text{\textit{w}d3}\) would reply with 13.e5+.
13.0-0 \(\text{\textit{f}8}\) ?

Black should continue with 13...\(\text{\textit{d}7}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{w}d2}\) \(\text{\textit{d}5}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{e}x}d5\) \(\text{\textit{d}5}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{f}1}\) \(\text{\textit{w}d8}\) 17.e5+ \(\text{\textit{h}8}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{f}6}\)

18...\(\text{\textit{f}5}\)

After 18...\(\text{\textit{xf6}} 19.\(\text{\textit{e}xf6}\) \(\text{\textit{g}8}\), White wins with 20.\(\text{\textit{f}7}\).
19.\(\text{\textit{x}f5}\) \(\text{\textit{xf5}} 20.\(\text{\textit{w}xf5}\) \(\text{\textit{xf6}}
21.\(\text{\textit{e}x}f6\) \(\text{\textit{w}f8}\) 22.\(\text{\textit{d}3}\)

Overlooking the much stronger continuation 22.\(\text{\textit{w}g6}\) and \(\text{\textit{d}6}\).
22...\(\text{\textit{f}7}\) 23.\(\text{\textit{g}x}h6\) \(\text{\textit{g}8}\) 24.\(\text{\textit{g}g7+}\)
\(\text{\textit{x}g7}\) 25.\(\text{\textit{f}xg7+}\) \(\text{\textit{w}xg7}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{w}c8+}\)
\(\text{\textit{w}g8}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{w}x}c7\) \(\text{\textit{d}x}d4\) 28.\(\text{\textit{w}x}d6\)
\(\text{\textit{e}6}\)

If 28...\(\text{\textit{f}3+}\), then 29.\(\text{\textit{w}f2}\).
29.\(\text{\textit{c}4}\)

Black resigns.
Vienna 1882

230 King's Gambit
Steinitz
Zukertort
Vienna tournament, 13 May 1882
Notes by Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Nf3 g5 4.h4 g4 5.Ne5 Nh6
It makes very little difference whether
the knight be played first in lieu of the
usual ...Bg7, which constitutes the
Paulsen defence. It amounts only to a
transposition of moves.
6.Nc4 d5 7.exd5 Ng7 8.Nc3 0-0
9.d4 Nh5 10.Ne2

10...c5
The idea of attempting to break
through with his pawn is old, and Herr
Zukertort has adopted it at various
stages of this opening against Mr.
Blackburne and Steinitz in 1872. But
we think he has hit now on the exact
point when it should be resorted to. It
may be remarked that this is the point
upon which Steinitz relied in playing
this hazardous gambit, for he had
found a flaw in the move recom-
manded by the book, viz. 10...Nh6
11.Nxf4 Nxf4 12.0-0 Nh6 (if
12...Nh3+, the pawn takes, followed
by Qd3) 13.g3 Nh3+ 14.Qg2 Qg7
15.Qh6 Qh6 16.Qxe4 Qg7
17.Qf6+, followed by Qd3 with a fine
game.

11.c3
It seems equally disadvantageous to take
the pawn in passing, e.g. 11.dxc6 Qxc6
12.Qxc6 bxc6 13.c3 (White cannot
castle on account of 13...f3, followed by
14...Qh4) 13...f3 14.gxf3 gxf3
15.Qf4 Qg3 16.Qh2 Qg4, with a fine
game.

11...cxd4 12.cxd4 Qd7
An excellent move, which as far as we
can see, gives Black the advantage in all
variations.

13.Qxd7
There seems nothing better. Of
course, the g-pawn with the knight
could not be taken, or a piece would
have been lost by the answer
13...Qb6. Again, 13.Qd3 was objec-
tionable on account of the reply
13...Qb6, followed by ...f3, and if
13.Qxf4, the game might have pro-
cceeded thus: 13...Qg3 14.Qh2 Qxe5
15.dxe5 Qxe5 16.Qd3 Qe8 with the
superior game.

13...Qxd7 14.Qd3?
A bad move, adopted under pressure of time limit. 14.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}d}2} or \texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}3} was better, though under any circumstances White had already the inferior game.

14...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}8}

Strong enough, but Black could have won here immediately by 14...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{g}e}8}, threatening 15...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{g}g}3}. If the king moved, Black could still capture the knight, followed by ...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{g}g}3}, and castling was still more out of the question on account of 15...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}2}, followed by 16...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{x}d}4+}, and 17...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{h}h}4}.

15.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{x}f}4} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}8+} 16.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}1}

The game is lost now. If the king moved on to the f-file, the reply 16...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}6} would win with facility.

16...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}5!}

Herr Zukertort conducts the attack now in excellent style.

17.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{x}h}5}

If the king's bishop moved, the reply 17...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}c}1+} would win a piece.

17...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}xc}4} 18.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}a}3} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{x}d}4} 19.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}2} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}b}6} 20.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}3}

Nothing better; if 20.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}1}, Black would move the rook to e2, threatening ...c3, followed, after sacrificing the bishop, by ...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3+}, with mate in a few moves. Again, if 20.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}1}, the answer was immediately 20...c3.

20...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3} 21.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}1}

21.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}4} would not have held out much longer, for Black would also take \texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}6} bishop with the bishop, followed by ...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}6}.

21...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{x}c}3} 22.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}c}3} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3}

23.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}xc}3}

If 23.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}xc}3}, the winning answer was

23...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}g}1+} 24.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}2} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}g}2+} 25.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3}

If 25.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}1}, Black would win a piece at

25...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}d}5+}; and if 26.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}1}, then Black would check twice, viz, at f1 and e2, followed by ...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}8}.

25...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}8+} 26.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}4}

Moving to f4, subjected Steinitz to mate in four moves by 26...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}3}, 27...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3+} 28...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}3+} etc.

26...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}e}4+} 27.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}5} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}e}7+} 28.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}6}

\texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}e}5+} 29.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}4} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{w}e}4+} 30.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}3}

\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}8+} 31.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}4} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}4+} 32.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}b4}

\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}3+} 33.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{b}b}2} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}4+}

White resigns.

23.3 Stonewall Attack

Ware

Zukertort

Vienna tournament, 15 May 1882

Notes by Zukertort

1.d4 e6 2.f4 d5 3.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}3} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{f}f}6} 4.e3

\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}5} 5.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}3} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}7} 6.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}3} \texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}6} 7.0-0

0-0 8.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{d}d}2} c4 9.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{c}c}2} b5 10.\texttt{\textit{\textsc{e}e}1} a5
11.b3?
The fabric of the 'Stonewall' is finished with all its characteristic details, but the appearance of the queen's bishop at h4, is dismissed as not advisable in the face of the adverse colleague at e7. The continuation chosen, however, in its stead is anything but favourable, for it meets half-way Black's designs to break through on the queen's side.

11...b4! 12.e5 c7 13.bxc4 dxc4 14.e2
14...a6 15.d2
14...a6 15.d2

15.bxc3?
A feeble trap to induce the opponent to reply with 16.dxc4?, which would cost a piece by 16...dxe5. Black had a continuation which would insure him a real superiority, viz: 15...b3! 16.axb3 axb3 17.d3 xd3 18.xd3 a4 and if

Vienna 1882
19.b5 then 19...dxe5 20.fxe5 f6 21.e3 or 21.e2 d5.
16.e3
16.e3 or 16.e1 were better.
16...d5 17.e4
If 17.a3 - to prevent the entry of the hostile knights - then ...ab8.
17...cxb4 18.a3 f6 19.g5
White's best continuation were 19.axb4 fxe5 20.b5! xxb5 21.xe5. It was pointed out after the conclusion of the game by Baron Heydebrand und der Lasa.
19...fxg5 20.axb4 axb4
Best, for Black can now well afford some sacrifice of material to break a hostile attack.

21.h5?
Very weak, for it affords to the opponent the opportunity to get rid of White's most important attacking piece, the king's bishop. The sacrifice of the bishop would be equally futile, viz: 21.xh7+ xh7 22.h5+ g8 23.h6 f6 24.h8+ f7 25.xf8 xh8 26.h3 g4 27.g3 b5, with an overwhelming superiority of forces.
White's best continuation were, perhaps, 21.e2, but even that would not alter the fate of the day, e.g. 21.e2 g6 22.xg6 f6 23.e4 b3 24.e2 c2 25.xd5 exd5 26.c3 b7 etc.
21...f6 22.f3 dxe4 23.xe4 b7! 24.b1 c2 25.c1 a1
26.\textit{\textbf{Wxa}}1 c3 27.\textit{\textbf{g}}3 b3 28.\textit{\textbf{W}}a4 \textit{\textbf{d}}5 29.e4

The 'Stonewall' to the rescue!

29...\textit{\textbf{A}}a8 30.\textit{\textbf{Wb}}5 b2 31.exd5 \textit{\textbf{c}}1\textit{\textbf{W}} 32.d6 \textit{\textbf{xd}}6 33.\textit{\textbf{Wb}}3 \textit{\textbf{xe}}5 34.\textit{\textbf{Wxe}}6+ \textit{\textbf{h}}8

White resigns.

232 Sicilian Defence

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textbf{Paulsen,L.}

Vienna tournament, 16 May 1882

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 c5 2.\textit{\textbf{f}}c3 \textit{\textbf{c}}6 3.\textit{\textbf{f}}f3 \textit{\textbf{b}}6

A very inferior continuation, introduced by Herr Paulsen in his first games played in the Vienna tournament. We are sure that this bad move accounts in a great measure for the adverse score originally made by the German master.

4.g3

White's best course were 4.\textit{\textbf{d}}d5 \textit{\textbf{a}}5 5.c3 \textit{\textbf{e}}6 6.\textit{\textbf{e}}e3 d6 7.\textit{\textbf{d}}3.

4...\textit{\textbf{e}}6 5.\textit{\textbf{g}}g2 \textit{\textbf{ge}}7 6.0-0 \textit{\textbf{d}}4 7.\textit{\textbf{e}}e2

After 7.\textit{\textbf{xd}}4 cxd4 8.\textit{\textbf{e}}e2, Black would slowly develop and finally get a very good game by posting his rooks in the open c-file.

7...\textit{\textbf{ec}}6 8.d3 d6 9.c3

It would be better, perhaps, to play first 9.\textit{\textbf{d}}d2 and then continue with 10.c3.

9...\textit{\textbf{xf}}3+ 10.\textit{\textbf{xf}}3 \textit{\textbf{e}}7 11.\textit{\textbf{c}}c2 0-0 12.\textit{\textbf{g}}g2 \textit{\textbf{d}}7 13.\textit{\textbf{e}}e3 \textit{\textbf{ec}}8 14.f4 f5 15.b4 \textit{\textbf{f}}xe4 16.dxe4 \textit{\textbf{a}}a6 17.bxc5 dxc5 18.\textit{\textbf{fd}}1 \textit{\textbf{cd}}8

We would prefer 18...\textit{\textbf{fd}}8.

19.\textit{\textbf{f}}f1

19...c4

A tempting but unfavourable continuation were 19...\textit{\textbf{b}}b4, and if the knight be taken, 20...\textit{\textbf{a}}4; e.g. 19...\textit{\textbf{f}}f4 20.cxb4 \textit{\textbf{a}}4 21.\textit{\textbf{w}}b2 \textit{\textbf{xd}}1 21...\textit{\textbf{xd}}1 22.\textit{\textbf{c}}c3, winning the second minor piece for the rook) 22.\textit{\textbf{xc}}4 \textit{\textbf{xd}}1 23.\textit{\textbf{c}}c3, and White wins \textit{\textbf{b}}b, bishop, for if Black attempts to protect it with 23...\textit{\textbf{d}}d6, White rejoins with 24.\textit{\textbf{xc}}5 and 25.\textit{\textbf{xe}}7.

20.\textit{\textbf{ad}}2 e5! 21.\textit{\textbf{ed}}1 e4?

Black was quite right in advancing the e-pawn on the previous move, for firstly, it secures for the end-game the exchange of his isolated pawn, which otherwise, might be fixed by White playing e5; secondly, it prevents the entry of White's minor pieces at d6. Black's 21st move, however, presents a grave error. It throws away half of the advantages just explained, establishes a hostile passed pawn, and opens for White the g-file.

22.\textit{\textbf{gf}}4 \textit{\textbf{d}}b8 23.\textit{\textbf{wb}}1 \textit{\textbf{a}}a4

Black begins herewith to mass his forces on the queen's side, altogether.
underrating the danger of his position on the opposite wing.

**24.**\( \mathcal{E} \times d 8 \) \( \mathcal{E} \times d 8 \)

It were far better to retake with the rook and thus prevent White from utilising his rook in the coming onslaught.

**25.**\( \mathcal{E} d 2 \) \( \mathcal{E} d 7 \) **26.**\( \mathcal{E} d 4 \) \( \mathcal{A} a 5 \)

**27.**\( \mathcal{E} g 2 ! \)

White effects now in a very short time a complete change of front, and gets thereby a deadly attack.

**27...**\( \mathcal{E} c 5 \)

He perceives too late that he dare not capture the pawn on account of the decisive reply **28.**\( \mathcal{E} c 1 \).

**28.**\( \mathcal{F} f 5 \) \( \mathcal{E} e 6 \) **29.**\( \mathcal{E} e 1 \) \( \mathcal{H} h 8 \)

**30.**\( \mathcal{W} g 3 g 6 \)

If **30...**\( \mathcal{E} x c 3 \), then **31.**\( \mathcal{E} d 4 \) (stronger than **31.**\( \mathcal{E} c 5 \) \( \mathcal{E} x c 5 \) **32.**\( \mathcal{W} x c 3 \) \( \mathcal{W} f 6 !)\)

**31...**\( \mathcal{E} x d 4 \) (**31...**\( \mathcal{E} f 7 \) **32.**\( \mathcal{F} f 5 \)) **32.**\( \mathcal{E} x d 4 \) \( \mathcal{G} g 8 \) **33.**\( \mathcal{E} e 5 \), followed by **34.**\( f 5 \), \( \mathcal{W} c 3 \) or \( \mathcal{E} x c 4 \) according to Black’s defence.

**31.**\( \mathcal{E} e 7 \) \( \mathcal{B} b 6 \)

**32.**\( f 5 ? \)

White should continue at once with **32.**\( \mathcal{E} x g 6 + \), for Black has no means of escape after **32...**\( h x g 6 \) **33.**\( \mathcal{W} x g 6 \) \( \mathcal{E} x e 3 +\) **34.**\( \mathcal{H} h 1 \).

**32...**\( \mathcal{E} x e 3 +\)

If **32...**\( \mathcal{G} g 7 \), probably Black’s best defence, White must win ultimately after **33.**\( f x g 6 \) \( \mathcal{E} x e 3 +\) **34.**\( \mathcal{W} x e 3 :\)

A) **34...**\( \mathcal{B} b 6 \) **35.**\( \mathcal{W} x b 6 \) \( a x b 6 \) **36.**\( \mathcal{E} c 4 \) \( \mathcal{E} e 8 \) **37.**\( \mathcal{F} f 2 \) etc.;

B) **34...**\( \mathcal{X} f 1 + \) (or **34...**\( \mathcal{W} f 6 \) **35.**\( \mathcal{G} f 5 \)) **35.**\( \mathcal{W} x f 1 \) \( \mathcal{W} f 6 + \) **36.**\( \mathcal{F} f 5 \) \( \mathcal{X} f 5 \) (of course, if **36...**\( h x g 6 \), then **37.**\( \mathcal{H} h 6 + \) \( \mathcal{G} g 8 \) **38.**\( \mathcal{E} x g 6 \)) **37.**\( e x f 5 \) \( \mathcal{W} x f 5 + \) **38.**\( \mathcal{W} f 2 \) \( \mathcal{W} b 1 + \) **39.**\( \mathcal{W} e 1 \) \( \mathcal{D} d 3 + \) **40.**\( \mathcal{G} g 1 \) \( h x g 6 \)

**41.**\( \mathcal{E} e 5 + \) \( \mathcal{G} h 7 \) (best) **42.**\( \mathcal{E} e 2 \) etc.

**33.**\( \mathcal{W} x e 3 \) \( g x f 5 \)

If now **33...**\( \mathcal{G} g 7 \), then, of course, **34.**\( \mathcal{E} x g 6 + \) \( h x g 6 \) **35.**\( \mathcal{H} h 6 + \) \( \mathcal{G} g 8 \) **36.**\( \mathcal{E} x g 6 \).

**34.**\( \mathcal{G} g 6 + \) \( \mathcal{G} g 7 \)

If the knight be taken, mate follows in three moves.

**35.**\( \mathcal{E} x f 8 + \) \( \mathcal{X} f 8 \) **36.**\( e x f 5 \)

Black resigns.

Wherever the knight may be played, **37.**\( \mathcal{W} c 5 + \) forces the game.

2.33 Scotch Game

Paulsen, L

Zukertort

Vienna tournament, 7 June 1882

Notes by Zukertort

**1.e4** \( e 5 \) **2.**\( \mathcal{F} f 3 \) \( \mathcal{C} c 6 \) **3.d4** \( e x d 4 \)

**4.**\( \mathcal{X} x d 4 \) \( \mathcal{F} f 6 \) **5.**\( \mathcal{C} c 3 \)

This continuation is invariably adopted by Herr Paulsen. The position resulting from it leads to early complications.

**5...**\( \mathcal{B} b 4 \) **6.**\( \mathcal{X} c 6 \)

The Handbuch gives here only **6.**\( \mathcal{G} g 5 \); the text move is decidedly better.

**6...**\( b x c 6 \) **7.**\( \mathcal{W} d 4 \) \( \mathcal{W} e 7 \) **8.f3** \( d 5 \)

**9.**\( \mathcal{G} g 5 ! c 5 \)
We do not think that the issue of this venture should be favourable to Black, who selected it chiefly for the sake of getting out of the routine track of a variation familiar to the opponent and novel to himself.

10...\(\text{b}5+ \text{f}8\)

White fails to hit upon the best reply, which is 11.d3, as played in the later game L.Paulsen-Chigorin. Now, after 11...d4 12.0-0-0!, Black obviously dare not take the knight, but would have to continue with 12...\(\text{b}7\), which leaves him with the inferior game. 11...\(\text{b}8\), threatening 12...\(\text{c}4\) seems Black's best continuation. The game actually continued 11...dxe4 12.fxe4 \(\text{xe}4+13.\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xc}3+14.bxc3 \text{xe}4 15.\text{c}6\) etc., but it were decidedly better to continue with 13...\(\text{xe}4\) 14.\(\text{c}6\) (if 14.0-0-0, then 14...\(\text{d}6\)) 14...\(\text{xc}3\) 15.\(\text{xa}8 \text{e}4+16.\text{c}3 \text{xc}3+\) (better than 16...\(\text{xc}5\)), 17.\(\text{xc}4 \text{cxb}418.\text{c}1 \text{e}6 19.\text{d}5\) 17.\(\text{xc}3 \text{xc}518.\text{b}1 \text{e}7 19.\text{b}8 \text{d}8\). Still, the text move contains a very fine design which but for Black's careful defence would prove successful. Tempting but ruinous would be 11.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{cxd}4\) 12.\(\text{xe}7+ \text{xe}7\) 13.a3 \(\text{dxc}3\) 14.axb4 \(\text{cxb}215.\text{b}1 \text{b}8 16.\text{c}6 \text{xb}4 17.\text{xd}5 \text{a}518.\text{d}2 \text{e}6 19.\text{c}3 \text{hb}8\) and Black must win.

11...d4 12.0-0-0

The next step of White's ingenious scheme, and far better than the commonplace reply 12.a3, which was turn out in Black's favour after 12...\(\text{dxc}3\) 13.axb4 \(\text{cxb}214.\text{b}1 \text{e}6\) etc.

12...\(\text{dxc}3\) 13.e5! h6

The only feasible reply, but in the same time securing to Black the advantage a strong counter attack. It now appear why White retreated the queen to \(f2\) threatened with his 13th move to force the mate after 14.exf6 \(\text{gxf}6\), with 15.\(\text{xe}6\) and 16.\(\text{g}3\).

11...d4 12.0-0-0

There is nothing better, for both 14.\(\text{h}4\) and 14.\(\text{b}1\) would prove inferior, e.g.

A) 14.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{hxg}515.\text{b}8\) 16.\(\text{xe}6\) 17.\(\text{f}5\), and Black has the superiority of forces and position.

B) 14.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{cxb}2+15.\text{b}1 \text{e}6\) 16.\(\text{xe}1\) \(\text{hxg}5\) (he might also play 16...\(\text{e}6\)) 17.\(\text{f}6\) 18.\(\text{xe}6\) 19.\(\text{f}6\) 20.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 21.\(\text{xc}5\) (it is obvious that the capture of the b-pawn with king or queen would lead to the loss of the bishop. 21...\(\text{ab}822.\text{c}4 \text{xe}4\) 23.\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{hd}8\) 24.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}2\), and Black must win eventually.

14...\(\text{gf}615.\text{f}4 \text{e}6\)
played with the object of preventing the retreat of White's king's bishop to c4, which would block Black's second pawn. Nevertheless, it were better to proceed at once with 15...\text{b}8, and if 16.c4, then 16...\text{e}6.

16.\text{We}3\text{b}8

17.a4

The position is of extreme difficulty, which increases with every move, and we think that White played here the best move. The capture of the h-pawn would prove detrimental to White's prospects, e.g. 17.\text{xb}6+ \text{g}8:

A) 18.\text{d}7 \text{xb}2+ 19.\text{b}1 (or 19.\text{xb}2 \text{xd}7 20.\text{xd}7 \text{d}2+ etc.) 19...\text{xa}2+ 20.\text{xa}2 \text{xe}3 21.\text{xe}3 \text{xb}5 22.\text{xc}7 (or 22.\text{d}8+ \text{g}7 23.\text{xe}8 \text{xe}8, and White cannot prevent the deadly rejoinder 24...\text{c}3, for, if 24.\text{b}3, then 24...\text{d}2+ 25.\text{c}4 \text{xe}3 26.\text{xb}5 \text{d}8 (or 26.\text{xd}8 27.\text{c}3 \text{xe}2 28.\text{xc}4 \text{xb}2 29.\text{b}1 \text{xe}2 30.\text{xe}2 \text{xe}2+ 31.\text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 32.\text{d}4) 22...\text{c}3 23.\text{xc}5 \text{xe}2 24.\text{b}1 \text{xc}5 25.\text{xc}5 \text{g}2 etc.;

B) 18.\text{d}3 (if 18.\text{c}4, then 18...\text{h}6 19.\text{xe}6 \text{xe}6, and White care not take the rook) 18...c4 19.\text{xa}7 \text{xb}2+ 20.\text{b}1 \text{dxc}3 21.\text{xb}8+ \text{h}7 22.\text{b}5 \text{xc}2+ and 23.\text{xb}6.

17...a6 18.\text{xa}6 c4 19.\text{a}7\text{g}7

At the time of play Black examined the position with the object of ascertaining whether he might not continue with 19...\text{a}3, leaving the rook en prise, he came, however, to the conclusion that after 19...\text{a}3 20.\text{xb}8+ \text{g}7 21.\text{d}6! \text{xd}6 22.\text{b}5, his position would hardly counterbalance the loss of the exchange. In playing over the game with Mr. Hirschfield, however, the latter pointed out that Black had now a winning attack with 22...\text{xb}2+ 23.\text{xb}2 (or 23.\text{d}2 \text{f}4+ etc; or 23.\text{b}1 \text{e}5 24.\text{c}3 \text{f}5+ 25.\text{xb}2 \text{c}6 26.\text{xc}4 26.\text{xc}6 \text{b}4+ 26.\text{b}+ 27.\text{c}1 \text{c}5! and wins) 23...\text{c}6 24.\text{xc}6 \text{e}5+ 25.\text{a}2 (if 25.\text{c}1, then 25...\text{f}4+; if 25.\text{c}3 or \text{b}1, then 25...\text{b}4+) 25...\text{c}+ 26.\text{c}4 \text{b}4, and wins.

20.\text{xc}7 \text{xb}2+ 21.\text{b}1 \text{xc}7

22.\text{xc}7\text{a}8

23.\text{xc}4

This fine stratagem by which White finally succeeds in averting more serious loss by the sacrifice of the exchange, shows White's deep insight into the intricacies of the position. The plausible continuation, 23.\text{b}5, would soon end disastrously, e.g. 23.\text{b}5 \text{hc}8 24.\text{g}3 (if 24.\text{d}6, then 24...\text{c}3 25.\text{a}3 \text{cb}8 26.\text{xb}2 \text{xb}2 27.\text{xc}2 \text{xc}4 and 28...\text{xb}5. Or 24.\text{b}6 \text{cb}8 25.\text{d}4 \text{xb}5 26.\text{c}3 \text{xc}3 27.\text{xc}3 \text{f}5+) 24...\text{c}3 25.\text{d}4 (Black threatens
25...\texttt{\textipa{h}c5} and 26...\texttt{\textipa{x}xb5} and likewise
25...\texttt{\textipa{x}xa4} 26...\texttt{\textipa{x}xa4} \texttt{\textipa{a}8} 25...\texttt{\textipa{c}5}
26...\texttt{\textipa{d}3} \texttt{\textipa{e}7} 27...\texttt{\textipa{c}e}1 \texttt{\textipa{b}4} 28...\texttt{\textipa{d}4} \texttt{\textipa{d}8}
29...\texttt{\textipa{x}d8} \texttt{\textipa{d}x8} 30...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} \texttt{\textipa{d}2} 31...\texttt{\textipa{d}3} \texttt{\textipa{d}7}, and White's game is defenceless.

23...\texttt{\textipa{x}xc4} 24...\texttt{\textipa{d}d4} \texttt{\textipa{xa}4} 25...\texttt{\textipa{c}c4} \texttt{\textipa{a}1+}

After 25...\texttt{\textipa{c}c8} 26...\texttt{\textipa{g}4+} \texttt{\textipa{h}7} 27...\texttt{\textipa{x}xb2} f5 (or 27...\texttt{\textipa{x}c7}) White would equalise
the game at least with 28...\texttt{\textipa{b}3}.

26...\texttt{\textipa{x}xb2} \texttt{\textipa{a}xh1} 27...\texttt{\textipa{xb}4} \texttt{\textipa{c}8} 28...\texttt{\textipa{d}6} \texttt{\textipa{c}6}

It were better to continue with
28...\texttt{\textipa{d}1} 29...\texttt{\textipa{g}4+} (29...\texttt{\textipa{f}4} \texttt{\textipa{g}1}; or
29...\texttt{\textipa{b}6} \texttt{\textipa{d}2}) 29...\texttt{\textipa{h}7} 30...\texttt{\textipa{f}4} h5 etc.

29...\texttt{\textipa{d}4} f5 30...\texttt{\textipa{c}4} \texttt{\textipa{g}1} 31...\texttt{\textipa{g}4} \texttt{\textipa{f}1}
32...\texttt{\textipa{g}xf5} f5 33...\texttt{\textipa{g}1} 34...\texttt{\textipa{f}4} \texttt{\textipa{e}6}

The immediate capture is necessary to
cut off the adverse king.

33...\texttt{\textipa{e}5}+ f6 34...\texttt{\textipa{f}4} \texttt{\textipa{c}5} 35...\texttt{\textipa{d}6} \texttt{\textipa{x}xf5} 36...\texttt{\textipa{c}5} \texttt{\textipa{g}5}! 37...\texttt{\textipa{d}2} \texttt{\textipa{f}7}
38...\texttt{\textipa{c}6} \texttt{\textipa{b}5}+

39...\texttt{\textipa{c}2}

If 39...\texttt{\textipa{c}1}, Black wins with 39...\texttt{\textipa{c}3}+ 40...\texttt{\textipa{c}2} \texttt{\textipa{x}xc2}+ 41...\texttt{\textipa{x}xc2} \texttt{\textipa{b}6} 42...\texttt{\textipa{c}7}
\texttt{\textipa{c}6}+ 43...\texttt{\textipa{b}3} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 44...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} h5
45...\texttt{\textipa{b}4} h4 46...\texttt{\textipa{b}5} \texttt{\textipa{c}2} 47...\texttt{\textipa{f}4} \texttt{\textipa{d}7}
48...\texttt{\textipa{b}4} (48...\texttt{\textipa{b}6} \texttt{\textipa{c}4}) 48...\texttt{\textipa{f}5} 49...\texttt{\textipa{b}3}
\texttt{\textipa{f}2} 50...\texttt{\textipa{e}5} f4 51...\texttt{\textipa{c}4} \texttt{\textipa{x}h2} 52...\texttt{\textipa{x}f4}
\texttt{\textipa{f}2}. After 39...\texttt{\textipa{a}2} \texttt{\textipa{c}3} 40...\texttt{\textipa{c}7} \texttt{\textipa{c}6}
41...\texttt{\textipa{e}2}, Black wins with 41...\texttt{\textipa{a}6}+ 42...\texttt{\textipa{a}3} \texttt{\textipa{c}5}.

39...\texttt{\textipa{b}6} 40...\texttt{\textipa{c}7} \texttt{\textipa{c}6}+ 41...\texttt{\textipa{d}1}

After 41...\texttt{\textipa{b}2} \texttt{\textipa{f}c3} 42...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} (42...\texttt{\textipa{f}c3} 43...\texttt{\textipa{e}d7} h5 44...\texttt{\textipa{g}4} Black may give one rook for bishop and pawn, for the white king being cut off, the passed pawn must win without difficulty.

41...\texttt{\textipa{f}c3}! 42...\texttt{\textipa{f}4}

If 42...\texttt{\textipa{d}4}, with the intention of avoiding the exchange of rooks, then
42...\texttt{\textipa{c}c4} 43...\texttt{\textipa{d}d3} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 44...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} h5 etc.

42...\texttt{\textipa{c}1}+ 43...\texttt{\textipa{e}2} \texttt{\textipa{c}2}
44...\texttt{\textipa{x}c2} \texttt{\textipa{x}c2}+ 45...\texttt{\textipa{f}3}
45...\texttt{\textipa{d}3} \texttt{\textipa{c}6} 46...\texttt{\textipa{d}4} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} would lead to a similar line of play as in the text, i.e., White must play his king on the kingside to stop the adverse passed pawn.

45...\texttt{\textipa{h}5} 46...\texttt{\textipa{g}3}? \texttt{\textipa{c}4}

With the intention of preventing 47...\texttt{\textipa{h}4}, but overlooking an easy way should White venture this move, e.g.,
46...\texttt{\textipa{c}3}+ 47...\texttt{\textipa{h}4} \texttt{\textipa{g}6} 48...\texttt{\textipa{d}6} etc.
48...\texttt{\textipa{h}3} \texttt{\textipa{c}4} 49...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} \texttt{\textipa{f}5} etc.
48...\texttt{\textipa{d}4}+ 49...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} \texttt{\textipa{f}5} 50...\texttt{\textipa{f}3} etc.
50...\texttt{\textipa{h}3} h4 51...\texttt{\textipa{g}2} \texttt{\textipa{c}3} etc.
50...\texttt{\textipa{c}3}+ 51...\texttt{\textipa{e}2} \texttt{\textipa{e}4} 52...\texttt{\textipa{d}2} \texttt{\textipa{c}c} 53...\texttt{\textipa{g}3} or \texttt{\textipa{e}7} f5 etc.

47...\texttt{\textipa{f}3} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 48...\texttt{\textipa{e}3} \texttt{\textipa{d}5}

After 48...\texttt{\textipa{d}7} 49...\texttt{\textipa{d}3} \texttt{\textipa{x}c7} 50...\texttt{\textipa{x}c7} \texttt{\textipa{x}c7}, White draws with 51...\texttt{\textipa{e}4} \texttt{\textipa{d}e} 52...\texttt{\textipa{f}5} \texttt{\textipa{e}7} 53...\texttt{\textipa{g}6} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 54...\texttt{\textipa{x}h5} \texttt{\textipa{e}5} 55...\texttt{\textipa{f}5} 56...\texttt{\textipa{g}6} etc.

49...\texttt{\textipa{d}3} h4

50...\texttt{\textipa{e}3}?
Better were 50...\texttt{d}d6, for Black would but draw if continuing with 50...\texttt{x}xd6
51.\texttt{xc}x4 \texttt{xc}7 52.\texttt{d}d5 \texttt{d}d7 53.\texttt{e}e4
\texttt{e}e6 54.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{f}5 55.\texttt{f}f3! \texttt{e}e5 56.\texttt{e}e3
\texttt{f}4+ 57.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{g}g5 58.\texttt{f}f2 \texttt{e}e4 59.\texttt{e}e2
\texttt{f}3+ 60.\texttt{f}f2 \texttt{f}f4 61.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}e3 62.\texttt{f}f1
and Black will stalemate whichever pawn he advance.
50 .. \texttt{e}e4+ 51.\texttt{f}f3
After 51.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{e}e8, Black wins easily whatever White play, e.g.: 
A) 52.h3 \texttt{c}c6 53.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{d}d7 54.\texttt{d}d5
\texttt{e}e1 55.\texttt{c}c5 \texttt{h}h1 56.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{h}h3
57.\texttt{e}e4 \texttt{b}b3 58.\texttt{f}f5 \texttt{h}h3 59.\texttt{g}g4 \texttt{b}b4; 
B) 52.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{e}e4 53.\texttt{d}d6 \texttt{f}5 54.\texttt{c}c4
\texttt{f}4 55.\texttt{b}b5 \texttt{f}3 56.\texttt{c}c5 \texttt{d}d3 57.\texttt{c}c6
\texttt{e}e2 etc; 
C) 52.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}e5 53.\texttt{e}e1 (53.\texttt{e}e3, then 53...
\texttt{d}d6+; if 53.\texttt{e}e3, then 53...
\texttt{f}5 54.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{f}4 55.\texttt{e}e6 \texttt{e}e4 etc.)
53...\texttt{h}h3 54.\texttt{g}g3+ \texttt{f}f5 55.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{g}g4
56.\texttt{d}d5 \texttt{f}5 57.\texttt{d}d6 \texttt{f}4 58.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{f}f3
59.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}e4 60.\texttt{d}d7 \texttt{a}a8 61.\texttt{c}c8
\texttt{xc}x8 62.\texttt{xc}c8 \texttt{f}3 63.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}e3 and
wins.
51...\texttt{e}e8

52.\texttt{g}g4
Making matters easy: 52.\texttt{d}d2 were probably White's best move, but even then he would not save the day, we
think. The variations are innumerable, and we may, therefore, select one which illustrates the modus operandi best:
52.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}e5 53.\texttt{f}f4+ \texttt{f}f5 54.\texttt{h}h3 \texttt{a}a8
55.\texttt{d}d6 \texttt{e}e6 56.\texttt{c}c5 (or 56.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{a}a3+
57.\texttt{e}e4 \texttt{d}d7 etc.) 56...\texttt{d}d7 57.\texttt{b}b6
(or 57.\texttt{e}e4 \texttt{a}a4+ 58.\texttt{d}d5 \texttt{a}a5 etc.)
57...\texttt{a}a4 58.\texttt{g}g2 \texttt{a}a6 and wins.
52...\texttt{e}e4 53.\texttt{d}d6 \texttt{f}5+ 54.\texttt{x}xh4
54.\texttt{f}f5 56.\texttt{g}g3 \texttt{e}e8 57.\texttt{h}h4
\texttt{xc}7 58.\texttt{xc}7
Desperate, but there is nothing to be done, for if 58.h5, then 58...\texttt{g}g7+
59.\texttt{h}h4 \texttt{x}xg3! 60.\texttt{x}xg3 \texttt{e}e3 61.h6 \texttt{f}f2
62.h7 \texttt{f}f1 63.\texttt{h}h6 \texttt{h}h3
58...\texttt{f}f2 59.\texttt{h}h5 \texttt{f}f1 60.\texttt{d}d8 \texttt{f}f5+
61.\texttt{h}h6 \texttt{f}f4
White resigns.

234 Italian Game
Schwarz
Zukertort
Vienna tournament, 13 June 1882
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{c}c6 3.\texttt{c}c4 \texttt{c}c5
4.0-0 \texttt{f}f6 5.d3 d6 6.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{g}g4
7.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{d}d4 8.\texttt{xd}d4 \texttt{xd}d4
9.\texttt{b}b1? \texttt{wd}d7 10.\texttt{h}h1
After 10.h3 \texttt{a}a5 11.\texttt{g}g4 \texttt{xd}x4
12.\texttt{xd}x4, Black comes out with three
pawns and the exchange for a piece with
12...\texttt{f}f6 13.\texttt{de}2 \texttt{x}xh3 14.\texttt{f}f3
\texttt{xf}3 15.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{xf}3.
10...\texttt{b}b6
Necessary now to avoid the exchange of
one of Black's bishops against the hos­
tile king's knight.
11.\texttt{e}e2\texttt{c}6
11...\texttt{h}h5 would be premature on ac­
count of 12.\texttt{d}d5.
12.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{h}h5 13.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{f}f4
14.\texttt{wd}1 \texttt{h}h5 15.\texttt{c}c3 0-0-0 16.\texttt{b}b4 \texttt{d}d5
17.\texttt{exd}5
After 17.\texttt{xe}5?, Black wins a piece
with 17...\texttt{xd}1 18.\texttt{xd}7 \texttt{xd}7.
17... cxd5 18...b3 e7 19...c2 b8

Preparing the decisive attack in the centre. 19...xf3 would be favourable to White.

20...g1

20...e1 would be better.

---

20...d4 21.cxd4 xd4 22...c4 c8!

Better than at once 22...hd8, for the text move forces the hostile queen to leave the best square at her command and it enables Black later on to capture the d-pawn, attacking the queen.

23...b3 c8 24.f3

25...xe6 xd3 26...c4

If 26...f5, then, of course, 26...g5. After 26...b2 xe6 27...c2 d2 28.g3

Black forces the game with 28...xc1

29.gxf4 xh2+ 30...g1 dd2.

26...fxe6 27...d1 d2 28.g3

28...c8! 29...e4

After 29...xc8+ xc8 30.gxf4, Black wins with 30...h4.

29...cc2 30...f2 xf2

31...xe5+ c7

White resigns.

Should White change queens and then take the knight, Black wins by capturing the knight.

---

235 Bird's Opening

Fritz

Zukertort

Mannheim, 15 July 1882

Notes by Hoffer

1.f4 e6 2...f3 d5 3.e3...f6 4.b3...e7 5...b2 0-0 6...d3

This development is frequently adopted by first-class players in giving the odds
of the queen's knight, but it is not commendable against a player of equal strength, and most decidedly bad against such an opponent as Dr. Zukertort.

6...c5 7.e5 bd7 8.g4
Both 7.e5 and the last move are premature. White is not developed enough to adopt such a bold line of play.

8...xe5 9.xe5 d7 10.b2
10.xc3 was preferable, because Black could gain no time in playing the next move.

10...f6
Much better than 10...h4+, Black's object being to get rid of this bishop, in order to have a clear diagonal for his queen.

11.c3 xc3! 12.xc3 Wh4+
13.f1

13.e5! 14.fxe5
If 14.f5 instead, Black obtains an overwhelming attack, with 14...d4 15.b2 Wh3+ 16.f2 Wh6 17.e2 h5, and White's position is hopeless.

14...f6! 15.e6 xe5 16.e7?
Decidedly a blunder. 16.f5 would have given a fair chance of resistance, e.g.

16.f5 g6 17.e7 xe8 18.xc8 xxc8
19.xe5 fxe5 20.f3 e4 21.g2 xe7
22.e2, and, if Black takes the open f-file with either rook, White opposes his rook, and, after the exchange of pieces, Black retains only a superior pawn position for the end game.

16.xg4!
The sacrifice of the rook is as brilliant as it is sound; and Black is sure to seize the opportunity of an elegant finish so rare in modern times, against a strong opponent.

17.exf8+w+ xf8 18.xe5
The last chance of prolonging the game, had Black been eager to take the queen, as White would have saved the bishop by attacking the queen on g3, and retained two pieces for the queen.

18...fxe5+
White resigns.

This little game, played for a special prize given by the Mannheim Chess Club, is illustrative of the judgement which is required in the conduct of irregular games. Both players have to rely on their own resources, and superior ingenuity must tell.

236 Evans Gambit
Dupré
Zukertort
Rotterdam, 29 July 1882
Notes from Times Democrat
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.c4 c5
4.b4 xb4 5.c3 a5 6.d4 exd4
7.0-0 dxc3 8.wb3 w6 9.e5 wg6
10.xc3 ge7 11.e2
Zukertort thinks that 11.a3 is the strongest attack against the Compromised Defence.

11...b5 12.e4 d3 e6 13.b2 d6 14.f4 e4 15.xf4 e6
Up to here the books are unanimous, but Black’s last move is controversial. Steinitz considers 15...h6, to prevent g5, as the best response, the Handbuch and Zukertort prefer the text move.

16.xad1
The correct line of attack is the following, which has been adopted by Fritz against Zukertort: 16.g5 e7 17.e6! dxe6 (if 17...fxe6 18.xh7) 18.xg7 etc. If the moves of Zukertort’s defence are the best in this variation, 15...h6 is obligatory for Black.

16...h6 17.g3 b7 18.h4?

19.g5!
The first move of a beautiful and very concealed combination, which the opponent had not seen, since he would have to reply 20.fxg5.

20.f5 b6+ 21.f2 gxh4!
A master combination, as difficult to meet in an actual game as it is to say whether or not it is sound; in any case its adoption is perfectly justified.

22.xb6 axb6+ 23.h1?
This move, which allows ...h3, is clearly weak; here White ought to have played 23.xf2 g8 (best; if 23...h3 23.g5 24.xf1 xf2 25.xf2 xg2+ (stronger than 25...xg2) 26.xe1 h3 27.xg2 dxe6 (if 27...fxe6 28.f6! etc.) 28.fxe6 fxe6 29.e2 g6 30.f6 with a splendid attack.

23...h3 24.d2 g8 25.ff2

25...0-0-0!
It is a singular position which allows a move such as this. White’s game is such that he cannot effectively make either an attacking or a defensive move.

26.f1 xf2 27.xf2 hxg2 28.xg2
There is nothing better. Mr. Dupont rightly said that the struggle could be prolonged by 28.xg2, but that the game could not be saved: 28.xg2 xg5 29.wf2 g5 30.h4 xh4 31.xh6 xg8 32.xh6 c6 33.a4 xg2 34.xg2 xg2 35.wf8+ db7 36.wf6!, threatening 37...g7 and wins.

28.xg2 29.xg2 g8
White resigns.
London 1883

237 Spanish Game
Chigorin
Zukertort
London tournament, 26 April 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.d4 d6 3.d5 e6 4.f3 f3 b5 d6
5.dxe4 c6 6.d5 e7 7.dxe5 cxd5

New, but no improvement on the usual continuations 7.dxc6 or 7.e2.
7...dxc6 8.dxc6
After 8.dxe5 cxd5 9.exd5 e6 and 10...0-0, Black has the better developed game.

8...f6! 9.cxb7
d5 would be met with 9...bxc6 10.wxc6+ d7 11.d5 b8 12.b3 c6 etc.
9...xb7 10.e3
If 10.e3, I intended to proceed with 10...d5, keeping the two bishops and a well-developed game.
10...0-0 11.b2 f8
Preparing the advance of the f-pawn and e-pawn.
12.b2 f5 13.b3 f4 14.a3 c5 e4
15.b4
I do not think that White has any continuation which would equalise the game, but the defensive moves 15.bxd2 or 15.exd7 seem to be better.

15..f3 16.b5
Obviously overlooking the extreme danger of his position. 16.e3 or c4 would be a little better, while 16.exf3 leads to immediate loss with 16...dxc5 17.e6 f6 18.(any)xc5 g6+ 19.h1 exf3.

16.wc8 17.f3 d6 18.a4

18.g5
If 18..g4+, then, of course, 19.xf3. Black threatens now to mate in four moves, beginning with 19..h3+ or 19..f4+ accordingly.

19.xf3 exf3 20.ed7 fxg2!
21.e7
If 21.ex7, Black wins with 21..h3+ 22.xg2 b7+ 23.xh3 (or 23.g3) 23..f3+ 24.xh4 f4+ etc.
21..h3+ 22.xg2 f4+
23.f3 wh3+ 24.e4 h7+
25.d4 e6+ 26.c4
Of course, if 26.ex6, then equally 26..f4+ etc.

26..f4+ 27..d4 xxc5 28.xc5
If 28..e8+, Black replies best 28..f7.
28..h5+ 29.c4 xd4+
White resigns.
238 Scotch Game

Mortimer

Zukertort

London tournament, 27 April 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3.d4 exd4
4.\(\text{\text{c4}}\) \(\text{\text{c5}}\) 5.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 6.\(\text{c3}\)
\(\text{\text{g7}}\) 7.\(\text{\text{c4}}\) \(\text{e5}\) 8.\(\text{\text{e2}}\) \(\text{\text{g6}}\)
9.\(\text{\text{f3}}\)

If 9.0-0, Black proceeds best with 9...d5.

9...0-0 10.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{d3}+\) 11.\(\text{f1}\) f5

If 11...\(\text{\text{xh}}\)b2, then 12.\(\text{\text{c2}}\).

12.exf5 \(\text{xf5}\) 13.\(\text{\text{xf5}}\) \(\text{xf5}\)

Of course not 14.\(\text{e4}\), for Black would mate in three moves, beginning with 14...\(\text{\text{xf2}}+!\).

14...\(\text{\text{xe3}}\) 15.\(\text{\text{xd3}}\) \(\text{\text{b6}}\) 16.\(\text{d1}\)
\(\text{d6}\) 17.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{e6}\) 18.b3 h6
19.\(\text{\text{g3}}\) \(\text{\text{f7}}\) 20.\(\text{\text{g1}}\) a5 21.h3 a4
22.c4 axb3 23.axb3 \(\text{a3}\) 24.\(\text{\text{b1}}\)

24...\(\text{d7}\)! 25.\(\text{e1}\)

The text move leads to decisive loss of material, but it is difficult to suggest any satisfactory rejoinder. If 25.\(\text{h2}\) then 25...\(\text{\text{xh3}}\); if, on the other hand, 25.\(\text{b2}\), then 25...\(\text{f6}\), threatening 26...\(\text{a2}\).

25...\(\text{xb3}\) 26.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{bxf3}\)
27.gxf3 \(\text{\text{xf6}}\) 28.\(\text{\text{c3}}\) \(\text{f4}\)
29.\(\text{\text{e4}}\) \(\text{\text{f5}}\)

Threatening to capture the knight, =:

if the pawn retake, to mate at \(\text{f2}\).

30.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{xf3}\) 31.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{f4}\) 32.\(\text{c5}\)
\(\text{\text{xe4}}\) 33.\(\text{\text{xe4}}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 34.\(\text{\text{xb6}}\)
\(\text{c6}\) 35.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e1}\) 36.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{e8}\)
37.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xb6}\) 38.\(\text{d2}\) d5 39.\(\text{c3}\)
\(\text{xf7}\) 40.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e6}\) 41.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{b4}\)
42.\(\text{e3}\) c5 43.\(\text{\text{f3}}\) c4 44.\(\text{\text{e3}}\)
\(\text{d6}\) 45.\(\text{e8}\) c3 46.\(\text{d8}\) \(\text{e7}\)
47.\(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{c4}\) 48.\(\text{d1}\) b5 49.\(\text{\text{e3}}\)
b4 50.\(\text{f1}\) b3 51.\(\text{d3}\) c2

White resigns.

239 Queen’s Gambit

Mason

Zukertort

London tournament, 30 April 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.c4 e6 2.e3 \(\text{\text{f6}}\) 3.\(\text{\text{f3}}\) d5 4.\(\text{d4}\)
\(\text{e7}\) 5.\(\text{\text{c3}}\) 0-0 6.\(\text{d3}\) b6

7.cxd5

Early exchanges of the centre pawns ±
all close openings of this sort, whether
made by the first or second player, are
not advantageous. It would be impossible
to frame a strict rule on the point;
in fact, the delicate handling of pawns
and other developing movements ±
close openings must entirely depend
upon the judgement of the player — but
ceteris paribus, the game should be
fully developed on both wings before
entering on any direct line of action.
7...exd5 8.\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{e}\text{5}\)
Leading to an exchange by which the opponent gains time in the development of his forces on the queen’s side.

8...\text{\texttt{b}}7 9.0-0 c5 10.\text{\texttt{d}}2 \text{\texttt{c6}}
11.\text{\texttt{xc}}6 \text{\texttt{xc}}6 12.\text{\texttt{c}}1
Having once begun to exchange the centre pawns, he should go on with it.

12.c4 13.b1 b5 14.e2 b4
15.g3 a5 16.e1

16...a4
At the first examination of the game I thought that I ought to have secured my king’s position against any attack with 16...e8 and 17.f8. Further analysis, however, convinced me that I was perfectly justified in pursuing at once the advantage already gained.

17.f5 a3 18.e4
The only promising reply: it is obvious that 18.bxa3 would cost a piece on account of 18...c3.

18.axb2 19.c2 a4
Necessary to avoid the loss of a piece threatened with 20.e7+ xe7 21.exd5.

20.e5 e8 21.g4 xc2
The capture is ill-judged. The rook could not escape (22.b2? c3) and it blocked completely the action of the king's bishop. Black should have continued at once with 21...a6, leaving to the opponent the task of freeing his own pieces.

22.xc2 a6 23.h6+

23.xh6
The sacrifice of the exchange is not absolutely necessary, but it enabled Black to resume at once his attack on the queen’s side, which ought to lead to victory against any play.

24.xh6 a5 25.f1
The only reply which prevents Black from advancing the pawn to b3 with decisive effect, e.g. 25.d2? b3! 26.xa5 bxc2, and Black wins by queening one of his pawns.

25.xa2 26.f5! g6 27.d7! b3! 28.xe7 g7 29.b1 c3! 30.c5 c2 31.xc2

31.e6?
An over-finessing move which might have led to the loss of the game. I had originally intended to continue with 31...bxc2, but after re-examining the position I adopted the text move, over-
looking the power of White's 34th move – see next note. White could not save the game after 31...bxc2 32...xc2 a8! (various commentators have suggested here all sorts of continuations, overlooking the rook's move, which wins offhand) 33.g4 (he cannot prevent 33...a1, but he may postpone it by providing an escape for his own king) 33...e6 34.g2 (if 34.e3, then 34...a1 etc.) 34...xd4 35.b1 (or 35.d3 or c7, c4 etc.) 35...b3 and wins.

32...xd5 bxc2 33...xa2 a8 34.d5!
I expected here 34.b1, whereupon I intended to proceed with 34...xb1+ 35.xb1 xd4 36.f1 c2. But here again my calculation was imperfect, for White may secure at least a draw with 37.c1 a3 38.xb2 xb2 39.xb2 c4 40.c3.

34...b1 35.c4 g7

36.e6?
A slip: White should have come out with a winning advantage by first blocking the egress of the hostile knight with 36.g4, and then continuing with c1.

36...fxe6 37.dxe6 b3 38.c7
The exchange of queens would lead to a draw, viz: 38...xb3 cxb3 39.e7 b1 40.c1 (White would lose after 40.c1? f7 41.f1 f5 42.g5 b4 and 43.b3) 40.f7 41.e8 f1 42.f1 e5 etc.

38...xe6 39.e7 d5
Threatening to cut off the bishop with g5.

40.h4 c6 41.e1 e8
I think that Black had considerable chances of scoring a victory after 41...b1 42.c1 f8.

42.a3 d8 43.b3! f7
44.e3 c8 45.c1 c4
46.f3+ g8 47.f6! g7
48.b2 f7 49.d4 h5 50.c1 h7 51.d3
White should have been satisfied with the draw which he would secure here and some moves later on by exchanging queens and minor pieces.

51...c4 52.d4 f7 53.e5 c7 54.f6 d8! 55.f3 f5
56.e2 c8 57.g3?

57...xg3! 58.f3
He had a much better chance of drawing after 58.fxg3 b6+ 59.g2 xb2 60.e7+ h8 61.e3 etc., than by the course actually adopted, for his pawns are now broken up and the black knight gets a commanding position.

58...f5 59.e4 c4 60.b7+ c8 61.b6 g4+ 62.h1
62.f1 d1+ 63.g2 xh4+ 64.h2 d6+ would lead to the same continuation, but two moves earlier.
62...\h1xh4+ 63.\g1g2 \g1g4+
64.\h1h1 \d1d1+ 65.\g2g2 \h4h4+
66.\h2h2 \d6d6+ 67.\g1g1 \f3f3+
68.\xf1f1
If 68.\g2g2, Black wins with 68...\h2h2+
69.\f1f1 \d2d2+ 70.\h2h2 moves \e7e7+ etc.
68...\a6a6+ 69.\g2g2 \h4h4+
70.\h2h2 \c8c8
71.\b6b6
71.\b4b4 would but prolong the contest for a few more moves, e.g. 71.\b4b4 \f3f3+
72.\g2g2 (best) 72...\f7f7 73.\e4e4 \g5g5
74.\e3e3 (if 74.\xc2c2, Black mates in two moves; if 74.\xc2c2, then 74.\xe4e4
75.\xc8c8 \xf2f2+ and 76...\xb2b2)
74...\g4g4+ 75.\f1f1 (75.\g3g3 \xf2f2+
76.\xd2d2 \d4d4+ etc.) 75...\e4e4.
71...\f3f3+ 72.\g2g2 \g4g4+ 73.\f1f1 \e7e7
White resigns.

240 Four Knights Game
Mackenzie
Zukertort
London tournament, 1 May 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\f3f3 \c6c6 3.\b5b5 \f6f6
4.\c3c3 \b4b4 5.0-0 0-0 6.d3 d6
7.\xc6c6 is a little better. The text move gives a slight superiority of position to the second player.
7...\xc3c3 8.bxc3 \e7e7 9.\d2d2 \g6g6

10.\h4h4? \h4h4 11.\h4h4 \xe4e4!
12.\xd8d8
12.dxe4 \h4h4 would leave White with three isolated and double pawns against four united.
12...\xd2d2 13.\xc7c7 \f1f1 14.\xf1f1
After 14.\xd6d6 \d2d2 15.\xf8f8 \xf8f8
16.\d1d1, Black comes out a piece ahead with 16...a6 17.\a4a4 b5.
14...a6 15.\a4a4
If 15.\c4c4, the reply would be 15...\d7d7, to be followed at the earliest opportunity with ...
15...\c6c6.
15...b5 16.\b3b3 \b7b7 17.\xd6d6
16.\e8e8 18.\c4c6 19.\f3f3
Preparing the attack against the black e-pawn; if at once 19.\e1e1, then 19...\e4.
19...\xc4c4 20.\xc4c4
White's sole aim should be to prevent the hostile rooks from entering into promising action. He should, therefore, retake, I think, with the pawn, which would enable him to block the queen's file by playing c5.
20...\a4a4 21.\e1e1
If 21.c3, Black would succeed in exchanging bishops or winning a pawn with 21...\b5b5.
21...\xc2c2 22.\xe5e5 \a4a4 23.\f3f3
24.\b5b5 24.\b3b3
Vainly endeavouring to escape the fatal exchange.
24...\xd3d3+ 25.\f2f2 \c8c8
26.\e3e3 \c4c4 27.\g3g3
27...\textit{Qxb}3! 28.\textit{axb}3

There is nothing better, for after
28.\textit{\textit{B}}xg7+ \textit{\textit{B}}f8 29.\textit{\textit{axb}}3, \textit{\textit{B}}l wins a
piece with 29...\textit{\textit{B}}xe5. If 28.\textit{\textit{B}}xg7, then
28...\textit{\textit{B}}c2+ 29.\textit{\textit{B}}f3 (29.\textit{\textit{B}}f1 \textit{\textit{B}}c4+ etc.)
29...\textit{\textit{D}}d5+ 30.\textit{\textit{B}}g4 \textit{\textit{B}}xg7.

28...\textit{g}6 29.\textit{\textit{B}}f3 \textit{\textit{B}}c2+ 30.\textit{\textit{B}}g3 \textit{\textit{f}}6!

A temporary sacrifice which enables
\textit{B}lack to simplify matters.

31.\textit{\textit{B}}xf6 \textit{\textit{B}}xe2 32.\textit{\textit{D}}d3 \textit{\textit{B}}xg2+
33.\textit{\textit{B}}f3 \textit{\textit{B}}xd2 34.\textit{\textit{B}}e3 \textit{\textit{B}}f2+
35.\textit{\textit{B}}e4

After 35.\textit{\textit{B}}g3 \textit{\textit{B}}g2+, \textit{\textit{B}}lwhite must
equally submit to the exchange of
rooks, for if 36.\textit{\textit{B}}h3 then 36...\textit{\textit{B}}xh2+
37.\textit{\textit{B}} moves \textit{\textit{B}}c2+ 38.\textit{\textit{B}}f3 \textit{\textit{B}}h3+ etc.

35...\textit{\textit{B}}fe2 36.\textit{\textit{B}}h4 \textit{\textit{B}}f7 37.\textit{\textit{B}}xe2
\textit{\textit{B}}xe2+ 38.\textit{\textit{B}}d3 \textit{\textit{B}}f2 39.\textit{\textit{B}}g5 \textit{\textit{B}}e6
40.\textit{\textit{B}}c4 \textit{\textit{B}}f5 41.\textit{\textit{B}}c5 \textit{\textit{B}}c2+
42.\textit{\textit{B}}b4 \textit{\textit{B}}e4 43.\textit{\textit{B}}a5 \textit{\textit{B}}d5
44.\textit{\textit{B}}xa6 \textit{\textit{B}}b2 45.\textit{\textit{B}}b6 \textit{\textit{B}}xb3+
46.\textit{\textit{B}}c7 \textit{\textit{B}}e6 47.\textit{\textit{B}}d8 \textit{\textit{B}}b8+
48.\textit{\textit{B}}c7 \textit{\textit{B}}f8 49.\textit{\textit{B}}h6 \textit{\textit{B}}f5

White resigns.

\textbf{241 Queen’s Gambit}

\textbf{Skipworth}

\textbf{Zukertort}

\textit{\textit{B}}london \textit{\textit{B}}ltournament, 3 \textit{\textit{B}}lMay \textit{\textit{B}}l883

\textit{\textit{B}}lnotes by Zukertort

1.\textit{\textit{B}}c4 \textit{\textit{B}}e6 2.\textit{\textit{B}}e3 \textit{\textit{B}}f6 3.\textit{\textit{B}}f3 \textit{\textit{B}}d5 4.\textit{\textit{B}}d4
\textit{\textit{B}}e7 5.\textit{\textit{B}}c3 0-0 6.\textit{\textit{B}}d3 \textit{\textit{B}}b6 7.0-0
\textit{\textit{B}}c5 8.\textit{\textit{B}}xd5 \textit{\textit{B}}xd5 9.\textit{\textit{B}}e4? \textit{\textit{B}}xd4

Black fails to take full advantage of
\textit{\textit{B}}lWhite’s premature advance. \textit{\textit{B}}lhe should
continue with 9...\textit{\textit{B}}c4 10.\textit{\textit{B}}c2 (10.\textit{\textit{B}}e2
\textit{\textit{B}}xe4 11.\textit{\textit{B}}xe4 \textit{\textit{B}}xe4, and \textit{\textit{B}}lBlack will
\textit{\textit{B}}lcome out a pawn ahead) 10...\textit{\textit{B}}xe4
11.\textit{\textit{B}}xe4 \textit{\textit{B}}b7, with the vastly superior
\textit{\textit{B}}lposition of pawns.

10.\textit{\textit{B}}xd5 \textit{\textit{B}}xd5 11.\textit{\textit{B}}ed5 \textit{\textit{B}}f6

Of course, if 11...\textit{\textit{B}}xd5, then 12.\textit{\textit{B}}xd5+
12.\textit{\textit{B}}c2 \textit{\textit{B}}b7 13.\textit{\textit{B}}xh7+ \textit{\textit{B}}h8
14.\textit{\textit{B}}e4

14.\textit{\textit{B}}f5 would be met with 14...\textit{\textit{B}}g
15.\textit{\textit{B}}h3 \textit{\textit{B}}c8 16.\textit{\textit{B}}h6 \textit{\textit{B}}g7.

14...\textit{\textit{B}}xd5 15.\textit{\textit{B}}d1 \textit{\textit{B}}c6 16.\textit{\textit{B}}xd5
\textit{\textit{B}}xd5 17.\textit{\textit{B}}e3 \textit{\textit{B}}fd8 18.\textit{\textit{B}}ac1

18...\textit{\textit{B}}ac8

18...\textit{\textit{B}}d4 would be better, as the fol­
\textit{\textit{B}}lloowing continuation shows: 19.\textit{\textit{B}}a+
(19.\textit{\textit{B}}d2 \textit{\textit{B}}xe3 20.\textit{\textit{B}}xb4 \textit{\textit{B}}xd1+
21.\textit{\textit{B}}xd1 \textit{\textit{B}}xd1+ 22.\textit{\textit{B}}e1 \textit{\textit{B}}a5!, or
19.\textit{\textit{B}}c4 \textit{\textit{B}}xc4 20.\textit{\textit{B}}xc4 \textit{\textit{B}}xe3 etc.)
19...\textit{\textit{B}}xa2 20.\textit{\textit{B}}xb4 \textit{\textit{B}}xe3 21.\textit{\textit{B}}xe3
\textit{\textit{B}}xb2.

19.\textit{\textit{B}}d2 \textit{\textit{B}}xa2 20.\textit{\textit{B}}g5 \textit{\textit{B}}xg5
21.\textit{\textit{B}}xg5 \textit{\textit{B}}f6 22.\textit{\textit{B}}g6 \textit{\textit{B}}e6?
23.\textit{\textit{B}}a1?

Both players overlook 23.\textit{\textit{B}}g5! win­
\textit{\textit{B}}lning.

23...\textit{\textit{\textit{B}}d}5 24.\textit{\textit{B}}d3 \textit{\textit{B}}a5 25.\textit{\textit{B}}ac1
\textit{\textit{\textit{B}}cd8 26.\textit{\textit{B}}b3 \textit{\textit{B}}b5

If 26...\textit{\textit{B}}e5, \textit{\textit{B}}lWhite would win the
d-pawn with 27.\textit{\textit{B}}xd4 \textit{\textit{\textit{B}}xd4 28.\textit{\textit{B}}xd4.
27...b4 28...c4 a5 29.a5 xe5 
xe5 30...c7 d3 31...h4+ g8 
32...c4

32...g3 would lead to the exchange of 
queens, and thus prolong the contest.
32...d2

33.b3
Rather tame, but White has no saving move, e.g. 33...f1 (or 33...f1 xc7 
34.xc7 d1") 33...xh2 34.xd2 
h1+ 35.e2 e8+ 36.f3 h5+ 
37.g3 (if 37.g4, Black mates in two moves) 37...g5+ winning the rook.
33...e1+ 34.f1 e8
White resigns.

242 Queen's Indian Defence
Zukertort
Blackburne
London tournament, 5 May 1883
Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Minchin
1.c4

Minchin: I have elsewhere stated my 
opinion that this is not only by far the 
finest game played in this tournament, 
but probably within the memory of the 
existing generation of chess-players. It 
may be fairly classed with the great 
game won by Anderssen of Kieseritsky 
more than thirty years ago.
1...e6 2.e3 f6 3.f3 b6

4.e2
Zukertort: The development of the king's 
bishop has been discussed by various 
analysts on every possible occasion. 
Here again I cannot propose a hard and 
fast rule, but I may state that whenever 
the queen's fianchetto is adopted before 
playing the d-pawn two squares, the 
opponent's king's bishop ought to be 
posted at e2; if, on the other hand, both 
players have advanced the d-pawn, the 
bishop may then be played at once to 
d3.
Steinitz: We believe that when the 
queen's fianchetto has been played by 
the opponent it is generally better to 
post the king's bishop as in the text, for 
in some contingencies the bishop can 
be well placed at f3 after castling and 
removing the knight. When the king's 
bishop is posted at d3 the opponent of-
ten gains time and ground by attacking 
it with the queen's knight as is done by 
White in the present game.
4...b7 5.0-0 d5 6.d4 a6 
7.c3 0-0 8.b3 b6 9.b2 
e7?
Zukertort: The routine move 9...c5 would 
be preferable,
10.b5
Steinitz: Promptly gaining the advantage 
of the two bishops.
10...e4 11.xd6 cxd6 12.d2
12...\texttt{d}f6?

Zukertort: The loss of time occasioned by this continuation gives to the opponent the first opportunity to prepare the following attack.

Steinitz: Very weak, for he might have foreseen the coming attack of the centre pawns, which could have been easily avoided by 12...f5. The weakness of his \textit{e}-pawn did not much matter, as White could not easily get at it, and in case of emergency Black could manoeuvre one of his knights to \textit{f}8 after removing the king's rook, and thus give ample protection to his centre and king's wing, or else he could play \ldots\texttt{f}6 in order to stop the advance of White's centre pawns.

13.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{xd}2 14.\texttt{wx}d2 \texttt{dxc}4

Zukertort: Mr. Blackburne underrated, I think, the power of the coming attack. It would have been more prudent to leave the king's rook on the king's side, and to occupy the open file with the queen's rook.

17.\texttt{e}ae1!

Steinitz: An excellent move, which shows fine judgement. White has nothing to fear on the queen's wing, and proceeds with the centre attack.

17...\texttt{e}c7

Steinitz: Black misapprehends the strength of the advance in the centre.

He had still time to equalize the game fully by 17...a5 with a view of exchanging one of the two powerful bishops by \ldots\texttt{a}6, or else to make a counter demonstration on the queen's side by \ldots\texttt{a}4, in case White stopped the exchange by \texttt{we}2.

18.\texttt{e}4 \texttt{ac}8 19.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{e}8

Steinitz: 19...\texttt{d}7, with the view of playing \ldots\texttt{f}8 and then protecting Black's weakest point on the king's side, was by far better.

20.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{g}6

Zukertort: Of course Black had to stop the further advance of the \textit{f}-pawn. Considering, however, that the text move weakens his king's position – especially the \textit{h}-pawn – without gaining any equivalent, I would suggest instead of it 20...f5 at once.

21.\texttt{e}e3

Minchin: When Zukertort made this move, he had in his mind's eye the whole combination that follows, down to Black's 28th move. It may seem singular that his opponent should have played the next seven moves exactly as anticipated, but it must be remembered that Mr. Blackburne doubled his rooks, with the intention of playing to \textit{c}2 as soon as he had got rid of the white king's bishop, and played for that purpose,
expecting to win a piece. The real beauty of Zukertort's play is that he led his opponent into this trap, correctly calculating its real results.

Steinitz: A very strong move under any circumstances. It threatens, for instance, $\text{f}3$ or $\text{h}3$ followed by $\text{f}5$ and $\text{h}6$. It has, however, been suggested that Zukertort had already at this point in his mind's eye the whole combination as it occurred up to White's 28th move, including the subsequent offer of the sacrifice of the queen and the mating combination six moves deep which would have followed if the sacrifice had been accepted. Or, in fact, that Zukertort laid a most ingenious trap 13 moves deep to his opponent at this juncture. To this assertion we have to remark in the first place, that there is not the least internal evidence in the progress of the game for the necessity of such a calculation, and it would have been simply the height of folly for any experienced, first-class master when playing under time limit to waste one moment on such a combination, considering all the possibilities of the defence that were at Black's disposal, such as the combinations arising from ..., $\text{g}7$, or ..., $\text{f}3$, or from 22...$\text{x}f6$. There is nothing so very extraordinary in reckoning so far ahead, and positions do sometimes occur, especially in the ending where it is absolutely necessary to look forward to as many moves as is alleged that Zukertort had in his mind. Moreover, such a process of reasoning is often more easy, especially when the moves on one or both sides are forced, than to look clear in all directions only three moves deep when there are many complications and sub-variations. But it is anyhow more meritorious to adopt such a move as the one in the text, which is a powerful one, no matter what Black may answer, as a result of intuitive position judgement, than to lay a trap for one particular line of play which was very improbable to occur and moreover was quite faulty, for more than one reason, as will be seen. It is in reality a depreciation of this fine game to assume that its chief feature was a mere trap.

21...$\text{f}5$

Zukertort: 21...$\text{g}7$ would be slightly better; White would then continue with 22...$\text{g}4$.

22.$\text{ex}f6$ $\text{xf}6$

Zukertort: He should retake with the queen, although he would have even then a difficult game, e.g., 22...$\text{xf}6$ 23.$\text{el}$. $\text{g}7$ 24.$\text{g}4$ and White would have unlimited time to force a probably irresistible attack.
23.f5!
Steinitz: An excellent rejoinder which prepares, moreover, a very beautiful combination.

23...\(\text{dxe4}\)
Steinitz: He had nothing better, for if 23...gxf5 the reply 24.\(\text{dxf5}\) disorganises his game. But it was evidently bad judgement to resort to such a line of defence which freed the diagonal of a powerful, adverse bishop from two pawns that had previously blocked its action.

24.\(\text{dxe4}\) dxe4

25.fxg6!
Steinitz: Undoubtedly of the highest order of play as he was bound to calculate the sequence accurately from this point. But how bad Black’s defence was on principle, and how little it could have been anticipated by any real master four moves ago, may be seen from the fact that White could also win here easily though not so elegantly by 25.d5, threatening \(\text{dxe4}\), when the game might have proceeded 25...\(\text{c6}\) (if 25...\(\text{e5}\) 26.d6 \(\text{dxe6}\) 27.fxg6 and wins) 26.\(\text{dxe4}\) e5 27.\(\text{dxe4}\) with an irresistible attack.

25...\(\text{c6}\)
Minchin: The excited spectators naturally thought that Zukertort had here lost a piece and the game, but one confident believer in his skill at this point bet a shilling that he would win the game not having the slightest conception of the manner in which he could escape from the apparently impending loss.

Zukertort: Notwithstanding its disastrous result, the text move constituted Black’s only chance, for if he play 25...\(\text{h5}\): White forces the game with 26.\(\text{g7}\) (if 26...\(\text{h7}\) then 27.\(\text{f6}\), winning, for if 27...\(\text{g6}\), then 28.\(\text{h5}\); 26...\(\text{e8}\), then 27.\(\text{h6}\) \(\text{g7}\) 28.\(\text{b4}\): if, at last, 26...\(\text{g7}\), then 27.d5+ \(\text{h6}\) 28.d6 \(\text{g7}\) 29.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{e8}\) 30.dxe6 \(\text{e8}\): 28.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e8}\) 29.\(\text{f6}\).

26.\(\text{gxf7+}\) \(\text{h8}\)
Zukertort: If 26...\(\text{h7}\), then, of course: 27.\(\text{g3}\); if 26...\(\text{xh7}\), then 27.\(\text{h6}\) \(\text{g8}\) 28.\(\text{h6}\).

27.d5+ e5 28.\(\text{b4}\)!!

Steinitz: Really a glorious move.

Minchin: This move literally electrified the lookers-on, who were absorbed in this contest. I was playing a game in the Vizayanagaram tournament at the time, when a friend whispered in my ear: 'The fiend has offered his queen, and cannot be taken without suffering mate!'
31. \(g3+\) (this is the line of play contemplated when offering the queen. All the commentators proceed with 31. \(f6+\); the difference, however, amounts but to a transposition of moves) 31... \(h6\) (if 31... \(h7\) or \(h5\), mate follows in three moves) 32. \(f6+\) \(h5\) (\(h7\)) 33. \(f5+\) (\(f7+\)) \(h6\) 34. \(f4+\) moves 35. king-rook mates. Black had no saving move: 28... \(e8\), then 29. \(e4\) \(x5\) (best) 30. \(x5\) \(x5\) 31. \(x5\) \(e5\) \(x5\) \(e5\) 32. \(e5\) \(e8\). If 28... \(e8\), then 29. \(d6\) \(e6\) 30. \(d7\) etc.

Steinitz: When Zukertort played \(e3\) at his 21st move, he had calculated that 28... \(e8\) was Black's best move, and had prepared the continuation 29. \(d6\) etc. In that case, so lost is the position that 29. \(f8+\) would equally win but not so rapidly.

29. \(f8+!\)

Steinitz: On this move, Mr. Steinitz remarks in Turf, Field and Farm, 'In conjunction with White's previous play, this forms one of the most noble combinations conceived over the chessboard,' a remark as honourable to the commentator as to his great rival.

Zukertort: The shortest and, I may say, the prettiest line of play, but White wins equally with 29. \(e4\) \(x2\) 30. \(f8+\) \(x8\) 31. \(e5\) \(h7\) (31... \(g7\) 32. \(e8+\) \(h7\) 33. \(h3+\) \(h6\) 34. \(e7+\) \(e6\) 35. \(xh6\) mate) 32. \(h3+\) \(g6\) (32... \(h6\) 33. \(e7+\) \(g8\) (33... \(g6\) 34. \(e6+\) etc.) 34. \(g3+\) \(h8\) 35. \(e8+\) etc.; if 32... \(g8\), then equally 33. \(g3+\) etc.) 33. \(g3+\) \(h7\) (33... \(h6\) 34. \(g5+\) \(h7\) 35. \(h3+\) etc.) 34. \(h5+\) and mates in two more moves.

29... \(xh7\)

Zukertort: If 29... \(xf8\), White replies 30. \(e5+\) \(h7\) 31. \(e4\) and mates in four moves.

30. \(e4+\) \(e7\) 31. \(e5+\) \(xf8\)

32. \(g7+!\)

Steinitz: A worthy finish to one of the most brilliant games on record. Our final verdict on this game is, however, that it stands superior to the celebrated game between Morphy and Paulsen, for the reason, in the first place, that the present one was played under time limit, which makes the exactitude of Zukertort's combination all the more meritorious. In the next place, it is certain that Zukertort never at any point of this game had the worst of the position, and this cannot be said of Morphy's game against Paulsen. We may mention by the way, without entertaining the least doubt, that in both these games the sacrificing player had fully calcu-
lated the result of this combination, that
anyhow, both Morphy and Zukertort
had an obvious and easy draw to fall
back upon in case they detected any
flaw in their reckonings. But, we think
that it is altogether an exaggeration to
place this game on a par as has been at­
tempted, with the well-known 'immor­
tal game' between Anderssen and
Kieseritzky in which occurs almost a
continuity of brilliancies, every one of
which bears the stamp of intuitive ge­
nius, that could have been little assisted
by calculations, as the combination
point arises only at the very end of the
game with a final sacrifice of the queen
after Anderssen had already given up
two rooks and a bishop.

12.\(\text{a}c7+!\)
Of course not 12.\(\text{a}e4\) on account
12...\(\text{h}h4+\), and if 13.\(\text{g}3\), then
13...\(\text{f}3+\) etc.

12...\(\text{d}7\)
Playing, I suppose, under the idea that
White will capture the rook, where­upon Black would get a won game with
(13.\(\text{a}x8\) \(\text{a}xg5\). Black should have
proceeded with 12...\(\text{a}x7\) 13.\(\text{a}e6+\)
\(\text{c}8\) (13...\(\text{a}x2+?\) 14.\(\text{a}x2\) \(\text{f}2-\)
15.\(\text{d}1) 14.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}7\) 15.\(\text{a}c7\) \(\text{a}x5\)
16.\(\text{c}3\). He had, however, even then a
much inferior game on account of the
dead position of his pawns.

13.\(\text{c}xe6\) \(\text{a}x6\) 14.\(\text{a}xe4\) \(\text{b}6\)
15.\(\text{d}5+\) \(\text{c}8\) 16.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}8\)
17.\(\text{a}e5\) \(\text{a}c7\) 18.\(\text{f}5\)
With two pawns ahead but the inferior
development, White had to play a
strictly defensive game.

18...\(\text{f}8\) 19.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{b}8\) 20.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{a}5\)
21.0-0-0 \(\text{e}6\) 22.\(\text{h}f1\) \(\text{c}8\)
23.\(\text{de}1\)
Preparing a counter-attack by occupi­
ying another open file.

23...\(\text{e}5\) 24.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 25.\(\text{e}4\)
\(\text{ac}6!\) 26.\(\text{f}5!\)
Doubling the rooks would just afford to
the opponent a fine opportunity for a
perplexing attack with one of his in­
genious sacrifices, e.g. 26.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{xc}3\)
27.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{xc}3!\) 28.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{a}3+\)
29.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{xc}3\) etc. The text move pro-
ides for this contingency, for White would now win easily after exchanging
queens with $30.\text{W}e5+$.

26...\text{W}d6 27.\text{Af}e1 $\text{Q}c7$ 28.\text{Af}4
\text{W}f8 29.\text{W}xa5 \text{b}6
29...\text{A}a6, then 30.\text{W}xc7+ $\text{A}c7$
31.\text{A}e8+ etc.
30.\text{B}b4 \text{W}d8 31.\text{E}e6 $\text{A}x\text{c}3$
32.bxc3 \text{W}d5 33.\text{W}xc6 \text{W}xc6
34.\text{E}e7
Black resigns.
Black cannot prevent the exchange of all
remaining pieces which White will
force with $\text{W}d6$.

244 French Defence
Zukertort
Sellman
London tournament, 11 May 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 exd5
4.\text{Af}3 $\text{G}f6$ 5.\text{A}d3 $\text{A}d6$ 6.0-0 0-0
7.\text{Cc}3 c6 8.\text{E}e2 $\text{W}c7$ 9.\text{G}g3 $\text{A}e6$
10.b3
The first nine moves have been played
innumerable times. The usual continua-
tions have been 10.\text{E}e1 or 10.\text{A}e3. The
text move may be recommended, I
think, for it enables White to carry out
operations on both wings, which may
supplement each other.
10...\text{B}b7 11.c4 $\text{E}f8$ 12.c5 $\text{G}f4$
13.b4 $\text{A}xc1$ 14.\text{W}xc1 \text{b}5?

15.\text{A}h4 $\text{A}f8$ 16.a4 a6 17.\text{A}a3
$\text{d}7$

18.\text{G}f5
I played the queen's knight for the pur-
pose of clearing the third row and
bringing eventually the queen's rook on
the king's side, if necessary. It would
have been better, however, to play the
king's knight, for nothing could then
prevent the planting of the knight at \text{d}6.
18...$\text{G}g6$! 19.\text{G}xg6 $\text{G}xf5$ 20.\text{A}e5
\text{xd}3 21.\text{G}xd3 $\text{G}a8$ 22.axb5
Premature: I should have played the
queen and then doubled the rooks.
22...axb5 23.\text{A}a6 \text{A}a8 24.\text{W}a3
\text{G}g4
Mr. Sellman rightly pointed out that this
manoeuvre put the knight for a consid-
erable time out of play. He proposed in-
stead of the text move the superior con-
tinuation 24...\text{E}d7.
25.g3 $\text{E}xa6$ 26.\text{W}xa6 f6 27.\text{A}a1
Intending 28.\text{W}b6, and if 28...\text{W}xb6
29.cx\text{b}6 $\text{A}b8$, White wins with 30.\text{A}a6,
31.\text{C}c5 etc.
27.\text{B}b8 28.\text{A}f4 $\text{A}f7$ 29.\text{W}a7!
\text{G}b7
Black has no satisfactory defence: after
29...\text{W}xa7 30.\text{A}xa7+ $\text{G}g8$, White wins
with 31.\text{C}c7 or 31.\text{A}e6. If 29...\text{C}c8,
then 30.\text{W}b6; if, at last, 29...\text{W}b7, then
30.\text{A}a6.
30.\text{W}a8 $\text{A}h6$
Of course, if 30...\(Bb8\), then 31.\(Ba7\), winning easily.

31.\(Wh8Bb8\)
White threatened the fatal rejoinder 32.\(Ba8\).

32.\(Bxh7\) \(Bd7\) 33.\(Bh5\) \(Bg8\)
34.\(Qxg7\)
34.\(Ba8\) would be 'pretty' but harmless, for Black would reply 34...\(Bf5\)!

34...\(Bxg7\) 35.\(Bxh6\) \(Be7\) 36.\(Bf4\) \(Bh7\) 37.\(Bb8\) \(Bg6\) 38.\(Bg8+\) \(Bf5\)
39.\(Bc8+\) \(Bd7\) 40.\(Bb8\)
The exchange of queens on this or the next move would finally win, but still it was not advisable on account of the weak position of White's b-pawn and d-pawn, while the black king was well in play.

40...\(Bc7\) 41.\(Bxe8\) \(Bd7\) 42.\(Bx3\) \(Be7\) 43.\(Bf4+\) \(Bg6\) 44.\(Bg4+\) \(Bf7\) 45.\(Bx3\)

45...\(Bxe1+\)
A futile attempt to draw by perpetual check, but had Black any better chance?

46.\(Bxg2\) \(Bxh2+\)
Of course, if 46...\(Bxe4+\), then 47.\(Bxe4\) \(Bxe4\) 48.\(Bc8\) etc.

47.\(Bxh2\) \(Bxf2+\) 48.\(Bh3\) \(Bf1+\)
49.\(Bh4\) \(Bh1+\) 50.\(Bh3\) \(Bxe4+\)
51.\(g4\) \(Bh7+\)
If 51...\(Bxh1+\), then 52.\(Bh5\) (52.\(Bg3\) \(Bh1+\) and Black draws) 52...\(Bd2\) 53.\(Bx3\) etc.

52.\(Bg3\) \(Bd3+\) 53.\(Bh2\) \(Bd2-\)
54.\(Bxg2\) \(Bf4+\)
Or 54...\(Bh6+\) 55.\(Bg3\) \(e3+\) 56.\(Bx3\): \(Bx1+\) or \(Bg1+\) 57.\(Bh3\).

55.\(Bx3\)
Black resigns.

245 Queen's Gambit
Zukertort
Rosenthal
London tournament, 14 May 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.\(d3\) \(d5\) 2.\(d4\) \(d6\) 3.e3 \(e6\) 4.c4
\(e7\) 5.\(c3\) 0-0 6.\(e2\) \(c5\) 7.0-0
\(c6\) 8.b3 \(e4\) 9.\(Bb2\) \(Bxd4?\)
10.\(Bxe4\) \(dxe4\) 11.\(Bxd4\) \(f6?\)
Mr. Rosenthal plays this game below his usual standard. He has already a bad game, but the text move loses time on the king's side and gives the adversary the opportunity to break up completely the king's side.

12.\(Bxc6\) \(Bxc6\) 13.\(Bc2\) \(f5\) 14.c5!
Blocking the action of both hostile bishops and opening a fine square for his king's bishop at c4.

14...\(Bc7\) 15.\(Bb8\) \(Bb8\) 16.\(Bc3\) \(Bf6\)
17.\(Bd1\) \(Bd7\) 18.\(Bx6\) \(Bx6\)

19.\(Bd6!\) \(Bxb4?\)
A blunder which costs the exchange, but Black's game was lost, whatever he
play. His pieces are blocked, and his pawns very weak, while the opponent commands the board.

20.\textit{W}d2 \textit{Ab}7 21.\textit{A}a6 \textit{E}e8 22.\textit{A}xb7 \textit{W}xb7 23.\textit{A}d8

The entry of the rooks puts a speedy end to all further resistance.

23...\textit{W}f8 24.\textit{W}d6 \textit{W}f7 25.\textit{B}b1 e5 26.\textit{B}bb8f4

An ingenious attempt to save a hopeless battle. Any quiet move must lead to the loss of the bishop.

27.exf4 \textit{W}xf4 28.\textit{W}xf4+ \textit{W}xf4 29.\textit{W}e4+ \textit{W}e7 30.\textit{W}f4+ \textit{W}e6 31.\textit{W}xf4 exf4 32.\textit{A}d8

Black resigns.

246 Spanish Game

Winawer

Zukertort

London tournament, 16 May 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{A}f3 \textit{Cc}6 3.\textit{A}b5 \textit{Ff}6 4.0-0 \textit{Fxe}4 5.d4 a6

Introduced by Morphy against Paulsen in the New York tournament 1857. The continuation was almost forgotten until it was adopted by Jessenthal against me in our fifth match game.

6.\textit{A}xc6

Paulsen and I continued with 6.\textit{A}d3. The variation is analysed by Herr Berger in \textit{Chess Monthly}.

6...\textit{A}xc6 7.\textit{A}e2 \textit{f}5 8.g4

The text move, I think, compromises White's king's flank without any equivalent in material or position. 8.dxe5 would about equalise the game.

8...\textit{g}6 9.h4 \textit{W}d7

Herr Berger continues with 9...f6; compare the following note.

10.\textit{A}xe5 \textit{W}xd4

11.\textit{A}f3

After 11.\textit{A}xg6 h\textit{xg}6 12.\textit{A}c3 f5 13.\textit{g}5 – a line of play proposed by Herr Berger in a private letter to me – Black would continue with 13...\textit{A}e7 14.\textit{A}xe7 (if 14.\textit{A}ad1, then 14...\textit{W}e5; if 14.\textit{A}f1, then 14...\textit{A}xg5 15.h\textit{xg}5 0-0-0, with the better game) 14...\textit{W}e7 15.h5 \textit{F}ae8 16.h\textit{xg}6 (if 16.\textit{A}f1, then equally 16...\textit{A}f6) 16...\textit{W}e6! 17.\textit{W}f3 \textit{W}e5 18.\textit{A}xe4+ \textit{W}xe4 19.\textit{W}xf5+ (or 19.\textit{W}xe4 \textit{A}xe4 20.\textit{W}f3 \textit{A}d2 etc.) 19...\textit{A}xf5 20.gxf5 \textit{A}e4 21.\textit{A}g2 \textit{A}xf5 etc.

11...\textit{W}d7 12.\textit{A}g5 \textit{W}e7 13.\textit{A}e1 0-0-0! 14.\textit{A}xe4 \textit{W}xe4 15.\textit{A}c3

Of course, if 15.\textit{W}xe4 \textit{A}xe4 16.\textit{A}xe4, then 16...\textit{A}d1+ 17.\textit{A}g2 \textit{A}xe1.

15...\textit{W}xe2

I might have safely continued with 15...\textit{X}e2, for if 16.\textit{W}e3, then 16...b6, with a pawn ahead and two bishops, however, I thought it best to avoid all complications by exchanging queens.

16.\textit{A}xe2 h5 17.g5 \textit{A}d6

But here I missed the strongest continuation, viz: 17...\textit{A}d4 18.f4 (18.\textit{A}e8+ \textit{A}d7 19.\textit{A}b8 b6 20.\textit{A}e3 \textit{A}g4+ 21.\textit{A}f1 \textit{A}xc2 22.\textit{A}c1 \textit{A}d3+ 23.\textit{A}e1 \textit{A}xh4 etc.) 18...\textit{A}d6 19.\textit{A}e3 \textit{A}c4 20.\textit{A}f1 b5 21.a3 a5 etc.

18.\textit{A}e3 \textit{A}he8 19.\textit{A}ae1 \textit{A}e7 20.\textit{A}g2 \textit{A}de8 21.\textit{A}d4 \textit{A}xc2
Johannes Zukertort

22.\texttt{Hxe7 \texttt{Hxe7} 23.\texttt{Hxe7 \texttt{Hxe7}}
\texttt{24.\texttt{Hxg7 b5 25.dxe2 \texttt{Hd6}}
Necessary to prevent White from continuing with 26.\texttt{Hg3}, and, if 26...\texttt{Hg6}, then 27.\texttt{Hf4}.
26.a3
Black threatened 26...\texttt{b4} and 27...\texttt{b1}.
26...\texttt{c5} 27.\texttt{Hg3 \texttt{Hg6} 28.f3 \texttt{Hd7}}
29.dxe3 \texttt{Hxe6} 30.f4 c4 31.dxe6 a5
32.e2 b4 33.axb4 axb4
34.f3
One of Mr. Winawer's 'wily' stratagems. White threatens now 35.\texttt{Hf5}, winning a piece if 35...\texttt{Hxf5}, and mating, if 35...\texttt{Hxf5}, with 36.\texttt{He4}.
34...\texttt{Hd5} 35.\texttt{He3 c3!} 36.bxc3 b3

37.\texttt{Hd2}
Of course, a mistake which is immediately fatal, but White would but prolong the contest, without averting the defeat, with 37.\texttt{c4+ \texttt{Hxc4} 38.b2 \texttt{Hd3} 39.\texttt{g3} (if 39.\texttt{Hd4}, then 39...\texttt{c5} 40.a1 \texttt{b1} 41.b2 \texttt{Hg6} 42.a1 \texttt{a3} etc. Or 39.\texttt{c1} \texttt{c5+} 40.\texttt{Hd2} \texttt{b4+} 41.\texttt{He3} \texttt{f5} 42.\texttt{He2} \texttt{g4} 43.\texttt{d4} \texttt{c3}) 39...\texttt{c5+} 40.\texttt{Hd2} \texttt{d4} 41.\texttt{He1} (if 41.\texttt{d4} \texttt{xd4} 42.\texttt{c1}, then 42...\texttt{c3}) 41...\texttt{e3+} 42.\texttt{d1} \texttt{c2}+ 43.\texttt{He3} moves \texttt{d4} 44.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 45.\texttt{Hd3} \texttt{Hd3} 46.\texttt{He1} \texttt{c3}.
37...\texttt{c4!} 38.f5 \texttt{Hxf5}
White resigns.

247 Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort
Englisch
London tournament, 21 May 1886
Notes by Zukertort
1.\texttt{Hf3 d5 2.d4 e6 3.e3 c5 4.d4}
White may also proceed with 5.\texttt{Hb2}, and 6.\texttt{d3}.
4...\texttt{f6} 5.0-0 \texttt{c6} 6.b3 \texttt{Hd7}
7.\texttt{b2} 0-0 8.c4 \texttt{xd4} 9.\texttt{exd4} \texttt{Hf6}
10.\texttt{Hbd2}
After the exchange of pawns on the previous move, White has to develop his queen's knight to d2 for two reasons: for the protection of his c-pawn, and, in case keep clear the c-file for his rooks.
10...\texttt{b7} 11.\texttt{Hc1 Hc8} 12.\texttt{Hd3 Hf6}
Black now begins to concentrate his forces to an attack against an unassailable point, White's c-pawn, and, of course, all his preparations must result in loss of time and position.
13.\texttt{He1}
Threatening to win a pawn with 14.cxd5 \texttt{Hxd3} 15.\texttt{dxc6 \texttt{b5} 16.\texttt{Hc4 \texttt{He8} (16...\texttt{d6} 17.a4) 17.Hf3.}}
13...\texttt{a5}
13...\texttt{dxc4} would be better.
14.\texttt{He2 \texttt{b4} 15.a3 \texttt{Hd6}}
Obviously overlooking the opponent's reply: he should have captured the knight, thus preventing further loss of time.
16.c5! \( \Box xd3 \) 17.\( \Box xd3 \) \( \Box f4 \)

After 17...\( bxc5 \) 18.\( dxc5 \) \( \Box xc5 \), White would win a piece with 19.\( b4 \). It would have been better, however, to retire the bishop at once to b8 – compare Black's 19th move.

18.\( \Box c2 \) \( \Box c6 \) 19.\( b4 \) \( \Box e7 \) 20.\( b5 \) \( \Box b8 \) 21.a4 \( \Box g6 \) 22.\( cxb6 \)

Premature: I ought to have doubled the rooks and played the bishop to a3 first.

22...\( \Box xb6 \)

22...\( axb6 \), recommended by Mr. Steinitz, would be better, but it would not equalise the game, for White's superiority of pawns on the queen's wing should finally tell.

23.\( \Box a3 \) \( \Box d6 \) 24.a5 \( \Box b8 \) 25.\( \Box c5 \) \( \Box d7 \) 26.\( \Box ec1 \) \( \Box e7 \) 27.\( \Box b3 \) \( \Box fe8 \)

28.g3 h6 29.\( \Box xd6 \) \( \Box xd6 \) 30.\( \Box c5 \) \( \Box f8 \) 31.\( \Box e5 \) f6 32.\( \Box c6 \) \( \Box xc6 \)

33.\( \Box b7 \) \( \Box b4 \)

Necessary to prevent White from opening an attack against the weak a-pawn, after the capture of the knight.

34.\( bxc6 \) e5 35.\( \Box c5 ? \)

A weak continuation which jeopardises the decisive advantage already secured.

White had an easy win after 35.\( dxe5 \) \( \Box xe5 \) 36.\( f4 \) \( \Box e1+ \) 37.\( \Box xe1 \) \( \Box xe1+ \) 38.\( \Box g2 \) \( \Box e4+ \) (if 38...\( \Box e6 \), then \( \Box f5 \), forcing the exchange of queens for the gain of the d-pawn, for if \( \Box x f7 \), then 40.\( \Box d6 \), and if

39...\( \Box e5 \), then 40.\( \Box e2 \) 39.\( \Box xe4 \) \( dxe4 \)

40.\( \Box d6 \) \( \Box c7 \) 41.\( \Box b5 \) \( \Box c8 \) 42.\( c7 \) (or 42.\( \Box xa7 \) \( \Box c7 \) 43.\( \Box b5 \) \( \Box c8 \) 44.\( c7 \) \( \Box e6 \) 45.a6 etc.) 42...\( \Box e6 \) 43.f5 a6 44.\( \Box xe6 \) \( axb5 \) 45.a6.

35...\( \Box xd4 \) 36.\( \Box d6 \)

36.\( \Box b5 \) would probably have led to a draw, e.g. 36.\( \Box b5 \) \( \Box e1+ \) (Black's only resource: if 36...\( \Box a4 \), then 37.\( \Box d6 \); if 36...\( \Box e7 \), then 37.\( \Box xd4 \) a6 38.\( \Box xd5 \), and White will easily force the gain of the a-pawn) 37.\( \Box g2 \) \( \Box xb5 \) 38.\( \Box xb5 \) \( \Box xc1 \) 39.\( \Box xd5+ \) \( \Box h7 \) 40.\( \Box d8 \) \( \Box g6 \)

41.\( \Box d7 \) (or 41.\( \Box xd4 \) \( \Box e5 \) etc.) 41...\( \Box xd8 \) (if 41...\( \Box a8 \), then 42.\( \Box e6 \))

42.\( \Box xd8 \) \( \Box xc6 \) 43.\( \Box xd4 \) \( \Box c7 \).

36...\( \Box e1+ \) 37.\( \Box xe1 \) \( \Box xe1+ \)

38.\( \Box g2 \) \( \Box e7 \) 39.\( \Box xc8 \) \( \Box xc5 \)

40.\( \Box a6 \)

If 40.\( \Box e2 \), intending 41.\( \Box e8 \), then 40...\( \Box f7 \).

35...\( \Box xd4 \)

40...\( \Box d3 \)

He should have played 40...\( \Box c2 \), as recommended by Mr. Steinitz. White has different continuations but none, I think, would effect more than a draw, e.g. 40...\( \Box c2 \) (best – any king move loses, e.g. 40...\( \Box f7 \) or \( \Box h7 \), then 41.\( \Box xa7 \); if 40...\( \Box h8 \), then 41.\( \Box b7 \) 42.\( \Box f7 \) d2 (42...\( \Box xc6 \) 43.\( \Box e7 \) \( \Box e6 \)) 44.\( \Box g6+ \) 43.\( \Box e7 \) \( \Box xe7 \) 44.\( \Box xe7 \) \( \Box d1 \) \( \Box g5 \) \( \Box f8+ \) \( \Box h7 \) 46.c7. If 40...\( \Box e6 \), then 41.\( \Box xa7 \) 41.\( \Box d6 \) (if
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41. \( \text{Oe}7+ \) \( \text{Oh}8 \) 42. \( \text{Oxd}5 \), then 42...\( \text{We}4+ \) 43. \( \text{Og}1 \) \( \text{Wxd}5 \) 44. \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 45. \( \text{c}8 \) \( \text{Wd}2 \!) 41...\( \text{d}3 \) 42. \( \text{Wxa}7 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 43. \( \text{Wf}7+ \) \( \text{Oh}7 \) 44. \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{W} \) (44...\( \text{Wxc}7 \) \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{W} \)) 46. \( \text{Oe}8 \) \( \text{We}6 \) 47. \( \text{Of}6+ \) (47. \( \text{Wf}7 \) \( \text{Of}4+ \) 48. \( \text{Gxf}4 \) \text{Wg}4+ and draws) 47...\( \text{Gg}6 \) 48. \( \text{We}5 \) \( \text{Gg}5 \) 49. \( \text{Oxd}5 \) \( \text{Wf}3+ \) 50. \( \text{Of}1 \) \( \text{Wd}1+ \) etc.) 45. \( \text{c}8 \) \( \text{Wxc}8 \) 46. \( \text{Oxc}8 \) \( \text{Gg}6 \) (Black threatens 47...\( \text{Wg}4 \) 47. \( \text{Oe}7 \) \( \text{Gxe}7 \) (he might draw at once with 47...\( \text{Of}4+ \)) 48. \( \text{Wxe}7 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 49. \( \text{a}6 \) etc. 41. \( \text{Wxd}3 \) \( \text{Wxa}5 \) 42. \( \text{Oe}7+ \) \( \text{Gf}7 \) 43. \( \text{Oxd}5 \) Threatening 44. \( \text{Wc}4 \).

43...\( \text{wc}5 \) 44. \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{wc}6 \)

If 44...\( \text{Oe}6 \), then 45. \( \text{Wb}3 \), followed by the same continuation as in the text.

45.f3

Mr. Arthur O'Neill points out in the Glasgow Herald that White had here an immediate win with 45. \( \text{Wc}3 \) \( \text{Wxd}5+ \) 46. \( \text{Wf}3 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 47. \( \text{Wb}7 \)

44...\( \text{Oe}6 \) 46. \( \text{Wb}3 \)

46...\( \text{We}8 \)

Black must provide against the threatened continuation 47. \( \text{Of}4 \). If 46...\( \text{Gg}5 \), White wins with 47. \( \text{Wd}3 \) \( \text{Wg}7 \) 48. \( \text{We}7 \) \( \text{Wxc}7 \) 49. \( \text{Wg}6+ \) \( \text{Gf}8 \) 50. \( \text{Wxf}6+ \) \( \text{Gf}8 \) 51. \( \text{Oxf}5 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 52. \( \text{Wxh}6 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 53. \( \text{Wh}8+ \) \( \text{Gf}7 \) (53...\( \text{Oxf}8 \) 54. \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{Gd}8 \) 55. \( \text{Wxg}5+ \) 54. \( \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{Gf}8 \) 55. \( \text{Wg}8+ \) \( \text{Gf}8 \) 56. \( \text{Wxg}5 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 57. \( \text{g}4 \) etc.

47. \( \text{wb}5 ! \) \( \text{Wxb}5 \) 48. \( \text{c}8 \) \( \text{Wf}7 \) 49. \( \text{Wxe}6+ \) \( \text{Wxe}6 \) 50. \( \text{Oc}7+ \) \( \text{Gd}5 \) 51. \( \text{Oxb}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \)

If 51...\( \text{a}5 \), White would win after 52. \( \text{Of}2 \) and 53. \( \text{Ge}3 \) etc.

52.f4+ \( \text{Gd}4 \) 53. \( \text{Od}6+ \) \( \text{Gd}3 \) 54. \( \text{Oe}7 \) \( \text{Ge}3 \) 55. \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Ge}2 \) 56. \( \text{Ge}4 \)

47...\( \text{Gd}5 \) \( \text{Ge}3 \) 59. \( \text{Oe}3 \) \( \text{Gf}2 \)

60.h3

For after 60. \( \text{Od}4+ \) \( \text{Gd}3 \) 61. \( \text{Ge}6 \) \( \text{a}5 \)

White obviously dare not capture the g-pawn. The advance of the pawn = two moves instead of one is well-timed for White forces thereby the position of the hostile king, which he requires for the final manœuvre.

60...\( \text{Ge}3 \) 61.h4 \( \text{Ge}2 \) 62. \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Gf}2 \)

63.g5 \( \text{h}5 \)

Or 63...\( \text{fxg}5+ \) 64.hxg5 \( \text{hxg}5- \) 65. \( \text{Oxg}5 \) \( \text{Ge}3 \) (f3,g3) 66. \( \text{Gg}6 \) \( \text{Gf}4 \) 67. \( \text{Oa}5 \) \( \text{Ge}4 \) 68. \( \text{Cc}6 \) \( \text{Gf}4 \) 69. \( \text{Ge}7 \) \( \text{a}5 \)

70. \( \text{Oxg}7 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 71. \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 72. \( \text{f}7 \) (72. \( \text{Od}5- \) winsequally) 72...\( \text{a}2 \) 73. \( \text{f}8(\text{G})+ \).

64. \( \text{Gxf}6 \) \( \text{Gxf}6 \) 65. \( \text{Gc}5 \) \( \text{Gg}2 \)

Or 65...\( \text{a}5 \) 66. \( \text{Ge}4+ \) \( \text{Ge}1 \) 67. \( \text{Gxf}6 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 68. \( \text{Od}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 69. \( \text{Gb}4 \) \( \text{Gd}2 \) 70. \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{Cc}3 \) 71. \( \text{f}7 \) etc.

66. \( \text{Oxa}6 \) \( \text{Gh}3 \) 67. \( \text{Cc}5 \) \( \text{Gxh}4 \)

68. \( \text{Ge}4 \)

68...\( \text{Gf}6 \) 69. \( \text{Ge}6+ \) \( \text{Gg}5 \)

70. \( \text{Gxh}4 \) \( \text{Gxh}4 \) 71. \( \text{Gd}4 \) \( \text{Gb}8 \)

Black resigns.
248 Spanish Game

Englisch
Zukertort
London tournament, 29 May 1883

Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\f3 c6 3.\b5 \f6
4.d3 d6 5.\c3 g6 6.h3 \g7
7.\e3 \d7 8.\d2 h6 9.0-0 \g8

Weak. I should have played 9...g5, followed by ...\e7 and ...\g6. The text move causes all but irreparable loss of time and position.

10.d4 exd4 11.\xd4 \ge7

11.\f1

12.\e1

12.\e1

12...\e5 13.\e2

12...\e5 13.\e2

12...\b5 14.\e4 (either) \xb5 \c4
5.\c1 \xe3 16.\xe3 a6.

13...\g5 14.f4 \xf4 15.\xf4 \g6
16.\e3 \h4 17.\f2 \g8 18.\h1

Preparing the retreat of the king's bishop, which is necessary to open the \h file. Black dare not play at once \xf8, for White would reply \f5.

19.\b3

Extremely weak: White had two continuations, 19.\f5 or 19.\d1, either of which would secure him the superior game.

19...\f8 20.\xh6?

19...\f8 20.\xh6?

20...\xg2! 21.\xg2

If 21.\xf8, then 21...\h4, and Black will draw at least.

21.\xg2 22.\xg2 \h4 23.\g5

After 23.\e3 \h6 24.\g3 \xg3+ 25.\xg3, Black would win easily with 25...\e7 26.\h1 \e3 etc.

23...\h3+ 24.\g1

If 24.\f2, Black mates with 24...\h2+ 25.\e1 (if 25.\f1 or \e1, Black mates in two moves) 25...\g3+ 26.\d4 c5+ 27.\xc5 dxc5+ 28.\d5 \mates.

24...\g3+ 25.\h1 \h3+ 26.\g1 \g3+ 27.\h1 \g4
28.\xg4 \xg4 29.\f1 \f3+
30.\xf3 \xf3+ 31.\g2 \h5+
32.\g1 \d7 33.\f2

Herr Englisch proposed here afterwards 33.\f4, but in examining afterwards the position together, we came repeatedly to the same result — viz., that after 33...\h6 34.\xh6 \xh6, the exposed position of White’s king led to decisive loss of material.

33...\g7 34.\f4 \xc3 35.bxc3
\e8 36.\f3
Not to much purpose; but I do not think that White has any satisfactory continuation: his pawns are all isolated and hopelessly weak.

36...\textit{h4}+ 37.\textit{f1}

After 37.\textit{g3} \textit{xe4} 38.\textit{xe4} (38.\textit{xf7}+ \textit{e7} and wins) 38...\textit{xe4} 39.\textit{f3} (39.\textit{d4} \textit{c5} 40.\textit{f3} \textit{d5} 41.\textit{e2} \textit{a4} etc.) 39...\textit{a4} 40.\textit{cl} \textit{a3} 41.\textit{c1} \textit{b5}, Black should win ultimately.

37...\textit{f5}! 38.\textit{c5+}

A futile attempt to escape with a drawn battle, but he had no satisfactory reply, for he dare not take nor protect the pawn, e.g. 38.\textit{xf5} (38.\textit{d2} \textit{fxe4} 39.\textit{xe4} \textit{f8}) 38...\textit{e1}+ 39.\textit{g2} \textit{h1}+ 40.\textit{g3} \textit{g1}+ 41.\textit{f2} \textit{f1}+.

38...\textit{dx} \textit{c5} 39.\textit{d3}+ \textit{e7}

39...\textit{c8} would not lead to a draw, but unnecessarily prolong the game, viz:

39...\textit{c8} 40.\textit{d6} \textit{e7} 41.\textit{b8}+ \textit{d7} 42.\textit{xb7}+ \textit{e6} 43.\textit{xc6}+ \textit{f7} 44.\textit{d5}+ \textit{e6} 45.\textit{xf5}+ \textit{xf5} 46.\textit{xf5} \textit{f6} and must win with correct play.

40.\textit{d6}+ \textit{f7} 41.\textit{d7}+ \textit{e7}

42.\textit{xf5}+ \textit{f6} 43.\textit{h7}+ \textit{d8}

Inferior to 43...\textit{f8}.

44.\textit{g8}+

A miscalculation which ought to have forfeited the victory. I had an easy win with 44...\textit{d7} 45.\textit{b8} \textit{xe5} 46.\textit{xb7}+ \textit{e8} 47.\textit{c8}+ \textit{f7} 48.\textit{d7}+ \textit{e7}.

45.\textit{xf8}+ \textit{xf8} 46.\textit{d6} \textit{f6}

46...\textit{c4} would not have won, e.g. 46...\textit{c4} 47.\textit{e2} \textit{f7} 48.\textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 49.\textit{e1} \textit{d6} 50.\textit{d4} and Black must play for a draw.

47.\textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 48.\textit{e2} \textit{c6}

49.\textit{f3} \textit{c5}

50.\textit{g3}

White could draw here with 50.\textit{c4} \textit{b5} 51.\textit{e3} \textit{a} 52.\textit{f3} \textit{a} 5 53.\textit{e3} \textit{b} 4 54.\textit{f3} \textit{a} 4 55.\textit{e3} \textit{a} 3 56.\textit{f3} \textit{c} 4 57.\textit{e5} (pointed out by Mr. Hirschfield and much safer than 57.\textit{f4} \textit{c} 3 58.\textit{e} 5 \textit{xc} 2 59.\textit{e} 6 \textit{b} 3 etc.) 57...\textit{xe} 5 58.\textit{e} 3 and secures an easy draw by keeping the opposition.

50...\textit{c4} 51.\textit{f3}

The fighting is over, for if 51.\textit{a} 4 , then 51...\textit{a} 5 and 52...\textit{b} 5.

51...\textit{b5} 52.\textit{g3} \textit{c} 5 53.\textit{f3} \textit{b} 4

54.\textit{e3} \textit{a} 5 55.\textit{xb} 4 \textit{c} 4

56.\textit{d2}

Of course, if 56.\textit{c} 3, then 56...\textit{b} 3 57.\textit{xb} 3 \textit{xb} 3 58.\textit{d} 3 \textit{a} 4 59.\textit{c} 4 \textit{a} 3 60.\textit{c} 3 \textit{b} 2 61.\textit{c} 2 \textit{xe} 4 etc.

56...\textit{xe} 4 57.\textit{c} 1 \textit{c} 3 58.\textit{d} 1

\textit{f3} 59.\textit{c} 1 \textit{e} 2

White resigns.
Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort
Mason
London tournament, 1 June 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1. d4 d5 2. c4 c6 3. e3 g4
After 8...dxc4 9...b5, Black dare not protect the pawn with 9...b5, on account of 10...xf5 etc.
9.b3 c8 10...d2
White dare not advance the e-pawn at once, for Black would reply 10...b4.
10...b8
Preparing already an attack against the adverse king's flank.
11.e1
Opening an outlet for his king and intending at the same time to force a breach in the centre.
11...h5 12.cxd5 cxd5 13.e4 dxe4
14.dxe4 dxe4 15.fxe4 f6
16...xh2+ 17.xf3
If 19...g4, White wins a piece with 20.xf7 (20...e7 20...f6; if 20...e7, then 21.fxe7+ xxe7 22.xxd6+ xxd7 23.fx e7 = etc.) 21.xd8 xh2+ 22.xe2 xf3 23.xd6.
20.xe2
20.e4 d6 21...e7 would be rather in Black's favour.
20...e6! The exchange leads to bishops of opposite colours, but it provides White with a fine attack.
21...e6 22.f4

18...d6
If 18...xd6, then 19.c3 g4 (19...b6 20.xf6 gx6 (20...xb7 21.xb7 xxb7 22.f7, with the better position for the endgame) 21.xf6 g8 22.f3 etc.) 20.xf6 xxf6 21.g2.
19...g5 e7
20.g6
If 22...xd6, White would win with 23.h5 f5 (23...g6 24.xg6 fxg6 25.xg6 h8 26...h6+ g8 27.xe6+ h8 (27...f7 or g7 28.g4+ and 28... or xd4 accordingly; 27...h7 28...e4+ etc.) 28.xh3+ moves 29.g4+ (moves 30.xd4) 24.d3 f6 (24...b6, then 25.c4 f6 (25...f6 26.xe6 xxe6 27.xd4) 26.h4 d6 27.xe6 etc.) 25.xe6 xxe6 26.c4 b6 (if 26...f6, 26...b6, then 27.xd4) 27...e1 h7 (or 27...f6 28...e8+ h7 (f8) 29...xh6 28...xf5 and recovers the rook with two pawns to the good.
23.e5 exd5 24.xd5 xxb6
25...xg3 xg7 26.d6 xc5
27.xd1 f6
Black dare not attempt to win the exchange with 27...a5, on account of 28...xg6+ fxg6 29...xg6+ g7 30...d5+, winning the queen or mating.

28...d5 29...c2 29...h7 30...d2 31...c7 ...c3 32...d3

Intending to continue with 33...f3 and avoiding the trap 32...xf7? ...c8+, I missed, however, the strongest continuation which would secure at least the gain of a pawn, viz: 32...d7, for if 32...g7, then 33...xf7.

32...g7 33...d5

33...a4 would be best, I think. Of course, if 33...f3?, then 33...c2!.

33...f6

The right reply, which threatens the continuation ...e7 or ...h4 accordingly. If 33...c2?, then 34...d2 and 35...xa7.

34...xa7

If now 34...d7, then 34...h4 35...g1 f6! 36...xf7+ h6! 37...h7+ g5 and wins.

34...a8 35...c5 ...a2 36.b4

35...c2?

Obviously a mistake. Black could not equalise the game with 36...c8 37...xh5+ gxh5 (or 37...h6 38...h6+ g7 (38...xh6 39...e3+ g7 40...xa2) 39...e3 ...c4 40...h3

Hf4 41...f3 etc.) 38...xh5+ e7 39...xa2, and if 39...c2, c7- 40...d8+ ...xd8 (40...f8 41...g7+ g7 42...xf7+ ...xf7 43...f5+ e7 41...xf7+ h7 42...f5+ h6 43...xc2.

37...xh5+ g8

Of course, if 37...gxh5, then 38...c7 etc.

38...h3 ...c3 39...xc3 ...xc3 40.b5 ...f6 41.b6 g7 42.b7 ...h6 43...g1 ...e5 44...d5 ...h2- 45...f1 ...f6 46...xf7+ ...xf7 47...xf7 ...xf7

After 47...b8 48...d7, White's victory is only a question of time, notwithstanding the bishops of opposite colours. Black cannot guard sufficiently his weak pawn and at the same time prevent White from forcing with rook and king the gain of a piece for b-pawn.

48.g3 ...xg3 49.fxg3 ...e6 50...g2 ...b8 51...b1 ...f5 52...f3 ...g5 53...b5+ ...f6 54...g4 ...g7 55...g5 ...h7 56...b6 ...g7 57...xg6+ ...xf7 58...b6

Black resigns.

250 Italian Game
Noa Zukertort
London tournament, 5 June 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2...f3 ...c6 3...c4 ...c5 4.d3 ...f6 5...c3 d6 6...e3 ...b6 7...d2 ...e7 8...g5 ...a5 9.a3 h6 10...e3 ...e6 11...b5 0-0 12...h3 ...d7 13.b4

13.g4 was more to the purpose.

13...b6 14...xc6 bxc6 15...e2 Again, I would prefer g4.

15.f5 16...xf5 ...xf5 17...h2 d5
Here I missed a very promising continuation, viz. 17...c5 followed by ...
...d5.

18.\(\text{axb6 axb6} \) 19.0-0 c5 20.f4 cxb4 21.axb4 \(c\text{xa1} 22.\text{cxa1 exf4} 23.\text{cxf4 g5} 24.\text{c1 f8} 25.\text{c1 d4!} 26.\text{e2}

After 26.\(\text{cxe6 wxc1} 27.\text{bxcl cxe6}, \) Black wins easily on the queen's side.

26...\(\text{xf1} + 27.\text{xf1}

It would be better, I think, to preserve queens with 27.\(\text{xf1}, \) for if 27...\(\text{xh3}, \) then 28.\(\text{xd4}.

27...\(\text{xc1} + 28.\text{xc1 d5} 29.\text{e2 e6} 30.\text{g4 f7} 31.\text{e5+ f6} 32.\text{g4+ e7} 33.\text{e5 d6}

34.\(\text{g6}

Intending to meet 34...\(\text{c6} \) with 35.\(\text{e7+}, \) but 34.\(\text{f7+} \) would be equally effective, for after 34...\(\text{c6} 35.\text{e5+}, \) Black dare not continue with 35...\(\text{b5} \) on account of 36.c4+, and if 36...\(\text{xc3}, \) then 37.\(\text{xc3}+ \) winning the bishop.

34...\(\text{c5 35.bxc5+ bxc5 36.e4}

Dr. Noa thought that the ultimate loss was occasioned by this move, and he proposed 36.\(\text{g4} \) in its stead. Black would equally continue with 36...\(\text{c7}, \) and after 37.\(\text{e1 g5 38.xd5 cxd5} 39.d2 e5, \) he has the superior ending.

36...\(\text{c7 37.e2 f7 38.g3 e5 39.g4 e8 40.h4 g5 41.f5+ e5 42.g2 h5 43.e1}

If 43.\(\text{g7}, \) then 43...\(\text{c6} 44.\text{e1 (44.gxh5 xg2 45.h6 h6; or 44.f2 hgx4 45.hxg4 xg2 46.xg2 a3) 44.hxg4 45.hxg4 d7 46.b3 a3} \) and 47...\(\text{a4}.

43...\(\text{hxg4 44.hxg4 d7 45.h6 f4}

46.f2

A trap: should Black capture the pawn, White wins the bishop with 47.\(\text{g2}+.

46...\(\text{c6 47.e2 c3+ 48.f2}

If 48.d2, Black wins with 48...\(\text{d5 49.e5} \) (or 49.c1 e3 and 50.e2) 49.\(\text{xg4 50.e7} \) (or 50.h6+ f4) 50...\(\text{g3 51.g6 g4 etc}

48...\(\text{d1+ 49.e2 e3 50.g8 xg4 51.e7 b7 52.g6+ f5 53.f8}

An awkward square for the knight, but White had no choice, for if 53.\(\text{e7+}, \) Black wins with 53...\(\text{f6} 54.g8+ \) f7.

53...\(\text{e5 54.d2 g4 55.e2 g3 56.f1 d5}

The game was here adjourned, and Dr. Noa resigned a few minutes before seven. His game is hopeless.
A plausible continuation would be 57.\(\text{g2}\) (necessary to rescue the king's knight, which is threatened by 57...\(\text{f6}\) 58.\(\text{h7+}\) \(\text{g6}\) 59.\(\text{f8+}\) \(\text{g7}\)) 57...\(\text{g4}\) 58.\(\text{h7}\) \(\text{h3}\) 59.\(\text{f4+}\) (or 59.\(\text{g5+}\) \(\text{h2}\) etc. If 59.\(\text{g1}\), then 59...\(\text{i3+}\) 60.\(\text{f1}\) (60.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{e1}\)) 60...\(\text{h2+}\) 61.\(\text{g1}\) \(\text{g2}\) 62.\(\text{g5+}\) \(\text{g4}\) etc.) 59...\(\text{h2}\) and must win the knight for the passed pawn.

251 Italian Game
Chigorin
Zukertort
London tournament, 6 June 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c5}\)
4.b4 \(\text{b6}\)
In my opinion this gives a slight but decided superiority of position to Black.
5.0-0 d6 6.a4 a6 7.c3 \(\text{g4}\)
With this and the next move I left the beaten track of the opening.
8.d3 \(\text{w6}\) 9.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{ge7}\) 10.\(\text{bd2}\)
After 10.\(\text{xb6}\) cbx6 11.\(\text{bd2}\) \(\text{g6}\), I would soon get a fine attack against the adverse king's quarters, for whether White proceed with 12.h3 or h4, my reply would be 12...h5!
10...\(\text{g6}\)
The first move of a well-conceived stratagem, by which I got the superior game.

11.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{w5}\) 12.\(\text{xg5}\) \(\text{xd1}\)
13.\(\text{xf7+}\) \(\text{e7}\) 14.\(\text{xe6}\)
White must recover the piece temporarily sacrificed, but neither \(\text{axd1}\) n: \(\text{fxd1}\) would be better than the text move, e.g.:
A) 14.\(\text{axd1}\) \(\text{xf4}\) (threatening to win a piece by 15...h6) 15.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{e2-}\) 16.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 17.\(\text{c1}\) (or 17.\(\text{a}\) \(\text{xb4}\) 18.\(\text{a3}\) \(\text{d4}\) 19.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{e4}\) 20.\(\text{b1}\) c5 etc.) 17...\(\text{xa4}\) 18.\(\text{a1}\) \(\text{b2}\)
B) 14.\(\text{fxd1}\) \(\text{xf4}\) (or 14...\(\text{e5}\) 15.\(\text{xg6}\) \(\text{xf2+}\) and 16...\(\text{hxg6}\) 15.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{e2-}\) 16.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 17.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d4}\).

14...\(\text{e2}\) 15.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{xd3}\) 16.\(\text{xe7}\)

16...d5!
The resource I relied upon when I offered to my opponent the opportunity to win a pawn.
17.h4
The text move is obviously played to permit the retreat of the king's knight, which is completely out of play - 17.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{w6}\). The capture of the pawn would lose a piece for three pawns, which, however, being divided on both wings, cannot be considered together with the knight an equivalent for the two hostile bishops, viz: 17.exd5 \(\text{wxe6}\) 18.dxc6 \(\text{wxe7}\) 19.cxb7 \(\text{a6}\) 20.\(\text{xe5+}\) \(\text{f6}\) 21.\(\text{ae1}\) \(\text{f5}\) and 22...\(\text{xb7}\).
Mr. Chigorin thought he ought to have continued with 17.a5 \&a7 18.acl d4 19.cxd4 \&xd4. I freely admit that this would have been better, but I fail to see how White would guard effectively his pawns on the queen’s flank after Black had protected his c-pawn with ... \&d6.

17...d4! 18.a5
If 18.cxd4, then 18...\&xb4, and 19...\&xd4 or exd4 accordingly.

18...dxc3 19.axb6 cxd2 20.\&ed1 cxb6 21.\&xd2 \&hd8
The safest continuation, but I might have taken the b-pawn at once, e.g. 21...\&xb4 22.\&a4 a5 23.\&xb4 axb4 24.\&xd3 d3 25.\&d2 (or 25.\&d5 b3 26.\&xe5+ \&d6 27.\&b5 \&c6 28.\&b4 \&c5) 25...b3 26.\&b2 \&c8 etc.

22.\&b2 b5
If 22...\&d4, then 23.b5!.

23.\&e1 \&d4 24.\&e3 \&xb4
25.\&d2 \&c4 26.\&f3 \&d4

27.\&g3
Which loses the exchange, but White must try to get some attack at any price, for a quiet line of play in face of the adverse three pawns would lead to a speedy collapse.

27...\&e2+ 28.\&xe2 \&xe2 29.\&f5 \&g8 30.\&g6 \&c4 31.\&b6 \&b8 32.\&g5
32.\&g6 I intended to meet with 32...\&f7 33.\&xg7 \&g8, forcing the exchange.
45...\&xa6
Equally decisive would be 45...bxc4
46.\&a4 b3 47.\&xc4 (47.\&xa3 b2)
47...a2 48.\&a4 b2 etc.
46.\&b3
Or 46.\&a2 b3 47.\&xb3 \&a5 etc.
46...\&b6 47.\&f2 \&a8 48.\&a2 b3
49.\&xb3 a2 50.\&xa2 \&xa2+
51.\&e3 b4 52.h6 \&h2
White resigns.

Quitting the beaten track: White gets
now, like frequently in the Lopez, a
short-lived attack which has no chance
of success against a careful defence.

11.\&xa4+ \&d7

12.h4
With this and the next two move:
White creates a block on the king's side.
thus preventing the breaking up of his
centre by the advance of Black's f-pawn.
The manoeuvre has, however, also its
disadvantages: it secures Black agains:
any attack on the king's side, while it:
weakens White's king's flank consider­
ably.

12...h6 13.h5 g5 14.g4 \&c8
15.\&e3 \&e7
Far better than 15...\&g7, where the
bishop would be perfectly out of play:
while from e7 it can be brought into
action over d8, as actually happens later
on.

16.\&bd2 0-0 17.\&c2
Mr. Steinitz proposes in his annotations
to this game 17.\&c4 instead of the text
move. The move may be better, but
White would derive no advantage from
it, e.g. 17.\&c4 \&cb6 18.\&a5 \&c8
19.\&c6 \&e8 20.\&c2 \&f6 21.\&h2
\&d7 or 21...\&c4.

17...c6 18.c4 \&cb6 19.\&g1 \&c7
20.b3 \&fc8
Threatening to continue after 21...cxd5 22.exd5, with 22...\( \text{xc} \)xd5.

\[
\begin{align*}
21.\text{dxc6} & \quad \text{\( \text{Wxc6} \) 22.\text{e2} \ a5} \\
23.\text{c3} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

23...a4?

Premature: the preparatory move 23...\( \text{d8} \) would be preferable.

\[
24.\text{xa4}
\]

Mr. Steinitz rightly points out that he might have played 24.b4, for if 24...\( \text{xc} \)xc4, then 25.\( \text{d5} \) and 26.\( \text{xa4} \).

\[
24...\text{xa4} 25.\text{bxa4} \text{d8!} 26.0-0 \text{a5} 27.\text{e2}
\]

Mr. Steinitz asserts that 27.\( \text{c1} \) would have maintained his numerical superiority, but I think that this is an error, as the following continuation shows:

\[
\begin{align*}
27.\text{c1} & \quad \text{\( \text{a6} \) 28.\( \text{d3} \) (if 28.\( \text{b3} \), then 28...\( \text{xd2} \) 29.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 30.f3 \( \text{c6} \))} \\
31.\text{~cd1} & \quad \text{\( \text{c5} \) etc.) 28...\( \text{xd2} \) 29.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 30.\( \text{a6} \) \( \text{a4} \) etc.) 29...\( \text{d5} \) and \( \text{Black} \) recovers the pawn, whatever \( \text{White} \) play. \\
27...\( \text{xd2} \) & \quad \text{\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 29.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 30.f3 \( \text{c5} \) 30...\( \text{a6} \) would have simplified matters more than I wished.} \\
31.\( \text{xc5} \) & \quad \text{\( \text{dxc5} \) 32.\( \text{f1} \) c4!} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Of course, 32...\( \text{a6} \) would secure the draw, but the text move was promising in every respect, and it complicated matters to my advantage.

\[
33.\text{c2}
\]

After 33.\( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{d6} \) (threatening 34...\( \text{d4} \) 34.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d8} \), Black gets a well advanced and sufficiently protected passed pawn, while White's a-pawn is hardly defensible.

\[
33...\text{c3} 34.\text{e3} \text{a6}
\]

35.\( \text{b6} \)

It would be worse than useless to attack the pawn, e.g. 35.\( \text{b3} \) (if 35.\( \text{a3} \), then equally 35...\( \text{d6} \) 35...\( \text{d6} \) 36.\( \text{a3} \) (after 36.\( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 37.\( \text{c3} \), Black wins the bishop with 37...\( \text{ec8} \) 38.\( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c5} \)) 36...\( \text{d2} \) 37.\( \text{f2} \) (after 37.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{d2} \) 38.\( \text{d}1 \), Black wins with 38...\( \text{c1} \) 37...\( \text{e2} \), and Black must win.

\[
35...\text{c6} 36.\text{a5} \text{ac6} 37.\text{f2} \text{c4} 38.\text{b3} \text{d4} 39.\text{d5} \text{xb6}
\]

40.\( \text{xb6} \) c2 41.\( \text{xd4} \)

Some commentators have asserted that White ought to have played at once 41.\( \text{c1} \), but Black would then win speedily with 41...\( \text{b2} \) (threatening 42...\( \text{c3} \) and 43...\( \text{b6} \) etc.): 42.\( \text{g3} \) 34.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{a3} \) 44.\( \text{h1} \) \( \text{e2} \); B) 42.\( \text{g2} \) 33.\( \text{e1} \) or 43.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d3} \) 44.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d1} \) 43...\( \text{e2} \) 44.b7 \( \text{xf3} \) 45.\( \text{h2} \) \( \text{d3} \) etc.

\[
41...\text{xex4} 42.\text{c1} \text{d3} 43.\text{e3} \text{e8} 44.\text{b7} \text{g7} ?
\]

Hastily played: 44...\( \text{f8} \) would leave White without any chance. Compare the next note.
45.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{xb7} 46.\texttt{xb7} \\
After 46.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{xd5} 47.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{b3+} 48.\texttt{xc2} \texttt{xf3} 49.\texttt{d6} — if the Black king were at \texttt{f8}, 49...\texttt{e8} would dispose at once of this defence — Black would win the d-pawn with 49...\texttt{a3} — a move ignored by Mr. Steinitz, who gives the ending as won for White — 50.\texttt{d1} \texttt{a8} 51.\texttt{d3} \texttt{f6} 52.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e6} etc. White has then, however, some chances to draw, as his king can reach the pawns.

46...\texttt{xb7} 47.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{b3+} 48.\texttt{xc2} \\
After 48.\texttt{e2} \texttt{e3}, Black wins by advancing his king.

48...\texttt{xf3} 49.\texttt{g1} \\

49.\texttt{e3} \\
A shorter road to victory was pointed out by Mr. Minchin, with 49...\texttt{f6} 50.\texttt{d2} (or 50.\texttt{g2}; if the rook moves anywhere else, Black wins with 50...\texttt{g3}) 50...\texttt{e5} 51.\texttt{e2} \texttt{xe4} 52.\texttt{a1} \texttt{f4} 53.\texttt{a6} \texttt{xe4} 54.\texttt{hxh} 55.\texttt{h8} \texttt{h3} 56.\texttt{h6} \texttt{f4} 57.\texttt{h7} \texttt{h2+} 58.\texttt{el} (or 58.\texttt{d3} \texttt{f3} 59.\texttt{g8} \texttt{xh7} etc.) 58...\texttt{f3} 59.\texttt{d1} \texttt{g3} 60.\texttt{g8} \texttt{xh7} 61.\texttt{g5+} \texttt{f2}.

50.\texttt{g2} \texttt{xe4} 51.\texttt{g3} \texttt{f4} 52.\texttt{e3} \texttt{f6} 52...\texttt{f5} 53.\texttt{gx} \texttt{f5} (53.\texttt{f5} \texttt{f5} 54.\texttt{a7+} \texttt{f7}; continued as in the text — compare Black’s 58th move.) 53...\texttt{h6}, and 54...\texttt{xf5}, would again have saved time.

53.\texttt{g2} \texttt{e5} 54.\texttt{g1} 55.\texttt{a1} \\
The only resource which prolongs the contest, for after 55.\texttt{gxf5} \texttt{xf5} 56.\texttt{g2} Black wins at once with 56...\texttt{g4} 57...\texttt{g5}.

55...\texttt{fxg4} 56.\texttt{a5+} \texttt{h6} 57.\texttt{a6+} \texttt{g7} 58.\texttt{a7+} \texttt{f7} 59.\texttt{a4} \texttt{g3} 60.\texttt{a4} \texttt{a4} 61.\texttt{a3} \texttt{a4} 62.\texttt{a2} \texttt{h5} 63.\texttt{g2} \texttt{h4} 64.\texttt{a6} \texttt{b1} 65.\texttt{h6} \texttt{b4} 66.\texttt{c6} \texttt{e4} 67.\texttt{f6} \texttt{h5} 68.\texttt{b6} \texttt{h4} 69.\texttt{h3} \texttt{a4} 70.\texttt{a6} \texttt{a6} 71.\texttt{a4} \texttt{g6} 72.\texttt{g8} \texttt{h5} 73.\texttt{h8} \texttt{h6} 74.\texttt{g8} \texttt{h7} 75.\texttt{a8} \texttt{g4} 76.\texttt{h2} \texttt{f7} 77.\texttt{a1} \texttt{g5} 78.\texttt{g8} \texttt{f4} 79.\texttt{h8} \texttt{h3}.

80.\texttt{h2} \\

80...\texttt{f3} \\
Threatening an immediate win with 81.\texttt{g3+} 82.\texttt{h1} (or 82.\texttt{xh3} \texttt{g3} 83.\texttt{h2} \texttt{f2}; if 82.\texttt{g1}, then 82...\texttt{h2} 83.\texttt{h1} \texttt{g2+} 84.\texttt{xh2} \texttt{f2} 82...\texttt{f2} 83.\texttt{g8} \texttt{g2+} 84.\texttt{h2} \texttt{f1} 85.\texttt{g6} \texttt{f2}.

Nevertheless, the threat is easily obviated, while 80...\texttt{f5} would force the game against any play. Compare the next note.

81.\texttt{g8} \texttt{f5} 82.\texttt{g7} \texttt{f4} 83.\texttt{g8} \texttt{f7}
A successful attempt to shorten the fight, but the win could only be forced with 83...\textit{\texttt{E}}e5 84.\textit{\texttt{F}}f8+ \textit{\texttt{G}}g5 85.\textit{\texttt{G}}g8+ \textit{\texttt{H}}h4 86.\textit{\texttt{H}}h8+ \textit{\texttt{H}}h5 87.\textit{\texttt{G}}g8 \textit{\texttt{H}}h7 88.\textit{\texttt{G}}g6 \textit{\texttt{A}}a7 and wins.

84.\textit{\texttt{G}}g6

For White could now compel Black to adopt the line of play just examined by playing the rook to any square on the 8th row.

84...\textit{\texttt{E}}a7 85.\textit{\texttt{F}}f6+ \textit{\texttt{G}}g5 86.\textit{\texttt{F}}f2 \textit{\texttt{H}}h4 87.\textit{\texttt{F}}f1 \textit{\texttt{A}}a4 88.\textit{\texttt{B}}b1 g3+ 89.\textit{\texttt{F}}f1 \textit{\texttt{H}}h1 \textit{\texttt{H}}h2

White resigns.

253 Queen’s Pawn Game

Zukertort

Blackburne

London tournament, 11 June 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.d4 e6 2.\textit{\texttt{F}}f3 \textit{\texttt{B}}b6 3.e3 d5 4.\textit{\texttt{E}}d3

The hostile d-pawn being already advanced, I played the bishop to d3 in accordance with my views on the development in close games, given previously in my annotations to this collection.

4...\textit{\texttt{E}}e7 5.0-0 0-0 6.b3 \textit{\texttt{C}}c5 7.\textit{\texttt{E}}b2 \textit{\texttt{C}}c6 8.\textit{\texttt{C}}bd2

I developed the knight to d2, determined to fight the whole battle on the queen’s side.

8...\textit{\texttt{C}}xd4 9.\textit{\texttt{C}}xd4 b6 10.c4 \textit{\texttt{A}}a6

The commencement of a futile attack, and nearly identical with the line of play adopted by Herr Englisch against me—cf. game 247.

11.\textit{\texttt{E}}e1 \textit{\texttt{C}}c8 12.\textit{\texttt{C}}c1 \textit{\texttt{A}}a5 13.\textit{\texttt{E}}e5 \textit{\texttt{B}}b4? 14.c5! \textit{\texttt{C}}xd3 15.\textit{\texttt{C}}xd3

\textit{\texttt{A}}xh2 16.\textit{\texttt{A}}xh2 \textit{\texttt{E}}e4 17.\textit{\texttt{A}}e3 \textit{\texttt{B}}e8 18.f3 \textit{\texttt{F}}f6 19.\textit{\texttt{C}}c2 \textit{\texttt{D}}d7

20.\textit{\texttt{D}}ec1 bxc5

This exchange gives White a crushing superiority of numbers on the queen’s side, which must decide the contest before Black can make any use of his strong centre.

21.\textit{\texttt{D}}xc5 \textit{\texttt{G}}b8

If 21...\textit{\texttt{C}}c6, then 22.b4.

22.\textit{\texttt{G}}e5f6

After 22...\textit{\texttt{B}}bc6 23.\textit{\texttt{F}}xc6 \textit{\texttt{F}}xc6 (23...\textit{\texttt{E}}xc6 24.\textit{\texttt{C}}c3), I intended to proceed with 24.b4, for Black dare not take the pawn on account of 25.\textit{\texttt{C}}c3!.

23.\textit{\texttt{C}}6!\textit{\texttt{C}}c7

The capture of the knight would be immediately disastrous, e.g. 23...\textit{\texttt{F}}xe5 24.c7 \textit{\texttt{D}}d7 or 24.\textit{\texttt{F}}e7 25.\textit{\texttt{C}}xb8 \textit{\texttt{E}}xb8 26.\textit{\texttt{C}}c7 and 27.\textit{\texttt{F}}xe5 or \textit{\texttt{F}}xe5 accordingly.

24.\textit{\texttt{F}}d2

The right reply: 24...\textit{\texttt{C}}c3 would lose a piece by 24...d4!

24...\textit{\texttt{F}}xe5 25.\textit{\texttt{C}}xa5 \textit{\texttt{C}}c8

If 25...\textit{\texttt{C}}xc6, then 26.\textit{\texttt{A}}a4, winning the knight.

26.\textit{\texttt{C}}xe5 \textit{\texttt{F}}f7

Black dare not play 26...\textit{\texttt{E}}xc6, for White would then force the win with 27.\textit{\texttt{E}}xa7.

27.\textit{\texttt{C}}xb8 \textit{\texttt{F}}xb8 28.\textit{\texttt{C}}c7 \textit{\texttt{C}}c8

29.\textit{\texttt{F}}xa7 e5 30.\textit{\texttt{C}}c5 e4 31.\textit{\texttt{C}}b5

\textit{\texttt{F}}f8 32.\textit{\texttt{C}}b8 \textit{\texttt{D}}d7 33.\textit{\texttt{F}}xe8 \textit{\texttt{F}}xe8

34.\textit{\texttt{A}}a4 \textit{\texttt{C}}xa4 35.bxa4 \textit{\texttt{F}}c8

36.\textit{\texttt{F}}xe4 dxe4
37...\texttt{g}f2

The Field gives the prettier conclusion:
37.a5 \texttt{e}7 38.a6 \texttt{e}7 39.a7 \texttt{d}7
40.\texttt{d}d1+ \texttt{x}c7 (or 40...\texttt{c}6 41.\texttt{d}d8 etc.) 41.\texttt{c}c1+ \texttt{f} moves 42.\texttt{d}x \texttt{c}8 etc.

37...\texttt{f}f7 38.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{e}e6 39.\texttt{x}e4
\texttt{g}6 40.\texttt{c}c6+ \texttt{d}7 41.\texttt{d}d5
Black resigns.

15.c3! \texttt{f}f4

Having compromised the game by the last move, I ought to have been satisfied with a draw, which I could easily get with 15...\texttt{g}x \texttt{g}3 16.\texttt{h}x \texttt{g}3 \texttt{f}xe5

17.\texttt{x}e3 \texttt{f}xe3+ 18.\texttt{x}e3 \texttt{f}6 etc.

16.\texttt{x}f4 \texttt{g}xf4 17.\texttt{f}f5 \texttt{d}d8
After 17...\texttt{f}xf5 18.\texttt{f}xe5 \texttt{f} moves; White wins a pawn, with 19.\texttt{d}d4.

18.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{f}f6

If 18...\texttt{g}5, then 19.\texttt{b}4.

19.0-0-0 \texttt{g}8 20.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{e}ad4

21.cxd4 \texttt{b}b4 22.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{dxe5}?

A serious mistake, which might have proved fatal. I ought to have continued with 22...\texttt{g}5 or \texttt{e}6.

23.\texttt{x}e5 \texttt{g}5 24.\texttt{d}d6+

Overlooking 24 \texttt{e}4!, which would gain the exchange at least.

24...\texttt{x}d6 25.\texttt{e}ed6+ \texttt{e}6

26.\texttt{c}c2 \texttt{f}3+ 27.\texttt{d}d2

27...\texttt{f}f8!

Black now quickly recovers the lost ground. The text move protects indi-
rectly both pawns — 28.\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}x\textbf{c}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{E}}c8}; 28.\textit{\textbf{\text{Q}}x\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{\text{W}}x\textbf{g}2} — and it enables Black to bring his rooks into cooperation.

28.\textit{\textbf{\text{G}}}3 \textit{\textbf{\text{D}}d5} 29.\textit{\textbf{\text{R}}}e1 \textit{\textbf{\text{D}}}d8 30.\textit{\textbf{\text{R}}}e3

30.\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}c3 would be a little better.

30...\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}f6 31.\textit{\textbf{\text{A}}}d3 \textit{\textbf{\text{E}}g5} 32.\textit{\textbf{\text{Q}}}xf3 \textit{\textbf{\text{D}}}f5 33.\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}c3 \textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xd6 34.\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\text{G}}}g7

35.\textit{\textbf{\text{G}}}4 \textit{\textbf{\text{F}}}f4 36.\textit{\textbf{\text{H}}}h4 \textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e6

Superfluous caution: I had determined some moves previously to continue with 36...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xf2!; but I now forgot all about it, and played mechanically the threatened rook.

37.\textit{\textbf{\text{F}}}f5+ \textit{\textbf{\text{H}}}h7 38.f3

\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{40.\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}f8}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{White must pursue even the semblance of an attack at any price, for his prospects of an endgame are nil.}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{40...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xe3 41.\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xe3 \textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xf3}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{Decisive: 41...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xf3 would lose, for White would reply 42.\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e8!}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{42.\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e5}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{White has no saving move: if 42.h3, then 42...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}c4+ 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{B}}}b1 \textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e4+ and White must sacrifice the exchange to escape a forced mate. If 42.\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e8, then 42...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xg4 etc. Equally disastrous would be 42.\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e6 \textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}c4+ 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{B}}}b1 (if 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{D}}}d2, Black mates in two moves) 43...\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}c4+ 44.\textit{\textbf{\text{B}}}a2 \textit{\textbf{\text{C}}}a4+ 45.\textit{\textbf{\text{B}}}b3 \textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xe6+ etc.}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{42...\textit{\textbf{\text{X}}}xg4 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{D}}}d6?}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{An opportune blunder: White had two moves which prevented the loss of a piece, viz: 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{D}}}e7 and 43.\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}e8, but in either case Black would force the game, beginning with 43...\textit{\textbf{\text{E}}}c4+.}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{43...\textit{\textbf{\text{W}}}xe5}}} \quad \textbf{\textit{\textbf{\text{White resigns.}}}}} \)
Tour of U.S.A. 1883-1884

255 Queen’s Pawn Game

Zukertort

Judd

Manhattan Chess Club, 6 November 1883

Notes by Hoffer

1.d4 e6

The development of the game in Irregular Openings depends entirely on the judgement of the players. No hard and fast rules can be laid down, only general principles. Chigorin’s method, for instance, in answer to 1.d4 is 1...d5 2.e3 c5f3 e5 3.g4 e2 e6 etc. But then the Russian master is an attacking player, and consequently averse to close games.

2.gf3 e5 3.e3 d5 4.d3 d4 5.0-0 0-0 6.b3 e8 7.b2 d7 c4 c6 9.bd2 f8

It might have been advisable now to break through in the centre with 9...e5, especially with the rook on the open file. But it was a preconceived notion, evidently, when Black played ...e8, to make room for the knight.

10.e4 11.xe4 xxe4

Bad judgement. Black weakens his e-pawn with the text move, and this weak spot must involve the loss of the game against a master of close openings such as Dr. Zukertort.

12.xe4 f5?

For the purpose of posting his rooks on the king’s side, and then to throw forward the pawns. We should have preferred to play at once 17...g5, or ...e7. ...e8, preparatory to it. But Black could hardly expect to succeed in his design with the king in such an exposed position.

17.f7

If 19.bxa5, Black would get it back with 19...e7.

19...c7

A well-timed sacrifice of a pawn, the force of which Black apparently greatly underrated.

10...dxe4 11.xe4 xxe4

12.xe4 f5?

A well-timed sacrifice of a pawn, the force of which Black apparently greatly underrated.
20...cxb5 21.d5 \textit{c}ad8

Obviously, if 21...exd5 instead of the text move, White would win at least a piece with 22.\textit{w}xd5+ \textit{e}e6 23.\textit{w}xf5+ \textit{g}g8 24.\textit{a}xe6+.

22.d6 \textit{e}c6 23.\textit{w}c3 \textit{g}g4 24.\textit{h}f2 \textit{b}4 25.\textit{w}e5 \textit{b}b8 26.\textit{d}d1!

An elegant finish. Black cannot save his queen.

26...\textit{g}6 27.\textit{h}h5!

Black resigns.

9.c3

Mackenzie v Zukertort, in the late London tournament, played here 9.\textit{g}g5 \textit{x}g5 10.\textit{x}g5 \textit{e}e7 11.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}7 etc. Mr. Judd's mode of development also has its merits.

9...\textit{b}7 10.\textit{e}e1 \textit{g}6 11.\textit{bd}2 \textit{e}7 12.\textit{c}c2 \textit{c}5

13...\textit{d}7 instead of the text move would have been better. Black must now lose a pawn.

13.\textit{d}d4 \textit{e}6 14.\textit{xe}6 fxe6 15.\textit{h}h5

Somehow one is impressed with a notion that there ought to be more in the position than the simple gain of a pawn which, after all, is counterbalanced by the disadvantage arising from the open files, which Black promptly utilises. Perhaps 15.\textit{g}4 was stronger. A probable continuation then would have been: 15...\textit{d}7 16.\textit{f}3 c5 17.\textit{b}4 \textit{f}8 18.bxc5 \textit{xc}5 19.\textit{e}3 \textit{e}7 20.\textit{d}4 with a decided advantage in position.

15...\textit{d}7 16.\textit{xe}6 hxe6 17.\textit{we}6 \textit{g}8 18.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}8 19.\textit{e}3 c5 20.\textit{ed}1 \textit{f}5 21.\textit{a}4 bxa4 22.\textit{xa}4 \textit{c}7 23.\textit{a}5 d4 24.cxd4 \textit{xf}3 25.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 26.\textit{c}1

We believe White ought to have left the rook en prise with many chances of a favourable result, e.g. 26.\textit{xa}6:
37.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{g2}}\) + 38.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e3}}\)

It is quite immaterial now where the king goes to. If 38.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e1}}\), then 38...\(\textcolor{red}{\text{g1}}\) + 39.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d2}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{d4}}\) + etc.

38...\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e4}}\) + 39.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d3}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{f1}}\) + 40.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d2}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{e2}}\) + 41.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d3}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{e4}}\) + 42.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d4}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{d1}}\) +

White resigns.

257 Vienna Gambit

Zukertort

Delmar

Manhattan Chess Club, 8 November 1883

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{c3}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{c6}}\) 3.f4 exf4

4.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{f3}}\) g5 5.h4 g4 6.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{g5}}\)

6...h6?

Mr. Delmar is evidently not familiar with this opening. Among the numerous defences we may point out: 6...\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e5}}\) 7.d4 h6 8.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf4}}\) (8.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xe5}}\) ? hxg5 9.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xe5}}\) d6 etc. with the better game) 8...\(\textcolor{red}{\text{g6}}\) 9.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf7}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf7}}\) 10.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{c4}}\) + d5 11.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xd5}}\) etc.

7.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf7}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf7}}\) 8.d4 h5?

The best continuation here is 8...d6, when the following is a probable continuation: 8...d6 9.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf4}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{g6}}\) 10.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{c4}}\) + \(\textcolor{red}{\text{g6}}\) 11.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e3}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{h7}}\) 12.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{d3}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{ge7}}\) 13.0-0 \(\textcolor{red}{\text{e4}}\) 14.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{b4}}\) d5 15.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{e6}}\) 16.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{h3}}\) etc.

9.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{c4}}\) + \(\textcolor{red}{\text{g7}}\) 10.\(\textcolor{red}{\text{xf4}}\) \(\textcolor{red}{\text{f6}}\) ?

11.0-0! \(\textcolor{red}{\text{xd4}}\)
If 11...\textit{\texttt{W}}xd4+, then 12.\textit{\texttt{W}}xd4+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}xd4
13.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e5+ and wins.
\begin{itemize}
  \item 12.\textit{\texttt{Q}}d5 \textit{\texttt{Q}}f3+ 13.\textit{\texttt{A}}xf3 \textit{\texttt{Q}}c5+
  \item 14.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e3 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xe3+ 15.\textit{\texttt{A}}xe3 \textit{\texttt{W}}xh4
  \item 16.\textit{\texttt{W}}d4+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}f6 17.\textit{\texttt{A}}f1 \textit{\texttt{Q}}f8 18.g3
  \item \textit{\texttt{W}}g5 19.\textit{\texttt{A}}f5 \textit{\texttt{W}}h6 20.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e1 d6
\end{itemize}

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

At last! An Allgaier Gambit without the d-pawn being moved must be hopeless. Black's game was in a desperate state immediately after his 6th move, and the subsequent ingenious skirmish of very little avail.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 21.\textit{\texttt{B}}xf6! \textit{\texttt{B}}xf6 22.\textit{\texttt{B}}f1 c5 23.\textit{\texttt{Q}}c3
  \item \textit{\texttt{Q}}f5
\end{itemize}

The only move to be able to hold out a few more moves.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 24.\textit{\texttt{B}}xf5 \textit{\texttt{B}}f8 25.\textit{\texttt{B}}xf6 \textit{\texttt{B}}xf6
  \item 26.\textit{\texttt{B}}xf6 \textit{\texttt{W}}xf6 27.\textit{\texttt{W}}xf6+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}xf6
  \item 28.\textit{\texttt{Q}}f2
\end{itemize}

Black resigns.

If 28 ...\textit{\texttt{Q}}e5, then 29.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e3, followed by 30.\textit{\texttt{Q}}d5 etc.

Too violent at this early stage. The game is not sufficiently developed for a counter attack, the previous move might have been dispensed with advantageously.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 10.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e1
\end{itemize}

In order to bring the knight to f1 for the defence of the h-pawn to make room for the king's knight, so as to be able to attack the adverse knight with f3, and at the same time support the subsequent advance of the e-pawn, after the bishop at e2 is removed.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 10...g5 11.\textit{\texttt{B}}f1 \textit{\texttt{W}}f6 12.\textit{\texttt{Q}}d2 \textit{\texttt{Q}}f8
  \item 13.f3 \textit{\texttt{W}}h6
\end{itemize}

\begin{center}
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\begin{itemize}
  \item 14.\textit{\texttt{Q}}d3
\end{itemize}

Without doubt, in a single-handed encounter Mr Zukertort would not have hesitated to capture the offered piece. But it can hardly be expected that a blindfold player, who has eleven other games to attend to, should venture to submit to such a powerful attack which necessarily must ensue from Black's sacrifice. White has a good game, and leaves nothing to chance. If 14.fxg4, then obviously 14...hxg4 and the only move for White to escape then would be 15.\textit{\texttt{Q}}d3. Among the numerous variations at the disposal of Black the most promising would be 15...\textit{\texttt{Q}}xh2+ 16.\textit{\texttt{Q}}f2 \textit{\texttt{W}}h4+ 17.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e2 \textit{\texttt{Q}}g3 18.\textit{\texttt{Q}}xg3
\textit{\texttt{W}}xg3 19.\textit{\texttt{B}}g1 f4 20.exf4 gxf4 21.\textit{\texttt{Q}}f1

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 258 Dutch Defence
  \item Zukertort
  \item Simonson
  \item 12 board blindfold exhibition, Manhattan Chess Club, 10 November 1883
  \item Notes by Hoffer
  \item 1.d4 f5 2.e3 e6 3.\textit{\texttt{Q}}f3 \textit{\texttt{B}}f6 4.\textit{\texttt{Q}}e2
  \item d5 5.0-0 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d6 6.c4 c6 7.b3 \textit{\texttt{B}}b7
  \item 8.\textit{\texttt{B}}b2 \textit{\texttt{Q}}g4 9.\textit{\texttt{B}}bd2 h5
\end{itemize}
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and the king will get into safety over d1 to c2.

14...g6 15.cxd5
White has a double object in view with the text move, viz. to open the e-file if 15...exd5, or if 15...cxd5, the bishop would have a good move in checking at b5 if attacked with ...\(\text{xf4}\) after the advance of\(e4\).

15...exd5 16.e4 fxe4 17.fxe4 0-0
18.e5 \(\text{xe6}\) 19.\(\text{xe5}\)
If 19.dxe5, then 19...\(\text{c5+}\) etc.
19...\(\text{xe5}\) 20.dxe5 c5 21.\(\text{f3}\) c4
22.bxc4 \(\text{xf3}\)

23.\(\text{h7+}\)!
Very clever! If 22.\(\text{xf3}\) or gxf3, then 23...\(\text{b6+}\), winning the bishop at b2. After White’s text move, either queen or bishop may interpose in answer to ...\(\text{b6+}\).

23...\(\text{xh7}\)
If 23...\(\text{xh7}\), then 24.gxf3, winning the knight.

24.gxf3 \(\text{h6}\) 25.\(\text{xd5+ f8}\)
Somewhat better would have been 25...\(\text{xf7}\); but White would have won ultimately with 26.\(\text{d8+ h7}\)
27.\(\text{xf5}\) etc.

26.\(\text{d8+ f7}\) 27.e6+
The speediest way to win. If 27...\(\text{g6}\), then 28.\(\text{e8+}\) etc. If 27...\(\text{xe6}\), then 28.\(\text{e1+}\) etc.
Black resigns.

This advance is perhaps premature. As a general rule a quiet development in games at the odds of a pawn and move and pawn and two moves is advisable.

5...exf4 6.\(\text{xf4}\) 0-0 7.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{g4}\)
8.0-0 \(\text{bd7}\) 9.\(\text{bc3}\) \(\text{h5}\)
10.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{xf4}\) 11.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{g5}\)
12.g3 \(\text{e5}\) 13.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{d7}\)
Black’s advantage of position more than counterbalances the pawn minus.

14.\(\text{e2}\)
If 14.\(\text{e2}\), Black would reply 14...\(\text{xf4}\)
15.gxf4 \(\text{h3}\) etc. If 15.\(\text{gxg4}\), then 15...\(\text{e3+}\), winning a piece.

14...\(\text{h6}\)
Preparing the advance of...\(g5\).

15.h3 g5 16.hxg4 gxf4
17...gxf4
If 17...dxg4, then 17...xf4 18.gxf4
(18...xf4 19.gxf4 dxg4 etc.)
18...dxg4 and we arrive at about the same position as in the text.

18...t2Jxg4 19.f5 19...h8 20...h1
t2Jg8 20...h3 19...h1
t2Jf5 21...e3!
22.Ba1 t2Jg5 23...g3 t2Jf8
24...h4 21...f2! 25...g2 t2Jxg3
26...xg3 e5
White resigns.

260 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Delmar
Manhattan Chess Club, 8 December 1883
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.tbf3 t2Jc6 3...b5 t2Jf6
4.0-0 t2Jxe4 5.d4 a6
It is customary to proceed with 15...t2Je7 in answer to White's t2Jh1, followed by t2Jg1 and g4 etc.
16...c3
16...t2Jd2 was here preferable.
16...t2Jf5 17...xf5 17...c7 18...h3 t2Jxf5
19...xf5 t2Jf3 20...xf3 c4
21...c2 b5 22...t2Jc1 t2Jc7 23...e4
a5 24...h4 t2Jf6
Although White gains an important move through 24...t2Jf6, yet it seems forced, as he cannot allow White's t2Jh5.
25...e1 t2Jf7 26...t2Jf4 t2Jc6
It is almost needless to point out that Black cannot capture the d5-pawn on account of 27...h5 h6 28...t2Jg4 etc.
27...t2Jg4 b4 28...d4 t2Jf7
29...h6 t2Jc5 30...t2Jc3 t2Jh8

31...h2J6!
So if 31...t2Jxg6, then 32...h4+ t2Jg8
33...t2Jxg6 and mate follows.
31...t2Jg8 32...h4!
Threatening mate in two moves.
32...t2Jg8 33...xf7 t2Jxg7
34...t2Jxg7 t2Jxg7 35...t2Jg5+ t2Jh8
36...t2Jxf6+ t2Jxf6 37...t2Jf6+ t2Jg8
38...t2Jg5+ t2Jf7 39...t2Jh5+ t2Jf7
40.f6+! t2Jd8
If 40...t2Jd7, then 41...xf5+ etc., or
40...t2Jf6 41...t2Jc5+ t2Je7 42...t2Jh7+ t2Jd8 43...t2Jg8+ wins.
41.f7
Black resigns.

261 Spanish Game
Sellman
Zukertort
2nd Match Game. Baltimore,
27 December 1883
Notes by Hoffer
1.e4 e5 2...f3 t2Jc6 3...b5 t2Jf6
4.0-0 t2Jxe4 5.d4 a6
Morphy adopted this move first, v L. Paulsen, in the New York tournament 1857. It was revived by Rosenthal v. Zukertort, in their match, 1880.

6. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{dxc6}}} \)

Paulsen and Zukertort prefer 6. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d3}}} \), but the continuation is rather complicated. A simpler line of play, 6. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xc6}}} \), as in the text, was originated by Chigorin. Both variations have been analysed by Prof. J. Berger, of Graz, and published in the Chess Monthly, February 1883.

6... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{dxc6}}} \) 7. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \)

Winawer plays here 7. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e2}}} \); Mr. Sellman's move is equally good. Black's reply in either case is the same.

7... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f5}}} \) 8. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c3}}} \)

8. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe5}}} \) seems to have been better. In consequence of the text move, Black is enabled to develop his game rapidly, and, after half a dozen more moves, he has already the better position.

8... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xc3}}} \) 9. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe5+}}} \) 10. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e6}}} \) 10. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{bxc3}}} \)

\( \text{\textit{\textbf{d6}}} \) 11. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \) 0-0 12. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g5}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c8}}} \)

13. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d2}}} \) 14. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d7}}} \) 15. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xd6}}} \)

The undoubling of the pawn is barely counterbalanced by White's remaining with knight against bishop, especially as Black immediately exchanges the knight.

15... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{cxd6}}} \) 16. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{a3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g4}}} \) 17. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f4}}} \)

\( \text{\textit{\textbf{xf3}}} \) 18. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xf3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{fe8}}} \) 19. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e6}}} \)

20. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ae8}}} \) 21. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d5}}} \) 22. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe6}}} \)

\( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe6}}} \) 23. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d6}}} \)

24. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \)

On the previous move the game was adjourned, Mr. Sellman enclosing his next move in an envelope. Either he was pressed for time, or he did not sufficiently contemplate the consequence of Black not exchanging rooks. Obviously it would have been advisable to guard against the loss of the pawn first.

24... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b8}}} \)

If 24... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe1}}} \), White would probably be able to draw, if Black were to capture either of the pawns.

25. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c1}}} \)

25. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} \) seems to prevent – at least immediately – the loss of a pawn.

25... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe2}}} \) 26. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e6}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f7}}} \) 27. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c7}}} \)

28. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \)

 Forced, else 28... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d7}}} \) would lose the rook.

28... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d7}}} \) 29. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e8}}} \) 30. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe8}}} \)

\( \text{\textit{\textbf{xe8}}} \) 31. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e7}}} \) 32. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b6}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g5}}} \)

33. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g7}}} \) 34. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{h5}}} \) 35. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c1}}} \)

h4 36. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{a4}}} \) f5 37. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g6}}} \)

38. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f6}}} \) 39. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g4}}} \) 40. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{fxg4}}} \)

fxg4 41. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{cx5}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{cx5}}} \) 42. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g6}}} \)

43. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g3+}}} \) 44. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e4}}} \) 45. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{cx5}}} \)

h3!

White resigns.

After 46. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{gxh3}}} \) to prevent ... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{h2}}} \) Black wins with 46... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{h1+}}} \) 47. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g2+}}} \) 48. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xd2+}}} \) and 43... \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g2}}} \).
262 Spanish Game
Judd
Zukertort
4th Match Game, St. Louis, 4 January 1884
Notes by Hoffer

1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 a6
4.a4 f6 5.0-0 xe4 6.e1
This move has been somewhat neglected of late in favour of 6.d4, which is justly considered stronger.

6...c5 7.xc6 dxc6 8.xe5
e7 9.d4 e6 10.e3 0-0 11.f4
e6 12.f3 e8
Black conducts the game from this point with great care and comes out after a dozen moves with a telling superiority of position.

13.c3 f8 14.h3
It is questionable whether this defensive move was necessary. We should have preferred 14.e2. If Black plays 14...g4, then 15.g3 followed by 16.h3 accordingly.

14...e6 15.e2 d7 16.g3
g6 17.d2
if 17.d3, then 17...d6.

17.d5
Superior to 17...d6, which White might answer with 18.e4.

18.f2 d6 19.h5 e7
20.eac1

Black has clearly the best of the strategical development so far. His bishops are well posted; he is ready to double his rooks on the e-file. The only piece comparatively inactive is the knight, but he has plenty of time to bring it into use by the subsequent clever manoeuvre. White attempts with the next move to support the advance of the c-pawn, but this is easily prevented by Black's ...b5. Any attempt to dislodge the bishop with b3 and c4 would be foiled by Black's ...a3 attacking the rook, etc.

20...b5 21.a3
We fail to see a reason for this move.

21.f7
Preparing the following manoeuvre of the knight.

22.h2
2.g4 at once, instead of the retreat of the knight, might have been done. White has lost too much time already, which his opponent readily turned to advantage.

22...e7 23.g4
To prevent the hostile knight from entering f5, but the move compromises White's position.

23.c8 24.f3 b6 25.d2
e8 26.g3 g6 27.a1
We notice a great want of purpose in White's movements. No sooner has he developed a piece, than he moves it back again. An instance – the several knights' tours and the last rook's move.

27.e7 28.gf1
Perhaps 28.b3 might have been better at this juncture. There was ample time for the text move.

28.h5! 29.h2
29.h4 might here be considered but White's position is already very precarious.

29.h7 30.df3 hxg4 31.xg4
g7 32.g2 eeh8 33.h1
7...e4 8...e7 9...c5 9...xg6 dxg6 10...xd4 0-0 11...e3 f6 12...xf6 e6 13.c3
We should prefer 13...c3. If Black replies 13...e6, then 14...ce2 with a well-developed game.
13...e6 14...f3 wxd1 15...xd1 c5 16...bd2 b6 17...e4 b7 18...xf6+ xf6 19...e1
If 19...g5, Black would answer 19...xg5 20...xg5 g6, with a winning advantage in spite of the different colour of the bishops. 19...e5, with a view of posting it at d7, was not any better, because it could not maintain itself in that position if attacked.
19...c4!

20.f3
There is no necessity for this move. The rooks might have been doubled on the open file instead.
20...e8 21...f2
The action of the adverse bishop being temporarily neutralised, 21...c2 might have been done here, so as to utilise this inactive piece. The sequel shows that owing to the king's move the adverse bishop gets into active play.
21...f8 22...c2 e4 23...b4
Under the circumstances it might perhaps have been advisable to retire 23...e1. Obviously it is Black’s inten-
tion to exchange bishop for knight and bring round his knight to d3, which is such an inviting place for it, supported by the advanced c-pawn.

23 ... a5 24.\(d5\) \(x\)xd5 25.\(x\)xd5 \(f6\) 26.\(e1\) \(g6\) 27.\(d2\)

As good as anything else. If 27.\(g3\) or 27.\(xd4\), then the knight would come in at e5 etc., when White's game might be considered over.

27 ... \(xe1\) 28.\(xe1\) \(f4\) 29.\(d1\)

White resigns.

264 Evans Gambit

Zukertort (without \(b1\))

Phillips

Toronto, January 1884

Notes by Ranken

1.e4 e5 2.\(f3\) \(c6\) 3.\(c4\) \(c5\) 4.\(b4\) \(b4\) 5.\(c3\) \(a5\) 6.0-0 \(d6\)

7.d4 exd4

If 7 ... \(xc3\), White may reply with 8.\(xf7+\), or else with 8.\(b3\), and if Black then takes the rook, by 9.\(xf7+\) \(f8\) 10.\(xg8\) \(xg8\) 11.\(g5\), he is said to obtain a winning attack. In the latter case, however, we opine that by 11.\(xg5\) 12.\(xg5\) \(xd4\), Black may make the assertion at least questionable.

8.\(b3\) \(f6\) 9.e5 \(xe5\) 10.\(g5\) \(g6\) 11.\(e1\) \(b6\)

It is very hard to say how Black ought now to meet the vigour of his opponent's assault. 11 ... \(xc3\) would not do, as White would answer with the fine move 12.\(xe5\); possible, however, is 11 ... \(f6\), and if 12.\(xg8\), then 12 ... \(xc3\) might be a feasible defence.

12.\(xe5\) \(xe5\) 13.\(xe5\) 14.cxd4!

A very subtle move, intended not merely to lure the unwary odds receiver into forking the rooks, but also threatening to check at a3, obliging the black queen to interpose, whereupon she would be lost by the reply \(d5\).

14 ... \(xd4\) ?

Falling into the trap! He should have played 14 ... \(d7\).

15.\(d1\) c5 16.\(xd4!\) \(e6\)

17.\(xb7\) \(c8\)

17 ... \(e8\) was, of course, the right move, but it could not long have averted the inevitable disaster. The whole of this little game is a brilliant specimen of Mr. Zukertort's genius.

18.\(xc8+\)!

Black resigns.

265 Vienna Game

Zukertort

Berry

12 board blindfold exhibition, Montreal,

13 February 1884

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(c3\) \(c5\) 3.f4 \(d6\)

4.\(f3\) \(f6\) 5.\(c4\) \(g4\) 6.d3 \(xf3\)

7.\(xf3\) \(bd7\)

Black could play here 7 ... a6, if his intention is to keep his bishop, which, to a certain extent, occupies a good position.
13.fxe5
13...\texttt{\textbackslash d}xe5 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e}2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 15.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}7 16.\texttt{\textbackslash d}4 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 17.\texttt{\textbackslash w}d3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 18.\texttt{\textbackslash a}ae1 \texttt{\textbackslash f}e8 19.\texttt{\textbackslash c}2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}f8
19...\texttt{\textbackslash d}f8 would not have been any better. Black has no alternative now but to remain passive and let events take their course. White has a splendidly developed game with two well posted bishops against two knights and open files to bring his rooks into action.

20.a3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}7

21.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 22.\texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}8 23.\texttt{\textbackslash f}1
White might have saved a move in playing 21.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3, and executed the same manoeuvre with it as with the king's rook. Obviously he would then have had a rook at \texttt{\textbackslash f}1, whereas he has to move the queen's rook to \texttt{\textbackslash f}1 now; but his position will easily bear such a slight extravagance.

23...c5 24.\texttt{\textbackslash f}4 c4
This only drives the queen into a more attacking position, perhaps 25...d5 might have proved, comparatively, better.

25.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash d}5 26.e5 fxe5 27.dxe5 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 28.\texttt{\textbackslash a}h6! \texttt{\textbackslash g}xh6 29.\texttt{\textbackslash w}h6+

29...\texttt{\textbackslash h}7
29...\texttt{\textbackslash h}7, giving up the exchange, would have delayed the game, but no: altered the result. White would have proceeded with 30.\texttt{\textbackslash x}h7 or 30.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f8, equally advantageous.

30.\texttt{\textbackslash w}f6+! \texttt{\textbackslash g}7 31.\texttt{\textbackslash x}h7 \texttt{\textbackslash w}b8 32.\texttt{\textbackslash f}5+ \texttt{\textbackslash g}8 33.\texttt{\textbackslash e}6+
Black resigns.

266 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Payne
Boston Chess Club, 27 February 1884
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash c}6 3.\texttt{\textbackslash c}4 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5 4.b4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}b4 5.c3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}5 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 dxc3 8.\texttt{\textbackslash b}b3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 9.e5 \texttt{\textbackslash g}6 10.\texttt{\textbackslash c}xc3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}7
In the game Zukertort-Tennison played at the New Orleans Chess Club, 25 April 1884, 10...\texttt{\textbackslash d}8? was played. The game concluded 11.\texttt{\textbackslash a}3 \texttt{c}6 12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}ad1 \texttt{b}5 13.\texttt{\textbackslash d}3 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e6 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e}4 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 15.\texttt{\textbackslash w}c2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 16.\texttt{\textbackslash f}e1! \texttt{\textbackslash b}7 17.\texttt{\textbackslash d}6+ \texttt{\textbackslash d}8 18.\texttt{\textbackslash f}5
Black resigned
11.\texttt{\textbackslash a}3 0-0 12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}ad1!
The strongest continuation, we think. It was first played by Munk against Zukertort at Berlin in October 1871.

13.e3 Wh5 is the established continuation.

14.Bxe7+ Wxe7 15.d5 b4
16.c1 Axd5 17.Bxd5

17.e7

Tempting, but disastrous. Black has no satisfactory continuation; if 17...Aa6, then 18.e1, threatening 19.e4; if 17...Wg4, then 18.d3 (otherwise Black would proceed with 18...W or Bc4) and we fail to discover any move which might satisfactorily meet the dangers of the situation, for White threatens, in the first instance, 19.e1 and 20.e4, and then 19.e6, either pawn takes pawn e6, 20.Bg5 etc.

18.Bg5!

Forcing the game in good style. White's position, however excellent, does not admit of another way, as problem composers would call it, viz: 18.e4 Bb7 (if 18...Axd5?, then, of course, 19.Axd5, and 20.Axa8; if 18...Ae6 then 19.Bg5 Wg4 20.Bd3) 19.Bg5 Axd5 20.Bxd5 Wg6 (if 20...Wg4, White wins with 21.Bxa8 Bxa8 22.Wxf7 Afc6 23.Bg6!). After 20...Axd5 21.Bxe6 fxe6, White would proceed with 22.Ba4) 21.Bxa8 Bxa8, and albeit Black has the inferior game, he has fair means to fight for a draw.

18...Axd5 19.Bh3

Black resigns.

The identical game was played about two years ago between Messrs Hirschfield and Zukertort. The latter won the rook.

267 Scotch Game

Zukertort

Wright

7 board blindfold exhibition, Boston,
29 February 1884

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.Bf3 Bc6 3.d4 exd4
4.Bxd4 Axd4 5.Bxd4 Bc7
6.Bc4 Bc6 7.Wd5 Wf6 8.0-0 d6
9.Bc3 Axc6

Premature. 9...a6 might be played preparatory to the text move.

10.Bb5 Bb8

Black ought to have castled instead. White could not have played 11.Bg5, because of 11...Bxc4.
11. d5! d8 12. f4 a6 13. w a4 e7 14. f5 d7 15. w a3 e5
15... e6, to prevent the advance of the f-pawn, followed by castling or the move in the text, would have been safer.

The usual move here is 10... e7 11. d3 0-0 etc.

11. d3 0-0 12. c3 h6
The text move is loss of time. Perhaps it would have been better, in spite of the slight deviation from the 'normal' defence indulged in by Black, to adhere to the recognised opening moves and play here 12... c5. Experiments prove as a rule abortive in such thoroughly analysed openings as the Evans'.

13. e2 c5 14. g3 c7

16. w g3! f6 17. x f6+ gxf6
White announced at this stage the following continuation, if 17... x f6:
18. g5 f3+ 19. x f3 d4+ 20. e3 x c4 21. x g7 f8 22. h6, and wins.
18. g7 e7 19. g5! f8
20. x f6+ e8 21. x e5 dxe5
22. x e5+ d8 23. d d1 b5
24. x f7 h6 25. e6 d6
26. x d7 x d7
26... x d7 is comparatively better; but it would not have changed the result of the game.
27. x d7+ x d7 28. e6+ d8
29. e1+
Black resigns.

15. h4! x e4
Somewhat risky. 15... b5 might have been tried here. It is quite evident that Black must obtain a counter attack on the queen's side, as the only chance of temporarily arresting White's preparation on the king's side. If he cannot succeed in that, of course the game is lost.

16. g f5 x f5 17. x f5 f6
18. d2 c4 19. x h6+! h8
Obviously if 19... g x h6, then 20. w x h6, and Black would have no means of saving his game.

20. c2 c3
A move frequently played by Bird. The object is if 21. x c3 to break the attack with 21... c4, and 22... e5 etc.

21. w x c3 c8
If 21... g x h6, White would continue with 22. f3 g7 23. g4+ h8
24.\textit{xf}5 etc. The text move does not improve matters; but nothing could.

22.\textit{He}3 \textit{wd}7 23.\textit{d}g4+ \textit{Ag}8
24.\textit{x}f6+
Black resigns.

269 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Martinez
Philadelphia Chess Club, 18 March 1884
Notes by Hoffer
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{Af}3 c6 3.\textit{C}c4 \textit{Cc}5
4.b4 \textit{xb}4 5.c3 \textit{Cc}5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \textit{C}b6 9.d5 \textit{Aa}5
10.\textit{B}b2 \textit{f}6
The more usual continuation here is 10...\textit{Le}7 11.d3 0-0 etc. The text move enables White to dispense with the move \textit{wd}2.

11.\textit{d}3

11...\textit{g}4
This move is not looked upon with favour by the authorities, because after the exchange of the knight, White gets an open file, which makes an already difficult defence for Black still more embarrassing; further, White will endeavour to post his knight at e6, and that object once accomplished, Black’s position may be considered untenable.

12.\textit{C}c3 \textit{e}7 13.\textit{h}1 0-0 14.\textit{E}e2
\textit{xf}3

Of doubtful value, for the above-stated reason. We should not have taken the knight unless compelled to. 14...\textit{Ag}6 instead might have been played.

15.\textit{xf}3 \textit{g}6 16.f4 \textit{wd}7 17.f5
\textit{e}5 18.\textit{Cc}1 \textit{a}6
The sequel shows the object of this move. Black intends to propose an exchange of queens, and to bring his queen’s knight into activity. The conception is ingenious, but fails to produce the desired effect against such a master of the Evans Gambit as Dr. Zukertort.

19.\textit{f}4 \textit{f}7 20.\textit{g}1 \textit{x}d3
There seems to be no apparent reason why Black should not have taken the pawn with his bishop.

21.\textit{wd}3 \textit{b}5 22.\textit{Cc}2 \textit{c}4

23.\textit{xf}6!
Dr. Zukertort evidently saw his opponent’s manoeuvre, and did not prevent it, as he gained a pawn by the transaction.

23...\textit{xf}6 24.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4
25.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xf}7
If 25...\textit{xf}2, White would have replied 26.\textit{Ag}7+! \textit{Ag}7 27.\textit{h}5+ etc.

26.\textit{g}2 \textit{E}e8 27.\textit{E}e6 \textit{h}8
28.\textit{Cc}3 \textit{Ed}7 29.\textit{Ac}3 \textit{Ag}8 30.\textit{f}6
\textit{g}6 31.\textit{h}3
Loss of time; he might have played \textit{Ef}3 at once.
31...\textit{\texttt{e8}} 32.\textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{e7}} 33.\textit{\texttt{h4}} \textit{\texttt{c5}} 34.\textit{\texttt{h5}} \textit{\texttt{d8}}

If 34...\textit{\texttt{gxh5}}, then 35.\textit{\texttt{g7}}.
35.\textit{\texttt{hxg6}} \textit{\texttt{xf6}}

36.\textit{\texttt{h3}}

Threatening mate in three moves with 37.\textit{\texttt{xh7+}} \textit{\texttt{g8}} 38.\textit{\texttt{g7+}} \textit{\texttt{h8}} 39.\textit{\texttt{h2}}

36...\textit{\texttt{g8}}

If 36...\textit{\texttt{e7}}, then 37.\textit{\texttt{g7+}} \textit{\texttt{g8}} 38.\textit{\texttt{xh7}} etc.
37.\textit{\texttt{gxh7+}} \textit{\texttt{h8}} 38.\textit{\texttt{g8+}}! \textit{\texttt{xf8}}
39.\textit{\texttt{hxg8}} \textit{\texttt{w+}} \textit{\texttt{xf8}} 40.\textit{\texttt{xd8}} \textit{\texttt{b5}}
41.\textit{\texttt{g2}} \textit{\texttt{a5}} 42.\textit{\texttt{b7}} \textit{\texttt{a4}} 43.\textit{\texttt{e5}}
\textit{\texttt{dxe5}} 44.\textit{\texttt{xc5}}

Black resigns.

We should have preferred 10.0-0. It seems to be imperative for White to advance \textit{\texttt{f4}} at the earliest opportunity, so as to neutralise the effect of Black's \textit{\texttt{...d5}} and, in castling, that object would be attained.

10...0-0 11.0-0 \textit{\texttt{d5}}! 12.\textit{\texttt{exd5}}

Compulsory; but there is no great harm done as yet, although Black has a shade the better developed game.
12...\textit{\texttt{cxd5}} 13.\textit{\texttt{cxd5}} \textit{\texttt{xd5}} 14.\textit{\texttt{f3}}

We see no better square for the bishop. It is clear, that White endeavours to simplify matters as much as possible which is the right course to be adopted under the present constrained position of his queen.

14...\textit{\texttt{ad8}}!

270 Scotch Game

\textit{\texttt{Martinez}}

\textit{\texttt{Zukertort}}

Philadelphia Chess Club. 19 March 1884

Notes by Zukertort

1.\textit{\texttt{e4}} \textit{\texttt{e5}} 2.\textit{\texttt{d4}} \textit{\texttt{c6}} 3.\textit{\texttt{d4}} \textit{\texttt{exd4}}
4.\textit{\texttt{exd4}} \textit{\texttt{c5}} 5.\textit{\texttt{e3}} \textit{\texttt{wif6}} 6.\textit{\texttt{c3}}
\textit{\texttt{ge7}} 7.\textit{\texttt{ec2}}

This move was introduced for the first time by Dr. Meitner \textit{\texttt{v Zukertort}} in the Vienna tournament, 1882; Zukertort played then 7...\textit{\texttt{d6}}, which is inferior to his present continuation.

7...\textit{\texttt{xe3}} 8.\textit{\texttt{xe3}} \textit{\texttt{d6}} 9.\textit{\texttt{xe2}} \textit{\texttt{e6}} 10.\textit{\texttt{d2}}

Perhaps 16.\textit{\texttt{e4}} might have been preferable; because if Black replies 16...\textit{\texttt{xe4}} 17.\textit{\texttt{xe4}} \textit{\texttt{g6}}, Black's queen's rook would still be on \textit{\texttt{d8}} instead of \textit{\texttt{d5}}, ready to be doubled with the king's rook.

16...\textit{\texttt{xd5}} 17.\textit{\texttt{c4}} \textit{\texttt{g6}}! 18.\textit{\texttt{ad1}}

18.\textit{\texttt{e2}} seems to give White more scope for resistance.

18...\textit{\texttt{fd8}} 19.\textit{\texttt{we2}} \textit{\texttt{d3}} 20.\textit{\texttt{g3}}

Without this defensive move, Black would have played 20...\textit{\texttt{ff4}} with fatal effect for White.
20..f5

21.\textit{wc2}

The queen ought not to have quitted this square unless absolutely forced to do so, on account of the advance of the adverse f-pawn. White might have played here 21.b3 and if 21...f4 22.\textit{e}e4 etc.

21...f4 22.\textit{e}e2 f3 23.\textit{g}g3 fxg2

White resigns.

271 Italian Game

\textit{Zukertort}

\textit{Martinez}

Philadelphia Chess Club, 25 March 1884

Notes by Hoffer

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}f3 \textit{c}c6 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{c}c5
4.b4 \textit{b}b6 5.a4 a6 6.c3 d6 7.a5
\textit{a}a7 8.d3 \textit{e}e7 9.\textit{bd}2 \textit{f}f6
10.\textit{f}f1 h6 11.\textit{g}3 \textit{d}8

This move seems not only unnecessary now, but it also proves a great impediment to Black's development later on, and may be considered as the primary cause of Black's future problems. The knight cannot be moved to e6 on account of the adverse \textit{f}5, and no other square is available for it.

12.0-0 \textit{e}e6 13.\textit{a}a2 0-0 14.\textit{h}4 \textit{h}7

Seemingly Black can gain a pawn here; but the result of such a venture would be fatal, e.g. 14...\textit{x}a2 15.\textit{x}a2 \textit{x}e4

16 \textit{h}f5 \textit{e}6, and either 17.dxe4 or 17.\textit{g}4 wins.

15.\textit{h}f5 \textit{d}7 16.\textit{h}1 d5

The text move does not give any relief to Black's cramped position. Perhaps he might have tried 16...\textit{g}8, followed by 17...g6 accordingly.

17.\textit{f}4 \textit{xf}4 18.\textit{xf}4 dxe4

This capture gives White the opportunity of displaying such rare brilliance which seldom occurs in match play. In such complicated positions the best course, as a rule, is to simplify matters as much as possible. It might, therefore, have been preferable to play here 18...\textit{xf}5 followed by 19...dxe4.

19.\textit{x}g7!

Perfectly sound. If 19...\textit{x}g7, then 20.\textit{e}5, winning back the piece at least.

19...\textit{x}a2 20.\textit{x}a2 \textit{d}5

21.\textit{h}7 \textit{h}5 22.\textit{x}h5 \textit{f}5

If 22...\textit{x}a2, White would win with 23.\textit{f}6+ \textit{g}7 24.\textit{x}h6+ \textit{h}8 25.\textit{h}5 etc.

23.\textit{e}d2 e3 24.\textit{e}e2 \textit{f}7 25.\textit{x}e3 \textit{x}h5 26.\textit{x}a7 \textit{f}7 27.\textit{d}4 \textit{c}6

Seventeen moves this knight stood inactive, and prevented the queen's rook to be brought into play, and now it has come back to the square whence it started.

28.\textit{e}7!
28...\texttt{g6}  
If 28...\texttt{xd1}, then 29.\texttt{xf7+ g8}  
30.\texttt{g7+ h8} 31.\texttt{xcd4}  
32.\texttt{xld1} with the exchange and two  
pawns plus.

29.\texttt{bf7+ xf7} 30.\texttt{e3 \texttt{b5}}  
31.\texttt{d4 c4} 32.\texttt{f4 \texttt{g8}} 33.\texttt{d3}  
\texttt{d5} 34.\texttt{h3 \texttt{g6}} 35.\texttt{xc7 \texttt{e3}}  
36.\texttt{f3 a2} 37.\texttt{g1 \texttt{d5}}  
38.\texttt{e5 f4} 39.\texttt{xf4 \texttt{c4}} 40.\texttt{e5}  
\texttt{xc3} 41.\texttt{d5!}  

Black resigns

Mr. Zukertort is of opinion that this is  
the best game he has played in Philadel­  
phia. It certainly is a very interesting  
specimen in many respects; but espe­  
cially because of the quiet and sound  
development in the opening until ev­  
everything is ready for the attack.

2 7 2 French Defence  
\texttt{Zukertort}  
\texttt{Labatt}  
New Orleans, April 1884  
Notes by Ranken  
1.\texttt{e4 e6} 2.\texttt{d4 d5} 3.\texttt{c3 f6}  
4.\texttt{g5 e75.e5}  
Introduced by Herr Englisch at the Paris  
tourney of 1878, and for a time thought  
well of, but, like all other variations  
of this opening in which the  
pawn is advanced to e5, it has now de­  
clined in esteem.

5...\texttt{fd7} 6.\texttt{xe7 xe7} 7.\texttt{d2}  

Necessary to prevent the check of the  
black queen at b4 when the knight is  
removed, and to make room for the  
night at d1, which is better than \texttt{c2}.

7...\texttt{a5}  
A useful precursor to Black's next move  
by shutting out the knight from b5.

8.\texttt{d1 c5} 9.\texttt{c3 c6} 10.\texttt{f4 f5}  
This pawn should only go to f6, to be in  
readiness to break up White's centre at  
the proper moment, for now he may  
leisurely bring out his pieces, secure of  
no disturbance at any rate on the king's  
flank.

11.\texttt{f3 b5} 12.\texttt{d3 b7}  
Black might also exchange pawns, and  
if White retook with pawn, either force  
the exchange of queens, or win a pawn  
by ...\texttt{b4}.

13.\texttt{0-0 b6} 14.\texttt{b3 c4} 15.\texttt{c2 0-0}  
Had Mr. Zukertort been conducting  
Black's game, he would here, we think  
have pushed on the b-pawn.

16.\texttt{e3 \texttt{ac8}}  

17.\texttt{g4!}  
At first sight it looks as if White should  
make himself comfortable by b4 before  
commencing the attack, but in that case  
the reply ...h5 would considerably frus­  
trate his designs.

17...\texttt{g6} 18.\texttt{h1 h8}  
Black now loses his last chance of any  
counter attack by ...b4, and henceforth:
can do little more than look on while
White concentrates his forces for the fi-
nal assault.

19.b4  a6  20.xd1  e8  21.xg3
f7  22.eag1  h6
These marches of the knight are worse
than useless for any purpose of defence,
but in such a position it is impossible to
suggest an alternative that would be of
real avail.

23.xg2  c8  24.xh3  f7

25.gxf5
Having with patient skill completed all
his preparations, White now opens his
batteries, and then carries the enemy’s
position by a brilliant coup de main.

25... exf5  26.xf5!  gxf5
27.xh7+  f8  28.xf5+  g6
29.xh3+  h6  30.xg6
Black resigns.
The only move left for Black is
30... xg7, whereupon follows
31.xxh6+  g8  32.e6+  f7
33.g5 and wins.

273 Italian Game
McConnell
Zukertort
New Orleans Chess Club, April 1884
Notes from Times Democrat
1.e4  e5  2.xf3  c6  3.xc4  f6
4.c3

This was one of numerous games
played with this opening, during the
month of April at the New Orleans
Chess Club, between McConnell and
Zukertort.

4...a6
The usual continuation is 4...c5  5.d3
d6 with an equal game.

5.a3  xxc3  6.xc3  xe4
A risky move; we are of the opinion that
it should lead to future difficulties for
Black.

7.xf7+  xf7  8.xd5+  e8
9.xe4  d5  10.xa4
Up to here, the moves are identical with
those played in a great number of
games played between these two play-
ers.

10...f6

In other games Zukertort played
10...d6, but this time he brings out
his rook, since the pawn does not need
to be defended, as will soon be seen.
After 10...d6  11.0-0  f8  12.e1
t7  13.xe5+  xxe5, played in an ear-
lier encounter, McConnell could have
continued 14.xf4+!  e6  15.xg4+
h5  16.f4 etc.

11.xe5?
Not foreseeing the strength of Black’s
12th move. Correct was 11.0-0, occur-
ing in another game, after which
Zukertort’s reckless sacrifice 11...xf3
failed against 12.gxf3 $h3 13.$e1 $f6 14.$f4 $d7 15.$g3 $f5 16.$g5.

11...$e7 12.f4

12...$d7! 13.0-0
We do not see anything better: if 13.$b3 $xe5 14.$xe5 $xe5+ and mate in a few moves.

13...$xe5 14.$d4 $c6 15.$xd5 $e6 16.$b5 $a6 17.$xb7 $c5+ 18.$e3
Forced. If 18.$h1 $a7 wins the queen.

18...$xe3+ 19.$h1 $b6 20.$xb6 $xb6 21.$ae1 $d7
White resigns.

274. Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort
Buck, Dunn, and Seguin
New Orleans Chess Club.

Notes by Zukertort
1.$f3 d5 2.$d4 $e6 3.$e3 $f6 4.$d3 $e7 5.0-0 0-0 6.$c4 $b6 7.$d2
Deviating from the usual development by b3. The b-pawn must now be left untouched or be played two squares. The text move occurs in a game played in the Berlin tournament of 1881 between Zukertort and Dr. Noa.

7...$bd7 8.b4 $c5 9.a3 9.b5 would be premature on account of the reply 9...a6.

9.$b7 10.$c3 $c8 11.$dc4?
Causing the isolation of the c-pawn and seriously compromising the game of the allies.

12.$xc4 $xc5 13.b5 14.$bd2 $fd8 15.$e2 $b6
Another weak move. Black should once have played 15...$d5, forcing the retreat of the white queen's bishop.

16.a4 $fd5 17.$ae5

17...$d6?
After the exchange of this bishop, the isolated pawn becomes indefensible. 17...$d7 is preferable.

18.$xd6 $xd6 19.$fc1 $f6 20.$a5 $bd5 21.$wd1
Threatening to win a piece by 22.$e4 and 23.$e5.

21...$e7 22.$c2 $g6 23.$f1 $we7 24.$a6 $a8 25.$a4 $d7 26.$c4 $d5 27.$c3 $c7 28.$e4 $a8 29.$b3 $dc8 30.$a5 $e5
Forced. White threatened to proceed with 31.$d4, followed by either knight to c6.

31.$g3 $gf8 32.$h3 $e6 33.$b3$f6
If 33...$d4, then 34.$f4 $xd4 $exd4 35.$xd4! etc.
34...c4 h5 35.d1 g6 36.d2 g7 37.e3

37...g5
If 37...d4, the following pretty variation results: 38.xd7 xb3 (comparatively best) 39.xc8 xc1 40.b7! xb7 41.axb7 xb7 42.xc1 xb5 43.d2 etc.

38.xe6 xe6 39.xc5
A stronger line of play consisted in 39.e1 and 40.d3 followed by the capture of the pawn.

39...xc5
The best continuation. It is obvious that Black dare not pin the knight with 39...b6 on account of 40.e6+.

40.xc5 b6 41.xc7+ xc7 42.xc7+ xc7 43.h4 g4 44.e1 g6 45.d3?
Weak; the best continuation would be 45.g2, with the object of eventually bringing the knight to e3.

45...b8! 46.c5?
Surrendering most of the advantage gained. White should have continued with 46.e2.

46.xe4 47.c4 f3 48.c5 d8?
48.d6 was far superior, and would have prevented, in a great measure, White's subsequent manoeuvres.

49.c2+ h6 50.e6 a5 51.c1+ g6 52.b1+ f7

53.c7 g7 54.e8+ f7 55.d6+ g7 56.c1 g6 57.c2+ g7 58.f5+ f7 59.b3+ g6 60.b1 f7 61.d6+ g7 62.f5+ f7 63.e3 g7 64.c4 d8 65.c1 c7 66.c2

66...c5
Had Black ventured upon the tempting reply 66...d5, a very instructive endgame would have resulted, e.g., 66...d5 67.e3 xc2 68.xc2 f7 69.e3 f3 70.c4 e7 71.b6 axb6 72.xb6 d6 73.a7 c7 74.a8 a8 75.xa8+ b7 76.f3! f5 (best) 77.fxg4 fxg4 78. f2! and White wins.

67.e3 b6 68.d3 c7 69.c4 a5 70.f5+ g6 71.e7+ h6 72.c8?
Throwing away the victory which could be forced with 72.c6!.

72...a1+ 73.f1 d4 74.c1+ h7 75.e7 e4 76.c6

Draw.

275 Pirc Defence
J.Jones
Zukertort (without f7-pawn)
Leadville, 10 June 1884
Notes by Hoffer
1.e4 d6 2.d4 f6 3.d3 e5 4.c3 e7 5.f4
It would have been better to develop the king's knight. The text move impedes the movements of the queen's bishop.

5...exd4 6.cxd4 0-0 7.c3

7.c3 would have prevented Black from playing 7...d5, and thus the centre would have remained intact for a time. The king's knight might have been moved afterwards.

7...d5 8.e5 dxe4 9.0-0 c5 10.c3

cxd4

11.dxe4

With this capture White throws away his advantage. Had he played here 11.dxe4, he would have gained a pawn, thus: 11...dxe4 12.xe4, and Black cannot defend the d-pawn with 12...c5, owing to 13.xh7+ xh7 14.c2+ f5 15.xc5 etc.

11...dxe4 12.xe4 c6

13.b3+ h8 14.d2 e8

15.ae1 g6 16.h1

Obviously White did not estimate his opponent's combination, commencing with 14...e8, at its full value; else he would have prevented the adverse bishop from coming into play with 16.g3 at once. The king's move is loss of time.

16.f5 17.g3 c2 18.xb7

ab8 19.d7 fd8 20.f5

Instead of abandoning a pawn, White ought to have retired. 20.h3, with a good chance of a powerful - though difficult - attack, in case Black should capture the b-pawn, e.g.

20...h3 xc2 21.f5 e8 22.f6 f8 23.f7+ g5 e8 24.g5 e8 25.d7+ e8 26.d8 d8 27.e8+ etc. The position is of a complicated nature, and presents innumerable lines of play, which the reader will find interesting to exhaust.

20...xd7 21.fxg6 xb2 22.gxh7 xxa2 23.d5 d3 24.f7+

If 24.f2 then 24...xg5, and if 25.f8+ xh7 26.xg5 xex5 etc.

24...xh7 25.f2 d7 26.g1 bb2 27.c1 d4 28.e1 c2 29.f1 g6

30.d6

Black's intention obviously is to play ...g5, which White cannot well obviate. The plausible move 30.e6 yields only a temporary relief, because of 30...xc1 31.xb2 xb2 32.xe1 d3 etc.

30...g5 31.d2 e3 32.xe3
dxe3 33.fxc2

Forced, because if 33.e2, then 33...h5 etc.

33.xc2 34.xc2 xc2

35.xe3 e2 36.xe4 d3

37.h3 a5 38.e6 xc4 39.xc4 a4

White resigns.
Three Knights Game

Zukertort

F. Jones

10 board blindfold exhibition, Leadville,
10 June 1884

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{\textit{c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c6}}\) 3.\(\text{\textit{f3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\)

Perhaps it might be preferable to adopt here the Four Knights Game with 3...\(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 4.\(\text{\textit{b5}}\) \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) etc., or 3...\(\text{\textit{g6}}\).

4.\(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf2+}}\)

This capture enables White to develop much quicker than in the variation 4...\(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) 5.\(\text{\textit{d4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d6}}\) 6.dxe5 etc. But in either case White's game appears preferable.

5.\(\text{\textit{xf2}}\) \(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) 6.d4 \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 7.\(\text{\textit{c4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d6}}\) 8.\(\text{\textit{e1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e6}}\)

8...\(\text{\textit{d8}}\) would have been more defensive.

9.\(\text{\textit{d3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc4?}}\) 10.\(\text{\textit{xc4}}\) \(\text{\textit{c6}}\)

Presumably because of 11.\(\text{\textit{b5}}\). But it seems as if 10...\(\text{\textit{d7}}\) immediately would have been better.

11.\(\text{\textit{g1}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 12.\(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{ae1}}\) 0-0-0

14.\(\text{\textit{b4!}}\) \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{a4}}\) \(\text{\textit{b8}}\)

15...\(\text{\textit{d5}}\) would have given a little elbow-room for a time.

16.\(\text{\textit{b5}}\) \(\text{\textit{c8}}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{b3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 18.dxc5 dxc5

Perhaps he might have taken here with the rook, without any greater danger;

but Black had very much the inferior game.

19.\(\text{\textit{d1}}\) \(\text{\textit{c4}}\) 20.\(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{c7}}\) 21.\(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{b6}}\) 22.\(\text{\textit{a1}}\) \(\text{\textit{cd8}}\) 23.\(\text{\textit{a5}}\) \(\text{\textit{c8}}\)

24.axb6 axb6 25.\(\text{\textit{a6}}\) \(\text{\textit{d6}}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{d5}}\) \(\text{\textit{b7}}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{xc4}}\) \(\text{\textit{h8}}\)

28.\(\text{\textit{f1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{a8+!}}\) \(\text{\textit{xa8}}\) 30.\(\text{\textit{c7}}\)

Mate.

Vienna Game

Zukertort

Franklin

12 board blindfold exhibition,
San Francisco, 8 July 1884

Notes by Hoffer

1.e4 \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 2.\(\text{\textit{c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 3.\(\text{\textit{f4}}\)

3...\(\text{\textit{xf4?}}\)

An unfavourable defence; but especially so if followed up as in the text by 3...\(\text{\textit{h4+}}\). Of course, 3...\(\text{\textit{d6}}\) is the correct move.

4.\(\text{\textit{g1}}\) \(\text{\textit{h4+}}\)

Comparatively better is 4...\(\text{\textit{xf4}}\). White replies 5.\(\text{\textit{d4}}\), then 5...\(\text{\textit{h4+}}\) 6.g3 \(\text{\textit{fxg3}}\) \(\text{\textit{h8}}\); but White's position is far superior.

5.g3 \(\text{\textit{h2}}\) 6.\(\text{\textit{g2}}\) \(\text{\textit{h6}}\)

6...\(\text{\textit{h1}}\) would be more dangerous if anything.

7.\(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) \(\text{\textit{we6}}\)
At $g_6$ the queen would be placed better, in view of the threatened advance of White's centre pawns.

$8.d4 \text{h}6 9.\text{dxe}3 \text{c}6 10.\text{d}2 \text{e}7 11.0-0 \text{b}6 12.\text{h}2!$

This is a subtle manoeuvre. White's intention being to play $d5$, but the $e$-pawn must be guarded first. If he were to play $\text{f}4$, Black would reply $...\text{g}5$, thus gaining a safe square for his queen at $g6$ in case White should attack it with $d5$. The text move obviously prevents Black from dislodging the bishop with $...\text{g}5$.

$12...\text{b}7 13.\text{f}4 \text{g}6 14.\text{d}5 \text{e}7 15.\text{d}6 \text{e}6 16.\text{h}3 \text{c}4$

17.\text{xd}7+!

Considering that Dr. Zukertort played twelve games blindfold in the same time enhances the merit of the sacrifice, which is perfectly sound. Of course, 17.dxc7 would be quite sufficient, because if Black were to castle, White could probably play $\text{xd}7$ and win, but the sacrifice at once is prettier.

17...\text{xd}7

It is immaterial whether Black takes the bishop or plays $...\text{f}8$. In the latter case one of the many continuations might be: 17...\text{f}8 18.e6 fxe6 19.\text{f}2 \text{g}8 20.\text{d}4 \text{c}5 21.\text{xe}6+ \text{h}7 22.\text{xh}6 and wins.

18.\text{dxc}7+ \text{xc}7 19.e6+ \text{xf}4 20.\text{xf}4+ \text{c}8 21.\text{xf}7 \text{c}5 22.\text{h}2 \text{c}6 23.e5 \text{b}7 24.\text{e}4 \text{xe}4 25.\text{xe}4+ \text{c}6 26.\text{d}7+ \text{c}7 27.\text{xc}6+ \text{xc}6 28.\text{d}6+ \text{b}7 29.e6 \text{a}8 30.\text{e}7 \text{c}8 31.\text{d}7 \text{c}6 32.\text{xc}7+ Black resigns.

If 32...\text{xc}7, then 33.\text{xc}7+ \text{xc}7 34.e7 etc.

278 Vienna Game
Zukertort
Franklin
San Francisco, 21 July 1884
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\text{c}3 \text{c}6 3.f4 \text{c}6
3...d5 ought to be played here.

4.\text{fx}e5 \text{xe}5 5.d4

Zukertort–Fewings, 12 board blindfold exhibition, Southampton, 14 November 1884, continued instead 5...\text{c}6 6.e5 \text{g}8 7.\text{f}3 \text{b}4 8.\text{c}4 \text{xc}3+ 9.\text{xc}3 \text{h}6 10.0-0 \text{d}6 11.\text{xf}7+ \text{e}7 (11...\text{xf}7 12.\text{h}4+!) 12.\text{h}4 \text{f}6 13.\text{b}3 \text{e}8 14.\text{xf}6+ \text{gx}f6 15.\text{e}1+ \text{e}5 16.\text{xe}5 \text{xe}5+1 \text{dx}e5 and White announced mate in seven moves: 18.\text{a}3+ \text{c}5 19.\text{xc}5+ \text{f}6 20.\text{f}3+ \text{g}5 21.\text{e}3+ \text{hx}4 22.g3+ \text{h}3 23.g4+ \text{h}4 24.\text{g}3 mate.
6.e5
The advance of the pawn is perhaps premature, because the centre cannot be maintained. 6...c4 seems preferable.
6...g8 7.f3

7...d6
Zukertort-Mielziner, 10 board blindfold exhibition, Brunswick, 5 June 1885. continued 7...b4 8.c4 b8e7? (8...d5 is better) 9.g5 xc3+ 10.bxc3 c5 0-0 d5 12.exd6 f5 13.h5 h6 14.xf7+! h8 (Black's best continuation would be 14...xf7) 15.xf7 g4! 16.dxc7 w5 17.xg7+ xg7 18.e6+ and 19.xh6+ etc.) 15.xh7 xh7 16.xg6+ xh8 17.xh6 and Black resigned.

8.d3 dxe5 9.dxe5 c5 10.g5 e7?
An unfortunate retreat; 10...b8e7 was far better. We can assign no reason for Black's text move except that he feared 11.b5+, but even then he had a valid reply with 11...d7 12.xd7+ xd7 13.xd7+ xd7 14.0-0-0+ e8, with quite a safe game.

11.e3 g4 12.0-0 xe5?
An injudicious move; but Black probably overlooked the sacrifice of the queen. If the pawn was to be captured at all, it would have been better to play 12...xf3, followed by 13...xe5.

13.xe5! xd1 14.axd1 d6
Black has no satisfactory defence.
15.xf7 w7
If 15...h4, then equally 16.b5+ etc.
16.b5+ c6 17.xd6+ w6 18.xd6 cxb5 19.xb5 c8
20.g5
Black resigns.

279 Spanish Game
Fewings
Zukertort
Tour of U.S.A. 1883-1884
27 board simultaneous display,
Southampton, 13 October 1884
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.b5 f6 4.d3 c5 5.0-0
Probably best: if 5.c3, Anderssen introduced here instead of the old defensive course 5...w7, which had proved unsatisfactory, the sacrifice of a pawn with 5...0-0 6.xc6 bxc6 7.xe5 d5.

5...c4 6.xd4 xd4 7.c3 b6 8.g5
Not commendable; 8.e3 would be better.

8...h6 9.h4 g5! 10.g3 w7 11.d2 c6
Black might have continued here or on the next move with ...h5.

12.a4 d6 13.h1 e6 14.f3 h5
15.b3 h4 16.f2 c7
17...fxe6!

An injudicious exchange, which frees the position of the adverse queen.

17...fxe6! 18.c4 h5 19.e3 d3+ 20.exg3

Of course, if 20.hxg3, Black mates in four moves with 20...hxg3+ 21.g1 hxh1+! etc.

20...hxg3 21.h3 b6 22.g4

If 22.d4, then 22...f12.

22...f7 23.wd2 0-0-0 24.b4 e5 25.a4 d8 26.d4

White should drive away the bishop with 26.a5. Black dare not reply 26...h7 on account of 27.axb6 d3+ 28.gxh3 d3+ 29.h2!

26...h7

Threatening to continue with 27...d3+ 28.gxh3 d3+ etc.

27.g1

Again, White should continue with 27.a5.

27...exd4 28.cxd4

White might have prolonged the fight with 28.c4.

28...xh3! 29.gxh3 xh3 30.g2 xd4+ 31.d2 xf2+ 32.xf2 xg2+

White resigns.

280 Scandinavian Defence

Zukertort

Kenny

12 board blindfold exhibition.

Southampton, 14 November 1884

Notes by Hoffer

1.e4 d5 2.exd5 f6

Not a favourable defence, but if adopted at all it is better to continue with 2...xd5 3.d3 d8 or 3.d5 a5 etc.

3.b5+ d7 4.c4 b5 5.b3

5.a5

If Black would play at once 5.g4, White could equally maintain the pawn plus with 6.f3 f5 7.e2 a6 8.c4 c6 9.d3 b4 10.a4, which threatens b6 in case Black attempts to try to regain the pawn.

6.a3 g4 7.f3 c8 8.c3 a6 9.d3 b4 10.axb4 axb4 11.b5!

The opening up to this move is given in the Handbuch, and Mr. Kenny evidently studied this particular debut carefully for the occasion. The Handbuch gives as White's move, 11.a2. Zukertort, how-
ever, moves 11...b5, hence Black's embarrassment.

11...b7
We should have preferred 11...c6. It is quite clear that Black must submit to the loss of the pawn, and try to develop his forces.

12.\text{x}xa8 \text{x}xa8 13.\text{c}e4 \text{a}6
14.\text{w}a1 \text{b}7 15.\text{w}a4!

15...\text{w}d7
Better than 15...\text{c}d7, because White would have continued 16.\text{w}xa6! \text{xa}6 17.\text{c}xc7+ \text{xc}7 18.\text{c}xc7, with two pawns ahead.

16.\text{d}e2\text{h}5
16...g6 might have been played here. The text move is without effect, therefore loss of time.

17.\text{c}xc7 g6 18.d6 e6 19.d4
To prevent the queen being disturbed by 19...\text{c}c5.

19...\text{g}7 20.0-0 0-0 21.\text{a}7 \text{f}6
22.\text{w}xd7 \text{xd}7 23.\text{a}4 \text{a}8
24.\text{c}xd7 \text{xa}7 25.\text{b}6 \text{a}8
26.\text{b}5 \text{f}6 27.\text{a}1 \text{h}5
A plausible move here would appear to be 27...\text{d}8; but White would win with 28.\text{c}xd8 \text{xd}8 29.\text{c}xa6 \text{xa}8 30.\text{c}xb7 \text{xa}1+ 31.\text{f}2, and Black cannot stop the pawn from queening.

28.d7
Black resigns.
14. \( \text{Q} \times d2 \text{ Q} \times h5 \) 15. \( \text{Q} \times e5+ \text{ Q} \times h8 \)
16. \( \text{Q} \times f7+ \text{ Q} \times f7 \) 17. \( \text{Q} \times f7 \text{ Q} \times f6 \) etc.
9. \( \text{Q} \times b3 \text{ b}6 \) 10. \( a4 \text{ h}6 \)

11. \( \text{h}4! \)

Quite a safe sacrifice. If Black captured the knight, his game could not be saved after 12. \( \text{h} \times g5 \), followed by 13. \( \text{h} \times h5 \) etc.
11...d5 12. \( \text{Q} \times f3 \text{ b}4 \) 13. \( \text{Q} \times d2 \text{ d}6 \)
14. \( \text{g}4 \text{ d}7 \) 15. \( \text{Q} \times h3 \)

Now this knight is in the way of the advance of the pawns and is required at \( f2 \) to defend the e-pawn two moves later.
15...dxe4 16. dxe4 \( \text{Q} \times d4 \) 17. \( \text{Q} \times f2 \text{ e}6 \)
18.0-0-0 \( \text{Q} \times c3 \)

It was difficult now to suggest any saving move for Black. Somewhat better, rather not so bad, would have been 18...\( \text{c}5 \).
19. \( \text{Q} \times c3 \text{ c}5 \) 20. \( \text{Q} \times d3 \text{ e}7 \)
21.g5 \( \text{h}7 \)

22.f6!

The obvious move here would seem to be 22.g6; but the text move is infinitely superior, and leaves Black without remedy whatsoever.
22...gx6 23.gxf6 \( \text{Q} \times f6 \)
24.\( \text{Q} \times d1+ \text{ h}7 \) 25. \( \text{Q} \times e5 \text{ h}6 \)
26.\( \text{Q} \times c6 \)

As forcible as it is elegant. If 26...\( \text{Q} \) moves, or \( bxc6 \), then 27. \( \text{Q} \times f6 \) etc.
Black resigns.
Tour of Europe 1885

282 Italian Game
Hirschfield and Hoffer
Zukertort
Consultation Game, London 1885
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.c4 c5
4.b4 b6 5.0-0 d6 6.c3 g4
This same continuation was adopted by
Zukertort against Chigorin in the late
London tournament.
7.d3 w6 8.b2 d2
Chigorin proceeded with 8.e3.
8...g7 9.e1 h6 10.h1 g5
11.a4 a5 12.b5 d8 13.g1
g6 14.f3 d7 15.b3
Initiating an ill-advised manoeuvre: we
would vastly prefer 15.b3 followed
by c4.
15...e6 16.e3 xe3 17.xe3
b6 18.d5 d8
Black dare not castle, for White would
capture the a-pawn with his knight, and if
Black retake, force the game with a7.
19.ad1 h5 20.d4 ef4 21.c6
h4 22.xd7+ xd7 23.dxe5

23...xe5!
Black takes with the knight, although it
permits the entry of the hostile knight
into the centre. Taking with the pawn,
however, would simplify matters after
the exchange of rooks and probably
lead to an early draw.
24.d4 c4

25.c1
The only satisfactory reply: the White
queen has to guard the c-pawn, and if
25.e1, then 25...h3!, and White dare
not continue with 26.g3 on account of
26.g2 and 27.e3.
25...d8 26.c6+? c8 27.d4
Which cuts off the knight for a very
long time from any action.
27.e6 28.e1 f6
Clearing the second row for the action
of the queen's rook, and enabling the
king's knight to re-enter advantageously
e5 – compare Black's 31st move.
29.e2 h3!
30...g4
The exchange of knights would lead to speedy loss, e.g. 30...fxg4 gxg4 (it would be unsound to proceed with 30...hxg2+ 31.hxg2 h6+ 32.h4!, or 31...Wg5 32.Wxf4 hxg2+ 32...g1 (or 32...g2 Wh3+ 33...g8! etc.) 32...hxg2 33...fxg2 34.exf5 Wxf5 35.txe5 Wxe5 etc.

30...g2 31...ed1 e5
Of course, if 31...either knight to e3?, then 32...d4f.

32.xf1
After 32.exf5 fxe5 33.d4f3, Black would establish a fine attack in the f-file.

32...h4 33...g1 b7
Black might proceed at once with 33...fxg4, if for 34.fxg4, then 34...g4, forcing the game.

34.ed5
Played with the view of getting a counter attack after 34...bxc6 35.bxc6+ bxg6, with 36...b2.

34...g4 35...d4 e8

36...e1
An additional mistake, which causes at least the immediate loss of the exchange, but the allies had no satisfactory continuation. It is obvious that the capture of the knight would be fatal on account of the reply 36...xe4+ etc.

36...g2 37.fxg4
Mr. Hirschfield retired here from the contest, which was continued by his partner but for two more moves.

37...e1 38...e1 h4
White resigns.

283 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Foord
28 board simultaneous exhibition, Manchester, 21 March 1885
Notes by Hoffer

1.e4 e5 2...f3 d6 3.d4 d5 4...c4 e5 5...c3 Wf6 6.d3 Wf5 7.d3 Wf6
Premature; 13...c5 should have been played here.

13...c5
Obviously better than 15...e6; because of 15...xe6 16.dxe6 Wf7, and the pawn cannot be supported by 17...f4 on account of 17...c4+ etc.

15...fxg5
The capture does not improve Black's position; he ought to have attempted a counter-attack on the queen's side with 15...b8 followed by 16...c7 and 17...b5 etc.

16.exf5 e5 17...f4
The precautionary move of 17...c1 would be better; because it prevents Black from bringing his queen's knight into play.

17...f7 18.e6 Wd7 19...c1 c4 20...e4 e8 21....
21...c3, followed by 22...h3, would have been more forcible.

21...d3
He could win a pawn here by capturing the knight; but it is hardly worthwhile for White to intercept his splendid attack for such a slight gain.

22...\(\text{c}5\) 23.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{a}4\) 24.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{xc}3\)

Although the result of this exchange is that White brings his rook quicker into play, it is nevertheless difficult to suggest anything better for Black in his compromised position.

25.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 26.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{c}3\) 27.\(\text{h}5\)

Obviously, if 27.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{xf}2\) etc.

27...\(\text{h}6\) 28.\(\text{g}6\) \(\text{h}8\)

29.g4

29.\(\text{g}5!\) was equally forcible.

29...\(\text{b}5\) 30.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}8\) 31.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 32.\(\text{g}xh6!\) \(\text{g}xg6\)

White announces mate in four moves.

The following is the mate: 33.\(\text{hxg}7+\) \(\text{g}8\) 34.\(\text{h}8+\) \(\text{f}7\) 35.\(\text{f}8+\) \(\text{xf}8\) 36.\(\text{g}xf8\) \(\text{w}\) mate.

An obsolete defence, which was played up to 1861, when L. Paulsen introduced 10...\(\text{e}7\). Mr. Sergeant no doubt thought that against the blindfold player he might venture to adopt a variation which has fallen into oblivion: but he soon found out his mistake.

11.\(\text{d}3\) \(0-0\) 12.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{g}4\) 13.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}6\) 14.\(\text{f}4\)

Better than 14.\(\text{g}3\), because the knight cannot be dislodged without compromising Black's position, and it keeps the centre pawn momentarily guarded.

14...\(\text{d}7\) 15.\(\text{d}2\)

15.\(\text{h}1\) previous to the text move is preferable.

15...\(\text{xf}3\) 16.\(\text{gxf}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 17.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{xf}3?\)

Black ought to have played here 17...\(\text{ac}4\), so as to exchange the dangerous adverse bishop; but he was evidently not prepared for his opponent leaving the queen en prise.
18.\textit{\textit{e}g1} \textit{\textit{\textit{x}g1}}

If 18...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{x}d}}2}, White mates in four
moves with 19.\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}7+ \textit{\textit{h}}8 20.\textit{\textit{g}}8+ \textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}8 21.\textit{\textit{g}}1+ \textit{\textit{g}}5 22.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}5 mate.
18...\textit{\textit{e}e5} would not save the game ei­
ther, because of 19.\textit{\textit{h}}5 \textit{\textit{g}}6 20.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}7 etc.

19.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}1 \textit{\textit{g}}6

If 19...\textit{\textit{f}}6, the game is equally lost with
20.\textit{\textit{e}e6} \textit{\textit{w}e7} 21.\textit{\textit{w}h}6 \textit{\textit{f}f}7 22.\textit{e}5 etc.

20.\textit{\textit{h}}5 \textit{\textit{f}}6 21.\textit{\textit{w}h}6 \textit{\textit{w}e7}
22.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}}6+ \textit{\textit{h}}x\textit{g}6 23.\textit{\textit{w}x}g6+ \textit{\textit{w}h}8
24.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}f}6} \textit{\textit{\textit{x}f}6} 25.\textit{\textit{\textit{x}f}6}+ \textit{\textit{w}xf}6
26.\textit{\textit{w}xf}6+ \textit{\textit{g}}8 27.e5 \textit{\textit{dxe}}5

Black resigns.

285 King's Gambit
Zukertort
Bonaparte Wyse
5 board blindfold exhibition, Paris,
24 April 1885
Notes by Rosenthal

1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.f4 \textit{exf}4 3.\textit{\textit{d}f}3 \textit{g}5 4.h4
\textit{g}4 5.\textit{\textit{g}5} \textit{h}6 6.\textit{\textit{xf}f}6 \textit{\textit{xf}f}7 7.d4
8.\textit{\textit{\textit{xf}f}4}

If 8.e5 \textit{f}3 9.gxf3 \textit{\textit{e}e7} 10.\textit{\textit{e}e3} \textit{\textit{x}h}4+ 11.\textit{d}d2 \textit{h}5, followed by ...\textit{\textit{\textit{h}6} and wins.

8...\textit{\textit{\textit{x}f}6} 9.\textit{\textit{c}c}3

If 9.e5 \textit{\textit{h}5} 10.\textit{\textit{w}d}2 \textit{\textit{e}e7} 11.g3 \textit{\textit{xf}4}
12.\textit{\textit{xf}4+ \textit{\textit{g}7} followed by ...\textit{\textit{f}8} and wins.

9...\textit{\textit{e}e6}
The correct move is 9...\textit{\textit{\textit{b}4} 10.\textit{\textit{e}e5} (if
10.\textit{d}d3 \textit{dxe}4 11.\textit{\textit{c}4+ \textit{\textit{e}e6} and wins,
and if 10.e5 \textit{\textit{h}5} or \textit{\textit{e}e4} 10...\textit{\textit{e}e4!}
(best; since if White continues with
11.\textit{\textit{x}h}8, then 11...\textit{\textit{\textit{x}c}3}.

10.\textit{\textit{e}e5} \textit{h}5

A loss of time which could lead to the
loss of the game. It was necessary to
play 10...\textit{\textit{g}7 11.\textit{\textit{d}d3} \textit{\textit{f}8} 12.0-0.\textit{\textit{g}8
-best.

11.\textit{\textit{d}d3} \textit{\textit{g}7} 12.0-0 \textit{\textit{g}8

This move is forced, since he was
threatened with 13.\textit{\textit{xf}6 followed by
14.e5.

13.\textit{\textit{w}e2} \textit{\textit{c}6} 14.\textit{\textit{\textit{e}d}5} \textit{\textit{d}d}5
15.\textit{\textit{\textit{c}d}5} \textit{\textit{c}d}5 16.\textit{\textit{f}5} \textit{\textit{d}d}7
17.\textit{\textit{f}f1} \textit{\textit{e}e7}

Preferable was 17...\textit{\textit{h}6 18.c4 \textit{\textit{e}e5
19.dxe5 \textit{\textit{e}e4} and wins.

18.c4 \textit{\textit{e}e5

An error which costs the game; 20...\textit{\textit{h}6 followed by...\textit{\textit{f}8 again was
the correct continuation.

21.\textit{\textit{xf}6} \textit{\textit{e}e5 22.dxe5 \textit{\textit{xf}6
}
23.\textit{\textit{xf}6} \textit{\textit{f}7

Despite being the exchange ahead,
Black has a compromised game because
of the two advanced and passed white
pawns.
24.\textit{We}5
Clearly, if Dr. Zukertort, instead of playing five games simultaneously blindfold against strong opponents, had sight of the board, he would have adopted the following continuation which was immediately decisive: 24.\textit{f}5 \textit{d}6 (if 24...\textit{xf}5 25.\textit{e}7+ and mate next move) 25.\textit{e}6+ \textit{f}8 (if 25...\textit{xf}6 26.\textit{f}2+ \textit{e}7 (forced) 27.\textit{f}7+ \textit{d}8 28.\textit{f}6+ and wins) 26.\textit{e}3 \textit{b}6 (forced, since he was threatened with \textit{g}5) 27.\textit{xb}6 \textit{axb}6 28.\textit{d}6 \textit{e}8 29.\textit{h}2 and wins, since if 29...\textit{f}8 30.\textit{f}7+ \textit{g}8 31.\textit{g}3 etc., and if 29...\textit{h}6 or \textit{h}7 30.\textit{f}7+ \textit{f}8 31.\textit{d}7 and wins.

24...\textit{h}6 25.\textit{f}5 \textit{d}8 26.\textit{e}6+ \textit{f}8 27.\textit{f}7 \textit{b}6+ 28.\textit{h}2 \textit{d}8 29.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}7 30.\textit{d}6 \textit{h}6 31.\textit{d}7 \textit{f}6 32.\textit{x}g4 \textit{xf}7
If 32...\textit{xf}7 33.\textit{e}8+ \textit{xe}8 34.\textit{x}h5+ \textit{g}6+ 35.\textit{x}g6+ \textit{x}g6 36.\textit{d}xe8\textit{w}+ and wins.

33.\textit{e}8+ \textit{exe}8 34.\textit{d}xe8\textit{w}+ \textit{exe}8 35.\textit{h}xh5
Black resigns.
Mr. Zukertort played the end of this game in admirable fashion and we warmly congratulate him.

286 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Bouzon
5 board blindfold exhibition, Amiens,
27 April 1885
Notes by Zukertort and Rosenthal
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}5
4.b4 \textit{b}6 5.b5 \textit{a}5 6.\textit{xe}5 \textit{w}f6
Zukertort: A safe but rather complicated defence. We prefer 6...\textit{h}6.
Rosenthal: This move, which we have advocated in the past, is still quite good,
but the strongest defence is 6...\textit{h}6 7.d4 d6 8.\textit{x}h6 g\textit{x}h6 etc.

7.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{f}8 8.d4 d6 9.\textit{x}g8 \textit{dxe}5 10.\textit{d}5

10...\textit{xd}4?
Rosenthal: Weak. The right move here is 10...c6 11.\textit{a}3+ (11.\textit{w}h5 \textit{g}6; 11.f4 or 11.0-0 is met by 11...\textit{cxd}5) 11.\textit{w}e8 12.0-0 \textit{cxd}5 13.\textit{c}3 \textit{g}6! (13...\textit{x}d4? 14.\textit{xd}5 \textit{f}7 15.\textit{d}6 \textit{c}4 16.\textit{c}7+ \textit{d}8 17.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 18.\textit{w}xd4+ and wins) 14.\textit{xd}5 (14.\textit{dxe}5 \textit{d}4 is better for Black) 14...\textit{g}4 15.\textit{d}3 \textit{g}4 16.\textit{c}7+ \textit{f}7 17.\textit{c}3 \textit{b}6 18.\textit{xa}8 (if 18.\textit{d}5+ \textit{e}6) 18...\textit{xa}8 19.\textit{d}5+ \textit{w}6, with the better game for Black.

11.f4!
Zukertort: Furnishing White with a winning attack. This fine coup was invented by Mr. Hirschfield 23 years ago.

11...\textit{xa}1 12.\textit{fxe}5

12...\textit{h}4+
Zukertort: If 12...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}x\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}}}5, then 13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f1+ (13.0-0+ would lose, as Black would interpose on his 15th move, checking)} 13...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e7 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}d8 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}}}g8+ and 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f8 mates.}}

Rosenthal: This move is very weak; however, his game is compromised and we do not see any good line of play. If 12...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}x\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}}}5 13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f1+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e7 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3+ c5 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}xc5+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}d8 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e6+ and wins, and if 12...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}g6 13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f1+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e8 (if 13...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e7 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3+) 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f7+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}xf7 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}xf7 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}xf7 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}h5+ g6 17.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f3+ and wins.

13.g3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}}}g4 14.0-0+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e8

Zukertort: If 14...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e7, then 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}d8 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}d3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e7 17.e6 etc.

15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}f7+ Black resigns.

287 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Schroder
10 board blindfold exhibition,
Concert House, Berlin, 4 May 1885
Notes by Hoffer
1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}f3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}c6 3.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}c4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}c5 4.b4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}xb4 5.c3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a5 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}f6

The moves up to this point are identical with those played in the first match game, Morphy-Anderssen, 20 December 1858. Subsequent analysis proved the text move not to yield a satisfactory defence. The capture of the third pawn, which constitutes the Compromised Defence, or 7...d6, is preferable.

8.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3

Morphy played here 8.e5. Dr. Suhle demonstrated satisfactorily in Deutsche Schachzeitung 1859, the superiority of 8.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a3. The variations arising from the text move are very interesting, and mostly in favour of White.

8...d6 9.e5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e4

Somewhat better would be 9...d5 10.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}}b5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e4 11.cxd4 etc.

10.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e1 d5 11.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}}b5 dxc3 12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}}a4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}}b6 13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xc3!

13...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}xc3

13...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}}xf2+, winning the exchange, would not be advisable in Black's present uncomfortable position. A probable continuation in that case would be 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}h1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xc3 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xc6+ bxc6 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e1 d6 17.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}}xe1, followed by e6, with an overwhelming attack.

14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xc6+ bxc6 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e6+ \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}}d7 16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xc3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}c8

If 16...c5, White would have responded with the text move. Comparatively better, however, seems to be 16...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e6.

17.e6d4

If 17...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}}e6, then 18.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xe6+ and 19.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}}}xg7.

18.exd7+\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}}xd7

470
19.\text{\texttt{Q}}xd4

The blindfold player, immediately after calling out his move, observed that 19.\text{\texttt{Q}}e5+ would have been the right continuation here.

19...c5 20.\text{\texttt{Q}}f5 \text{\texttt{Q}}c7 21.\text{\texttt{Q}}e7 \text{\texttt{Q}}d4 22.\text{\texttt{W}}xd4 cxd4 23.\text{\texttt{Q}}ac1+ \text{\texttt{Q}}b7 24.\text{\texttt{Q}}xc8

Black resigns.

288 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Ranneforth

10 board blindfold exhibition.
Concert House Berlin, 4 May 1885
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\text{\texttt{Q}}f3 \text{\texttt{Q}}c6 3.\text{\texttt{Q}}c4 \text{\texttt{Q}}c5
4.b4 \text{\texttt{Q}}xb4 5.c3 \text{\texttt{Q}}c5 6.0-0 d6
7.d4 exd4 8.cxd4 \text{\texttt{Q}}b6 9.d5 \text{\texttt{Q}}a5
10.\text{\texttt{Q}}b2 \text{\texttt{Q}}e7 11.\text{\texttt{Q}}d3 0-0 12.\text{\texttt{Q}}c3
\text{\texttt{Q}}g6 13.\text{\texttt{Q}}e2 f6?

The well-known theoretical move 13...c5, preventing the adverse knight from entering at d4, should have been played here.

14.\text{\texttt{Q}}h1
14.\text{\texttt{Q}}f4 d4 is preferable.

14...c5 15.\text{\texttt{Q}}c1 \text{\texttt{Q}}b8 16.\text{\texttt{Q}}g3 \text{\texttt{Q}}c7
17.\text{\texttt{Q}}f5 b5 18.g4 \text{\texttt{Q}}f4 19.\text{\texttt{Q}}g1
\text{\texttt{Q}}xd3 20.\text{\texttt{W}}xd3 \text{\texttt{Q}}c4 21.\text{\texttt{Q}}a1
\text{\texttt{Q}}e5 22.\text{\texttt{Q}}xe5 fxe5 23.\text{\texttt{W}}d2

Intending 24.\text{\texttt{Q}}g5, followed by \text{\texttt{Q}}e6 etc.

23...\text{\texttt{Q}}xf5 24.\text{\texttt{Q}}xf5 \text{\texttt{Q}}a5 25.\text{\texttt{W}}e2 \text{\texttt{Q}}b7
25...h6 would not be any better, owing to 26.\text{\texttt{Q}}g6, followed by \text{\texttt{Q}}cgl etc.

26.\text{\texttt{Q}}g5 \text{\texttt{H}}f6 27.\text{\texttt{Q}}g3 c4 28.\text{\texttt{Q}}cg1
\text{\texttt{W}}e8 29.\text{\texttt{Q}}e6 \text{\texttt{Q}}xe6
If 29..\text{\texttt{Q}}ff7, then 30.\text{\texttt{W}}h5 \text{\texttt{Q}}c8 31.f6 etc.

30.dxe6\text{\texttt{Q}}d8
If 30...\text{\texttt{W}}d8, then 31.\text{\texttt{W}}h5 \text{\texttt{Q}}f6 32.\text{\texttt{Q}}h3
h6 33.\text{\texttt{Q}}g6 etc.

31.\text{\texttt{W}}d2 \text{\texttt{W}}f8 32.\text{\texttt{W}}h6

32.\text{\texttt{W}}d5 was much more forcible.

32...\text{\texttt{Q}}f6 33.\text{\texttt{W}}h5 \text{\texttt{Q}}h
If 33...\text{\texttt{Q}}e7, then 34.\text{\texttt{Q}}h3 \text{\texttt{Q}}h 35.\text{\texttt{Q}}g6
\text{\texttt{W}}f8 36.\text{\texttt{W}}xh6, and wins.

34.\text{\texttt{Q}}g6 \text{\texttt{W}}h4 35.\text{\texttt{W}}xh4 \text{\texttt{Q}}xh4
36.f6

Black resigns.

289 Evans Gambit
Zukertort
Hirsch

10 board blindfold exhibition.
Leipzig, 4 June 1885
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\text{\texttt{Q}}f3 \text{\texttt{Q}}c6 3.\text{\texttt{Q}}c4 \text{\texttt{Q}}c5
4.b4 \text{\texttt{Q}}xb4 5.c3 \text{\texttt{Q}}a5 6.d4 \text{\texttt{Q}}f6?

White departs from the book move 7.dxe5, which might be answered with 7...\text{\texttt{Q}}g4, for if 7...\text{\texttt{Q}}xe4, then 8.\text{\texttt{W}}d5.

7...d5
If 7...h6, then 8.dxe5 etc.
8...exd5 Qxd5 9.0-0 Qg4 10.Qe1 Qxc3? 11.Qxe5! Qxe5 12.Wxg4
Black resigns.

290 King’s Gambit
Zukertort
Weicke
10 board blindfold exhibition,
Magdeburg, 8 June 1885
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.f4 Qc6 3.Qf3 d6
4.c4 Qg4 5.Qc3 Qf6 6.0-0
exf4 7.d4 h6 8.Qxf4 g5 9.Qg3
a6 10.Wd3 Qd7 11.Qe1 0-0-0

12.Qxa6!?
Not sound, but promising a lively
attack.
12...Qb4 13.Qxb7+ Qxb7
14.Wc4 Qa6 15.d5 c5 16.Qb5
Qe8 17.Qe3 Qb8 18.Qb3 Qa8
19.Qxd6 Qec7
If 19...Qxb3, then 20.Qxa6+ Qa7
21.Qc6+ Qb7 22.Qxb7 Qxb7
23.Wxe8+ etc. If, on the other hand,
19...Qxd6, then 20.Qxa6+ Qa7
21.Wc6+ Qb7 22.Qa3.
20.Qxb8+ Qxb8
20...Qxb8 would but slightly prolong
the contest.
21.Qe5!
Black resigns.
It is obvious that Black loses the queen
with a very bad position in the bargain.

291 Vienna Game
Zukertort
Kastner
10 board blindfold exhibition,
Chemnitz, 13 June 1885
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.Qc3 Qf6 3.f4 exf4?
4.e5 We7 5.Qe2 Qg8 6.Qf3

6...c6
A very common continuation is here
6...d6, which, of course, proves ruinous
at once by 7.Qd5.
7.d4 g5 8.Qe4 h6
If 8...g4, then 9.Qd6+ Qd8 10.Qg5.
9.Qd6+ Qd8 10.Qc4 Qh7
11.Qd3 b5?
A ruinous advance, which at least
precipitates matters.
12.Wb3
White should have continued with
12.Wb4 a5 13.Qc5 etc.
12...Qg7
13.\textbf{d}d2 a5 14.\textbf{w}a3 a4
If 14...b4, then 15.\textbf{x}xb4.
15.\textbf{w}c5 \textbf{a}6 16.\textbf{a}5+!
Black resigns.

292 Two Knights Defence
\textbf{Zukertort}
\textbf{Gerold}
10 board blindfold exhibition,
Glauchau, 15 June 1885
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textbf{f}f3 \textbf{c}6 3.\textbf{c}4 \textbf{c}6 4.\textbf{g}5 d5 5.exd5 \textbf{d}x5 6.\textbf{xf}7 \textbf{x}f7 7.\textbf{f}3+ \textbf{e}6 8.\textbf{c}3 \textbf{e}7 9.d4 h6
Another continuation is 9...c6 10.\textbf{g}5 h6 11.\textbf{xe}7 \textbf{xe}7 12.0-0 etc.
10.0-0 c6 11.dxe5 \textbf{f}5? 12.d1\textbf{e}7 13.\textbf{e}3 b6
Preventing the adverse bishop from entering c5, and also enabling his own
queen's bishop to be played to b7 for additional protection.
14.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{b}7 15.\textbf{d}d1 \textbf{d}7
16.\textbf{w}h3+
Hastily played; 16.\textbf{g}4+! was much better.
16...\textbf{f}5 17.\textbf{x}d5 \textbf{c}x5 18.\textbf{x}d5+
It was stronger to continue with 18.\textbf{x}d5, and if 18...\textbf{x}d5, then 19.\textbf{x}d5.
18...\textbf{x}d5 19.\textbf{x}d5 \textbf{c}7
If 19...\textbf{f}7, then 20.\textbf{f}4, intending 21.\textbf{b}3.
20.\textbf{g}4 \textbf{g}5 21.\textbf{e}4! \textbf{e}7 22.\textbf{d}6+! \textbf{f}7 23.\textbf{xf}5+ \textbf{e}8
24.\textbf{d}7 \textbf{d}8 25.\textbf{e}6 \textbf{x}d7 26.\textbf{e}d7 \textbf{xd}7 27.\textbf{e}d7+
Black resigns.

293 Evans Gambit
\textbf{Zukertort}
\textbf{Schmid and Seydel}
Consultation Game, Dresden Chess Club,
20 June 1885
Notes by Zukertort
1.e4 e5 2.\textbf{f}f3 \textbf{c}6 3.\textbf{c}4 \textbf{c}6 4.b4\textbf{d}5
We prefer 4...\textbf{b}6.
5.\textbf{e}5 \textbf{c}6 6.\textbf{c}c4 \textbf{c}5 4.b4\textbf{d}5
The strongest continuation.
6.\textbf{e}7 7.\textbf{e}xe5 \textbf{e}x5 8.d4 \textbf{d}6
If 8...\textbf{x}b6, then 9.\textbf{a}3.
9.\textbf{g}5 \textbf{e}6
Of course, if 9...\textbf{f}6, then 10.\textbf{xf}6! \textbf{xf}6 (10...\textbf{g}xf6 11.\textbf{h}5+) 11.\textbf{f}7 etc. We think Black should proceed with 9...c6.
10.\textbf{b}5+ \textbf{c}6 11.\textbf{xc}6
11...\textbf{b}xc6
If 11...\textbf{b}6, then 12.\textbf{xe}7+ etc; not 12.\textbf{xa}7+ \textbf{f}8 12.\textbf{xc}6+ \textbf{xc}6
Unsound, of course, but leading to very interesting complications.
Johannes Zukertort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.e4</td>
<td>e5</td>
<td>2.Qf3</td>
<td>Qc6</td>
<td>3.Qc4</td>
<td>Qe7</td>
<td>4.d4</td>
<td>d6</td>
<td>5.Qd5</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very quiet and supposedly safe defence, which Black adopted out of a natural apprehension of the Evans Gambit. He appears, however, to have moved out of the frying pan into the fire.

4.d4 d6

Perhaps the better of the two moves at Black’s command. 4... exd4 is not quite so good, e.g. 4... exd4 5.0-0 Qf6 6.Qe1 0-0 7.e5 Qe8 etc., and Black has a cramped and somewhat more difficult game.

5.Qd5

5.0-0 or c3 the books recommend here in preference.

5...Qb8 6.Qd3 Qf6 7.c4 c6

Leaving the books, to which both players have hitherto kept. White follows the usual plan of a full development on both wings before commencing any attack.

294 Hungarian Defence

Zukertort

Whitby

11 board simultaneous exhibition,
Liverpool Chess Club, 3 December 1885

Notes from Liverpool Courier

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qe7

9...Qbd7

9...Qa6 would have been better. Black seems bent on cramping his game.

10.Qd2 cxd5 11.cxd5 Qh5

If 11...Qxf3, White would, after retaking, probably castle on the queen’s side, and make it very dangerous for Black to do so on either side.

12.0-0 0-0 13.Qh1 Qe8 14.Qg1 Qg6 15.g4

Effectually preventing ...f5, the only move that can free Black’s game in any way.

15...a6

Objectless, but he must move something. 15...Qd6 looks not quite so bad.

16.Qg2 b5 17.Qag1

17...Qc5

A hopeless attempt to ‘create a diversion’ on the queen’s side, which White takes no notice of.

18.h4!

Black must now make an opening for his queen’s bishop, as he dare not play 18...Qxh4.

18...f6

If 18...Qxh4 19.g5 winning easily:

19.h5 Qf7 20.Qe2 Qh8 21.Qh2 Qg8 22.Qh4 Qc7 23.Qg6+ Qxg6 24.hxg6 h6 25.Qxh6

Black resigns.

As White must mate in three moves by Qxg7+.
World Championship Match with Steinitz 1886

295 Scotch Game

Steinitz
Zukertort

2nd Match Game, New York,
13 January 1886
Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz, Hoffer, Schallopp, Chigorin and Euwe

1.e4 e5 2.\c3f3 \c6 3.d4 exd4
4.\c3xd4f6

Hoffer: This defence was introduced about twelve years ago by E. von Schmidt, and revived in 1876 by Steinitz and Potter, in a consultation game v Blackburne and Zukertort, at a chess party given by Mr. James Eccles. Since then Zukertort has adopted it in various matches, viz. against Blackburne, Paulsen and others.

Schallopp: This defence has been quite popular recently. It is as least as good as the usual 4...\c5.

5.\c3c3

Hoffer: Blackburne played here 5.\c3xc6, followed by 6.\d3, in the first match game v Zukertort, and in the following games, 6.e5.

5...\b4 6.\c3xc6 bxc6

7.\d3

Steinitz: The usual move at this juncture by Paulsen and other German masters is 7.\d4. It generally leads to the following continuation: 7.\d4 \e7 8.f3 d5 9.\g5 c5 10.\b5+ \f8 11.\d2 (if 11.\xf6 cxd4 winning a piece) 11...d4 12.0-0-0.\b7 and ought to win.

Schallopp: We prefer 7.\d4 \e7 8.f3.

Louis Paulsen

After 8...d5 9.\g5 c5 10.\b5+ \f8, it is not Black, but White who is favourably placed; the queen goes back to 11.\d3, and 11...d4 would now be met with 12.0-0-0 c4 13.\xf6.

Euwe: But best here is 8...\c5! 9.\d3 \b8! 10.\a4 \b4+ 11.c3 \d6 with good prospects for Black.

7...d5 8.exd5 cxd5

Steinitz: 1f 8...\c3xd5 9.0-0 \c3c3 10.\e1+ etc.

9.0-0 0-0 10.\g5

Hoffer: This is perhaps of questionable value. The bishop has to retreat after-
wards. 10.\( \land d2 \) might therefore be suggested.

10...c6

Steinitz: The d-pawn had to be defended or the knight exchanged. In the latter case, White’s disadvantage of a doubled pawn was fully compensated by his having two bishops and a prospect of an attack by ...c5 or ...\( \land b8 \).

Chigorin: We would prefer 10...\( \land xc3 \) 11.bxc3 h6 — wherever White retreats the bishop, Black plays 12...\( \land d6 \), and if 13.h3, then 13...c5 14.c4 \( \land b7 \); an attack emerges for Black after ...\( \land c6 \).

11.\( \land e2 \)

Chigorin: By playing 11.\( \land f3 \), White would have obtained, in any case, a better position than in the game. It would be unfavourable for Black to allow doubled pawns on the king’s flank, and that is why 11...\( \land e7 \) is necessary; then 12.h3, and afterwards \( \land e2 \) at the first opportunity.

11...\( \land d6 \) 12.\( \land g3 \)

Euwe: Black was threatening 12...\( \land xh2+ \) 13.\( \land xh2 \) \( \land g4+ \). However, 12.\( \land d4 \) would have been more active play for White.

12...h6

13.\( \land d2 ? \)

Hoffer: If 13.\( \land e3 \), then obviously 13...\( \land g4 \) with advantage. Having once pinned the knight unnecessarily, it would have been preferable to take it off than to retreat.

Schallopp: This characterises his 10th move as a lost tempo. White should have immediately exchanged on f8. Black has now obtained the slightly better position and exploits this very skillfully.

13...\( \land g4 ! \)

Steinitz: An excellent move which gives the second player a slight advantage.

Hoffer: Now Black assumes the offensive which is chiefly owing to White’s 10th and 13th moves.

14.\( \land e2 \)

Steinitz: The only defence, for ...\( \land h4 \) was threatened, and if 14.h3 (14.f3 \( \land xh2! \) ) 14...\( \land xf2 \) 15.\( \land xf2 \) \( \land h4 \) followed by ...f5 and ...f4, recovering the piece by force, with a pawn ahead.

14...\( \land h4 \) 15.\( \land xg4 \) \( \land xg4 \) 16.\( \land c1 \)

Schallopp: After 16.f3 \( \land d7 \) 17.f4! \( \land e8 \), Black is excellently developed.

16.\( \land e2 \)

Steinitz: By this ill-advised sortie and the subsequent posting of that bishop at a6, Black throws away the advantage he had gained. 16...\( \land e7 \) was superior. Had he, however, advanced ...f5 now, White, by answering f4 would have broken the attack and the adverse queen’s bishop would have been badly posted.
Chigorin: Here, best would be to play 16...\textit{\textbf{d}}7, then, on 17.f4 - 17...\textit{\textbf{ae}}8 or 17...f5, maintaining the small advantage (free play and attack) which Black obtained thanks to White’s last move.

17.\textit{\textbf{e}}e1 \textit{\textbf{a}}6

Schallopp: The bishop is very well placed here, as the further course of the game shows.

18.\textit{\textbf{c}}3

Steinitz: White has now assumed the offensive, he threatens 19.\textit{\textbf{x}}xg7, which cannot be captured on account of 20.\textit{\textbf{f}}f5+ and Black dare not advance ...d4, on account of the reply \textit{\textbf{e}}e4.

18...f5

Schallopp: While parrying the threat of \textit{\textbf{x}}xg7, Black at the same time begins a counterattack.

19.\textit{\textbf{e}}e6 \textit{\textbf{ad}}8 20.\textit{\textbf{w}}d2

Euwe: So as to answer 20...f4 with 21.\textit{\textbf{wd}}4.

20...d4

Steinitz: Though the pawn is only defended by the queen, it is obvious that White cannot take it, on pain of losing a piece by ...\textit{\textbf{x}}xg3 accordingly before or after the exchange of queens.

Chigorin: Hardly good, though also tempting. Upon correct play on White’s part, Black’s central pawns will become jaded. 20...\textit{\textbf{f}}7 is better. 20...f4? would be a mistake, because of 21.\textit{\textbf{g}}6 \textit{\textbf{d}}7 22.\textit{\textbf{wd}}4 \textit{\textbf{ff}}7 23.\textit{\textbf{f}}f5 and wins.

21.\textit{\textbf{a}}5

Steinitz: Better than 21.\textit{\textbf{x}}xd6 at once, for in that case Black would first take the bishop and would then advance ...f4 and ...f3.

21...\textit{\textbf{ed}}7 22.\textit{\textbf{x}}xd6 \textit{\textbf{xd}}6 23.\textit{\textbf{b}}b4

\textit{\textbf{wf}}6 24.\textit{\textbf{fd}}1

Steinitz: 24.\textit{\textbf{e}}e1 was much superior; but if 24.\textit{\textbf{x}}xf5 \textit{\textbf{fd}}7 25.\textit{\textbf{x}}xf8 \textit{\textbf{xf}}5 and, although White is a pawn ahead, Black has a good game and almost a sure draw with bishops of opposite colours.

24...\textit{\textbf{ed}}5 25.\textit{\textbf{xf}}8 \textit{\textbf{xf}}8 26.\textit{\textbf{h}}h5

Hoffer: Useless. With this and the following knight’s move, White allows his opponent to improve his position.

26...\textit{\textbf{we}}8 27.\textit{\textbf{f}}f4 \textit{\textbf{e}}5

Steinitz: Black has finely taken advantage of the opponent’s omission on the 24th move and has taken indisputable possession of the king’s file.

28.h4c5

Steinitz: If 28...g5 White would win by 29.hxg5, followed by 30.\textit{\textbf{d}}d3.

Schallopp: The black pawns gain still more in importance.

29.h5?

Steinitz: A weak move. Contrary to his usual style, Mr. Steinitz pursues a prospective attack on the king’s side and
neglects a positive and, we believe, a decisive advantage, which he could have obtained in the centre and on the queen’s side by b4 at this point. The number of the move in the text and White’s desire to save time, so close on the 30th move, may perhaps account for the omission.

29...\textit{Be}4 30.c3

Chigorin: Black threatened to win a pawn by ...\textit{b}b8; best would be 30...\textit{b}3.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\caption{Chessboard Diagram}
\end{figure}

30...\textit{We}b8

Steinitz: The design of playing the queen on this diagonal is excellent, as it compels White to weaken his king’s side, but we see no reason for not playing ...\textit{We}5 at once.

Schallopp: This move was said to be very fine. We are not able to share this view and regard it as a lost tempo. An immediate 30...\textit{We}5 would have achieved exactly the same result: 31.\textit{d}d3 (which after 30...\textit{We}b8 would be met by 31...\textit{Wh}4 32.g3 \textit{X}xh5 33.\textit{X}xc5 \textit{We}a8) is no less disadvantageous after 30...\textit{We}5, because of 31...\textit{We}d6 with a similar continuation as in the game itself, resp. 32.f3 \textit{He}3 33.f2 \textit{X}xf3 34.gxf3 \textit{Wh}3+ 35.\textit{g}h1 \textit{X}b7.

31.g3 \textit{We}5 32.\textit{g}6?

Steinitz: Total waste of time, as the retreat on the next move shows. He could have gained a fair advantage of position by 32.f3 \textit{He}3 33.cxd4 cxd4 34.\textit{W}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 35.\textit{W}xd4 \textit{X}xf3 36.\textit{X}g2 \textit{b}7 37.\textit{X}d5 \textit{He}3 38.\textit{W}f2 etc.

Hoffer: This has all the appearance of a mistake. We can see no reason why 32.f3 should not be played here, which would seem to secure at least a probable draw, e.g. 32.f3 \textit{He}2 33.\textit{X}xe2 \textit{X}xe2 34.f4 \textit{We}4 35.\textit{X}e1 \textit{d}3 36.\textit{X}xe2 \textit{dxe}2 37.\textit{W}f2 \textit{Wh}1 etc.

32...\textit{We}6 33.\textit{h}f4

Hoffer: If 33.\textit{He}1, the reply would be 33...\textit{d}3 etc.

Schallopp: White is already at a loss for a move. He wants, so it seems, to prevent the advance of the d-pawn; but this is in vain.

33...\textit{d}3

Steinitz: A fine move, which greatly hampers White’s game, but which would not have presented any real danger by proper precautions on the other side. It will be noted that White cannot take the pawn on account of 34...\textit{X}xd3 followed by ...\textit{He}1+ and ...\textit{X}xd1.

34.b3c4 35.\textit{X}f1 \textit{Wh}7 36.\textit{Wh}2

Steinitz: An unaccountably weak move. By \textit{b}2 at once, he would have ob-
tained the same position which he had
two moves later on without giving his
opponent time to withdraw the bishop
to the more commanding diagonal at
b7. 36.bxc4 followed by 37.b7, if the
bishop retook, was also satisfactory
enough. It is obvious that then Black’s
defence was much hampered, as he
could not remove the queen and allow
the rook to enter at b8, whereupon
\( g6 \) was threatened.
Euwe: 36.\( g2 \) would have been more
exact.
36...\( b6 \) 37.\( g1 \)
Steinitz: Black threatened \( ...e2 \), fol-
lowed by \( ...xf2+ \) and \( ...b7 \).
37...\( b7 \) 38.\( b2 \) \( c6 \)
Steinitz: Threatening \( ...xf4 \) or
\( ...e1+ \).
39.f3
Euwe: If 39.\( bxc4 \), then 39...\( e1+ \), and if
39.\( h2 \), then 39...\( xf4 \).
39...\( c5+ \)
Schallopp: All this is beautifully played.
40.\( f2 \)
Hoffer: If 40.\( h2 \), then 40...\( e2+ \)
41.\( xe2 \) \( f2+ \) 42.\( h3 \) \( f1+ \)
43.\( h2 \) \( xf3 \) and mate next move.
Schallopp: If 40.\( g2 \), then 40...\( e3 \) and
wins.
40...\( e1+ \)

41.\( h2 \)?
Steinitz: A fatal error. He still had at least
an even game by 41.\( g2 \), e.g. 41.\( g2 \)
\( e3 \) 42.\( e6 \) \( xf3+ \) 43.\( xf3 \) \( xe6 \\
44.bxc4 etc.
Hoffer: And if, after 41.\( g2 \), \( xf3+ \),
then 42.\( xf3 \).
Chigorin: And, further, if 44...\(\text{Ke}3\), then 45.\(\text{W}d5\). However, in place of 42...\(\text{Kxf}3\), stronger is 42...\(\text{We}5!\)
43.\(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Qd}5!\) in order, by having a defence for the \(d3\)-pawn, to transfer the queen to \(e8\) and the rook to \(e5\), threatening to win the \(h\)-pawn. White's position is highly constrained.

41...\(\text{Wxf}2+\) 42.\(\text{Wxf}2\) \(\text{Kxf}3!\)
Steinitz: A beautiful coup which wins a pawn and decides the game.
Schallopp: A splendid finish. Black handles the bishop quite excellently.

43.\(\text{g}4\)
Steinitz: Desperate, but he had no good resource. Obviously he could not stop the \(d\)-pawn if he took the bishop, and if 43.\(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Kxg}2\) 44.\(\text{Wxg}2\) \(\text{cb}3\) 45.\(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{He}1\) and wins both pawns, for if now 46.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{He}2\) 47.\(\text{Wf}1\) \(d2\) 48.\(\text{He}2\) \(d1\text{W}+\) and wins.

43...\(\text{Se}2\) 44.\(\text{Qg}2\) \(d2\) 45.\(\text{Qe}3\)
\(\text{cxb}3\) 46.\(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{Kxg}4\)
White resigns.

296 Slav Defence
Zukertort
Steinitz
3rd Match Game, New York,
15 January 1886
Notes by Steinitz, Hoffer and Schallopp

1.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 2.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{Kf}5\) 4.\(\text{a}3\)
Hoffer: Preparing at once the advance of the pawns on the queen's side. The continuation in the first game was 4.\(\text{Qc}3\).
Schallopp: Though the intended subsequent advance of the c-pawn keeps the bishop away from the b8-h2 diagonal, on which it developed such great efficiency in the first game, in other respects it proves to be just as unfavourable.

4...\(\text{e}6\)
Schallopp: Black has imperturbably pursued his aim and now through the next move obtains the better game.

13.0-0
Steinitz: 13. \texttt{wd1}, with the object of supporting the chain of pawns by b4, was preferable, but Black, in that case, could also obtain a good game by ...b5, followed by ...a4.

Hoffer: If White had played 10.\texttt{kc3}, then he would now be able to continue with 13.\texttt{db6} \texttt{xb6} 14.\texttt{cxb6 wd8} and protect the advanced pawn whenever required with \texttt{d4}.

13...b6 14.\texttt{cxb6} \texttt{xb6} 15.\texttt{xb6} \texttt{cxb6} 16.\texttt{wc3} \texttt{b7} 17.\texttt{a2}
Steinitz: Much as this hampers his game, it was, no doubt, his best, and as will be seen, he obtains thereby the opportunity of placing his bishop on c3 after removing the queen. 17.\texttt{d1} instead, the only other alternative, would have blocked his game beyond hope of extrication.

Schallopp: A sorry post for the rook.

17...\texttt{d7} 18.\texttt{d1}
Steinitz: A bold move which offers to give up a pawn for position.

18...c5
Steinitz: If 18...\texttt{b1} 19.\texttt{a1} \texttt{xb2} 20.\texttt{a4} \texttt{b8} (20...\texttt{b6} 21.\texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 22.\texttt{axb1} 21.\texttt{d1} \texttt{d6} or \texttt{a6}, and though Black is a pawn ahead, he seems to have little prospect of utilising his advantage.

19.\texttt{a4}
Schallopp: On 19.b3 could have followed 19...c4 20.bxc4 dxc4, since 21.\texttt{xc4} led to a speedy loss because of 21...\texttt{c6} 22.\texttt{e2} \texttt{b1}.

19...c4
Schallopp: What you do to me, so I to you. But on White's part, the advance was premature, here it is made at the right time.

20.\texttt{wc1} \texttt{f6} 21.\texttt{c3} \texttt{d6} 22.f3
Steinitz: Loss of time. As he is immediately compelled to advance this pawn two squares, he would have better submitted to the necessity at once.

22...\texttt{b8}
Schallopp: This forces the advance of the f-pawn, since on 23.\texttt{el}, at least a pawn is lost by 23...\texttt{d3}.

23.f4
Steinitz: If 23.\texttt{el} Black would answer 23...\texttt{d3} winning a pawn.

23...\texttt{d3} 24.\texttt{e1}

24...h5
Steinitz: Of course with the object of advancing on the knight and then entering with his own knight at e4 into a commanding position.

Schallopp: Compelling the opponent to block with his h-pawn, which now becomes a welcome object of attack and after six moves will be won.
25.h4
Steinitz: This pawn is ultimately lost, but it was, no doubt, his best play to defend the centre against the occupation of the adverse knight as long as possible.

25...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}d8}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d1}\)
Schallopp: So as, on 26...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g4}\), to equalise the game by 27.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}xh5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}xh4}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}xg4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}xg4}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d1}\).

26...g6
Schallopp: Black protects h5, and then continues the attack on h4 only after securing himself on all sides.

27.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d2}\)

27...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b8}\)
Steinitz: 27...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b5}\) was much superior, for it would have subsequently enabled Black to double the rooks without loss of time. White could not well displace the rook by a4 without afterward subjecting himself to a vehement attack at b4.

28.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}f2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}e7}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}f3}\)
Schallopp: On indifferent moves, e.g. 29.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}a1}\), Black wins the pawn on h4 by a move of the knight, the best perhaps ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c8}\). After the text move, the latter would be met by 30.e4.

29.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}e4}\)
Steinitz: Hardly as good as 29...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}e8}\) with the object of afterward playing the knight to d6 and b5.

Hoffer: If the knight retire, White would open the game with 30.e4 and get a fine position.

30.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}xe4}\) dxe4 31.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h1}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}xh4}\)
32.g3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}e7}\) 33.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d5}\)

Hoffer: Black has now won a pawn, and he steadily follows up now with a manoeuvre by which he hopes to break up the opponent’s game on the queen’s wing, while White essays the same on the opposite wing. The knight proves now very powerful, while the black queen’s bishop is rather hampered.

34.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}f2}\) a4

Steinitz: Black pursues the simple plan of breaking in on the queen’s side. But ...g5, a move pointed out by Mr. J.Ryan, would have won with great ease, e.g. 34...g5 35.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g2}\) (if 35.fxg5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}xg5}\) 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g2}\) or 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d6}\) followed by ...h4 or ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h7}\) and should win) 35...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}xf4}\) 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}xf4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h7}\) with a winning attack.

35.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g2}\) b3 36.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h1}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g7}\)
Schallopp: 36...f5 would have definitely forestalled White’s counterattack.

37.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}a1}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d8}\)
Schallopp: Also now 37...f5 was appropriate, to secure the carrying out of the intended combination (...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}a5}\) followed by ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc3}}}\) and ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{ab8}}}\)).

38.g4
38...hxg4?

Steinitz: An unhappy move which uselessly subjects him to a powerful attack, and is all the worse as he would have won the game straight off by 38...a5 39.gxh5 (if 39...a5, Black retakes with the queen, and should White exchange queens, his b-pawn must soon fall. Black otherwise could also obtain a very fine game by doubling the rooks on the b-file) 39...hxg6 40.bxc3 ab8 41.hxg6 fxg6 42.d1 f5 followed by ...b2 or ...xc3 with a winning game.

Steinitz: If he could have gained two pieces for the queen, it would have been his best resource, but he could not, e.g. 40...xh7 41.f6+ g7 42.xd5, and if 42...xc3, the knight retakes, while if 42...exd5, White answers 43.xa5.

Hoffer: With one blow the game is transformed. White now obtains a decisive attack.

Hoffer: Black here offered a draw.

40.h7+!

Hoffer: Unconscious of the imminent danger. If 39...f5, then 40.e5 a5 41.e1 xc3 42.bxc3 ab8 43.f2!

Schallopp: Now 42.xa8 does not achieve the objective, because of 42...xc3. White therefore continues the attack in a different way.

42.h7+ f8

43.f2!
Steinitz: A masterly coup which decides the game.

43...\textit{d}d8

Steinitz: No better was 43...\textit{xc}3 44.bxc3 g5 45.\textit{e}e5 followed by fxg5 or \textit{xf}x7.

Hoffer: If 43...\textit{xc}3, then simply 44.bxc3, threatening of course 45.\textit{wh}4. If 43...g5, then 44.fxg5 threatening immediate mate. If 43...\textit{e}7, then 44.\textit{wh}4+ \textit{d}6 45.\textit{xf}x7 \textit{d}8 46.\textit{wh}7, 47.\textit{e}e5 etc.

44.\textit{e}e5

Schallopp: White energetically maintains the attack.

44...\textit{g}8

Steinitz: If 44...\textit{a}7, the answer 45.\textit{h}8+ was equally fatal.

Schallopp: On 44...\textit{a}7, resp. 45...\textit{b}7, follows, as in the text, 45 \textit{ah}1...

45.\textit{ah}1 \textit{f}6

46.\textit{xf}7

Hoffer: Best. 46.\textit{g}3 would offer some chances after 46...\textit{ab}8 or 46...\textit{b}5.

46...\textit{f}8

Hoffer: Of course, if 46...\textit{xe}5, then 47.\textit{fxe}5 threatening 48.\textit{h}8+.

Schallopp: Against 46...\textit{xe}5, decisive is 47.\textit{fxe}5 \textit{d}8! 48.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}5 49.\textit{h}8+ \textit{xh}8 50.\textit{wh}2+ etc.

47.\textit{xf}6!

Black resigns

Steinitz: Of course, White wins by \textit{wh}4.

Schallopp: If Black takes the rook, then follows of course 48.\textit{wh}4. In addition, 47 \textit{g}3! was also decisive.

297 Slav Defence

Zukertort

Steinitz

5th Match Game, New York,
20 January 1886

Notes by Steinitz, Lasker, Hoffer and Schallopp

1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.\textit{c}c3

Hoffer: White modified his opening here. In the first and third games he played 3.e3. The text move is probably the strongest continuation.

3...\textit{f}6

Steinitz: 3...\textit{xc}4 would not be good, as White would attack the pawn by 4.e3, which cannot be protected by 4...\textit{b}5, on account of 5.\textit{xb}5 followed by \textit{f}3.

Hoffer: If 3...\textit{xc}4, the theoretical continuation is 4.e3 \textit{e}6 (if 4...\textit{b}5 then 5.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}5 6.\textit{f}3 etc.) 5.\textit{f}3 and White would either recover the pawn or obtain an overwhelming advantage of position. If 3...\textit{f}5, then 4.\textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 5.\textit{b}3, or at once 4.\textit{b}3 etc.

4.e3 \textit{f}5

Steinitz: This is disadvantageous now, as White thereby gains a move, the bishop being compelled to retreat to \textit{c}8. For Black dare not then play ...\textit{d}7, as will be seen later on.

Schallopp: At this stage the bishop move has less to recommend itself; but probably the mistake lies, in the first place, in the next move.

5.\textit{xd}5

Steinitz: This is a deviation from White's usual course which consists in advancing the pawn on the queen's wing. Mr. Zukertort seems to have abandoned his
usual favourite development on that side.

5...cxd5
Lasker: In his notes Steinitz indicates 5...dxe5, as the stronger move.
Schallopp: Here 5...dxe5 came into consideration, through which Black avoids the following retreat of the bishop.

6...b3

6...c8
Steinitz: If 6...d7 7.b5 c6 8.f3 e6 9.e5 c7 10.a4 c8 11.cx6 etc.
Schallopp: White powerfully exploits the hasty development of the opponent's bishop. On 6...b6, 7.b5+ followed by 8.xd5 wins a pawn; on 6...d7 follows 7.b5 c6 8.f3 with a good attack (the threat is 9.e5 followed by 10.xc6+ and 11.a4).
Lasker: Nowadays this variation is continued with the offer of a pawn: 6...b6 7.xd5 xdx5 8.xd5 e6. Black, however, hardly gets sufficient attack.

7.f3 c6 8.e5 e6
Hoffer: Obviously, 8...xe5 9.dxe5 and Black loses a pawn.

9.b5 c7 10.d2 d6 11.f4 0-0 12.c1
Lasker: The pressure on the black queen's knight is strong. The threat is now

12...xe5
Steinitz: Forced; for White threatened 13.h6 followed by 14.b5 winning at least a pawn, e.g. 12...d7 13.xc6 bxc6 14.b5 b8 15.d6 etc.
Schallopp: This exchange opens the f-file for the opponent, and the hope, through ...f6, to force a capture or, if the e5-pawn stands where it is, through an exchange of it to isolate the White pawn, proves to be a deception. Admittedly it is difficult to find a good move for Black; on 12...d7 follows 13.xc6 followed by 14.b5, 15.d6 and 16.b4; on 12...b6 can follow 13.a4 followed by the win of a pawn.
Lasker: Relieves the pressure but opens a line for the white rooks.

13.fxe5 e8
Steinitz: Best. If 13...d7 14.xe5 bxc6 15.b5 b8 16.d6 c5 (if 16...xb3 the c-pawn must shortly fall) 17.dxc5 xxc5, then 18.c2 d7 (best; for if ...e4, White captures the bishop which Black dare not retake, as White could effect mate by giving up the queen for the two rooks) 19.a4, with a fine game.

14.0-0 f6
Steinitz: Loss of time. 14...f5 at once would have been much superior.
15...\texttt{d}3! \texttt{xf}7

Steinitz: If 15...\texttt{fxe}5, White wins the exchange by 16.\texttt{xh}7+.

Hoffer: If 15...\texttt{d}7, the following continuation was probable: 16.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{exd}5 17.\texttt{xd}4+ \texttt{h}8 18.e6 \texttt{c}8 19.\texttt{hx}5 \texttt{g}6 20.\texttt{xe}6 \texttt{xe}5 (best) 21.d5 \texttt{e}5 22.\texttt{b}4 and should win.

16.\texttt{xc}2!

Lasker: This weakens the king's side. If 16...\texttt{g}6 17.\texttt{xe}6. If 16...\texttt{h}6 17.\texttt{g}6.

16...\texttt{f}5

Steinitz: If now 16...\texttt{fxe}5, White gets an overwhelming attack, thus: 17.\texttt{xh}7+ \texttt{h}8 (or 17...\texttt{f}8 18.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{xf}1+ 19.\texttt{xf}1+ \texttt{f}6 20.g4 and wins) 18.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{xf}1+ 19.\texttt{xf}1 \texttt{g}6 20.\texttt{d}1 followed by g4 with a winning attack.

Hoffer: Forced — so leaving White’s centre intact. If 16...\texttt{g}6, then 17.\texttt{xe}6 \texttt{hx}6 18.\texttt{xg}6+ \texttt{f}8 19.\texttt{xf}6 followed by e4 or \texttt{f}4, with a formidable attack and three pawns for a piece.

Schallopp: On 16...\texttt{g}6 follows 17.\texttt{xe}6 (17...\texttt{hx}6 18.\texttt{xe}6+ \texttt{g}7 19.\texttt{xf}6); on 16...\texttt{h}6 similarly 17.\texttt{g}6 (17...\texttt{e}7 18.\texttt{xe}8 \texttt{xe}8 19.\texttt{xf}6); on 16...\texttt{fxe}5, finally, 17.\texttt{xh}7+ \texttt{h}8 18.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{e}7 19.\texttt{xf}7 \texttt{xf}7 20.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{e}7 21.\texttt{xe}8 \texttt{xe}8 22.\texttt{c}7 or 18...\texttt{xf}1+ 19.\texttt{xf}1 \texttt{e}7 20.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{f}6 21.\texttt{d}6 \texttt{h}7 (if 21...\texttt{xd}6, then 22.\texttt{xf}6) 22.\texttt{f}7 \texttt{g}5 23.\texttt{f}8+ \texttt{xf}8 24.\texttt{g}5. Black is therefore forced into the text move and White maintains the pressure on e6.

17.\texttt{e}2

Lasker: Now White prepares to open the f-line by g4 and prepares it thoroughly. Such play is straightforward and strong.

17...\texttt{d}7

Steinitz: ...\texttt{g}6 now, as well as later on, was much preferable.

18.\texttt{f}2

Steinitz: We see no reason why g4 at this point should not be played.

18...\texttt{c}8 19.\texttt{c}3

Hoffer: Preparatory to the doubling of the rooks. If 19.\texttt{c}1, then 19...\texttt{b}6, and White would have no satisfactory means of preventing threatened exchanges with 20...\texttt{b}4.

19...\texttt{b}6 20.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{e}7 21.\texttt{c}1

Schallopp: White quietly prepares the attack.

21...\texttt{b}5 22.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{a}6 23.g4

Schallopp: This introduces a direct attack on the king.

23...\texttt{g}6 24.h3

Schallopp: The g4-pawn needs this protection, since White intends to play a rook on to the f-file, to free his knight or to force the exchange of it.

24.\texttt{c}7

Steinitz: 24...\texttt{c}4 would have been a very strong move now. It would have
forced White to play a3, for if 25 b3 he would lose a piece by ...\texttt{xe}e2 followed by ...\texttt{xc}3. Black's bishop at c4 would have effectively protected the centre and indirectly the king's side, for if White then exchanged the g-pawn Black would retake with the knight instead of pawn, as he was forced to do eventually, and afterward, if White advanced the e-pawn, Black's bishop would be available for the protection of the centre.

Schallopp: 24...\texttt{g}7, with a view to playing the queen's rook to f8, seems to deserve the preference.

25.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{g}7

Hoffer: Having made all the arrangements to keep the knight pinned with what would seem the obvious intention of taking it off, Black suddenly changes his mind, and instead of the necessary 25...\texttt{xe}2, he makes an indifferent move. Everyone knows that two knights are inferior to two bishops, but in the present instance the choice lay with the lesser evil, especially as White's intention to release the knight was clearly indicated by 25.\texttt{e}e1.

Schallopp: Black should exchange on e2. The knight will now be very unpleasant.

26.\texttt{f}4d8 27.\texttt{g}5f5 \texttt{g}5f5

Steinitz: If 27...\texttt{xf}5, then follows 28.e4 dxe4 29.\texttt{xe}4, and Black cannot stop the fatal advance of White's d-pawn.

Lasker: If 27...\texttt{xf}5 28.e4 dxe4 29.\texttt{xe}4 and the d-pawn advances to weaken the position of the obstructive knight. Then the decision comes about in the centre. Now it falls on the g-file.

28.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{h}8 29.\texttt{h}2 \texttt{c}6 30.\texttt{Reg}1

Schallopp: Threatening 31.\texttt{h}5. The best reply for Black is probably 30...\texttt{e}e8 followed eventually by ...\texttt{d}d7, and only then ...\texttt{e}7.

30...\texttt{e}7 31.\texttt{f}2

Schallopp: 31...\texttt{e}8

Steinitz: Of course, fatal at once, but there was nothing to be done. If 31...\texttt{d}7 32.\texttt{w}h4 \texttt{c}8 33.\texttt{h}5 \texttt{g}8 34.\texttt{f}6 and wins; or 33.\texttt{h}6 \texttt{g}8 34.\texttt{b}4 and wins.

Hoffer: Black took nearly half an hour over this move, which loses a piece. His game was, however, utterly disorganised, e.g. 31...\texttt{d}7 32.\texttt{b}4 \texttt{c}6 33.\texttt{d}6 \texttt{c}8 34.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{a}5 (if 34...\texttt{d}8, then 35.\texttt{h}6 etc.) 35.\texttt{g}4 threatening 36.\texttt{g}6+ moves 37.\texttt{x}h7+ \texttt{x}h7 38.\texttt{h}4+ \texttt{h}5 39.\texttt{x}h5+ and mate in two moves. If 31...\texttt{g}6, then 32.\texttt{x}g6 hxg6 33.\texttt{x}g6+ \texttt{g}8 34.\texttt{h}4 etc.

Schallopp: Now this is a serious mistake, since the e6-pawn loses the protection of the queen. Meanwhile White has already for a long time had the superior position and would have undoubtedly even against a better defence led his troops to victory. In this connection we take the following variation from \textit{Sonntagsblatt} — 31...\texttt{e}8 32.\texttt{h}4 and White threatens mate in four moves: 33.\texttt{g}8+ \texttt{x}g8 34.\texttt{g}6+ \texttt{g}7 35.\texttt{e}7+. 36.\texttt{g}8 mate; if Black parries this threat by 32...\texttt{g}7, then fol-
... and the loss of a piece is unavoidable; just as little helps the protection 32... g7, then 33... h6 g8 34... h5! etc. Against the move 31... g8, which an American analyst proposes, decisive is 32... g6+ hxg6 33... h4+ followed by 34... xg6, etc. Also there is no salvation in 31... c8, e.g. 32... h4 g8 33... h6, and Black can only move queen and bishop, without, however, being able to meet the elegant four move mate 34... g4, 35... xh7+, 36... h4+, 37... xh5+, other than by the saddest sacrifice. On other replies on the 31st move, White finally achieves victory with f2-h4-h6, followed eventually by f4-h5-f6 etc.

Lasker: A blunder, but the black position weak on all black squares and battered on the g-file, was untenable.

32... xg7
Black resigns.
Steinitz: If 32... xg7 33... xg7 g7 34... xe6+ g moves 36... xc7 with a piece and a pawn ahead. Mr. Zukertort deserves high praise for the rare skill and vigour with which he had conducted the attack.
Lasker: If Zukertort has a plan in mind, he is a match for Steinitz, possibly even his peer. In this game, every move of Zukertort's pointed towards a vigorous cooperation of the pieces united to attack the king — at first against its initial position, then against the castled king. The forceful concentration of pieces against the king is the old Italian plan: Zukertort found it ready made, and in the tactics of mere execution he was a great master. Steinitz, however, discovered sound and successful plans over the board.

298 Queen's Gambit
Zukertort
Steinitz
13th Match Game, New Orleans,
5 March 1886
Notes by Steinitz, Lasker, Hoffer and Schallopp
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3... c3 d6 4... f4
Schallopp: White chooses this time a slightly different way of development than in earlier games. On the whole it amounts to the same thing.
4... c5
Steinitz: Morphy, in his match with Harrwitz, Paris 1858, here played 4... a6, which precaution against the entrance of the queen's knight is not alone unnecessary, as will be seen, but gave him such an inferior game that, as stated by Löwenthal, he decided to avoid this form of the Queen's Gambit, by playing 1... f5, in reply to 1.d4.
Schallopp: Black goes out again to isolate the.d-pawn.
5.e3
Steinitz: If now 5... b5 cxd4 and White dare not answer 6... c7+, on account of 6... xc7 7... xc7 b4+, recovering the queen with a pawn ahead. Nor does White improve his game by 6... a4, on account of the rejoinder 6... d7 which
would also enable him to take knight with queen, in reply to \( \text{Qc7}^+ \), and if 6.\( \text{Wxd4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \), followed by ...\( \text{b4}^+ \) with the superior game.

5...\( \text{cxd4} \)

Hoffer: The text move is 'the isolated pawn theory' tacked on to the old style. Zukertort is of the opinion lately, that the disadvantage of the isolated pawn is compensated by more freedom of action obtained by White.

6.\( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 7.\( \text{xc4} \)

7...\( \text{c6} \)

Steinitz: 7...\( \text{Qbd7} \) is, we believe, the better post for that knight, and should, by correct continuation, give Black the superior position, similar to the one which Steinitz obtained in the ninth game of the match, played at St. Louis. Any attempt on White's part to press the attack, by 8.\( \text{Qb5} \), would then be worse than premature, e.g. 7...\( \text{Qbd7} \) 8.\( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{b4}^+ \) 9.\( \text{f1} \) 0-0 10.\( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{b6} \) 11.\( \text{Qxa8} \) (if 11.\( \text{b3} \), then 11...\( \text{Qbd5} \), and evidently, if White then takes the rook, he will lose his bishop, and his knight will not be able to get out) 11...\( \text{Qxc4} \) 12.\( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{e5} \) 13.\( \text{Qxe5} \) (if 13.dxe5, then 13...\( \text{Wxc7} \)) 13...\( \text{Qg4} \), threatening ...\( \text{Qe3}^+ \), with a vehement attack.

8.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9.0-0 0-0 10.\( \text{Fe1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 11.\( \text{We2} \) \( \text{a5} \) 12.\( \text{b5} \) Schallopp: A mistaken manoeuvre. The black queen is restricted; but he does not manage to trap it.

12...\( \text{a6} \) 13.\( \text{c7} \)

Steinitz: Beyond slightly disarranging the position of pawns on Black's queen's wing, he gains nothing by the combined attack of bishop and knight, and further bearing out the remarks in our note on Black's 4th move, it will be seen that \( \text{Qc7} \) now would have been bad, on account of the reply ...\( \text{a7} \), winning two minor pieces for the rook finally.

13...\( \text{b6} \)

Steinitz: Of course the only answer to save the queen which, if removed, would be harassed to death by the adverse pawns.

14.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{fc8} \) 15.\( \text{f4} \)

Schallopp: White has now, after four moves, again reached the old position; but Black, in the meantime, has gained terrain and obtained an attack.

15...\( \text{b5} \)

Lasker: The black queen has parried the assault and now Black assumes the initiative by pushing the queen's side pawns, so as to gain space for his pieces.

16.\( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 17.\( \text{ed1} \)

Steinitz: This rook has now moved twice, and has afterward to return again to the post he now leaves. But, of course, it was of importance to him to defend the d-pawn once more, for the purpose of releasing his king's knight, and he would not employ the other rook on the d-file for this post, probably because he had in view an eventual attack by a4, or posting that rook at c1.

17...\( \text{a5} \)

Lasker: An advanced post at c4 is to be established!

18.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c4} \) 19.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \)
Lasker: Why the advance post so soon retires is not clear, unless it is so that the knight may take up a waiting position where it keeps its eye on two strong posts, c4 and f5.

20.\textit{\textbf{Qe5 Qe8}}

\textit{\textbf{Hoffer:}} Threatening 22.d5. If 22...\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}}, then 23.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}} winning a piece; if 22...\textit{\textbf{exd5}}, then 23.\textit{\textbf{Qxf7}} 24.\textit{\textbf{Qxe7+}} 25.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5+}} etc.

21.\textit{\textbf{Qd8}}

\textit{\textbf{Steinitz:}} Black could not well enter on his plan of doubling the rooks on the c-file at once, for if 21...\textit{\textbf{a7}}, then White would gain valuable time by the answer 22.\textit{\textbf{e3}}, and if 21...\textit{\textbf{c7}} 22.\textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{ac8}} 23.\textit{\textbf{Wh3}} h6 (or 23...\textit{\textbf{g6}} 24.\textit{\textbf{Wh4}} etc.) 24.\textit{\textbf{Qxh6}}, with a strong attack.

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} A defensive move, which later also turns out suitable for the attack.

22.\textit{\textbf{Wf3}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} White undertakes a little attack on the king's flank, which, however, also does not materialise.

22...\textit{\textbf{a7}} 23.\textit{\textbf{Wh3}} h6 24.\textit{\textbf{e3}}

\textit{\textbf{Steinitz:}} The object of Black's 21st move will be clear now. For it will be perceived that White can not very well now sacrifice the bishop for the two pawns, since Black, after retaking, would immediately play ...\textit{\textbf{f8}}, and his king's knight would remain defended by the queen.

24.\textit{\textbf{Wa7}}

\textit{\textbf{Lasker:}} Black is well-developed, he has the superiority in the centre and is aggressive on the queen's side.

21.\textit{\textbf{Qg5}}

\textit{\textbf{Hoffer:}} Threatening 22.d5. If 22...\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}}, then 23.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}} winning a piece; if 22...\textit{\textbf{exd5}}, then 23.\textit{\textbf{Qxf7}} 24.\textit{\textbf{Qxe7+}} 25.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5+}} etc.

25.\textit{\textbf{d5}}

\textit{\textbf{Hoffer:}} Threatening 26.\textit{\textbf{b6}}.

\textit{\textbf{Steinitz:}} His attack against the king's side being repelled, he now gives up his isolated d-pawn, in order to gain the adverse a-pawn for it, which gives him the advantage on the extreme queen's wing for the ending. But the plan gives the opponent the initiative for a strong attack.

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} White now frees himself of his isolated pawn, but does not thereby improve his position.

\textit{\textbf{Lasker:}} To get rid of the isolated pawn, Black gives for the central pawn the side pawn and thereby gains further superiority in the centre.

25...\textit{\textbf{b4}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} On 25...\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}} follows of course 26.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5}} \textit{\textbf{exd5}} 27.\textit{\textbf{b6}}.

26.\textit{\textbf{Qe2}} 27.\textit{\textbf{Qxa6}} 28.\textit{\textbf{Qd3}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} Black has now obtained open lines, and the pawn on b4 hampers the white game.

28...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}} 29.\textit{\textbf{Qd4}} 30.\textit{\textbf{b5}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} Black has now obtained open lines, and the pawn on b4 hampers the white game.

28...\textit{\textbf{Qd6}} 29.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}} 30.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} Black has now obtained open lines, and the pawn on b4 hampers the white game.

28...\textit{\textbf{Qd6}} 29.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}} 30.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}}

\textit{\textbf{Schallopp:}} Black has now obtained open lines, and the pawn on b4 hampers the white game.
Hoffer: Threatening ...\textdagup x d 4 , followed by ...	extdagup f 4 , and after exchanging knight for bishop, to continue the attack by ...	extdagup d 5 , followed by playing the other rook to d 7 .

Lasker: The a-pawn is helpless, the white knight on d 4 pinned, the black pieces have a great deal of space: the result of the attack by the black queen’s side pawns is excellent.

32.\textdagup f 3 \textdagup a 4 33.\textdagup e 1

Steinitz: He delays the advance of b 3 which he afterward reluctantly adopts, as it opens too long an attacking range for the adverse king’s bishop, and leaves also both pawns on his left wing very weak.

32.\textdagup f 3 \textdagup a 4 33.\textdagup e 1

Hoffer: If instead of the text move, which weakens the pawns, 34.\textdagup f 5 , then 35.\textdagup x e 6 f x e 6 36.\textdagup x e 6 + followed by \textdagup x f 5 etc.

Schallopp: The king’s flank was indeed weakened by this, but not in a decisive way.

35.b 3

Steinitz: It is difficult to suggest anything better.

35.\textdagup e 8 36.\textdagup c 4 \textdagup f 5

Steinitz: This is the turning point, and the move in the text ought to have assured the game for Black.

Lasker: The white knight cannot be defended. If 37.\textdagup a d 1 \textdagup d 7 .

37.\textdagup x e 6 ?

Steinitz: The sacrifice, or more correctly speaking, the loss of the piece was compulsory. Obviously, if the knight moved elsewhere, white would lose the exchange without the faintest vestige of compensation in position, and if 37.\textdagup a d 1 \textdagup d 7 38.\textdagup x e 6 \textdagup x d 1 winning offhand.

Hoffer: It is doubtful whether the sacrifice is sound. White obtains a good attack in addition to two pawns for the piece.

Lasker: A desperate sacrifice.

37...f x e 6

Steinitz: At this juncture the game was adjourned and the clock of Steinitz marked 2 hours 40 minutes, while his opponent had consumed 1 hour and 54 minutes.

38.\textdagup x e 6 + \textdagup g 7

Schallopp: 38...\textdagup f 7 was probably better.

39.\textdagup a d 1

39...\textdagup e 7 ?

Steinitz: This hasty and ill-considered move compromises his advantage seriously. 39...\textdagup b 8 instead would have left White practically without resource, for, supposing 39...\textdagup b 8 40.\textdagup f 4 \textdagup e 5 41.\textdagup b 1 \textdagup e 7 , winning easily.

Lasker: Herewith Black loses a move, which in the defence is a matter of im-
portance. He should at once attack the queen with 39...\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}a8. If 40.\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}xb4 \textit{c}h4 and Black, who has a firm hold on the a-pawn also, would assume the offensive against the king. That was the logical conclusion, but Steinitz failed here and afterwards failed again, when the queen on e2 came under the fire of the white rook and at last lost the game. It is useless to record the remaining moves of the game; they would tell nothing, whereas up to the present point the idea of an attack by pawns advancing on the queen's side is well exemplified.

40.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}4 \textit{e}5 41.\textcolor{red}{\textit{b}}b1 \textit{x}e1+

Steinitz: If 41...\textit{c}c6 instead, then White could win at least another pawn by 42.\textit{x}x6, followed by 43.\textit{x}f5+

Schallopp: 41...\textit{c}c6 was better. In any case Black should not have exchanged the rook.

42.\textit{x}e1 \textit{c}c3

Schallopp: 43.\textit{x}f5 was threatened. 42...\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}c5 does not work because of 43.\textit{x}f5 followed by 44.\textit{e}e6+

43.\textit{d}d5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}c5

Schallopp: Better is 43...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}d8 (44.\textit{xc}7 \textit{x}e1 45.\textit{xc}7 \textit{xe}8+ \textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}xe8 46.\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}xel \textit{f}f6) though the following variation, 44.\textit{d}d1 \textit{x}d4 45.\textit{xc}7 \textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}xc7, came to the same thing as the game itself.

44.\textit{xc}7\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc}7}

Hoffer: Obviously compulsory. If 44...\textit{x}e1, then 45.\textit{xe}8+ etc.

45.\textit{d}d1

Hoffer: if 45.\textit{xf}5, then 45...\textit{x}e1 46.\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}xel \textit{g}xf5 and White cannot capture the bishop on account of Black threatening mate.

45...\textit{d}d4 46.\textit{c}c4 \textit{c}c6 47.\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}d3 \textit{a}a8?

Steinitz: A grossly misconceived plan which only loses valuable time. The proper play was 47...\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}f4, followed by ...\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}f6, if White opposed his queen at e3.

Schallopp: Incomprehensible. With 47...\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}f4 Black would maintain quite a good attack.

48.\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}e3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}d6

Steinitz: He had no time for instituting the contemplated attack by ...\textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}b7, against the king's flank, for White, after simply defending by f3, would threaten \textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}e8, besides \textcolor{red}{\textit{x}}d4 or a3.

49.a3!

Steinitz: A splendid coup, which relieves him of all trouble on the queen's side.

49...\textit{c}c6

Steinitz: Of course, if 49...\textit{f}f3+, then White would simply take the knight with queen.

Schallopp: This is no longer useful. Black is already dependent on waiting moves.

50.axb4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{w}}f6

Steinitz: This protects the bishop indirectly, for White dare not take on account of ...\textit{e}e2+. A comparison of this position with the one indicated in our note on Black's 47th move will show that Black has lost several important moves, for he might have then arrived at the present position of his minor pieces and the queen, with a strong pawn at b4, which White could not have got rid of by a3.
51.\textit{f}1 \textit{b}5 52.\textit{w}e6 \textit{we}6
53.\textit{x}e6 \textit{xb}4
Steinitz: It would probably have been better to return with the knight to d4, followed by ...\textit{f}6, in reply to \textit{c}4.

54.\textit{c}d7!
Steinitz: The two minor pieces, when alone on the board and in an open position, can only with difficulty make a stand against a rook and passed pawn if cut off from the support of their king, more especially are bishop and knight helpless in such contingencies, as compared to two bishops. White exercises very fine judgement in thus forcing the exchange of one of the adverse bishops.
Schallopp: White forces the exchange of the bishop and now has a slightly better endgame. All the same it is still quite difficult.

55...\textit{c}c3
Steinitz: 54...\textit{a}7 was still worse, for then followed: 55.\textit{a}1 \textit{c}5 56.\textit{x}c6 \textit{xc}6 57.\textit{xc}1 and wins.
55.\textit{d}4 \textit{xd}7 56.\textit{xd}7+ \textit{f}6
57.\textit{d}4 \textit{e}7 58.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}5 59.\textit{c}4 \textit{b}5 60.\textit{c}6 \textit{d}6 61.\textit{b}6 \textit{d}4 62.\textit{b}7!
Schallopp: The rook manoeuvre is quite splendid.
62...\textit{g}5 63.\textit{b}5 \textit{d}5 64.\textit{b}6 \textit{c}6 65.\textit{h}7
Steinitz: White has most cleverly drawn off the adverse king from the support of the pawns on the other wing, and his passed b-pawn having served its purpose, he abandons it in right time, in order to get rid of all the pawns on the other side and to remain with two combined passed pawns which win easily with the help of the king.

65.\textit{xb}6 66.\textit{h}6 \textit{c}7

67.h4!
Steinitz: White clears the road to victory.
Schallopp: White hereby obtains two connected passed pawns, and now the win is no longer all that difficult.
67...\textit{g}xh4 68.\textit{h}xh4 \textit{f}5 69.\textit{h}7+ \textit{d}8 70.\textit{g}4 \textit{e}771.\textit{g}2 \textit{e}8
Steinitz: ...\textit{g}6, with the object of fixing himself at f4 with the knight, was also of no use, for White would enter with his king at e4 via f3, and then he could easily manoeuvre to attack the adverse bishop in a loose position or else to reach f5 with his rook.

72.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5 73.\textit{h}5 \textit{d}4
74.\textit{g}3 \textit{f}7 75.\textit{f}4 \textit{c}3
Hoffer: Mr. Steinitz gave here notice that the remainder of the game should proceed under 'the fifty-move rule'.
76.\textit{b}5 \textit{e}1+ 77.\textit{h}3 \textit{c}3 78.\textit{g}5 \textit{a}1 79.\textit{g}4 \textit{c}3 80.\textit{f}5 \textit{d}4 81.\textit{b}7 \textit{c}3 82.\textit{h}5
Hoffer: See the article by Zukertort, following this game, for further analysis of this ending.

82... \( \text{d4} \) 83.\( \text{h6} \)

Steinitz: The whole conduct of the game after the exchange of queens, is a model of fine ending play by Mr. Zukertort.

83... \( \text{g7+} \) 84.\( \text{h7} \) \( \text{e5} \) 85.\( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{f8} \)

The August number of Mr. Steinitz' International Chess Magazine contains, in its section 'Personal and General', the following remarks: 'It has hitherto been supposed that two passed pawns and a rook always win by force against two minor pieces, and I recollect that Zukertort, who is well known as a fine ending player, somewhat reproachingly remarked to me that some time before the end of the thirteenth game, which I lost in New Orleans, he expected me to resign, instead of claiming a count of fifty moves as I did. I then answered that I was well aware that the two pawns and the rook were mostly stronger than the two pieces if each party had other pawns on the board, but in that particular instance I thought I ought to have an opportunity of sacrificing one of my pieces for two pawns. It appears now that my general judgement was correct, though my special reasons over the board were wrong. For Professor Berger, of Graz, points out that I could have drawn that game as late as the 82nd move, and therefore four moves before I resigned. The position shown on the subjoined diagram and the demonstration of our distinguished correspondent will be found fully worthy of study.

86.\( \text{x}e7! \)

Steinitz: The final crushing blow. After this, there is nothing to be done, for White will advance the g-pawn which Black must take, and then the other pawn queens without hindrance. Black resigns.

Black to move, played here 82... \( \text{d4} \). Professor Berger gives us the key move to an analysis which proves that 82... \( \text{g7} \) would draw, e.g. 82... \( \text{g7} \) 83.\( \text{d7} \) (if 83.\( \text{a7} \) or 83.\( \text{c7} \) Black attacks the rook accordingly at e5 or d4, and White can never gain time for the winning move, \( \text{h6} \)) 83... \( \text{e5} \), and now 84.\( \text{h6} \) will not answer on account of the rejoinder, 84... \( \text{e8} \), followed by 85... \( \text{xf5} \), and if 84.g6+, then 84... \( \text{f6} \) 85.g7 (or 85.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 86.\( \text{f7} \) \( \text{g6} \)) 85... \( \text{g8} \). etc.'

Well, I think that Mr. Steinitz puts the case far too strong when saying that it was supposed that two passed pawns
and a rook always(?) win by force against two minor pieces, nor do I quite understand his argument about either party having additional pawns. So they were in our case until they were exchanged, as they usually are in all similar cases, which I know from my own experience or the literature of the game. I must further add that Mr. Steinitz misunderstood me completely if he thought that I was complaining about his not resigning earlier. He certainly resigned at the proper moment, viz.: when his game became hopeless. What I considered not quite right on his part was his declaration at the 75th move that he do proceed under the fifty move rule, for the rule did not apply for endings like the one we were playing, or at least not for that stage of it. My opinion on the matter was shared at the time by the gentlemen present of our committee.

Professor Berger's analytical remarks, given by Mr. Steinitz, are certainly clever, but not exhaustive. When I started on the advance of my king, which was necessary for the support of the pawns, I fully expected that my opponent would try to prevent me from crossing with my king the square h6, and, of course, he could only do it with:

82...<g7

It is pretty obvious that White must move his rook, and that the different rook's moves which Professor Berger mentions are of no use. But I still think that the move which I had decided at the time of play in answer to the bishop's move would have won, viz:

83.<b5

Black, in his turn, has not much choice: he dare not play his king, for 84.f6 would then prove decisive; any bishop's move, but to f8, would permit 84.<h6, with a similar continuation as in actual play. So we must examine 83...</f8 or any promising knight's moves.

83...<f8 84.f6

84...c6

If 84...c8, then 85.b8 d6 86.g6+ etc; if 84...g8, then 85.b7+ e6 86.b6+ f7 87.g6+ etc.

85.g6+g8

If 85...xf6 or e6 then 86.b6.

86.b7 any 87.h7 and wins.

Or

83...g8

The only continuation which offers some difficulty. If 83...c6 then 84.f6 f8 (84...xf6 85.f5) 85.g6+ etc, as in the preceding variation; if 83...c8, then 84.f6 f8 (best) 85.b7+ g8 (best) 86.g6 etc.
84.\textbf{Bb6 d4}

If 84...\textbf{e7} (84...\textbf{e} anywhere else 85.f6+), then 85.\textbf{g6} or 85.\textbf{b7+ f8} 86.\textbf{b8+ f7} 87.\textbf{g6+} etc.

\textbf{85.a6 e5} or \textbf{c3}

Or 85...\textbf{g7} 86.g6+ \textbf{e7} 87.\textbf{a7+ f8} (87...\textbf{f6} 88.\textbf{f7+}) 88.\textbf{a8+}.

\textbf{86.g6+ e7} or \textbf{g7} 87.\textbf{a7+ f8} (best) 88.\textbf{g7+ xg7}

If 88...\textbf{e8}, then equally 89.\textbf{g6}.

\textbf{89.g6} and wins.

I have a very high opinion of Mr. Steinitz's general judgement of position, but in this instance, if he should re-examine the ending, I think he will find that not only his special reasons but also his general judgement were wrong.

\textit{J.H. Zukertort}

However, later also Zukertort's analysis was shown to be faulty and Berger subsequently found the correct procedure. A clear explanation of the winning method was given by Reuben Fine in his classic \textit{Basic Chess Endings}...

Rook plus two pawns vs two minor pieces is always a win, subject to the inevitable exceptions of blockade and special cases, such as drawn rook and pawn vs. bishop or knight endings.

The general case when there is no other material on the board is seen in Steinitz-Zukertort, 13th Match Game, New Orleans 1886.

The game continuation was 82...\textbf{d4}? when White wins by force: 83.\textbf{h6 g7+} 84.\textbf{h7 d4} 85.g6+ \textbf{f6} 86.\textbf{x e7!} and Black resigned. If 86...\textbf{x e7} 87.g7 etc.

But against the best defence 82...\textbf{g7}!

White cannot force his king through to h6 because he cannot gain a tempo with his rook. On 83.\textbf{c7 e5} 84.\textbf{a7 d4} 85.\textbf{d7 e5}! follows, for if now 86.\textbf{h6? e8=}. There remains then the alternative of trying to force the advance of the pawns.

While this is a long and arduous process, analysis, chiefly by Berger, shows that it can be done.

After 82...\textbf{g7} the most forceful win is

\textbf{83.g4}!

Not 83.b5? \textbf{d4} 84.h6? \textbf{g8+} 85.h7?

\textbf{83.g4}! 86.\textbf{gxf6+}!! 86.gxf6 \textbf{e3}!! because the white king is trapped in the corner – first pointed out in the \textit{Times Democrat} – ed.

\textbf{83.c3}

The white king is trying to reach e5. On other bishop moves \textbf{f3-e4} at once may follow.

496
84.\texttt{b3}!
Now 84.\texttt{f3}? \texttt{d2}! is useless for White.

84...\texttt{g7}
The alternatives are:
A) 84...\texttt{d5} 85.\texttt{f3} \texttt{e7} 86.\texttt{e4} \texttt{d6} 87.\texttt{a3} \texttt{c6} 88.\texttt{a6+} \texttt{c5} 89.\texttt{f6};
B) 84...\texttt{e5} 85.\texttt{b5} \texttt{c3} 86.\texttt{b7!} \texttt{e5} 87.\texttt{f3} \texttt{c3} 88.\texttt{e4} \texttt{d2} 89.g6+ \texttt{f6} (89...\texttt{f8} 90.\texttt{e5}) 90.\texttt{b6+} \texttt{g7} 91.f6+!! \texttt{g6} 92.fxe7+ \texttt{f7} 93.\texttt{e6!} \texttt{e8} 94.\texttt{f5} \texttt{b4} 95.\texttt{e4} \texttt{xe7} 96.\texttt{e6} wins.

85.\texttt{f4}
Not 85.\texttt{f6}? \texttt{xf6} 86.\texttt{f3} \texttt{g8} 87.gxf6 \texttt{g6}! 88.f7 \texttt{h6+} and 89.\texttt{xf7}.

85...\texttt{h8} 86.\texttt{e4} \texttt{g7}
Now that the king is centralised White can set about advancing his pawns.

87.\texttt{e6} \texttt{c3}
If instead 87...\texttt{h8} 88.\texttt{g6+}
A) 88...\texttt{f8} 89.\texttt{b8+} \texttt{g7} 90.\texttt{f4} followed by \texttt{g5};
B) 88...\texttt{g7} 89.\texttt{b8} \texttt{g8} 90.\texttt{e5} \texttt{f6} 91.\texttt{xh8} etc.

88.\texttt{f6}

88...\texttt{g6}
Or 88...\texttt{c8} 89.\texttt{c6}, or 88...\texttt{xf6} 89.\texttt{xf6+} \texttt{g7} 90.\texttt{a6}, or finally 88...\texttt{g8} 89.\texttt{f5} and neither sacrifice 89...\texttt{xf6} 90.gxf6 nor 89...\texttt{xf6} 90.gxf6 \texttt{h6+} 91.\texttt{g5} is of any use.

89.\texttt{b7+} \texttt{e6}
89...\texttt{e8} 90.\texttt{f5} is worse.

90.\texttt{e7!} \texttt{h4}
On other knight moves, 91.\texttt{e7+} and 92.\texttt{f5} follows.

91.\texttt{e7+} \texttt{d6} 92.\texttt{h7} \texttt{g6}
93.\texttt{f5} \texttt{f8}

94.g6!
and Black must give up both pieces for the two pawns.
299  Spanish Game

Zukertort

Pollock

British Chess Association tournament, London, 14 July 1886

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.d4 f3 d6 3.b5 d6

Freed his opponent's position.

5...dxe5 6.0-0 d5 7.tbc3 tge7 8.tbc4 c4 9.e5 dxe5

White threatened 9.g5.

9...e3 g4 10.h3 h5 11.g3 tge6 12.h4 a5 13.d3 d5

Greatly improving his game.

14.d5 txe3 15.txe3 tge4

16.tge2

16...h2, followed up by 17.g2, would be better.

16...tbc6 17.b2 eae8 18.g3

Threatening to continue with 19...tde6 and 20...tcf4+.

19.txe5 txe5 20.gxf5 tge8 21.c3 tbc6

with a knight against a bishop for the end-game.

22.g6 23.wg4 tge6

24...h2

White should first capture the knight.

24...c5 25.ad1 ad8 26.xc6 txc6 27.f4 xae1 28.xd1 ed6

29.fxg6 fxg6 30.f6xb6 31.wd2

If 31.ad2, Black might continue with 31...wce3 and 32...wcf4.

31...e7

With the intention of getting rid of the adverse knight by continuing with ...tde4 or ...tge5 and ...f4.

32.b3 tge5 33.h1 wcf4

34.fxg6 txc6 35.wf5 tge8

36.xc6 txc6 37.wge1 tge6

38.wf1 tce6 39.wce2 tge6

40.ad1 wge6

41.ad7! tge6

If 41...tgb6, then 42.tde1, and if then 42...txb2 or tcf2, White mates with 43.wxh7! txh7 44.wxh5+ etc.

42.wg4 tgb6

After 42...tgc4 43.xh4 txg4 44.xc7, Black's game would be de-
fenceless. If 42...\textit{c}6, then 43.\textit{c}xg8+! \textit{c}xg8 44.\textit{d}e7+ etc.

\textbf{43.\textit{g}7}  
Much better than 43.\textit{d}d8, which would be met with 43...\textit{c}g6.

\textbf{43...\textit{e}6} 44.\textit{b}3 a5 45.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}c1 46.\textit{a}3\textit{c}6

Of course, if 46...\textit{a}xa3, then 47.\textit{c}xh7+! \textit{c}xh7 48.\textit{h}h5+ etc.

\textbf{47.\textit{c}5 \textit{f}4 48.\textit{b}4}

\textbf{48...a4}  
Obviously unconscious of the final onslaught which his opponent has prepared, for otherwise he would open the a-file with 48...\textit{a}xb4. This would not prevent White's victory, but would render it a little more difficult.

\textbf{49.\textit{a}xg8+ \textit{c}xg8 50.\textit{d}d1! \textit{c}g5}  
51.\textit{d}7 \textit{f}6 52.\textit{b}7 \textit{d}8
If 52...\textit{g}5, White forces the game with 53.\textit{b}8+ \textit{d}8 54.\textit{e}5+ \textit{f}6 55.\textit{e}8+ etc.

\textbf{53.\textit{x}c6 \textit{f}7 54.\textit{d}5 \textit{f}6}  
55.\textit{d}7 \textit{h}6 56.\textit{d}6 \textit{g}5  
57.\textit{x}h6+ \textit{x}h6 58.\textit{x}h6 \textit{g}7
59.\textit{g}4 \textit{c}7 60.\textit{b}5 \textit{f}7 61.\textit{b}6  
\textit{d}8 62.\textit{e}5+

Black resigns.

\textbf{300 Spanish Game}  
\textbf{Taubenhaus}  
\textbf{Zukertort}  
British Chess Association tournament, London, 16 July 1886

Notes by Zukertort

\textbf{1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}c6 3.\textit{b}5 \textit{c}c6 4.d3 d6 5.c3 g6 6.d4 exd4}

Up to here the game proceeds like the 16th and 18th in the Steinitz v Zukertort match. Zukertort continued against Steinitz with 6...\textit{g}7.

\textbf{7.cxd4 \textit{d}7 8.\textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 9.h3 0-0}  
10.\textit{e}e3 \textit{e}8 11.\textit{d}3 \textit{h}6 12.g4 \textit{h}5

\textbf{13.g5}  
We would prefer 13.\textit{h}2 \textit{c}8 14.f3 or 14.\textit{g}1.

\textbf{13...\textit{h}7 14.\textit{d}2 \textit{c}8 15.h4}  
16.\textit{a}2 a6 17.\textit{g}1 b5 18.f3  
19.\textit{d}5 \textit{e}7 20.\textit{e}7+ \textit{x}e7 21.\textit{d}3 \textit{b}7 22.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}8
23.\textit{f}4 c6 24.\textit{e}2 d5! 25.e5 c5!

26.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}6
26...\textit{g}4 would be better.

\textbf{27.0-0 cxd4 28.\textit{e}d4 \textit{c}5}  
29.\textit{xb}5

A better continuation would be 29.\textit{f}5 \textit{xf}5 30.\textit{x}c5 \textit{xd}3 31.\textit{x}d3 \textit{c}7
32.\textit{d}6 \textit{c}4 etc.

\textbf{29...\textit{xd}3 30.\textit{d}6 \textit{xb}2}  
31.\textit{x}d3
31...\(\text{h}3!\) 32.\(\text{wx}d5\)

In selecting this continuation, White, we think, underrated the power of Black's 31st and 32nd moves.

32...\(\text{xd}8!\) 33.\(\text{d}4\)

White has no satisfactory continuation.
If 33.\(\text{xe}1\), then 33...\(\text{xd}6\) 34.\(\text{ex}d6\) \(\text{xe}3\) 35.\(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xa}1+\) etc.

33...\(\text{e}2!\) 34.\(\text{f}3\)

If 34.\(\text{f}2\), then 34...\(\text{g}4+\) 35.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{xh}4\) 36.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{xf}4\) 37.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 38.\(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 39.\(\text{xf}7+\) (best)
39...\(\text{xf}7\) 40.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{xf}7\) etc.

34...\(\text{xf}1\) 35.\(\text{xf}1\) \(\text{xf}3\) 36.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{xd}6\) 37.\(\text{ex}d6\) \(\text{xd}4+\)

White resigns.

301 King's Gambit
Bird
Zukertort
British Chess Association tournament,
19 July 1886
Notes by Zukertort
1.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 2.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{ex}f4\) 3.\(\text{xe}2\)

The game was started as From's Gambit, but turned by White's second and third moves into a Bishop's Gambit Limited, which rare opening is of late patronised by Mr. Bird.

3...\(\text{f}5\)

Advocated by the Handbuch and frequently adopted by Mr. Hoffler.

4.\(\text{e}5\)

We would prefer 4.\(\text{ex}f5\); the text move is upset by Black's reply.

4...\(\text{d}6\) 5.\(\text{ex}d6\) \(\text{h}4+\) 6.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{xd}6\)
7.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 8.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 9.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}6\)
10.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{c}7\) 11.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 12.\(\text{h}4\)
\(\text{d}7\) 13.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{h}6\)

A tempting, but unsound sacrifice of a pawn, as Black's 18th move amply demonstrates.

15.\(\text{xc}5\) 16.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xc}5\)
17.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 18.\(\text{d}4\)

18...\(\text{e}0\) 19.\(\text{a}4\)

For if 19.\(\text{xe}5\), then 19...\(\text{xe}5\) and 20...\(\text{xd}4\).

19...\(\text{b}8\) 20.\(\text{h}3!\)

An ingenious device which, however, owing to Black's superiority of development, only tends to simplify matters in Black's favour.

20...\(\text{g}4\) 21.\(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\)
22.\(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 23.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{g}2+\)
24.\(\text{g}2\)

If 24.\(\text{g}1\), then 24...\(\text{xc}5+\) 25.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}3+\) etc.

24...\(\text{xe}2+\) 25.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{a}6\)
26.\(\text{xf}4+\) \(\text{a}8\) 27.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{xb}2\)
28.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}2\) 29.\(\text{c}7\) \(\text{hd}8\)
30.\(\text{h}1\)

If 30.\(\text{xf}5\), Black mates with 30...\(\text{g}2+\) 31.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}1+\) 32.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}2\) mate—White threatens now 31.\(\text{b}3\).

30...\(\text{xa}2\) 31.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}5+\)

White resigns.
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**Four Knights Game**

**Mackenzie**

**Zukertort**

British Chess Association tournament, 23 July 1886

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c}f3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 3.\(\text{g}b5\) \(\text{g}f6\)

4.\(\text{c}c3\) \(\text{b}b4\) 5.0-0 0-0 6.d3 \(\text{d}d4\)

7.\(\text{c}x\text{d}4\) \(\text{exd}4\) \(8.\text{e}5?\)

A mistake which leads to loss of material and position.

8...\(\text{dxc}3\) 9.\(\text{exf}6\) xf6 10.bxc3

\(\text{xc}3\) 11.\(\text{b}b1\) c6 12.\(\text{c}c4\) d5

13.\(\text{b}b3\) \(\text{e}e8\) 14.\(\text{e}e3\)

Loss of time, as White's next move proves.

14...\(\text{wh}4\) 15.\(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{e}e5\) 16.\(\text{g}3\)

The only defence at White's disposal: if 16.\(\text{h}3\), then, of course, 16...\(\text{xh}3\)!; if 16.\(\text{f}4\), then 16...\(\text{d}d4\) + 17.\(\text{wh}1\) \(\text{g}4\) 18.\(\text{cl}\) \(\text{e}e2\), with an overwhelming attack.

16...\(\text{wh}3\) 17.\(\text{c}c3\) \(\text{g}4\) 18.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}5\)

The immediate sacrifice of the king's bishop would lead but to a draw. With the text move Black attacks in the first instance the hostile d-pawn and threatens besides to sacrifice the king's bishop and then proceed with ...\(\text{e}e6\).

19.\(\text{e}e1\) \(\text{e}e6\) 20.\(\text{b}b2\) \(\text{ae}8\)

21.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{c}7\) 22.\(\text{c}c2\) \(\text{h}5\) 23.\(\text{d}d2\)

\(\text{b}6\) + 24.\(\text{h}1\)

Perfectly sound: Black must come out of the melee with rook, bishop and three pawns for the queen.

25.\(\text{xcg}2\) \(\text{e}e2\) + 26.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{h}3\)

27.\(\text{d}4\)

If 27.\(\text{g}1\), then 27...\(\text{xcg}1\) 28.\(\text{xcg}1\)

\(\text{g}2\) + 29.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{ee}2\) etc.

27...\(\text{xf}1\) 28.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}2\) + 29.\(\text{g}1\)

\(\text{xf}3\) 30.\(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{xe}2\) 31.\(\text{c}c1\)

\(\text{g}2\) + 32.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{h}2\) 33.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}7\)

34.\(\text{a}3\)

If 34.\(\text{e}3\), then 34...\(\text{e}4\), and if 35.\(\text{g}5\), then 35...\(\text{f}6\).

34...\(\text{h}1\) + 35.\(\text{c}f2\) \(\text{e}4\)

Threatening to capture the g-pawn.

36.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{h}2\) +

37.\(\text{f}1\)

The only move by which White avoids decisive loss. If 37.\(\text{e}3\), then 37...\(\text{d}8\)

38.\(\text{c}f4\) \(\text{e}2\) 39.\(\text{c}d1\) \(\text{g}5\) + 40.\(\text{c}e5\) \(\text{c}7\)

etc. If 37.\(\text{d}1\), then 37...\(\text{h}4\) 38.\(\text{g}xh4\)

\(\text{f}3\) + 39.\(\text{c}d1\) \(\text{f}4\) + 40.\(\text{d}b1\) \(\text{e}4\) + 41.\(\text{c}a1\) \(\text{h}1\).

37...\(\text{d}3\) + 38.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}2\) 39.\(\text{f}2\)

\(\text{a}5\) 40.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}5\) 41.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{c}4\)

42.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 43.\(\text{c}c1\) \(\text{f}6\) 44.\(\text{g}2\)

\(\text{d}3\) 45.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}4\) + 46.\(\text{f}1\)

Best: if 46.\(\text{g}1\), Black forces the win with 46...\(\text{b}2\) 47.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{xc}3\).

46...\(\text{f}3\) 47.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{a}2\) 48.\(\text{e}1\)

\(\text{e}3\) 49.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 50.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}6\)

51.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{a}1\) 52.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}7\) 53.\(\text{g}xh5\)

\(\text{g}5\) 54.\(\text{h}6\)

24...\(\text{wxg}2\) +!
Black has conducted well the attack for a long series of moves: here, however, he misses the right continuation, which would have forced the game in a few more moves. After 54...f5 White has no rejoinder with which he could carry on his defence to any purpose.

55.\textit{We}3! $\textit{W}$a2

An ingenious resource, but Black could recover completely the lost ground with: 55...$\textit{W}$f4 56.$\textit{W}$h3 $\textit{W}$g8 57.$\textit{W}$h5 $\textit{W}$f7 58.$\textit{W}$e8 (or 58.$\textit{W}$f7+ $\textit{W}$h6 59.$\textit{W}$f6+ $\textit{W}$h5 58...$\textit{W}$g3.

56.$\textit{W}$h7

Of course, if 56.$\textit{W}$xg5?, then 56...$\textit{W}$d3+ 57.$\textit{W}$gl $\textit{W}$h2+ 58.$\textit{W}$h1 $\textit{W}$e4++.

56...$\textit{W}$xh2 57.$\textit{W}$xg5 $\textit{W}$d3+

If 57...$\textit{W}$xh7, White may reply 58.$\textit{W}$h4. The text move forces a change of the position of the white king, and thus dispenses of that continuation.
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Overfinessing: Black should proceed with 75...$\textit{W}$h4+ 76.$\textit{W}$e2 (best) 76...$f$3+ 77.$\textit{W}$d2 $\textit{W}$g4.

76.$\textit{W}$e1 $\textit{W}$g4 77.$\textit{W}$d7+ $\textit{W}$g3 78.$\textit{W}$f2+

78...$\textit{W}$g2?

A blunder with which Black throws away the game, which he must win after 78...$\textit{W}$h2! 79.$\textit{W}$xb5 (or 79.$\textit{W}$c7+ $\textit{W}$h1 80.$\textit{W}$h7+ $\textit{W}$g2 81.$\textit{W}$h5 $\textit{W}$f6 etc.) 79...$\textit{W}$f6.

79.$\textit{W}$g4+

Black resigns.

303 King’s Gambit

Zukertort

Pollock

Nottingham tournament, 3 August 1886

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.$\textit{W}$c4 $\textit{W}$f6

4.$\textit{W}$c3 $\textit{W}$c6 5.$\textit{W}$f3 $\textit{W}$e7

5...$\textit{W}$b4 is considered to be the best continuation.

6.0-0

6.e5 would be a better reply.


If 11...0-0, then 12.$\textit{Q}$b5, regaining the gambit pawn with the superior position.
12.d5 \(\text{d8} \) 13.\( \text{We2} \) \(\text{g7} \) 14.\( \text{e1} \)

Threatening \(\text{xf4} \).

14...g5 15.\( \text{xg5} \) \(\text{c5}+ \)

After 15...\( \text{xg5} \) 16.\( \text{xf4} \) \(\text{f6} \)

(16...\( \text{c5}+ \) 17.\( \text{e3} \) etc; 16...\( \text{d8} \)

17.\( \text{xg5} \) etc.), White wins with 17.d6!

(17.\( \text{e5?} \) \(\text{b6}+ \) 18.\( \text{h1} \) 0-0)

17...\( \text{cxd6} \) 18.\( \text{xf4} \) \(\text{e4} \)

16.\( \text{Wh1} \) \(\text{lxg5} \) 17.\( \text{xf4} \) \(\text{e4} \)

If 17...\( \text{f7} \), White proceeds with 18.d6.

18.\( \text{xe4} \) \(\text{fxe4} \)

19.\( \text{Wxe4?} \)

Hastily played, and overlooking Black's intention of castling. White could force the win with 19.\( \text{Wh5}+! \) \(\text{d8} \) (if 19...\( \text{f8} \) 20.\( \text{h6}+ \) \(\text{g8} \) 21.\( \text{e8}+ \) \(\text{f8} \)

22.\( \text{f1} \). If 19...\( \text{d7} \), White continues also with 20.\( \text{xe4} \) 20.\( \text{xe4} \) \(\text{e8} \) (if 20...\( \text{f6} \), then 21.\( \text{g5} \) 21.\( \text{ael} \) \(\text{d7} \)

22.\( \text{g5} \).

19...0-0 20.\( \text{h6} \)

White might come out with three pawns for a piece with 20.\( \text{ewe7} \) \(\text{e7} \)

21.\( \text{exe7} \) \(\text{xf4} \) 22.\( \text{xc7} \).

20...\( \text{f7} \) 21.\( \text{e3} \) \(\text{f5?} \)

He overlooks the only satisfactory reply, 21...\( \text{d6} \).

22.\( \text{g3}+ \) \(\text{h8} \)

If 22...\( \text{g6} \), then, of course, 23.\( \text{exg6}+! \) \(\text{hxg6} \) 24.\( \text{exe6}+ \) \(\text{h8} \) 25.\( \text{xf7} \).

23.\( \text{e5}+ \) \(\text{f6} \) 24.\( \text{xf7} \) \(\text{xe8} \)

25.\( \text{f1} \)

Threatening a forced mate with 26.\( \text{xf6}+! \) \(\text{xf6} \) 27.\( \text{g7}+ \) \(\text{g8} \)

28.\( \text{xf6}+ \) \(\text{d6} \) moves 29.\( \text{d8} \) or \(\text{h4} \).

25...\( \text{d4} \) 26.\( \text{c3} \) \(\text{h4} \) 27.\( \text{g5} \)

\(\text{xg5} \) 28.\( \text{xf7} \) \(\text{d8} \) 29.\( \text{f5} \) \(\text{h6} \)

30.\( \text{e5}+ \) \(\text{g8} \) 31.\( \text{e6}+ \) \(\text{h8} \)

32.\( \text{f7} \)

Black resigns.

304 Vienna Game

Zukertort

Thorold

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{c3} \) \(\text{f6} \) 3.\( \text{f4} \) \(\text{d6} \)

The usual continuation is 3... \(\text{d5} \).

4.\( \text{c3} \) \(\text{g4} \) 5.\( \text{c4} \) \(\text{xf3} \)

It would be better to proceed with 5...\( \text{c6} \).

6.\( \text{xf3} \) \(\text{bd7} \)

Again, we would prefer 6...\( \text{c6} \).

7.0-0 \(\text{c6} \) 8.\( \text{d3} \) \(\text{c7} \) 9.\( \text{e3} \) \(\text{h5} \)

At least, premature.

10.\( \text{d4!} \) \(\text{xd4} \) 11.\( \text{xd4} \) \(\text{e7} \)

12.\( \text{ae1} \) \(\text{b5?} \) 13.\( \text{xb5} \) 0-0-0

Of course, if 13...\( \text{cxb5} \), then 14.\( \text{e5} \) \(\text{b8} \)

15.\( \text{xf6} \) \(\text{xf6} \) 16.\( \text{xf6} \) \(\text{xf6} \) 17.\( \text{d5} \)

\(\text{c5}+ \) 18.\( \text{h1} \) and wins.

14.\( \text{a6}+ \) \(\text{b8} \) 15.\( \text{b4} \) \(\text{g4} \) 16.\( \text{h3} \)

17.\( \text{xf6} \) \(\text{b6}+ \) 18.\( \text{h1} \) \(\text{gxf6} \)

19.\( \text{c4} \) \(\text{h7} \) 20.\( \text{b5} \) \(\text{d4} \) 21.\( \text{xc6} \)

\(\text{xc4} \)
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Of course, if 21...b6, then 22.c7+.  
22.cxd7 Qxd7 23.Qb1+ Qc8  
24.Qd5 Qd8 25.Qb4 Qc5  
26.Wa3 Qd7  
If 26...a5, White would proceed with 27.Wa4+.

27.Qb7+  
Good enough to win: it would be better style, however, to continue with 27.Wa4+ Re6 28.f5+ Re5 29.Wb3! etc.  
27...Re8 28.Qxc5 dxc5 29.hxg4  
Black resigns.

305 Italian Game  
Taubenhans  
Zukertort  
Nottingham tournament, 5 August 1886  
Notes by Zukertort  
1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qc5  
4.d3 Qf6 5.c3 d6 6.Qe3 Qb6  
7.h3 Qe7 8.Qe2 c6 9.Qb3 Qg6  
10.Qbd2 d5?  
Black should exchange bishops first: the immediate advance is not quite sound.  
11.exd5?  
Now White in his turn omits to take advantage of his opponent's slip.  
11...Qxe3! 12.fxe3 Qxd5 13.Qe4  
0-0 14.0-0-0?  
An error of judgement: Black is sure to be first in the field with an attack.  
14...a5! 15.g4 a4 16.Qxd5?  
This exchange is not favourable, as it weakens the position of the white king, and opens at the same time, an important file for the hostile rooks. Black had, however, under any circumstances the better game  
16...Qxd5 17.Qg3?  
17.Qf2 would be better.  
17...a3! 18.Qf5  
For now White dare not reply 18.b3, on account of 18...Qc7 19.Qd2 e4, winning a piece.  
18...Qxb2+ 19.Qxb2 Qa5  
20.Qh2 Qe6 21.Qb4 Qa7 22.d4  
e4 23.Qh4 Qxh4 24.Qxh4 Qfc8  
25.Qb2 Qc4 26.Wb3 b5 27.Qb1  
Qac8 28.Qg2 Qd7 29.Qf4 b4  
Threatening 30...Qa4.  
30.Qxd5 Qe6  
If now 30...Qa4, White could rejoin with 31.Qe7+, and if 31...Qf8, then 32.Qxc8.
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31...bxc3!
Best: if 31...axc3, White would proceed with 32.\textit{\textbf{xf}4 c7 33.\textit{\textbf{a}1.}}

32.\textit{\textbf{xe}6 c2+ 33.\textit{\textbf{xc}2 xxc2}}

34.\textit{\textbf{c}5 h2}
After 34...\textit{\textbf{xc}5 35.\textit{\textbf{d}x}c5 b8, White would escape with 36.\textit{\textbf{a}1.}}

35.\textit{\textbf{c}1}
If 35.\textit{\textbf{a}1, Black forces the game with 35...\textit{\textbf{b}8 36.\textit{\textbf{c}4 \textit{\textbf{a}3 37.\textit{\textbf{b}1 \textit{\textbf{b}2.}}} \textit{\textbf{b}6 38.\textit{\textbf{a}4 \textit{\textbf{xb}3+ 37.axb3 h5}}}}}
White resigns.

306 French Defence
Zukertort
Trenchard
Board simultaneous exhibition,
British Chess Club, 18 December 1886
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{\textbf{c}3 \textit{\textbf{f}6}}
4.\textit{\textbf{g}5 \textit{\textbf{e}7}} 5.e5 \textit{\textbf{fd}7 6.\textit{\textbf{xe}7 \textit{\textbf{xe}7}}}
7.\textit{\textbf{xe}7 7.\textit{\textbf{xe}7}} 0-0 8.f4 \textit{\textbf{f}6 9.\textit{\textbf{f}3 \textit{\textbf{xe}5}}}

If 10.fxe5, then 10...c5 11.\textit{\textbf{b}5 cxd4}
12.\textit{\textbf{c}7 (12.\textit{\textbf{d}6 \textit{\textbf{c}6}) 12.\textit{\textbf{xf}3}}}
13.gxf3 (13.\textit{\textbf{xa}8 \textit{\textbf{xe}5 14.0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{f}8}}}
15.\textit{\textbf{x}d4 \textit{\textbf{bc}6}) 13...\textit{\textbf{xe}5 and 14.\textit{\textbf{xe}7.}}

10...a6 11.\textit{\textbf{d}3 \textit{\textbf{c}6 12.0-0-0}}

15.\textit{\textbf{e}2 b5}

15...\textit{\textbf{f}5 would be better, probably.}

16.g4!
White takes up herewith a direct attack against the adverse king's quarters, which he carries through consequently to a successful issue.

16...\textit{\textbf{b}4 17.\textit{\textbf{b}3 c5 18.c3 \textit{\textbf{c}6}}}
19.h4 \textit{\textbf{e}7 20.h5 \textit{\textbf{h}6 21.\textit{\textbf{g}1 \textit{\textbf{d}7 22.g5 \textit{\textbf{f}5 23.\textit{\textbf{xe}5 \textit{\textbf{h}6 24.Eg6 \textit{\textbf{h}8 25.\textit{\textbf{h}1 \textit{\textbf{f}5}}}}}}}}}
26.\textit{\textbf{e}5 \textit{\textbf{e}8 27.\textit{\textbf{c}2! \textit{\textbf{a}7}}}
27...\textit{\textbf{h}4 or any other knight's move would be met with 28.\textit{\textbf{h}6+}.}

28.\textit{\textbf{g}3 \textit{\textbf{c}8 29.\textit{\textbf{xf}5 \textit{\textbf{xf}5}}}
30.\textit{\textbf{e}2 \textit{\textbf{f}8 31.\textit{\textbf{h}3 \textit{\textbf{e}7}}}}
To no purpose, but it is difficult to suggest anything better. We do not think that Black has any satisfactory continuation.

32.\textit{\textbf{g}4 \textit{\textbf{f}7 33.h6 \textit{\textbf{a}7 34.\textit{\textbf{g}5! \textit{\textbf{b}7}}}
If 34...\textit{\textbf{xf}4, then 35.\textit{\textbf{h}xg7+ \textit{\textbf{f}6 or \textit{\textbf{x}g7 36.\textit{\textbf{h}5+ and wins.}}} \textit{\textbf{h}xg7+ \textit{\textbf{hxg7 36.\textit{\textbf{h}5+}}}}
White might prevent Black's 37th move by continuing with 36.\textit{\textbf{h}4+}.

36.\textit{\textbf{h}7 37.\textit{\textbf{h}7 \textit{\textbf{xf}4+}}
If 37...\textit{\textbf{xf}7, then 38.\textit{\textbf{x}g8+ \textit{\textbf{x}g8 39.\textit{\textbf{x}g8+ \textit{\textbf{x}g8 40.\textit{\textbf{e}8+ and 41.\textit{\textbf{xc}8 etc.}}} \textit{\textbf{b}1 \textit{\textbf{f}5+ 39.\textit{\textbf{xf}5 \textit{\textbf{xf}5}}}
40.\textit{\textbf{f}6}
Black resigns.
British Chess Club Handicap,  
Match with Blackburne and Frankfurt 1887

307 French Defence  
Mundell  
Zukertort (odds of two moves)  
British Chess Club Handicap tournament,  
London, 6 March 1887  
Notes by Zukertort  
1.e4 - 2.d4 e6 3.f4

Not commendable, it leads to an obsolete form of the French Defence.  
3...d5 4.e5 c5 5.c3 d6 6.f3  
\textit{h6} 7.d3 \textit{e7} 8.h3 0-0 9.g4  
\textit{h8}

Anticipating any direct advance against the king's wing.  
10.g5? \textit{xf5} 11.\textit{xf5} exf5 12.h4  
f6 13.\textit{e3} fxe5 14.dxe5 b6  
15.h5 \textit{b7} 16.h4  
Intending 17.g6+ hxg6 18.hxg6+  
g8 19.\textit{h5} etc.  
16.g8

If now 17.g6, Black would reply 17...\textit{e8}.  
17.d2

If 22.\textit{xh4}, Black proceeds with 22...\textit{g5}.  
22...\textit{xf3} 23.\textit{c4}+  
Or 23.\textit{xd8} \textit{xe2} 24.\textit{xa8} (best)  
24...\textit{xa8} 25.\textit{xe2} \textit{e8} 26.\textit{xe3}  
\textit{xe5}+ 27.\textit{f3} g5 etc.  
23...\textit{h8} 24.\textit{xd8} \textit{xd8}  
25.b3 e2

White resigns.

308 Queen's Indian Defence  
Wainwright  
Zukertort (odds of two moves)  
British Chess Club Handicap tournament,  
London, 7 March 1887  
Notes by Zukertort  
1.d4 - 2.\textit{f3} d5 3.c4 e6 4.e3  
\textit{d6} 5.a3  
Intending the continuation 5...c5,  
and intending then to proceed with  
6.dxc5 \textit{xc5} 7.b4 and 8.c5.  
5...b6 6.\textit{c3} \textit{b7} 7.b4 a5 8.b5  
\textit{bd7} 9.\textit{b2} \textit{d6} 10.\textit{ec1} 0-0  
11.\textit{c2}

Evidently under the misconception that  
Black has given up the advance of the c-pawn. Otherwise White would have  
probably continued with 11.\textit{b3}.
11...\textit{e}e7 12.cxd5 \textit{exd5} 13.a4
\textit{ac8} 14.d3 c5 15.bxc6 \textit{xc6}
16.0-0 \textit{fc8} 17.\textit{b3} \textit{e}e6
18.\textit{b5}?
A weak move which puts the knight for a considerable time out of play without any necessity.
18...\textit{b}8 19.\textit{xc6} \textit{xc6} 20.\textit{xc1}
\textit{e}4 21.\textit{xc6} \textit{xc6} 22.\textit{f1}
Not to much purpose. White should acknowledge his mistake on the 18th move by putting now the queen’s knight back to c3.
22...\textit{h}6
Threatening to capture the h-pawn, for after 23...\textit{xh2} 24.g3, Black would obviously win with 24...\textit{g}xg3 etc.
23.h3
\textbf{23...\textit{g}3! 24.\textit{xe4}}
The only feasible reply, for after 24.fxg3, Black wins offhand with 24...\textit{xe3}, White being compelled to capture the knight at the price of his queen, as the only means to escape the mate threatened by 25...\textit{dxe5}.
24...dxe4 25.\textit{e}5
Intending to meet 25...\textit{f6} with 26.\textit{xf7}+ \textit{xf7} 27.\textit{xf7} \textit{xf7}
28.\textit{fxg3} etc.
25...\textit{xe5} 26.dxe5 \textit{c}5 27.\textit{c}4
27.\textit{c}2 would be probably better.
27...\textit{h}5 28.\textit{g}1 \textit{d}1+ 29.\textit{h}2
\textit{xa4} 30.\textit{xa4}?
White had here a far superior continuation, viz. 30.\textit{d}6!, for whether Black change queens or proceed with 30...\textit{d}7, we fail to see how he can preserve his extra pawn.
30...\textit{xa4} 31.\textit{d}4 \textit{c}6
\textbf{32.\textit{c}3}
The result of the move, bishops of different colours, is of no avail to effect a draw against two united passed pawns, but White has no better move. If 32.\textit{d}7, Black wins speedily with 32...\textit{d}7, 33...\textit{f}6 etc. If 32.\textit{d}6 or 32.\textit{d}3, then 32...b5, and Black wins, after advancing his king.
32...\textit{xc3} 33.\textit{xc3} \textit{f}8 34.\textit{g}1
\textit{e}7 35.\textit{f}1 \textit{e}6 36.\textit{e}2 \textit{d}5
37.\textit{f}4
Or 37.\textit{d}2 \textit{c}4 38.\textit{c}2 a4 etc.
37...\textit{xf3}+ 38.\textit{xf3} \textit{c}4 39.\textit{d}4
b5 40.\textit{f}4 b4 41.\textit{d}2 \textit{b}3 42.\textit{f}5
\textit{e}4 43.e6 \textit{xe6} 44.fxe6 \textit{g}5
45.e7 \textit{g}6 46.\textit{f}6 \textit{a}2 47.\textit{e}4 \textit{a}4
White resigns.
309 Franco-Sicilian Defence
Lowe
Zukertort
(\textit{odds off-pawn and two moves})
British Chess Club Handicap tournament, 9 March 1887
\textbf{Notes by Zukertort}
1.e4 – 2.d4 e6 3.\textit{d}3 c5 4.dxc5
It would be safer to continue with 10...\textit{d}d8, compare the next note.

11.\textit{b}b5 \textit{b}b8 12.c4

It would be much stronger play to con­
tinue with 12.\textit{c}c5, preventing Black from castling, a continuation which
would be to no purpose had Black re­
tired his queen home, on account of the
rejoinder 12...d6. The text move only
weakens White’s game.

12...a6 13.\textit{c}c3 0-0 14.\textit{d}d2

If 14.0-0 \textit{g}g4 15.h3, Black would pro­
cceed with 15...\textit{g}e5, with a good at­
tacking position.

14...\textit{g}g4 15.0-0-0 \textit{ce}5
16.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 17.\textit{e}e2 \textit{g}g6
18.\textit{f}3 \textit{b}5 19.\textit{c}5

19...\textit{a}5!

The sacrifice of a pawn, if not strictly sound, offered many promising continu­
ations.

20.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}4 21.\textit{xb}4 \textit{f}6
Promising both for attack and defence.

22.\textit{d}6?

Tempting but deceptive. White’s game required a strictly defensive continua­tion.

22...\textit{a}6

Black now has an overwhelming advan­tage of position: his rooks must do

23.\textit{c}4

For the purpose of preventing the im­
mediate attack with 23.\textit{xf}b8.

23...\textit{xc}4 24.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xa}3
25.\textit{d}d4 \textit{g}g5+ 26.\textit{c}c2 \textit{fa}8
27.\textit{b}b1 \textit{a}a2+ 28.\textit{b}b2 \textit{xb}2+
29.\textit{xb}2

If 29.\textit{xb}2, Black wins with 29...\textit{d}d2+.

29...\textit{xb}2 30.\textit{xb}2 \textit{d}d2+

White resigns.

310 Queen’s Pawn Game

Zukertort

Gunsberg

British Chess Club Handicap tournament,
11 April 1887

Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.\textit{d}4 \textit{d}5 2.\textit{f}f3 \textit{e}6 3.\textit{e}3 \textit{f}6
4.\textit{d}d3 \textit{c}5 5.\textit{b}3 \textit{c}6 6.\textit{b}b2 \textit{xd}4

Steinitz: It is better to delay at least the exchange of pawns, for White’s e-pawn is not of much use at e3.

7.\textit{xd}4 \textit{d}6

Steinitz: As usual in this opening we pre­
fer playing the bishop one square, espe­
cially for the first player.

8.0-0-0 9.\textit{c}4 \textit{xc}4

Steinitz: In consequence of his premature exchange on the 6th move he has now
to guard against the advance of \textit{c}5,
which would establish a strong majority of pawns on the queen's side for the opponent.

10.bxc4 b6
Steinitz: We do not approve of this advance which weakens the queen's side and blocks the queen. The open diagonal for the queen's bishop is not much compensation, for we believe that this bishop can be made better use of at d7 for an ultimate attack on the queen's wing.

11...bd2 &b7 12..c1 &f4
Steinitz: Much time is wasted by this and the following manoeuvres which do not improve Black's game in the least.
Zukertort: Resulting in nought but the displacement of his king's bishop.

13.g3

13...&b4
Zukertort: Persistently displacing his own pieces and driving the adverse into a better position.

14..e2
Steinitz: The correct reply, for if 14..b1 Black wins the exchange by 14...&xf3, whereas if now Black answer 14...&xd2, the queen retakes and Black obviously dare not afterward capture the a-pawn.

14...&h6
Zukertort: It would be preferable to adopt some exchanges.

15..a4 &a6
Steinitz: An unreasonable retreat, 15...&c6 was clearly better.
Zukertort: 15...a5 would be better, probably.

16..fd1 &b8 17..e5 &e4
Zukertort: The last opportunity to get rid of the displaced king's bishop by exchanging it against the adverse queen's knight.

18.f4 f6?
Steinitz: Evidently an error of judgement. 18...&xd2 followed by ...g6 or perhaps even ...g5 were plainly enough indicated by the position.

19..g4 &xd2 20..xd2 &d7
21..b3 &c5
Zukertort: Not a favourable manoeuvre.

22..e3 &e4 23..dd1 &e8
24..f3 &d6 25..xh6+ gxh6
26..h5

26...&xc4!?
Steinitz: Though not absolutely sound, it was perhaps relatively his best chance, as he had otherwise a bad game which was sure to break down slowly.
Zukertort: A desperate attempt to retrieve a compromised game.

27..xc4 &d5 28..e2
Steinitz: The only correct move to avoid loss.

28...&ec8
Johannes Zukertort

Steinitz: Black has evidently no other prospect of maintaining his attack than by avoiding the exchange of queens, which he could not do if he commenced to check by \( \text{w}h1+ \) at once, for White's queen would ultimately interpose at \( f2 \) as actually occurred.

Zukertort: If 28... \( \text{e}e7 \), White would reply 29.\( \text{c}c3 \), losing but two pawns for the hostile knight.

\[ \begin{align*}
29.\text{d}c1 & \text{xc}4 \\
30.\text{x}c4 & \text{h}1+ \\
31.\text{x}f2 & \text{x}h2+ \\
32.\text{e}e1 & \text{x}g3+ \\
33.\text{f}f2 & \text{h}3
\end{align*} \]

Zukertort: If 33... \( \text{d}d3 \), White replies best 34.\( \text{c}c7 \).

\[ \begin{align*}
34.\text{e}e2
\end{align*} \]

Zukertort: If now 34.\( \text{c}c7 \), Black might proceed with 34...\( \text{x}h5 \) 35.\( \text{g}3+ \) (35.\( \text{x}b7? \) \( \text{h}1+ \)) 35...\( \text{g}6 \), forcing White to unite the hostile pawns.

\[ \begin{align*}
34.\text{d}d5 & \text{c}7
\end{align*} \]

Steinitz: A loss of time which might have become serious. The proper play was 35.\( \text{c}c3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 36.\( \text{x} \)d3, and if now 36...\( \text{e}4 \), then 37.\( \text{g}2+ \) \( \text{x}g2 \) 38.\( \text{x}f5 \) and should win easily, for obviously he recovers the piece by \( \text{g}3+ \) if Black take the bishop. If, however, Black on the 36th move play his queen anywhere, then follows 37.f5, giving White a passed pawn with an excellent position.

\[ \begin{align*}
35.\text{h}8 & 36.\text{d}2 \text{g}8 37.\text{c}3
\end{align*} \]

\( \text{37}...\text{f}5? \)

Steinitz: An ill-considered and feeble move. We believe that Black could have at least equalised the position with fair winning chances for himself by 37...\( \text{h}1 \), threatening \( \text{b}1 \) besides \( \text{g}2 \). If White answered 38.\( \text{c}1 \), then 38...\( \text{e}4 \) and 39.\( \text{d}3 \) would lose on account of 39...\( \text{h}g2 \). Anyhow, the move we propose would have cost White either the f-pawn or the a-pawn and at the same time would have augmented Black's attack.

Zukertort: 37...\( \text{h}1 \) would be a little better, but would hardly affect the final result. White would, of course, equally reply 38.\( \text{g}3 \) etc.

\[ \begin{align*}
38.\text{g}3 & \text{c}8 39.\text{d}3 \text{h}5 40.\text{f}5!
\end{align*} \]

Steinitz: An excellent move which gives White a winning passed pawn for the ending.

\[ \begin{align*}
40...\text{xf}5 & 41.\text{xf}5 \text{f}8 42.\text{d}3 \text{w}7 43.\text{w}4 \text{e}8
\end{align*} \]

Steinitz: In such situations it is not advisable to give up a single pawn without a struggle. 43...\( \text{h}5 \) might possibly have given White some trouble in the ending.

\[ \begin{align*}
44.\text{w}xh6 & \text{w}e7 45.\text{e}3
\end{align*} \]

Steinitz: This simplification was the most effective way of gaining the battle.

\[ \begin{align*}
45...\text{xe}3+ & 46.\text{xe}3 \text{xe}3 47.\text{xe}3 \text{xa}2
\end{align*} \]
48...e4!
Zukertort: The single passed pawn wins easily, backed up by the two bishops.
48...g8 49.d5 f5 50.e3 f7 51.d4
Zukertort: Loss of time: White should proceed with 51.f4 and 52.xf5 or 52.e5.
51.f6 52.e3+ e7 53.f4 a5 54.xf5 b5 55.e5 b4
56.d6+ d8 57.c1 b3 58.g5+
Black resigns.
Steinitz: For wherever the black king may move, White checks with the bishop at g4 or c6 accordingly and then advances the pawn which must queen while Black's b-pawn can be easily stopped.

311 Queen's Pawn Game
Zukertort
Blackburne
2nd Match Game, British Chess Club.
London, 10 May 1887
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz
1.d4 d5 2.f3 e6 3.e3 f6 4.b3 c5 5.b2 c6 6.b2 c6 7.e2 c8 8.0-0 cxd4 9.exd4 9...d6

16.a4
Steinitz: Quite in accordance with modern theory and practice, White pursues his plan of attack on the queen's side where he has already obtained an advantage, whilst keeping himself on the defence on the other wing. Mr. Blackburne does the reverse, without,
however, finding any tangible point on the adverse king’s side, which is only natural as long as White is cautious not to advance any of his pawns on that wing.

16...\(\text{d}f4\) 17.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{h}7\) 18.\(\text{e}1\)

Zukertort: With the intention of opening the f1-square for the queen’s knight...

18...f5 19.\(\text{f}1\)

...and the c-file for the queen’s bishop.

19...\(\text{f}7\) 20.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{x}e5\)

Zukertort: Which illustrates the waste of time in Black’s movements: the bishop was carefully preserved as main attacking piece to be exchanged against a hostile knight at the first opportunity.

21.\(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{f}6\) 22.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{g}7\)

23.g1 \(\text{c}1\) 24.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}8\)

25.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{h}7\) 26.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{x}h5\)

27.\(\text{w}h5\) \(\text{w}f6\) 28.\(\text{d}1\) h5

29.\(\text{g}3!\)

Zukertort: White paralyses with this and the next well-timed moves any chance of success which Black might have had on the king’s wing.

29...g4

Zukertort: Forced, for if 29...f4, then 30.\(\text{x}g6\), and if 30...\(\text{w}xg6\), then 31.\(\text{xf}4\) etc.

30.f4!

Steinitz: With a positive advantage for the ending in hand White has confined himself to parrying the adverse formation of an attack against his king and to an exchanging off policy of two minor pieces. By the move in the text he paralyses Black’s centre and guards against any eventual break in by ...e5.

30...\(\text{g}7\)

Steinitz: Had Black played 30...\(\text{gxf}3\). White would probably have retaken with the pawn, and the open g-file would have been a greater source of danger for Black than for White.

31.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{w}d8\) 32.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}7\)

33.\(\text{f}1\)

Steinitz: White, after securing the centre and the king’s side, has already concentrated his forces against the weak point of the opponent on the other wing, but here consistently with his plan \(\text{c}1\), followed by \(\text{e}2\) and \(\text{a}2\), would have saved time.

33...\(\text{f}8\) 34.\(\text{d}3\)

Zukertort: Preparing the further advance of the pawns on the queen’s wing.

34...\(\text{e}8\) 35.\(\text{b}3\)

Zukertort: Anticipating the possible manoeuvre of the knight over \(d7\) and \(f6\) to \(e4\). White would then take the knight, and the f-pawn retaking, immediately advance the f-pawn and play the queen’s bishop to \(f4\) etc.

35...\(\text{g}6\) 36.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}8\) 37.\(\text{c}2\)

\(\text{f}6\) 38.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 39.\(\text{a}1\)
Steinitz: At last and after some unnecessary delay White has formed the correct battle order which ought to have secured success.

39...h4
Steinitz: ...\text{\textit{w}}_a5 would have been of no use on account of the reply \textit{\texttt{d}}_2. He has no means of stopping the advance of the pawns on the queen's side and tries the effect of a diversion on the other wing, though probably with little hope.

Zukertort: If 39...\textit{\texttt{w}}_a5, then 40.\textit{\texttt{b}}_3, threatening \textit{\texttt{d}}_2.

40.a5 \textit{\texttt{c}}_7 41.\textit{\texttt{c}}_1 \textit{\texttt{f}}_8 42.a6! b6
Steinitz: A desperate resource, but nothing could save the game by proper play on the other side.

Zukertort: Compulsory: after 42...\texttt{b}xa6 43.\textit{\texttt{d}}xa6, White forces the gain of the a-pawn and wins then easily with his two passed pawns.

43.cxb6!
Steinitz: Brilliant and good enough certainly, though not so easy and simple as \texttt{\texttt{a}}a3, which would have secured the winning command of the c-file.

Zukertort: A well planned coup, which should carry the day against any play.

43...\textit{\texttt{w}}xc3 44.\textit{\texttt{w}}xc3 \texttt{\texttt{x}}c3 45.b7 \texttt{\texttt{e}}xd3
Zukertort: The only chance left: if 45...\texttt{d}7, White wins with 46.b6 etc.

46.b8\textit{\texttt{w}} \textit{\texttt{x}}e3 47.b6 g3 48.\textit{\texttt{w}}xe8
Zukertort: Good enough to win: it would be stronger, however, to continue with 48.b7.

48...\texttt{a}xb6 49.h3?
Steinitz: Feeble. \textit{\texttt{w}}h5 on this or the next move which, we learn from our London correspondent, was suggested by some bystanders, would have won almost without an effort, for whenever one of the black rooks become troublesome to the queen, White could simply take it off and win with the a-pawn.

Zukertort: A superfluous precaution: White could here continue well with 49.\textit{\texttt{b}}_8.

49...\texttt{c} 50.\textit{\texttt{b}}_8?
Steinitz: Also ill-considered, for he throws his last winning chance away. See our last note.

Zukertort: A thoughtless continuation, which throws away a hard-earned victory with 50.\textit{\texttt{d}}_8.

50...\texttt{a}a3! 51.\texttt{f}f1?
Steinitz: Still worse, he ought to have seen that he could no more win and should have played \texttt{\texttt{e}}e1 or \texttt{\texttt{b}}_1 without allowing his clever opponent to form positions where mate was threatened.

Zukertort: Locking up his own king into a mate net; he should play 51.\texttt{\texttt{e}}_1.

51...\texttt{e}c2 52.\textit{\texttt{d}}_8
Zukertort: White could force an easy draw with 52.a7 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a2 53.\texttt{\texttt{e}}e1 and Black must draw by perpetual check to prevent White from queening.

52.\texttt{\texttt{a}}a2 53.\textit{\texttt{g}}_5+ \texttt{\texttt{f}}_7 54.\textit{\texttt{w}}h5+
Steinitz: We suspect that Mr. Zukertort, being demoralised by his previous bad play, lost all courage to fight out this game in which there was some fair chance left for a draw, for though, no doubt, his position was not a good one.
we cannot see any sure win for Black if White had played 54...h81, followed by h3 in answer to ...xg2.

54...g6

Steinitz: If 54...g7 55.g5+ g6 56.e1 xg2+ 57.h1 h2+ 58.g1 h3, threatening ...g2 and wins, for if now 59.e6, then follows 59...a1+ 60.g2 h2+ 61.f1 a3+ 62.e3 f2 mate.

White resigns.

Zukertort: If 55.f3, Black wins with 55...xf4 etc. Nevertheless, resignation was premature, White could still detain a forced mate for a considerable time after 55.e1.

Steinitz: He should play 55.h7+ f6 56.e1, threatening 57.e6 mate.

12.b5+

Steinitz: In order to avoid a draw which would be forced by ...e1+, followed by ...h4+, if White captured the bishop at once.

Zukertort: Steinitz introduced the text move for the sake of avoiding the draw.

12...c6 13.gxf3 cxb5 14.xe4 xe4+

Steinitz: So far the moves are identical with that of the above-named game in which, however, Blackburne proceeded here with 14...h6+ 15.f2 c6 which we believe to be better than the play in the text, for White's king becomes well posted thereby for the ending, and altogether White's game appears to us superior.
Zukertort: Up to here identical with the match game just mentioned: Blackburne continued with 14...\textit{h}h6+. We prefer, however, the text move, which secures for Black a small superiority.

15.\textit{x}xe4 o-o 16.\textit{d}b1

Zukertort: Mr. Blackburne thinks that 16.\textit{d}d1 would have saved a move.

16...a6 17.\textit{d}d1 \textit{c}c6

18.\textit{a}3?

Steinitz: We believe that White could have obtained the better game here by 18.\textit{a}4, for if Black retreated 18...\textit{a}a7, then 19.\textit{d}d7, followed by \textit{e}e3 or \textit{c}4 would have strengthened White's attack. The text move is sheer waste of time.

Zukertort: Forcing the adverse rook into action; we would prefer 18.\textit{e}e3.

18...\textit{f}e8 19.\textit{f}4 \textit{f}6 20.\textit{d}d5 \textit{ac}8 21.\textit{bd}1

Steinitz: In order not to allow the adverse queen's rook to obtain command on the king's side, via \textit{f}2, as was done later on, and also to prepare again \textit{a}4, it was much better to plant \textit{d}d6 at once. If Black answer ...\textit{a}a5, White would reply \textit{d}d3.

21...b6

Zukertort: Black conducts the game with great care; the text move prevents the hostile rook from occupying the c-file.

22.\textit{d}d3 \textit{c}c7 23.\textit{d}d6

Zukertort: Worse than useless: Black would have played anyhow his queen's rook on the f-file.

23...\textit{f}7 24.\textit{e}e3?

Steinitz: A bad move which we think is the true source of White's losing the game. He could have still kept an equal position by 24.\textit{f}3, which not alone neutralised the action of the hostile rook after Black's exchange of the centre pawns, but also left White at liberty to give a good answer by \textit{a}4 against any attempted sally of ...\textit{a}a5, which becomes so strong after the move in the text.

Zukertort: 24.\textit{f}3 would be a little better.

24...\textit{a}5 25.\textit{b}4

Steinitz: If 25.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}c4 26.\textit{d}d4 fxe5+ 27.\textit{x}xe5 \textit{x}xe5 28.\textit{xe}5 29.\textit{xe}5 \textit{e}7+, followed by ...\textit{e}e2 etc.

25...\textit{c}4 26.\textit{ed}3 fxe5 27.fxe5

27.\textit{f}2

Zukertort: The entry of the rook practically disposes of any promising resistance.

28.\textit{d}8

Zukertort: Comparatively best, for it limits the loss to one pawn for the time being.

28...\textit{e}2+ 29.\textit{f}3 \textit{xe}5
Steinitz: After the fall of this pawn White's game is practically lost and the rest of the ending, which is well played by Zukertort, hardly requires any comment.

30.\textit{xe8}+ 31.\textit{d6} 32.\textit{f2} 33.\textit{g3} 34.\textit{d7}+ Zukertort: With the intention of forcing the advance of the a-pawn and then attacking the b-pawn.

34...\textit{g6} 35.\textit{a7} a5 36.\textit{d7} e3! 37.\textit{d2} f5 38.\textit{b8} h5 39.\textit{g1} e4 40.\textit{f2} f5 41.\textit{g1} h4 42.\textit{f2}+ 43.\textit{d2}

43...\textit{c6}

Zukertort: He might also proceed with 43...\textit{f6} 44.\textit{d4}+ \textit{f3} 45.\textit{d2} \textit{g4}!.

44.\textit{a7} \textit{d5}

Zukertort: The safest road, but Black would equally win with 44...\textit{b4} etc.

45.\textit{d4}+ \textit{e5} 46.\textit{b8}+ \textit{e6} 47.\textit{e4}+ \textit{f6} 48.\textit{e2} \textit{xc3} 49.\textit{e5}+ \textit{f5} 50.\textit{xc3} \textit{xc3} 51.\textit{f2}+ \textit{g6} 52.\textit{d2} \textit{h5} 53.\textit{e2} \textit{a3} 54.\textit{e6} \textit{xa2} 55.\textit{xxb6} b4 56.\textit{c6} a4 57.\textit{h3} a3 58.\textit{c8} \textit{b2}

Zukertort: 58...\textit{xc2} would be good enough.

59.\textit{h8}+ \textit{g6} 60.\textit{g8}+ \textit{f5} 61.\textit{f8}+ \textit{e5} 62.\textit{a8} a2 63.\textit{f2}

Zukertort: Prolonging the defence beyond ordinary limits.

63.\textit{xc2}+ 64.\textit{e3} \textit{c3}+ 65.\textit{d2} \textit{a3} 66.\textit{e8}+ \textit{d6} White resigns.

313 Evans Gambit

Fritz

Zukertort

Frankfurt tournament, 23 July 1887

Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f3} \textit{c6} 3.\textit{c4} \textit{c5} 4.b4 \textit{b6} 5.b5 \textit{a5} 6.\textit{e2} \textit{f6} 7.\textit{c3} d5 8.exd5 \textit{xd5} 9.0-0 9.\textit{xe5} \textit{d4} would be obviously in Black's favour.

9...0-0 10.\textit{a3} \textit{e8}

After 10...\textit{xc3} 11.dxc3 Black would have no means of defending the exchange and at the same time the e-pawn.

11.\textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 12.d3

The sacrifice of the b-pawn is occasioned on the strength of a scheme which is faulty, as the immediate sequel proves.

12...\textit{xb5}! 13.c4 \textit{c6} 14.c5 \textit{xc5} 15.\textit{c1}

15...\textit{xa3}!

Black had already decided to give up his queen when capturing the pawn on his 12th move; he gets rook, bishop, and two pawns with a good position for it.

16.\textit{xc6} \textit{xc6} 17.d4
British Chess Club Handicap, Match with Blackburne and Frankfurt 1887

White's position is rather cramped, and he gives up an additional pawn for the sake of an attack which, however, proves of short duration.

17...exd4 18.\textit{c}4

After 18.\textit{d}xd4 \textit{d}d8 19.\textit{b}b3, Black would win a piece of course. He might recover the sacrificed pawn with 18.\textit{b}b5 \textit{d}d7 19.\textit{d}xd4 etc.

18...\textit{e}6 19.\textit{x}xe6\textit{xe}6 20.\textit{g}5

He might continue with 20.\textit{xd}xd4 \textit{d}d8 21.\textit{b}b3 etc.

20...\textit{f}6

Necessary, as White threatened 21.\textit{b}b3.

21.f4 \textit{h}6 22.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}6 23.\textit{g}3 \textit{ae}8 24.f5

If now 24.\textit{b}b3, Black would support his numbers with 24...\textit{b}b4 25.a3 \textit{e}3 etc.

24...\textit{e}3 25.\textit{g}4 \textit{f}8

Thus securing his position against any assault.

26.\textit{h}5 \textit{h}8 27.\textit{f}6 \textit{g}6 28.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}5 29.\textit{d}d1 \textit{d}d8 30.\textit{h}4 \textit{d}3

31.\textit{d}d2 \textit{c}4 32.\textit{c}c3 \textit{b}5 33.\textit{h}5

33...\textit{d}2! 34.\textit{x}g6+\textit{c}3

White's game is hopelessly lost: if 34.\textit{w}a1, then 34...\textit{c}c5 35.\textit{h}1 (35.\textit{h}h2 \textit{d}6 etc.) 35...\textit{d}d4 36.\textit{b}1 \textit{xf}6 37.\textit{x}g6 \textit{d}7 etc.

34...\textit{f}xg6 35.\textit{f}7+ \textit{xc}3

White resigns.
Black has the inferior game under any circumstances, but we think that 29...\(\mathcal{W}\)xf6 would offer better chances to escape with a drawn battle.

\[30.\mathcal{D}f4\]

The final manoeuvre, which dispenses of Black's scattered pawns.

\[30...\mathcal{E}b8 31.a3\]

Necessary to prevent 31...\(\mathcal{W}\)b4.

\[31...\mathcal{E}e8\]

After 31...\(\mathcal{W}\)b6 32.\(\mathcal{D}\)h5 \(\mathcal{E}\)d7 would win with 33.\(\mathcal{D}\)g5 etc.

\[32.\mathcal{E}xe8+ \mathcal{X}xe8 33.\mathcal{D}h5!\]

The correct continuation.

33.\(\mathcal{D}\)xd5 \(\mathcal{E}\)f8, Black would threaten 34...\(\mathcal{D}\)c6.

\[33...\mathcal{E}f8 34.\mathcal{D}xf6 h6\]

Prolonging the resistance beyond reasonable limits.

\[35.\mathcal{D}xd5 f6 36.\mathcal{W}xf6+ \mathcal{W}xf6 37.\mathcal{D}x6 \mathcal{E}f7 38.\mathcal{W}f2 \mathcal{E}e7 39.\mathcal{D}e4 \mathcal{D}d5 40.\mathcal{W}e3 a5 41.\mathcal{D}d4 \mathcal{b}3 42.h4 \mathcal{B}d1 43.\mathcal{G}g5 \mathcal{G}g4 44.\mathcal{H}e5\]

Black resigns.
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315 French Defence
Zukertort
Mason
British Chess Association tournament, 30 November 1887
Notes by Zukertort and Steinitz

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\(a\)c3 3.b4
Zukertort: An obsolete continuation, which leads to some loss of time.
4.exd5 exd5 5.\(a\)f3 5.f6 6.d3 5.g4
7.0-0 0-0 8.\(a\)e2

Steinitz: The present position first occurred in a game between Steinitz (White) and Mr. Blackburne (Black) in their first match in 1863, and the move in the text has been since recognised as the strongest at this juncture.

8...\(a\)d6
Steinitz: In the above-named game Black played here 8...\(a\)xf3, whereupon White, after retaking, obtained a fine attack by removing \(a\)h1, followed by \(a\)g1, and then manoeuvring the queen via f1 to h3.

9.\(a\)g3 \(a\)c6
Steinitz: We prefer in this situation the same ...\(a\)d7 for the defence.

10.c3 \(a\)e7 11.h3 \(a\)xf3

Zukertort: It would have been much better to continue with 11...\(a\)e6. The text move puts the white queen into a commanding position.

12.\(a\)xf3

12...\(a\)g6
Steinitz: Black’s game has already become inferior, but though the move in the text is a usual routine move, it is quite ill-judged at this juncture, and little as it may seem so, his game is hopeless after the opponent’s excellent reply which reduces Black to complete inactivity while White can shape his attack at leisure. 12...\(a\)d7 was the only correct play.

13.\(a\)g5
Steinitz: Considerably increasing White’s advantage.

13...\(a\)e7
Steinitz: He saw probably too late that he could not get rid of the adverse bishop by ...h6, for after the exchange, which of necessity would include that of queens, White would win a pawn with a fine position by \(a\)f5, for after 16...\(a\)h7, 17.h4! is even worse for Black.

14.\(a\)f5 c6 15.\(a\)ae1 \(a\)d6 16.\(a\)e2 \(a\)c8 17.\(a\)fe1 \(a\)b8
Johannes Zukertort

**Zukertort:** Intending to escape from all trouble with 18...\(\text{c7}\)!

18.g3!

**Steinitz:** Finely played. Black’s position becomes absolutely helpless after this and the advance of the h-pawn wins. The move in the text was a necessary preparation in order not to allow the opponent to release his king’s knight by ...\(\text{c7}\), threatening mate.

18...\(\text{d6}\) 19.h4 \(\text{c7}\) 20.h5 \(\text{e7}\)

**Steinitz:** 20...\(\text{h8}\) was the only other alternative but of course it would have subjected him to the crushing rejoinder 21.h6 followed by \(\text{xd6}\) and \(\text{xf6}\) if the g-pawn advanced.

**Zukertort:** If 20...\(\text{h8}\) White would proceed with 21.h6 or 21.\(\text{xg7}\)! \(\text{xg7}\) 22.h6+ \(\text{g8}\) 23.\(\text{xf6}\) etc.

21.\(\text{xf6}\) gxf6 22.\(\text{xe7}\)!

Black resigns.

**Zukertort:** 23.\(\text{g4}\) + is threatened.

---

316 Queen’s Gambit

**Burn**

**Zukertort**

British Chess Association tournament, 1 December 1887

Notes by Zukertort

1.d4 \(\text{d5}\) 2.c4 \(\text{e6}\) 3.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\)
4.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 5.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{b6}\) 6.cxd5 \(\text{exd5}\) 7.e3 \(\text{b7}\) 8.\(\text{f3}\) 0-0 9.\(\text{e2}\) c5 10.dxc5 \(\text{bxc5}\) 11.\text{0-0} \(\text{e3}\)
12.hxg3 \(\text{c6}\) 13.\(\text{c2}\)

Not to much purpose, as the sequel shows. If at all, White should play the queen at once to a4.

13...\(\text{c8}\) 14.\(\text{fd1}\) \(\text{e7}\)!

The black queen is well posted here, both for defence and attack.

15.\(\text{ac1}\) \(\text{fd8}\) 16.\(\text{a4}\) g6

After 16...\(\text{d4}\) 17.exd4 cxd4 18.\(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 19.\(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 20.\(\text{xd4}\), Black dare not continue with 20...\(\text{xc3}\) 21.\(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{e2}\), on account of 22.\(\text{e3}\) !.

17.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g7}\) 18.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{c7}\)
19.\(\text{cd2}\) \(\text{cd7}\) 20.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{d6}\)
21.\(\text{g4}\) h6 22.g5 hxg5 23.\(\text{wxd5}\)

Of course, if 23.\(\text{xc5}\), then 23...\(\text{c3}\) etc.

23...\(\text{d4}\)!

24.\(\text{h4}\)

If 24.\(\text{xc5}\), Black would proceed with 24...\(\text{dxc3}\) 25.\(\text{xd6}\) \(\text{xd6}\) 26.\(\text{xd6}\)
(26.\(\text{x}\) 26.\(\text{xd6}\) 27.\(\text{xd6}\) c2)
26...€e4, emerging with a piece ahead against two pawns. If, on the other hand, 24.€xc6, then 24...dxc3
25.€xd6 xd6 26.€xd6 €xd6
27.€xb7 (27.€a4 cxb2 28.€c2 €e4 etc.) 27...cxb2 and wins.

24...€e5 25.€xe5 €xe5
26.exd4 cxd4 27.€e2 d3
28.€c3

It would be better to proceed with 28.€g3, albeit even then Black would emerge with the superior game: e.g.
28...€c4 29.€g5+ gxf5
30.€xf5+ €g8 31.€xd4 €xd4
32.€xd3 €g4 33.€e2 €xg2+
34.€f1 €h2 etc.

28...€d4 29.f4

If 29.g3, Black intended to continue the attack with 29...€f3 30.€e1 €g4 etc.

29...€xf4 30.g3 €fd4 31.€e1
€f4 32.€a4 €c4 33.€dd1
€xb2 34.€b1 d2 35.€e7 €xa4
36.€xb7

Black might safely capture the knight, and he would, after some checks, bring his king into safe quarters.

37.€xd1 €xd1+ 38.€g2 €d2+
39.€f1+ €e3 €d1
40.€f2 €f1+ 42.€g2 €d2+
43.€h3 €c5 44.€a7 €f6
45.€g2 €f3 46.€f4 €g5+
47.€g4 €ce6 48.€xe6+ €xe6

36...d1++

White resigns.

317 Two Knights Defence
Zukertort
Pollock
Simpson's Divan Handicap tournament,
20 April 1888
Notes by Zukertort

Up to here all the moves are book, the text move we think was some time ago introduced by M.Chigorin. It provides to meet 15.€a3 with 15...cxd4, and if
16.€b5, then 16...€xb5! etc.

15.€h1

Well-judged: the move forces Black to exchange pawns immediately, for, otherwise, White would play 16.dxc5! etc.

15...cxd4 16.cxd4 €d5
17. $\text{c3!}$

The critical juncture: White has an extra pawn, but Black the better developed game. The text move gives up the material advantage for a telling superiority of position.

17... $\text{xc3}$ 18. $\text{xc3} \text{xe5}$

The exchange is forced, if Black desire to capture the pawn, for after 18... $\text{xc3}$ 19. $\text{d2} \text{a3}$ or $\text{c7}$ 20. $\text{xa5} \text{xa5}$, White would proceed with 21. $\text{c6}$.

19. $\text{fxe5} \text{xc3}$ 20. $\text{d2} \text{a3}$

If 20... $\text{c7}$, then, of course, likewise 21. $\text{c1}$.

21. $\text{c1!}$

21... $\text{b7}$

The position is rather complicated, but we do not think that Black had any better continuation. If 21... $\text{b2}$, then 22. $\text{c5} \text{b7}$ 23. $\text{c3} \text{xa2}$ 24. $\text{c4}$, with a fine game.

22. $\text{c3} \text{e7}$

After 22... $\text{xa2}$ 23. $\text{c4} \text{b2}$ 24. $\text{g3}$, White's position would be an ample equivalent for the sacrificed pawn.

23. $\text{g3!} \text{h7}$ 24. $\text{c4} \text{d8}$

Absolutely necessary to protect the attacked pawn and to enable Black to bring his queen's rook into action, which is necessary for the protection of his threatened king's quarters.

25. $\text{h5} \text{b6!} 26. \text{d5} \text{f5}$

Black might have continued here with 26. $\text{c5}$. White might then reply, we think, 27. $\text{e6!}$, to which Black can answer 27... $\text{xc4}$, or 27... $\text{xe6}$ or, at last, 27... $\text{xe6}$ e.g.:

A) 27... $\text{xc4}$ 28. $\text{xf7}! \text{xf7}$ 29. $\text{h6+ h7}$ or $\text{h8}$ (if 29... $\text{g8}$, White mates in two moves with 30. $\text{xf8+}$ etc.) 30. $\text{xf8+ g8}$ 31. $\text{xf8+}$ etc.

B) 27... $\text{xe6}$ 28. $\text{h6}$ g6 (if 28... $\text{xh6}$, then 29. $\text{xf7+}$ etc.; if 28... $\text{xc4}$, then 29. $\text{g7+}$ etc.) 29. $\text{xf7+! g7}$ (if 29... $\text{xf7}$, White mates in two moves) 30. $\text{xe7+}$ $\text{g8}$ 31. $\text{xf8+ h8}$ 32. $\text{xc5}$ and wins; or

C) 27... $\text{xe6}$ 28. $\text{dxe6} \text{xf5}$ 29. $\text{e7} \text{xe8}$ 30. $\text{xd8} \text{xd8}$ 31. $\text{xf7} \text{g8}$ 32. $\text{c3}$, and should win.

27. $\text{d6!}$

Absolutely decisive, whatever Black reply.
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27...\textit{\textbar}xe5 28.\textit{\textbar}g6+ \textit{\textbar}h8
29.\textit{\textbar}xh6! \textit{\textbar}b7 30.\textit{\textbar}f4

The coup de grace.
Black resigns.
There is nothing to be done: if 30...\textit{\textbar}xf4, White mates in four moves with 31.\textit{\textbar}h3+ etc.

318 Vienna Gambit
Zukertort
Grundy
Simpson’s Divan Handicap tournament.
30 April 1888
Notes by Zukertort

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\textbar}c3 \textit{\textbar}c6 3.f4 exf4
4.\textit{\textbar}f3 g5 5.d4 d6

Of course, if 5...g4, White would continue with 6.\textit{\textbar}c4 gxf3 7.0-0.

6.h4
Leading by a transposition of moves to the known Hamppe-Allgaier-Thorold variation. In the latter, however, Black continues best, after 5.h4 g4 6.\textit{\textbar}g5 h6
7.\textit{\textbar}xf7 \textit{\textbar}xf7 8.d4, with 8...d5!, and if 9.exd5 \textit{\textbar}e7+, and after 10.\textit{\textbar}e2 f3
1.0-0.\textit{\textbar}xh4 etc.

6...g4 7.\textit{\textbar}g5 h6 8.\textit{\textbar}xf7 \textit{\textbar}xf7
9.\textit{\textbar}xf4 \textit{\textbar}g7 10.\textit{\textbar}c4+ \textit{\textbar}g6
11.\textit{\textbar}e3 \textit{\textbar}ge7 12.0-0 \textit{\textbar}f8
13.\textit{\textbar}d3 \textit{\textbar}b4 14.\textit{\textbar}d2 \textit{\textbar}bc6?

Weak: he should continue with 14...d5.

15.\textit{\textbar}xf8 \textit{\textbar}xf8 16.\textit{\textbar}f1 \textit{\textbar}d8
If 16...h8, then likewise 17.\textit{\textbar}e2.

17.\textit{\textbar}e2! \textit{\textbar}d7 18.h5+ \textit{\textbar}h7
18...\textit{\textbar}xh5 19.\textit{\textbar}f4+ \textit{\textbar}h4 20.g3+ etc.

19.\textit{\textbar}f7 \textit{\textbar}g8 20.\textit{\textbar}f4 \textit{\textbar}e8

Of course, if 20...\textit{\textbar}e8, then 21.\textit{\textbar}xg7+! \textit{\textbar}xg7 22.\textit{\textbar}e6+ etc.

21.\textit{\textbar}xd7! \textit{\textbar}xd7 22.\textit{\textbar}e6

Securing the draw.

22.\textit{\textbar}e8
The only feasible reply: if 22...\textit{\textbar}d8, White forces the game with 23.\textit{\textbar}f5+ \textit{\textbar}h8 24.\textit{\textbar}g6+ \textit{\textbar}h7 25.\textit{\textbar}e5+ \textit{\textbar}h8
26.\textit{\textbar}f7 mate.

23.\textit{\textbar}f5+ \textit{\textbar}h8 24.\textit{\textbar}g6+ \textit{\textbar}h7
25.d5
After 25.\textit{\textbar}e5+ \textit{\textbar}h8 26.\textit{\textbar}g6, Black would get the superior game with 26...dxe5! 27.\textit{\textbar}xe8 dxe8 etc.

25...\textit{\textbar}b8
25...\textit{\textbar}d8 would be probably better.

26.\textit{\textbar}d4!

\begin{figure}
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26...\textit{\textbar}f6
After 26...\textit{\textbar}xd4+ 27.\textit{\textbar}xd4, Black would have to give up a piece to escape mate on the move. At the conclusion of the game Black expressed the opinion that the text move lost the game, and tried in its stead: 26...\textit{\textbar}a6
27.\textit{\textbar}f4+ \textit{\textbar}h8 28.\textit{\textbar}xg7+ \textit{\textbar}xg7
29.\textit{\textbar}e6+ \textit{\textbar}f6 30.\textit{\textbar}d4+ \textit{\textbar}e7
31.\textit{\textbar}g6 and wins.

27.\textit{\textbar}e7+ \textit{\textbar}h8 28.\textit{\textbar}xf6 \textit{\textbar}xh5
The only move to avoid immediate mate.
29.\( \text{c} \text{g}6+ \text{c} \text{g}8 \) 30.\( \text{x} \text{c}5 \text{g}3 \)

If 30...\( \text{x} \text{c}7 \), White intended to continue with 31.\( \text{w} \text{c}3+ \text{f}7 \) 32.\( \text{w} \text{x} \text{c}7+ \) etc.

31.\( \text{e} \text{e}7+ \text{c} \text{c}7 \) 32.\( \text{w} \text{c}3+ \text{f}6 \)

After 32...\( \text{f}7 \) 33.\( \text{g}6+ \text{x} \text{g}6 \) 34.\( \text{x} \text{c}7 \text{g}6 \) 35.\( \text{w} \text{x} \text{c}7 \) White must win another pawn and the knight.

33.\( \text{w} \text{f}6+ \text{f}7 \) 34.\( \text{g}6+ \text{e}8 \)

35.\( \text{w} \text{h}8+ \)

Black resigns.

319 French Defence
Zukertort
Gunsberg

British Chess Club Handicap tournament, 13 June 1888

Notes by Zukertort, Steinitz and Hoffer

1.\( \text{e} \text{e}4 \text{e}6 \) 2.d4 d5 3.\( \text{c} \text{c}3 \text{f}6 \) 4.e5

Hoffer: The move more frequently made is 4.\( \text{c} \text{g}5 \). 4.e5 has undergone many vicissitudes. 3.e5 was the old variation in the French, abandoned as obsolete, revived by L.Paulsen, and readopted by Steinitz on various occasions, till the latter succeeded, only three years ago, in a pretty game against Sellman, of Baltimore, to modify the variation by playing 4.e5 after the development of the queen's knight.

4...\( \text{e} \text{f}7 \) 5.\( \text{f} \text{f}4 \text{c}5 \) 6.\( \text{d} \text{x} \text{c}5 \)

Hoffer: This forms the chief merit of Steinitz's innovation. The weak point of the old form, alluded to above, was the counter attack which Black instituted on the d-pawn, upon which White concentrated all his available forces. Instead of which, Steinitz, after years of unsuccessful attempts, hit upon the plan of 6.\( \text{d} \text{x} \text{c}5 \). This being feasible, the variation holds good.

6...\( \text{x} \text{c}5 \) 7.\( \text{g} \text{g}4 \)
8.\textit{\textbf{d}d3}
Steinitz: We prefer $8.\textbf{d}f3$ with the view of commencing an attack by $h4$.

8...\textit{\textbf{c}c6} 9.\textit{\textbf{d}d2}
Steinitz: $9.a3$ will do no harm here, we think. It is necessary to preserve the king's bishop for the attack in this situation.

9...\textit{\textbf{b}b4} 10.\textit{\textbf{f}f3} \textit{a6}
Steinitz: Necessary, as he will be bound to exchange the king's bishop for the adverse king's knight, and cannot afford to let the queen's knight come in at $b5$, but of course it weakens his game.

11.a3
Zukertort: Forcing Black to a decision. After $11...\textbf{x}xd3+ 12.cxd3$, White would continue at the earliest opportunity with $d4$.

![Chess diagram]

11...\textit{\textbf{c}c6}
Zukertort: We should prefer $11...\textbf{x}xd3+$.  
Steinitz: Though there were some objections against opening the c-file for the opponent's rook, it was on the whole preferable to exchanging the bishop, considering that by the retreat of the knight he has evidently wasted time.

Hoffer: Clearly the defence cannot afford to lose two moves. The knight was advanced with the intention of taking the bishop, and Black should have done it.

We fail to find a reason for the retreat of the knight.

12.\textit{\textbf{h}h3} \textit{\textbf{e}e8}
Zukertort: The text move is not to our liking. We would prefer $12...\textbf{g}g7$.

13.\textit{\textbf{h}h6} \textit{\textbf{g}g8} 14.\textit{\textbf{g}g5} \textit{\textbf{e}e7} 15.h4 \textit{\textbf{d}d7} 16.\textit{\textbf{h}h3}
Zukertort: Intending to continue with $17.\textbf{g}g3$ and $18.h5$.

Steinitz: We do not see much use for this rook here, and we would have preferred castling.

16...\textit{\textbf{x}xg5} 17.\textit{\textbf{h}xg5} \textit{\textbf{b}b6}
Steinitz: The queen would have been much better placed on $c7$.

18.0-0-0 0-0-0 19.\textit{\textbf{e}e3}!
Steinitz: Finely played, for it would be evidently useless for Black to attempt forking the two pieces by $...d4$, as White would retreat $\textbf{f}2$ or $\textbf{g}1$, followed by $\textbf{e}4$ with a fine attack.

19...\textit{\textbf{a}a5} 20.\textit{\textbf{e}e2} \textit{\textbf{b}b8} 21.\textit{\textbf{h}h4} \textit{\textbf{c}c8}

![Chess diagram]

22.\textit{\textbf{f}f2}!
Zukertort: White establishes herewith a decisive advantage of position, in driving back the only piece which Black has in play.

22...\textit{\textbf{d}d8}
Hoffer: Compulsory; White threatening $23.\textbf{b}b6 \textbf{a}4$ $24.\textbf{c}c3$ winning the queen.
23.\texttt{b6} \texttt{We8} 24.\texttt{c5} \texttt{e7} 25.\texttt{g4}

Höffner: Black being in quite a helpless position, White has ample time to wait with his final attack. The text move prevents the adverse knight from entering into play.

25...\texttt{a8} 26.\texttt{d6} \texttt{Wd8} 27.\texttt{d4}

Zukertort: Intending to play 28.\texttt{b3} and 29.\texttt{c5}.

27...\texttt{a4} 28.\texttt{b3}

Steinitz: We would have preferred \texttt{d2} threatening \texttt{b4}.

28...\texttt{e8} 29.\texttt{b2} \texttt{d7} 30.\texttt{c4}

Steinitz: 30.\texttt{d2} appears to us still superior.

30...\texttt{dxc4} 31.\texttt{xc4}

31...\texttt{b6}?

Steinitz: Probably an oversight, for now he might have first played 31...\texttt{h8}, in order to be enabled to play ...\texttt{d5} without losing his h-pawn by the answer \texttt{xh8}.

32...\texttt{xa6}?

Zukertort: Mr. Bird pointed out immediately after the conclusion of the game that White might have gained here the exchange with 32.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xc4} 33.\texttt{d8} etc.

32...\texttt{d5}

Steinitz: Promptly taking advantage of the adverse error.

33.\texttt{f1} \texttt{c6} 34.\texttt{d2} \texttt{d7}

Höffner: Black gives up another pawn for a counter attack, as a last resource.

35.\texttt{h7} \texttt{c5} 36.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5}

37.\texttt{c1} \texttt{b6} 38.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{h8}

39.\texttt{xc6}?

Zukertort: This premature capture leads to difficulties which might have been easily avoided by 39.\texttt{c4}.

Höffner: 39.\texttt{c4}, to be followed by the exchange of the two minor pieces, would have simplified matters.

39...\texttt{xc6} 40.\texttt{xc6} \texttt{bxc6} 41.\texttt{c4}

41...\texttt{e3}

Zukertort: Black had besides three other continuations which he might have tried, viz (1) 41...\texttt{h2}, with an attempt
to draw after the sacrifice of the rook;
(2) 41...\( \text{g}1 \); and (3) 41...\( \text{d}8 \).

(1) 41...\( \text{h}2 \) 42.\( \text{w}xh2 \) \( \text{d}4+ \) 43.\( \text{c}2 \)
\( \text{c}3+ \) (or 43...\( \text{e}3+ \) 44.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}1+ \)
45.\( \text{a}2 \) and wins) 44.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{e}1+ \)
45.\( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}3+ \) 46.\( \text{a}2 \) and wins.

(2) 41...\( \text{g}1 \) 42.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{h}2 \)
43.\( \text{xc}6+ \) \( \text{b}8 \) 44.\( \text{wh}2 \) \( \text{wh}2+ \)
45.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}3+ \) 46.\( \text{c}4 \) and White
should win without much difficulty.

(3) 41...\( \text{d}8 \) 42.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 43.\( \text{c}2 \)
\( \text{d}4+ \) 44.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) (if 44...\( \text{c}5 \), then
45.\( \text{b}4 \) 45.\( \text{w}e2 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 46.\( \text{f}5 \), and White
should win, we think.

42.\( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{f}1 \) 43.\( \text{wb}4! \)

Steinitz: Settling the question.

43.\( \text{h}2+ \)

Zukertort: A peculiar position: Black may
check with queen or rook, but neither
yields more than one check.

44.\( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) 45.\( \text{axb}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \)

Zukertort: On the faint chance that White
might allow 46...\( \text{d}1 \) and 47...\( \text{c}3 \).

46.\( \text{Ed}7 \)

Hoffer: Now the game is over. It is curi­
os that, with all the black forces in the
proximity of the white king, there
should be no danger at all.

46...\( \text{f}2 \) 47.\( \text{f}5 \)

Black resigns.
English grandmaster Stuart Conquest, who rediscovered Johannes Zukertort's grave at Brompton cemetery in West London in 2011, lays flowers after the erection of a new headstone. To his back, left, is Jimmy Adams, the editor of this book.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - L****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
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<td>JHZ - De Vere</td>
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<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Steinitz - JHZ</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Amateur - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Hunter &amp; Jenkins - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Bird's Opening</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. a1b1) - Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. a1g1) - Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - De Vere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - De Vere</td>
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<tr>
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<td>JHZ (w.o. a1b1) - Amateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Ranken - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>Marrett - JHZ (w.o. f-pawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>Cochrane - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Blydenstein - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Oppenheim - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Bishop's Opening</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. a1b1) - Beardsall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>JHZ &amp; Bird - Potter &amp; Wisker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Amateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Martin - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Blackburne &amp; JHZ - Potter &amp; Steinitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Amateur - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Blackburne &amp; Potter - Steinitz &amp; JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Burn, Steinitz &amp; JHZ - Blackburne, MacDonnell &amp; Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Moriau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Queen's Pawn Game</td>
<td>Potter - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Bird's Opening</td>
<td>Potter - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Dutch Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Queen's Indian Def.</td>
<td>JHZ - Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Lindsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Janssens - JHZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Janssens</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1876 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 King's Gambit</td>
<td>Martin - JHZ</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1876 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Scotch Game</td>
<td>MacDonnell - JHZ</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1876 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Scotch Game</td>
<td>Blackburne - JHZ</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1876 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Old Indian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Potter</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1876 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Dupré</td>
<td>Rotterdam 1876 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - Ehrlich</td>
<td>West End Chess Club 1876 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Wayte</td>
<td>St George's Chess Club 1876 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 King's Gambit</td>
<td>Martin - JHZ</td>
<td>West End Chess Club 1876 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Minchin</td>
<td>West End Chess Club 1876 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Minchin</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1877 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Queen's Gambit Acc.</td>
<td>Meier - JHZ</td>
<td>Manchester 1877 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Spanish Game</td>
<td>MacDonnell &amp; JHZ - Blackburne &amp; Potter Kensington 1877 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Wayte</td>
<td>St George's Chess Club 1877 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 Bishop's Opening</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - Str.</td>
<td>West End Chess Club 1877 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - W.</td>
<td>St George's Chess Club 1877 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Spanish Game</td>
<td>Blackburne - JHZ</td>
<td>London 1877 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Four Knights Game</td>
<td>JHZ - English</td>
<td>Leipzig 1877 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Paulsen - JHZ</td>
<td>Leipzig 1877 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 Scotch Gambit</td>
<td>Metger - JHZ</td>
<td>Leipzig July 1877 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Scotch Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Schallopp</td>
<td>Leipzig 1877 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>Paulsen, Göring &amp; Metger - Anderssen, JHZ &amp; Schmidt</td>
<td>Leipzig 1877 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Scotch Game</td>
<td>Göring - JHZ</td>
<td>Cologne 1877 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 Spanish Game</td>
<td>Wemmers - JHZ</td>
<td>Cologne 1877 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 Four Knights Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Hammacher, Kockelkorn, Leffman &amp; Wemmers</td>
<td>Cologne 1877 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 Bishop's Opening</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - S.</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1877 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 Pirc Defence</td>
<td>F.H. - JHZ (w.o. f7-pawn)</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1877 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 Italian Game</td>
<td>Greenhough - JHZ</td>
<td>London 1878 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Webber</td>
<td>London 1878 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 Bishop's Opening</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - Str.</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1878 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o. b1) - Strauss</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1878 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 Owen's Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Bird</td>
<td>Paris 1878 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 Italian Game</td>
<td>Bird - JHZ</td>
<td>Paris 1878 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 French Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Mason</td>
<td>Paris 1878 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 Queen's Gambit Acc.</td>
<td>JHZ - Gifford</td>
<td>Paris 1878 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 Spanish Game</td>
<td>Blackburne - JHZ</td>
<td>Paris 1878 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Owen</td>
<td>Chislehurst 1878 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 Queen's Fianchetto</td>
<td>Owen - JHZ</td>
<td>Chislehurst 1878 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 Queen's Fianchetto</td>
<td>Owen - JHZ</td>
<td>Chislehurst 1878 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192 Owen's Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Owen</td>
<td>Chislehurst 1878 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Style</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Venue/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Def.</td>
<td>Minchin - JHZ (w.o.f7-pawn)</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Fianchetto</td>
<td>Minchin - JHZ (w.o.f7-pawn)</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Minchin</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Lewis</td>
<td>Dublin 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Hirschfield</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Carr</td>
<td>Cambridge 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Knights Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Rosenthal</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Rosenthal - JHZ</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Rosenthal - JHZ</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Rosenthal</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Bird, Winawer &amp; Blackburne - LPaulsen, WPaulsen &amp; JHZ</td>
<td>Wiesbaden 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>X. - JHZ</td>
<td>Wiesbaden 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Hammacher, Kockelkorn, Leffman &amp; Wemmers - Von Oppenheim &amp; JHZ</td>
<td>Cologne Chess Club 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>Hammacher, Schottländer &amp; JHZ - Bier, Schwarz &amp; Dr. Schwede</td>
<td>Brunswick 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Frank, L.Paulsen &amp; Schallopp - Niemeyer, Schottländer &amp; JHZ</td>
<td>Brunswick 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen's Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Tinsley</td>
<td>London 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ (w.o.Qb1) - A.B.</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>Wayte - JHZ</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Blackburne</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Knights Defence</td>
<td>Steel - JHZ</td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Rayner</td>
<td>Huddersfield 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Knights Game</td>
<td>Walter - JHZ</td>
<td>Huddersfield 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Blackburne</td>
<td>St.George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Blackburne</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Indian Def.</td>
<td>JHZ - Blackburne</td>
<td>StGeorge's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Blackburne - JHZ</td>
<td>St. George's Chess Club 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Wittek - JHZ</td>
<td>Berlin 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Chigorin</td>
<td>Berlin 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Hirschfield - JHZ</td>
<td>Mr. Hirschfield's house 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Hirschfield</td>
<td>London 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Steinitz - JHZ</td>
<td>Vienna 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall Attack</td>
<td>Ware - JHZ</td>
<td>Vienna 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Paulsen, L</td>
<td>Vienna 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Paulsen, L - JHZ</td>
<td>Vienna 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Schwarz - JHZ</td>
<td>Vienna 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird's Opening</td>
<td>Fritz - JHZ</td>
<td>Mannheim 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Dupré - JHZ</td>
<td>Rotterdam 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Chigorin - JHZ</td>
<td>London 1883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
238 Scotch Game  Mortimer - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 408
239 Queen's Gambit  Mason - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 408
240 Four Knights Game  Mackenzie - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 411
241 Queen's Gambit  Skipworth - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 412
242 Queen's Indian Def.  JHZ - Blackburne  London 1883 ............ 413
243 Vienna Game  JHZ - Bird  London 1883 ............ 418
244 French Defence  JHZ - Sellman  London 1883 ............ 419
245 Queen's Gambit  JHZ - Rosenthal  London 1883 ............ 420
246 Spanish Game  Winawer - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 421
247 Queen's Pawn Game  JHZ - Englisch  London 1883 ............ 422
248 Spanish Game  Englisch - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 425
249 Queen's Pawn Game  JHZ - Mason  London 1883 ............ 427
250 Italian Game  Noa - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 428
251 Italian Game  Chigorin - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 430
252 Spanish Game  Steinitz - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 432
253 Queen's Pawn Game  JHZ - Blackburne  London 1883 ............ 435
254 Spanish Game  Rosenthal - JHZ  London 1883 ............ 436
255 Queen's Pawn Game  JHZ - Judd  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 438
256 Spanish Game  Judd - JHZ  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 439
257 Vienna Game  JHZ - Delmar  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 440
258 Dutch Defence  JHZ - Simonson  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 441
259 Pirc Defence  Hanham - JHZ (w.o.f-pawn)  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 442
260 Evans Gambit  JHZ - Delmar  Manhattan Chess Club 1883 .. 443
261 Spanish Game  Sellman - JHZ  Baltimore 1883 ........... 443
262 Spanish Game  Judd - JHZ  St. Louis 1884 ............ 445
263 Spanish Game  Moehle - JHZ  St. Louis Chess Club 1884 .. 446
264 Evans Gambit  JHZ (w.o. a1b) - Phillips  Toronto 1884 ........... 447
265 Vienna Game  JHZ - Berry  Montreal 1884 ............ 447
266 Evans Gambit  JHZ - Payne  Boston Chess Club 1884 .. 448
267 Scotch Game  JHZ - Wright  Boston 1884 ............ 449
268 Evans Gambit  JHZ - Limbeck  New York Chess Club 1884 .. 450
269 Evans Gambit  JHZ - Martinez  Philadelphia Chess Club 1884 451
270 Scotch Game  Martinez - JHZ  Philadelphia Chess Club 1884 452
271 Italian Game  JHZ - Martinez  Philadelphia Chess Club 1884 453
272 French Defence  JHZ - Labatt  New Orleans 1884 ........... 454
273 Italian Game  McConnell - JHZ  New Orleans Chess Club 1884 455
274 Queen's Pawn Game  JHZ - Buck, Dunn, & Seguin  New Orleans Chess Club 1884 456
275 Pirc Defence  Jones - JHZ (w.o.f7-pawn)  Leadville 1884 ........... 457
276 Three Knights Game  JHZ - F. Jones  Leadville 1884 ............ 459
277 Vienna Game  JHZ - Franklin  San Francisco 1884 ............ 459
278 Vienna Game  JHZ - Franklin  San Francisco 1884 ............ 460
279 Spanish Game  Fewings - JHZ  Southampton 1884 ............ 461
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Player 1</th>
<th>Player 2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>ScandinavianDefence</td>
<td>JHZ - Kenny</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>ViennaGame</td>
<td>JHZ - Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Hirschfield</td>
<td>Hoffer - JHZ</td>
<td>London 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Fördel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Sergeant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brixton Chess Club 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Bonaparte Wyse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Bouzon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amiens 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Schröder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Rameforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Hirsch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Weicke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magdeburg 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Vienna Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Kastner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemnitz 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Two Knights Def.</td>
<td>JHZ - Gerold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glauchau 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Schmid &amp; Seydel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dresden Chess Club 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Hungarian Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liverpool Chess Club 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Scotch Game</td>
<td>Steinitz - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Slav Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Steinitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Slav Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Steinitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Steinitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Spanish Game</td>
<td>Taubenhaus - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>Bird - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Four Knights Game</td>
<td>Mackenzie - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>King's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Vienna Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Thorold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Italian Game</td>
<td>Taubenhaus - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Trenchard</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Chess Club 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>Mundell - JHZ (odds 2 moves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Queen's Indian Def.</td>
<td>Wainwright - JHZ (odds 2 moves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Franco-Sicilian Def.</td>
<td>Lowe - JHZ (odds f-pawn + 2 moves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Queen's Pawn Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Gunsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Queen's Pawn Game</td>
<td>JHZ - Blackburne</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Vienna Game</td>
<td>Blackburne - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Evans Gambit</td>
<td>Fritz - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Taubenhaus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Queen's Gambit</td>
<td>Burn - JHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>London 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Two Knights Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Vienna Gambit</td>
<td>JHZ - Grundy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simpson's Divan 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>French Defence</td>
<td>JHZ - Gunsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>British Chess Club 1888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Index of Players

Numbers refer to pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Englisch</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur</td>
<td>208, 216, 225, 234</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>118-128, 131-132, 140-142, 163, 181, 183-184, 186-189, 198-199, 292, 318-319</td>
<td>Fewings</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foord</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>459-460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fritz</td>
<td>404, 516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beardsall</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bier</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>223, 240, 307-308, 351, 418, 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blydenstein</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouzon</td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn</td>
<td>240, 520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chigorin</td>
<td>389, 407, 430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>166-167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vere</td>
<td>203, 211, 213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delmar</td>
<td>440, 443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufresne</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupré</td>
<td>270, 405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrlich</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laba:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leffmar:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbeck</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littduer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowinsohn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonnell</td>
<td>202, 240, 264-265, 279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>54, 411, 501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrett</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>226, 228, 258, 262, 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>451-453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>309, 408, 427, 519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayet</td>
<td>136, 139, 143-144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meier</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metger</td>
<td>290, 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer</td>
<td>57, 408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundell</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munk</td>
<td>168-169, 174, 176-179, 192-193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemeyer</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noa</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppenheim</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>327, 329-330, 333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Schottländer</td>
<td>355, 357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulsen, L</td>
<td>Schröder</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schulten</td>
<td>138-139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulsen, W</td>
<td>149, 288, 351</td>
<td>146, 155-156, 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>Schurig</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>Schwarz</td>
<td>355, 403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock</td>
<td>498, 502, 521</td>
<td>Schwede</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>223, 229, 235, 243, 247, 250, 253, 268, 279</td>
<td>Sellman</td>
<td>55, 419, 443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seydel</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simonson</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skipworth</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sother</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wainwright</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>272, 281, 362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webber</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weicke</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winawer</td>
<td>195, 197, 317, 321, 323, 351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WISS</td>
<td>201, 223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wитеk</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wladimiroff</td>
<td>173-174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyse</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ranken</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranneforth</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rayner</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ritter</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosenthal</td>
<td>312, 315, 342-343, 346, 348, 420, 436, 432, 475, 480, 484, 488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinitz</td>
<td>59, 73, 77, 80, 204, 206, 229, 235, 240, 395, 432, 475, 480, 484, 488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stosch</td>
<td>157, 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strauss</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>125, 129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Schallopp</td>
<td>137, 148, 162, 290, 357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>152, 160-161, 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schnitzler</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Taubenhaus</td>
<td>499, 504, 517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thorold</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As one of the contestants in the first official World Championship march in 1886, Johannes Hermann Zukertort (1842-1888), is undeniably one of the great players of chess history. Despite a commanding lead in the early stages of that march, Zukertort ultimately had to bow for Steinitz, plagued by health problems that would cause his untimely death only two years later.

The high-point of Zukertort’s career was his triumph at the 1883 ‘super-tournament’ in London. His dazzling win against Blackburne still stands as one of the greatest games of all time.

Acclaimed chess author Jimmy Adams presents a selection of Zukertort’s best games, mainly annotated by Zukertort himself, and a collection of insightful articles on Zukertort from contemporary sources.

In this monumental book, originally published in 1989 in a limited edition and highly sought after by chess collectors, Jimmy Adams brings Zukertort’s masterpieces to the notice of today’s chess world and secures his rightful place in history as an important link between the old combinational and the modern positional school.

Jimmy Adams is a prolific chess author, who has written, translated and compiled a wide range of books on openings, historical tournaments and legendary players. From 1991 to 2010 he was the editor of the English magazine Chess.

“Such comments as ‘a labour of love’ and a tour de force come to mind when perusing this large book.”
British Chess Magazine

“Another fine achievement.”
Edward Winter, Chess Notes
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