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Introduction

If a group of average club and tournament players in the West were to be asked what they know about Mikhail Chigorin (1850-1908), the replies are likely to be: 'He was a Russian chess champion. He was an attacking player from the gambit era of a hundred years ago. He invented a couple of opening variations.' And that would be about it!

However, if the same question were asked in Russia, I suspect the responses would be quite different: 'He is a Russian hero. He was a man of the people. He laid the foundations for the development and expansion of chess in our country. He always played to win and represented Russia with honour in many international tournaments. He came within a couple of points of winning the World Championship. He explored new paths in the openings and also made great contributions to the theory of all phases of the game. He was an unselfish, public-spirited man who promoted chess through his editorship of chess magazines and newspaper columns as well as public appearances and exhibitions. For over half a century, we have held annual Chigorin Memorial tournaments in his honour...'

You see, the fact of the matter is that relatively little has been written about Chigorin in the West, whereas in Russia he is revered. And it is precisely for this reason that I decided to turn to Russian chess literature in an endeavour to compile a book on this remarkable man and bring to the attention of the English speaking chess world at large not only his brilliant games but also the story of his turbulent life. After all, who better to write about the first great Russian chess player than Russians themselves, whether they be grandmasters, masters, amateurs or journalists?

My first attempt to produce such a work came in 1987 with the publication by Caissa Editions, Delaware, USA, of Mikhail Chigorin: The Creative Chess Genius, which contained 100 annotated games and a summary of Chigorin's chess career.

Now New in Chess have published this revised and expanded second edition, with a huge increase in both the number of games and the amount of biographical material. In fact it is two books in one!

Part One: Mikhail Chigorin: The Creative Chess Genius, is essentially a translation of the 1972 biographical best games collection of Chigorin by Alexander Narkevich, Alexander Nikitin and Evgeny Vasyukov. This combination of writers – an academic, a chess trainer and a strong grandmaster – works brilliantly in presenting the life and times of Chigorin, as well as offering the reader a modern and instructive appreciation of over sixty of Chigorin's greatest games and their relevance to present day chess.
Part Two: Mikhail Chigorin: His Friends, Rivals and Enemies by Vasily Panov, is a second, quite different and indeed complementary biography from that given in Part One. Translated from the original 1963 Russian book, it provides a hard-hitting account of the strengths and weaknesses of Chigorin’s character, which ranged from absolute genius for chess and enormous capacity for hard work to a certain naivety in terms of sporting preparation and even a self-destructive addiction to alcohol. It also charts his lifelong struggles against adversity, which included the damaging effects of a childhood spent in a brutal orphanage, habitual poverty, ill health and even the malicious actions of jealous rivals who sought to undermine his pre-eminent position in Russian chess. Added to this is a selection of a further 159 games, annotated by a variety of masters and grandmasters, including Chigorin himself, and extracted from the Russian books, Selected Games of Chigorin (1926) by Efim Bogoljubow, M.I.Chigorin: The Great Russian Chess Player (two editions, 1939 and 1949) by Nikolai Grekov and 120 Selected Games of M.I.Chigorin (1952) also by Nikolai Grekov, The Creative Legacy of M.I.Chigorin (1960) by Isaac Romanov, and Mikhail Chigorin (1985) by Mikhail Yudovich. These games, like the biography, show both positive and negative sides to Chigorin – brilliances to be sure, but also blunders, to which he was unfortunately prone. But, whatever the results of these chess battles, always there is that endless searching for new ideas in an endeavour to broaden the horizons of chess...

Actually there is also a third part to this book, an introductory survey of Chigorin’s chess career by his turn of the 20th century contemporary Peter Romanovsky, which appeared in the above-mentioned work by Romanov. I suggest that the reader digests this first as it will serve as a very nice appetizer for the second and third courses...

It should be kept in mind that much of the text of the present book was written during the Soviet era, although new analysis has sometimes been added to the original annotations in the form of footnotes, in order to identify and clarify debatable points of play. Overall, readers will find ample evidence here of Chigorin’s creative work in all phases of the game.

The Openings: Of his generation, Chigorin was the greatest exponent of open games and gambit play, yet paradoxically it is his closed defence in the Spanish Game, still bearing his name today, that is one of the most frequently played openings of all time. The Chigorin Defence to the Queen’s Gambit also has quite a reputation, although perhaps not for the significant fact that its original concept of allowing White to construct a big pawn centre, only to undermine it later with blows from the flanks, was some twenty years later claimed as its own by the so-called ‘Hypermodern’ chess movement!

Then again, Chigorin also experimented with other avant-garde openings such as the King’s Indian Defence and similar fianchetto developments, as well as the
Semi-Slav Defence, way back in the 19th century – yet these openings only really resurfaced fifty years later when they became major weapons in the armoury of the mighty Soviet School of Chess – and indeed are still amongst the most popular openings in competitive chess of today.

The Middlegame: Chigorin was a master of the sustained initiative. He paid as much attention to the preparation and build-up of a kingside offensive as he did to the calculation of the eventual breakthrough and delivery of the final winning combination. A study of Chigorin’s games is in itself an education in the fine art of carrying out a properly planned attack.

In his career Chigorin also employed a number of methods of play which were later attributed to Nimzowitsch, such as the principles of centralisation, blockade, exploitation of weak squares, dynamic manoeuvring, and the latent power of seemingly cramped positions. Also, like Nimzowitsch, Chigorin displayed exceptional skill when handling the knights, although he denied any suggestion that he considered this piece to be superior to the bishop. He stated that his play was guided solely by the specific demands of each individual position and not by any dogmatic 'general principles' such as were proclaimed by Dr. Tarrasch at this time and against which Chigorin vigorously rebelled, considering that adherence to such fixed rules and regulations squeezed the life-blood out of chess creativity.

The Endgame: Chigorin played to win in every game and to achieve this desired result he frequently had to demonstrate both his skill and patience in the endgame. Former World Champion Botvinnik said that whenever he entered a rook endgame he would recall how Chigorin defeated Dr. Tarrasch from a seemingly dead drawn position with just kings, a pair of rooks and a handful of pawns on the board.

So to conclude, we can confidently state that Chigorin was years ahead of his time in his understanding of chess and was only fully appreciated long after his death. Indeed, his unceasing creative approach to all phases of the game, which he displayed to the full in both his play and writings, later served as a great inspiration to a long line of Russian and Soviet players, including World Champions Alekhine, Botvinnik, Smyslov, Tal and Spassky, all of whom have spoken of the profound influence of Chigorin on their own play. Even Kasparov, with his love of dynamic play and precise analysis, continued the Chigorin traditions.

I hope the present varied compilation provides a balanced view of Mikhail Chigorin, both the man and his creative chess legacy, and that he will in the future be held in the same high regard throughout the whole world as he is in his native Russia.

Jimmy Adams
London 2016
Mikhail Chigorin

Grandmasters on Chigorin

'The most worthy challenger in the struggle for the World Championship.' Steinitz

'Chigorin's creative work in the area of the openings can serve as a model for chess masters... In the Soviet Union, the Chigorin traditions are being maintained.' Lasker

'A naturally-gifted genius – he was the first Russian to work at the creation of public chess life in Russia.' Winawer

'Though ruined by ill-health, he, at the same time, contributed so much that was new to the theory of the openings, like nobody else.' Rubinstein

'There was nobody in chess who was more artistic and creative than Chigorin.' Mieses

'There was never a master who combined the art of attack and defence to such an extent as Chigorin.' Pillsbury

'Combinations, such as Chigorin's, can be created only by a great master.' Gunsberg

'An outstanding master of the endgame.' Schlechter

'For Chigorin, in principle, the word “draw” did not exist. What could a half, a one and a zero mean for him when he was looking for a fight, for discovery, for truth?' Spielmann

'No master was closer to the great Morphy than Chigorin.' Maroczy

'My best teacher.' Charousek

'There was no master, against whom a defeat would be less annoying, than a defeat in an encounter with Chigorin.' Salwe

'There was nobody who was so little favoured by tournament luck as Chigorin, but also nobody who needed so little luck in a tournament as Chigorin.' Tarrasch

'Remembrance of the great Chigorin lives on in my memory as lives and will live his glory in the history of chess art for as long as people play chess.' Duras

'Chigorin is the founder of the Russian chess school. No one has done so much for the development and popularisation of chess in Russia as Chigorin. We, Soviet chess players, follow his creative behests, revere his memory, and are profoundly grateful to him for his selfless service to the game.' Smyslov

'Chigorin was one of the greatest Russian players, an artist of chess thought, and perhaps the first player in the world to treat the game as it deserves. He did a great deal for the development of chess in Russia and had a very powerful influence on world chess thought. He was many years ahead of his time, and his work will always be an inexhaustible source for the development and perfection of chess ideas.' Botvinnik
Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin

By Peter Romanovsky

Chess life has in the last few decades taken giant strides forward.

However, even this stormy period of development of chess thought which we have experienced cannot in any way dim Soviet chess players' memory of the creative outlook of the founder and organiser of the Russian chess school, Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin.

And what is more, with the years further and further removing us from the time of life and creative work of this great Russian master, we are giving him even more attention, we sense the need to retain unbroken contact with the inexhaustible well of Chigorin's creative work.

The name of Chigorin stands by itself in the history of the development of chess thought of his day.

Chigorin lived in a period, when, in the arena of chess art, shone such leading lights as Zukertort, Steinitz, Lasker, Tarrasch, Pillsbury, Schlechter, Janowski, Teichmann, Maroczy and Blackburne. It would seem to have been impossible to take up a special place in this brilliant constellation of talent. And yet there was a chess player who managed to do this—and it was Chigorin.

To the chess world, everything was unusual about this representative of Russian chess: the suddenness of his appearance in the arena of at first Russian and then international chess life, the late age—24 years, at which he, for the first time, in the court of the best Russian masters of that time, Shumov and Schiffers, cast his own creative discoveries, both the swiftness of his chess development and spreading fame as a master, personifying his own ideas of artistic beauty, and many other things.

At first, the chess world regarded Chigorin as a talented individual, almost a new Morphy, this time appearing from the East. Shortly afterwards, however, Western critics, following the example of Steinitz, declared Chigorin an adherent of the 'old' combinational school, which, in Europe, was represented at that time, in the opinion of these same critics, by Anderssen, Blackburne, up to a certain point Zukertort, and several other masters.

It would be difficult to find a greater lack of understanding of the creative outlook of Chigorin. How would it be possible to explain their 'old', that is, archaic, backward, belonging to the past, when Chigorin saw each game as a step forward in the progressive process of the development of chess thought? Not very much in accord with this characteristic is also the fact that Chigorin, supposedly representing the old views, after administering a series of shattering defeats both to Steinitz and his associates, was himself declared by them as being a purveyor of the ideas of the heralded by them 'modern school'.

11
Chigorin, indeed, did enter international chess life as a lone man. But passionate adherents and followers already soon began to appear amongst masters of the West, not to mention Russia.

The famous Czech grandmaster, Oldrich Duras, wrote: 'It is difficult for me to explain to the wide audience of the modern generation what the name of Chigorin meant and to this day means to Czech players... On the Chigorin traditions which dominated Czech chess art, I also grew up. Remembrance of the great Chigorin lives on in my memory even now, as lives and will live his glory in the history of chess art for as long as people play chess.'

Declaring themselves disciples of Chigorin were the very talented but unfortunately prematurely deceased Rudolph Charousek, the Austrian Rudolf Spielmann, and many others.

Through his creative work, Chigorin actively influenced the attitudes of many foreign chess players, who were attracted by his innovations and the scope of his ideas, the artistic value of his style, and finally his wholehearted love of chess.

'It was characteristic of Chigorin', wrote Spielmann, 'that the main thing in chess for him was not the numerical result, but the search for truth, and through truth – the thirst for knowledge. Immediately after the end of a game he would sit down to analyse it. An endless melody of irrationality, not yielding to calculation, the unexplored, the inexhaustible, he lived through all this during the game, but after the game he worked tirelessly so that the irrational was made rational and intelligible, the incalculable – worked out precisely, the unexplored – explored; this is how he fought for truth in chess art.'

If we are seeking to identify what essentially distinguishes and sets apart Chigorin in the history of chess thought, then the answer will be found in his understanding of chess as a full-blooded art and his principal view that his creative searching should take a truly artistic line.

Yes, Chigorin was a great chess artist and hardly any of his contemporaries could compare with him in the quality and quantity of the artistic chess productions he created.

And so Chigorin was neither a follower of the ideas of the 'old' Italian school, nor a champion of the positional teachings of Steinitz. Chigorin was the founder and organiser of a new progressive chess tendency, which gave life to the Russian chess school.

However, this school consisted not only of creative work, but also organisational collaboration.

When we speak about Chigorin as the founder of the Russian chess school, we
have in mind not only his creative work, due to which, in itself, Russian chess players rallied around him, but also work in the public and literary-publicity field, to which he devoted many years of his life.

Chigorin was the first real public chess worker, organiser of the chess press and enthusiast-propagandist in our country.

There were many strong masters before Chigorin, for example A. Petrov and S. Winawer, but for them chess was a side-line and therefore they could not fully appreciate its immense cultural-educational role. The significance of Chigorin’s active work for the development of Russian chess culture was immeasurably greater.

Even in his first years of service to Russian chess, Chigorin launched the magazine ChessSheet. Though he had a very modest income, Chigorin had to put his own money into the business of bringing out his first-born magazine, since the subscriptions (there were not even 250 subscribers in the whole of Russia!) covered only part of the expenses involved in its publication. In the end, the magazine ceased due to lack of resources. The same fate befell another publication, rising out of its ashes and again conducted by Chigorin—Chess Herald. Nevertheless, the literary and public propaganda activities of Chigorin expanded from year to year. He conducted extensive correspondence with chess players and chess circles of different towns in Russia, played many games by correspondence, and from time to time visited the provinces, where he strived to support chess enterprises through simultaneous exhibitions and talks, to heighten interest in chess.

The organisational and public activity of Chigorin bore its fruit. The ranks of Russian chess players increased. Chigorin’s distinctive and beautiful style of play, as well as his numerous victories over foreign masters, attracted the sympathy of broad circles of Russian chess players, especially the young.

The well-known chess player, Rosenkrantz, wrote: ‘Chigorin was in the full sense of the word “a ruler of men’s minds” when it came to Russian chess youth...All the young players found themselves under the spell of Chigorin’s elegant play and the beauty of his combinations.’

Another young contemporary of Chigorin, E. Znosko-Borovsky, defined his role and place in Russian chess life in the following lively way: ‘Chigorin... you know he represents the best in Russian chess life, you know he is the whole of our chess life. To speak about him means to speak about chess in general in Russia, about the most beautiful in it, about the greatest successes, about the best of its time, about the supreme efforts and manifestations of Russian chess creative work... Chigorin has not only elevated the name of Russian chess to an unprecedented height, hitherto unattained by any other Russian, but also justified his own life, as it were, by actually sanctifying chess itself in Russia.’

‘His exceptional talent’, remarked the prominent Soviet writer and strong chess player, professor A. Smirnov, about Chigorin, ‘was expressed in his own individual style of play, which he created and which was successively passed on directly and indirectly to a whole galaxy of disciples, colouring all our most recent chess creative work and leading to the establishment of a Russian chess school.’
And so, the result of the many-sided activities of Chigorin was the creation of a native chess school. A tireless organiser, a public-spirited person, a writer, a great and original talent in chess art, a passionate and selfless chess enthusiast, Chigorin not only laid the foundations, but also erected the main construction of the building, where Russian and Soviet chess players later grew and were nurtured.

***

Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin was born 31 October 1850 in St.Petersburg. His father worked in the Okhtensk gunpowder works, his mother came from peasant stock. Chigorin's parents died young and already by the age of nine little Misha became an orphan. Soon after, thanks to the efforts of his aunt, in whose care he was left, Misha entered the Gatchina Orphans' Institute.

Chigorin began to play chess only at 16 years of age, not long before he was expelled from the Institute for taking part in 'disturbances' which had been provoked by the brutality that had been directed against the pupils.

However, Chigorin's appearances on the horizons of St.Petersburg relate to an even later period – 1873-1875. He encountered E.Schiffers, I.Shumov, S.Winawer – Russian chess celebrities of this time. In the very first small tournaments and matches, Chigorin performed with great success.

The year 1876 should be mentioned as the beginning of Chigorin's literary activity. In September of this year came out the first number of his magazine Chess Sheet.

In 1873-1880 Chigorin gained the reputation of being the best Russian chess player, defeating Schiffers, Alapin, Von Schmidt, Asharin, etc. in matches and tournaments. Beautiful combinations with sacrifices wound up many of Chigorin's attacks and made a strong impression on his contemporaries.

Chigorin's name also became known in foreign chess circles. His international debut – participation in the Berlin international tournament of 1881 – was met with great interest and ended in an important success: the sharing of 3rd and 4th prizes (amongst 17 competitors) with Winawer – one of the winners of the international tournament in Paris 1878. Above him were only Blackburne and Zukertort. Chigorin's victories over L.Paulsen, Winawer, Von Schmidt and Riemann displayed beautiful creative ideas and attracted universal attention.

In 1882, at the international tournament in Vienna, occurred Chigorin's first encounter with Wilhelm Steinitz, considered at that time, due to his numerous brilliant victories, the best chess player in the world. The tournament was double-round and therefore the opponents met twice, scoring one win apiece in highly interesting and stormy games.

Despite the fact that Chigorin managed to gain several victories over serious opponents, his overall result proved to be a failure. Out of 34 games, he scored a total of 14 points and shared 12th and 13th places with Schwarz.

In the following year, 1883, Chigorin took part in the great international tournament in London (14 competitors, double round), where were gathered practically all the best chess players in the world, amongst whom were numbered Steinitz, Zukertort, Blackburne, Mason, Englich, Winawer and Mackenzie.
In this tournament, Chigorin compensated fully for his failure in Vienna. He gained 4<sup>th</sup> prize, won both games against Steinitz and exchanged victories with Blackburne, against whom he had already lost three times in previous competitions. However it was not just sporting success, but above all the style of Chigorin's victories which once again attracted universal attention.

His deeply ideological and purposeful play, pouring out with brilliant, elegant combinations, far from stereotyped, genuinely innovative, aroused true admiration in chess circles.

***

'Organisation and activity! This is the password and slogan of those who work for the future of chess in our land', exclaimed Chigorin in the pages of Chess Herald. 'It is not enough to love and study chess, all chess enthusiasts must unite in order to achieve common aims. It is not enough to unite in societies, these societies must live a full life, work, propel themselves and others forward.'

Chigorin advanced the idea of creating an All-Russia chess union with annual congresses and tournaments in different towns. This idea, it is true, was not destined to be fulfilled in the conditions of the autocratic regime which prevailed at the time. But, all the same, Chigorin's activity bore its fruit. Chess societies were formed in many towns. In St.Petersburg and Moscow, chess movements began amongst students.

'Tireless energy, passionate love and selfless work – all of his strength, all of his life, all of himself, Chigorin gave to chess art' – this is how the well-known Chigorinophile, N.Grekov, characterised the public, literary and organisational activities of the great Russian chess player.

***

From 1889 began a new and very important period in the creative life of Chigorin. He once again travelled abroad, in order to defend the colours of Russian chess art in a struggle against the World Champion, Steinitz.

This struggle was not a usual sporting duel, but a clash of two creative trends, which, starting with the decade 1880-1890, became a pivot for the development of world chess art.

Steinitz, the creator and leader of the positional school, which he termed 'modern', duly recognised the talent of Chigorin, but came forward with statements about the principal erroneousness of his views.

The significance of combinations, which for Chigorin served as beacons for his artistic purposefulness, Steinitz reduced almost to the level of simple tactical motifs, considering that, upon a good and correct defence, combinations ought not to have a place in the course of a chess struggle.

The whole of his theory of positional struggle, Steinitz laid down in a series of laws and principles, creating a very basis for solving creative problems by means of evaluation and understanding of general characteristics.

With such an approach to chess (by which, incidentally, Steinitz himself was far from always guided and which his 'blind' admirers very quickly made so much of), the living creative process was, to a certain extent, inevitably substituted by worship
of dryish principles and theoretical canons, while the creative individuality of a chess player was levelled and even erased. And though, in the positional teachings of Steinitz, there was much new, fresh and progressive, on such ground inevitably had to develop, and later actually did develop, the roots of dogmatism.

For Chigorin, as we have already mentioned, chess was a continually developing art.

The distinguishing feature of Chigorin's method of play consisted of bringing to a high level of perfection, the concrete 'definition' of a position, that is deciding it not on the basis of 'general positional considerations', but by means of the calculation of concrete variations. Of course, not all positions lent themselves to calculations of this sort, and Chigorin did not always have to depend upon the calculation of variations for his decisions. But when calculation was possible, Chigorin usually carried this out to maximum depth and in this way revealed heavily veiled features of a position, which for many of his opponents remained unfathomable secrets.

Another feature (and in addition particularly near and dear to us) of the creative work of Chigorin was his striving to avoid, as far as possible, well-trodden paths. Chigorin was a fierce enemy of stereotype. His experimental play in the opening time and again gave rise to stormy criticism by his contemporaries, who stuck strictly to the way of Steinitz's positional teachings.

It should be emphasised that Chigorin's creative searchings, his thirst for the new, the unknown, were not anarchic attempts to protest against the principles of the 'modern school'. He not only recognised the right of many of these principles to exist, but also he himself was at times prepared to be guided by them. It was not the actual laws and principles which Chigorin condemned, as many thought; not at all. He was protesting only against the excessive limitation of the creative process by these laws and principles. He maintained that they were not the beginning and end of the creative line of chess thought, that this line was far broader than the existing positional dogma, and warned that orientation only on these principles paralysed the flight of creative imagination of a chess player and, as it were, deprived him of the possibility of becoming a real artist, an active participant in the process of the development of chess thought.

'In general, the game of chess', wrote Chigorin in his famous article 'The opening and its logical development', 'is far richer than is to be gathered from the existing theory which endeavours to compress it within definite narrow bounds.'

Seeing Chigorin as a talented and principal opponent of his views, Steinitz himself announced his name as the most worthy pretender to the World Champion's title. He wanted, of course, to take revenge for the three defeats that he had suffered in the tournaments at Vienna and London.

And so, Chigorin entered into a duel with the World Champion. The match took place in Havana in January-February 1889. In this contest, the creative dispute of the two great chess players revolved mainly around the Evans Gambit, which Chigorin offered in all the games (except one) where he played White. Steinitz gladly accepted the gambit, considering it, in accordance with the principles which he had enunciated, as being incorrect.
The beginning of the match was marked by serious mistakes on both sides. Thus, in the first game, on an already comparatively empty board, Steinitz suddenly overlooked the loss of a piece. An outright 'blunder' of a piece was made also by Chigorin in the fifth game. Gross errors likewise marred the course of the second and third encounters. This can apparently be explained by the lack of training of the contestants, particularly Chigorin, who, from 1883 to 1889, was not able to play one official game. It was also not easy to get acclimatized to the tropical climate of Havana.

After eight encounters, the score was 4-4, while the games played with the Evans Gambit gave Chigorin a 2-1 advantage. This included the seventh game, one of the most brilliant of Chigorin's efforts in this contest.

But, all the same, the creative discussion revolving around the Evans Gambit remained unresolved in the first match. Despite the unsatisfactory nature of the defence 6...Wf6, Chigorin obtained only a minimal advantage of one point (+4 -3 =1).

Meanwhile, the games in which Chigorin played Black revealed his lack of preparation for defending positions arising from the Queen's Gambit. Out of eight of these encounters, Chigorin lost seven, in several putting up only weak resistance. Particularly characteristic in this respect is the 4th game of the match.

The match was played to the best of 20 games, but already after the 17th encounter, Steinitz, by scoring 10½ points (+10 -6 =1), was able to defend his title of the strongest chess player on the planet.

It was, in all, a month after the end of the match with Steinitz when Chigorin once again entered the field of battle, by taking part in the great international tournament in New York. 20 contestants, double-round, 38 games (in fact more, since, in the second half, draws were replayed), only a passionate, wholehearted love of chess could have induced Chigorin to accept this new load, virtually without a rest after the tiring match against Steinitz.

The backbone of the participants of the New York tournament consisted of American masters, headed by Delmar, Lipschütz, Hanham and Showalter. English chess was very strongly represented in the personage of the venerable Blackburne and Mason, while also the international debutants Burn and Gunsberg had appeared in tournaments with great success in their country. Finally, great interest was aroused by the participation of the Austro-Hungarian champion, Weiss, who had performed very successfully in several international tournaments in Europe.

The tournament lasted about two months. Chigorin conducted the struggle enterprisingly, sharply, combinatively, at times riskily. His play earned him the general sympathy of spectators and high praise from Steinitz. Chigorin shared 1st and 2nd prizes with Weiss.

World public opinion unanimously recognised the need for a second match between Chigorin and Steinitz for the chess crown. Such a duel soon did take place, but before this there occurred several important events.

Firstly came the match between Chigorin and Gunsberg, which was held in Havana again, at the end of 1889-beginning of 1890. The struggle, surprisingly
for many, assumed a stubborn character and ended with a level score: +9 -9 =5. Of course, this result did not reflect the actual relative strengths, but it opened the way for Gunsberg to a match with Steinitz, which, as is well known, brought a new victory for the World Champion.

Secondly, the telegraph match between Chigorin and Steinitz (1890-1891), which was one of the central episodes of the creative discussion that was developing between them.

As far back as 1889, a dispute arose between the two chess players over these two positions:

![Chess Diagram]

The first is reached in the Evans Gambit after 1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c}\)f3 \(\text{c}\)c6 3.\(\text{c}\)c4 \(\text{c}\)c5 4.b4 \(\text{f}\)xb4 5.c3 \(\text{f}\)a5 6.0-0 \(\text{f}\)f6 7.d4 \(\text{h}\)h6, the other — in the Two Knights Defence, after 1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c}\)f3 \(\text{c}\)c6 3.\(\text{c}\)c4 \(\text{f}\)f6 4.\(\text{g}\)g5 d5 5.exd5 \(\text{c}\)a5 6.\(\text{b}\)b5+ c6 7.dxc6 bxc6 8.\(\text{e}\)e2 \text{h}6 9.\(\text{e}\)e3.

In both cases, Steinitz considered that the side having the extra pawn should win. Chigorin could not agree with such an assessment. It is necessary, however, to state that in respect of the second position, he by no means held a diametrically opposite view, as is depicted by N.Grekov in his book M.I.Chigorin.

Time and again, Chigorin pointed out that it required a great deal of practice in order to draw any kind of definite conclusions about the position at issue in the Two Knights Defence, and that he did not even draw them after his victory in the match by telegraph. Chigorin also said later that 9.\(\text{f}\)h3, instead of 9.\(\text{c}\)f3, was worthy of attention. With regard to the position from the Evans Gambit, Chigorin expressed himself more categorically, considering already that Black's 6th move \(\text{f}\)f6 was unsatisfactory.

It was not Chigorin, but Steinitz, who endeavoured to give the match a principal character, by portraying it as a clash of the 'modern' and 'old' schools.

In one of his annotations relating to the first game, after 8.\(\text{g}\)g5 \(\text{d}\)d6 9.d5 \(\text{d}\)d8 10.\(\text{a}\)a4 \(\text{b}\)b6 11.\(\text{a}\)a3 c6 12.\(\text{e}\)e2, Steinitz, after reference to his move 12...\(\text{c}\)c7, noted: 'In general I may remark that my antagonist's attack is of the same description as in most of the games which we have played together and it is representative of the old school. He believes in advancing the pawns and sacrificing one or more of them in order to create difficulties on the king's side, or for the purpose of blocking his opponent's pieces, whereas I maintain that the king is a strong piece that can
usually take care of itself, and that in his style of attack Chigorin has to employ powerful pieces in order to block inferior ones. In the end, I opine that as usual, my minor pieces will thoroughly develop, while his far advanced pawns, which cannot retrace their steps, will form weak marks for my own ultimate counter attack. For the present I am a pawn ahead, but I am likely to lose it, as on previous occasions, in order to rectify my position. Or in other words, if the sacrificing tactics hold good, I have one pawn to spare for the purpose.'

Upon this self-confident tirade Chigorin gave the following reproof, which is an unusually vivid reflection of his creative outlook:

'I do not consider myself belonging to this or that "school", I am guided not by abstract theoretical considerations on the comparative strength of pieces etc., but only the data as it appears to me in this or that position of the game, which serves as an object of detailed and possibly precise analysis. Each of my moves presents itself as a feasible inference from a series of variations in which theoretical "principles of play" can have only a very limited significance.'

At the end of the match, in which, as is well-known, Steinitz suffered cruel defeats in both games, he nevertheless tried to save the reputation of the 'modern school'. 'It remains, therefore, a fair question, which I trust will be put to another test either over the board or by correspondence, whether or not I have overshot the mark in the two innovations which have been the bone of contention. But so far from the play in the cable match being a proof contrary to the doctrines of the modern school, I think that impartial experts will have to recognise that the Russian master's tactics seem to show a conversion to the new ideas or at any rate that the modern principles have made their impression on his style (just like on that of most players of the new generation)... But I feel sure that the match will not affect the modern school, which is accepted in theory and practice amongst first class masters. Nor can I admit that my own views about the two openings in dispute have been completely disproved.'

In another article, Steinitz quoted a letter which he had received from Chigorin, where, incidentally, the Russian master wrote: 'True friends of chess must be thankful to you for the interest which you constantly awake with your innovations and for your aversion to routine-like play. As known to you, I do not share your theory and principles completely, which, however, does not prevent me from appreciating them. But you are doing me an injustice, dear Mr. Steinitz, when you ascribe to me a one-sided view about the treatment of the king's flank. After all, we are probably both right in our views about the conduct of the game. In some of your own best games you have also not denied to yourself the attack on the royal flank.'

This interesting letter, as it were, finding a way to bring together both points of view, did not meet with a due response from Steinitz. 'I may answer', he wrote, 'that some critics who have systematically claimed Chigorin as belonging exclusively to the old school are more responsible for his being charged with one-sided views than I am. However his letter on the subject of the late cable match will no doubt confirm in the main my comments on his style of play.'
We see that Chigorin had great respect not only for Steinitz personally, but also, to a large extent, for his ideas about positional principles. Even if he did not agree with Steinitz, Chigorin was capable of making an objective assessment of his views.

The chess world heaped great praise upon Chigorin's victory. The Parisian magazine La Stratégie wrote: 'This mighty battle is over: the "old" school has gained a victory over the "modern". We are cheered by this result, because we prefer brilliant combinations, though they do not represent strictly theoretical play, to skillful and correct play, the main basis of which is not to lose sight of the draw."

This interesting appraisal of the match is, of course, primitive. The two trends of chess thought which came up against each other were depicted as correct play according to theory (Steinitz) and brilliant combinations (Chigorin), while the outcome of the struggle as a victory of the 'old' over the 'modern'. Unfortunately a similar interpretation was made by many people, amongst whom were also numbered Russian chess players. Chigorin was highly grieved by this; such a vulgarisation of chess sickened him.

And so the question of a second match for the World Championship between Chigorin and Steinitz came to be on the agenda. Steinitz refused an offer to play the match in St. Petersburg, and Chigorin had to travel once again to hot Havana.

The match was played to ten won games.

This is how the first report ran on the match (1892) from Havana. 'The first move in the first game of the great chess contest between the two strongest players of our time was made by Chigorin on 2 January at 2.30 p.m. In the first game, Chigorin drew the white pieces; as everybody expected, he offered the Evans Gambit. But this time Steinitz refrained from his previous defence with the queen and preferred to go back to the old variations, analysed even by Anderssen... On the 19th move, Chigorin, after 15 minutes reflection, sacrificed a knight.'

In other games played with the Evans Gambit, Steinitz also decided not to fall back on his defence 6...\textit{Wf}6. The overall score of these proved to be more favourable for Chigorin than in the first match (+4 -1 =3).

With white, Steinitz at first stuck to the move 1.e4. In the Spanish Game he achieved an overwhelming advantage +3 -1. However the struggle bore the character of a principal discussion on the Two Knights Defence, where Steinitz tried to defend the 'telegraph' retreat \textit{Qh}3 on the 9th move. The 6th game ended in a success for him, but in the three following even numbered encounters he was crushed and so then refrained from his experiment. The 12th game, which summed up the creative discussion about the pawn sacrifice which lies at the base of the Two Knights Defence, was particularly convincing.

The threat of defeat hung over Steinitz. After the 19th game, the score was +8 -7 =4 in favour of Chigorin. Then Steinitz switched to the platform of the Queen's Gambit. Before the 23rd game, which was destined to be the last, the World Champion already had a point advantage. However, the denouement came about surprisingly when Chigorin, a piece ahead in the final encounter, made a suicidal blunder allowing a mate in two moves. If, on the other hand, he had gained a full
point, with the score at 9-9 the match would have been continued up to three more won games.

The match with Steinitz ended the first stage of Chigorin’s creative activity, in which he encountered mainly masters of the old generation, who began their chess life in the 50s and 60s of the 19th century: Blackburne, Mackenzie, Engisch, Rosenthal, Zukertort, L.Paulsen, Winawer, Shumov and, finally, the first World Champion, Steinitz. Chigorin failed to do battle only with the famous Adolph Anderssen, who passed away in 1879, before Chigorin’s entry into the international arena. Anderssen, however, was one of the beacons which lit up the whole length of Chigorin’s creative path, as is witnessed by the great deal of material published in the pages of this book.

* * *

The year 1893 opened a new stage in Chigorin’s creative activity. He had encounters in prospect with the mighty cohort of masters of the new generation, which developed in the 80s-90s and at once took up a leading position in world chess life. Already gaining world fame was the strict ‘law-giver’ Tarrasch, the most talented followers of Steinitz – Pillsbury and Lasker, the successors of Weiss – the Austro-Hungarian masters, Marco and Schlechter, then later Maroczy, Teichmann, Janowski. It was with these that Chigorin was about to cross swords in the last decade of the 19th century.

From 1893 to 1900, Chigorin took part in nine great tournaments. He had a preceding (in 1893) important match with Tarrasch. The German champion, not without foundation, was at that time considered the main rival of Steinitz in the struggle for the chess ‘throne’. The unofficial match was seen as a contest for the chess championship of Europe. Tarrasch had to his credit three first prizes in international tournaments at Breslau 1889, Manchester 1890 and Dresden 1892, and out of 53 games played here he lost only one! Possessing fine positional intuition, Tarrasch, at the same time, conducted the struggle very actively, attacked magnificently, combined excellently, hardly ever made a serious oversight, let alone a ‘blunder’, and was an outstanding expert on opening theory and the endgame. Tarrasch’s chess technique was at a high level, but a particularly important place in his creative work was taken by the planning of a game. In other words, there was a serious test in prospect for the creative views and style of Chigorin.

The experience of the struggle with Steinitz, of course, did not pass without leaving its mark on Chigorin. He understood the need to work out more diligently an opening platform for Black against the Spanish Game and the Queen’s Gambit, while, when playing White – to deviate from the boundaries of theoretical routine in those cases when the opponent, on 1 e4, refrained from the reply 1...e5. In the creative work of Chigorin was finally put together and reinforced that realistic style which was to bring him a great number of victories in future battles. A deeper and more comprehensive penetration into the secrets of positions, rejection of unjustified risk, mastery of the creation of combinative situations in sharp middlegames, raising of the technique of active defence and endgames – all these
realistic features of his style Chigorin brought to the arena of the struggle against the mighty German champion.

And though, as also in his match with Steinitz, Chigorin did not always succeed in overcoming his 'rebellious' inclinations, the match ended all square – 9-9 (not counting draws). This score showed that Chigorin could boldly enter into battle with European chess youth and, in the struggle with them, defend the creative views and methods of the Russian chess school.

* * * *

Chigorin’s theoretical innovating manifested itself in the move 2.\textit{\$e2} in the French Defence and ...\textit{\$d7} in the Spanish Game. Both of these opening 'discoveries' brought good results.

The reader will find statements about the move 2.\textit{\$e2}, taken from the above-mentioned article 'The opening and its logical development', amongst the game annotations.

Interesting polemics developed between Chigorin and his opponents regarding the plan with ...\textit{\$d7}. Thus, in the 17\textsuperscript{th} match game with Tarrasch, after 1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\$f3} \textit{\$x}c6 3.\textit{\$b}b5 a6 4.\textit{\$a}a4 \textit{\$f}6 5.\textit{\$x}c3 d6 6.d4 \textit{\$d}d7 7.\textit{\$e}2, he played 7...f6. This move was roundly condemned by many commentators, who declared, in particular, that the weakness of the move was so obvious that a theoretician such as Dr. Tarrasch would exploit it without difficulty.

Assessing Chigorin’s idea from the point of view of modern opening principles, it is not difficult to see that, with his 7\textsuperscript{th} move, he in fact anticipates the formation of a defensive system in the Spanish Game which is not infrequently seen in our day – 1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\$f3} \textit{\$x}c6 3.\textit{\$b}b5 a6 4.\textit{\$a}a4 d6 5.\textit{\$x}c6+ bxc6 6.d4 f6. It is true that the triangle of pawns, d6-e5-f6, is today formed in a somewhat different way, but the prototype of such a formation belongs, without doubt, to Chigorin.

'I do not see the weakness of the move ...f7-f6', retorted Chigorin to his critics. 'Not having the possibility of foreseeing all the perturbations which could occur in actual play, I naturally wanted to test in practice what would come out of all this.'

Chigorin appears here as a bold experimenter, who was ready to take risks in an important match with a dangerous opponent in order to test in practice the new idea, which went far beyond the boundaries of the opening routine of this time.

Nearly two years passed between the match with Tarrasch and the next international tournament in which Chigorin took part. This time Chigorin devoted mainly to literary and analytical work. He organised his third, perhaps best, magazine under the name Chess, but unfortunately it did not exist very long – in all for half a year.

And so Chigorin's chess views finally took shape, his understanding of positions became wiser and more sober, and he considerably enriched his knowledge of opening theory, not only due to a great deal of analysis, but also on the basis of his bold struggle against routine and the search for the new.

Filled with great creative hopes, Chigorin travelled to England in summer 1895 to take part in the Hastings international tournament where the pick of world chess brainpower was gathered. Here were the new World Champion, Emanuel
Lasker, who had won a match against Steinitz in 1894, Steinitz himself, Tarrasch, Burn, Blackburne, Schlechter, Teichmann, Gunsberg, and finally the exceptionally talented representative of the New World, Pillsbury.

Chigorin showed in Hastings that he was an all-round master, who had reached the peak of chess art. He defeated his opponents both in strict positional style (Lasker, Teichmann, Von Bardeleben) and in fierce attacks (Pillsbury, Gunsberg, Tinsley, Tarrasch) and delicate endgames (Blackburne, Schlechter), and in many other situations. All of these games went into the history of chess as artistic productions, the life of which will last for ever.

Not one of the participants of the tournament created even half of those masterpieces through which the ideas and thoughts of Chigorin adorned the days at Hastings. And yet Chigorin did not come first, but only... second. In the end, Pillsbury outdistanced him by half a point.

Two rounds before the end, Chigorin was in first place, having 15 points out of 19. Lasker and Pillsbury were half a point behind. In the 20th round, however, occurred a creative catastrophe, roughly of the same order as that of the last game of the second Chigorin-Steinitz match. In his game with the young Janowski, who was placed somewhere in the second half of the tournament table, Chigorin, already on the 17th move, had to resign because of unavoidable mate. It is difficult even to annotate this game, since it is clear by Chigorin’s moves that on this day he was in no condition to play chess. Chigorin also included it in his chess column without notes, subjecting his own play only to silent criticism by means of question marks, which he placed on 8 of his 16 moves! Pillsbury’s opponent in this round was Vergani, who was hopelessly placed in bottom position with 3 points. The struggle was over quickly and Pillsbury went up to first place. In the last round, Chigorin and Pillsbury both won their games.

The international tournament at Hastings represented the culmination of the development of Chigorin’s creative thought. The wise realism of his play, hand in hand with his brilliantly coloured combinative creations, won him general admiration.

He played two great games against Lasker and Tarrasch.

***

In 1895/96, at St.Petersburg, was held a match-tournament of leading players, in which, besides Chigorin, took part Lasker, Pillsbury and Steinitz. Tarrasch declined an invitation. Great organisational responsibilities fell upon Chigorin and, indeed, also certain social conditions prevailing at the time in St.Petersburg, which were particularly unfavourable for him, did not provide the necessary climate for creative inspiration. This resulted in Chigorin playing throughout the first half of the tournament extremely badly: out of 9 games he won only one, suffered seven defeats, and made one draw. In the second half, Chigorin played convincingly, but by this time it was impossible to lift himself out of last place. His result against Lasker (-4 =2) was totally unsatisfactory; he also lost his match to Pillsbury (-3 +2 =1) though all three defeats occurred in the first half of the contest; in return, he won against Steinitz (+3 -2 =1).
In 1896, Chigorin took part in the international tournament at Nuremberg, where there was assembled an even stronger line-up than at the Hastings tournament. To the 'Hastingers' were added Maroczy and Charousek – the most prominent representatives of Hungarian chess. By this time, Janowski was not the novice that he had been in Hastings. Also appearing were the talented American Showalter – Pillsbury's main rival in the struggle for the title of champion of the New World, Porges – the second prizewinner in the Dresden tournament of 1892, and finally Winawer.

Chigorin began the tournament very well. After seven rounds he was at the head of the tournament table, with Lasker. In the eighth round took place their personal encounter. After a tense struggle Chigorin won a pawn, but firstly missed a win, then twice a draw, and in the end suffered a defeat. This apparently shook him so much that in the following 11 rounds he scored, in all, 4½ points and, for the first time in his international practice, was left without a prize.

In the same year, Chigorin compensated for this failure by gaining first prize in the tournament at Budapest. Here he created a series of magnificent productions of chess thought (we mention the brilliant rook ending against Tarrasch and the beautiful combinational attack in his game with Walbrodt), but, on the whole, starting from this time, age (46 years!) and nervous fatigue began to tell more and more on Chigorin's play.

In the Berlin tournament of 1897, Chigorin had, after the 15th round, 10½ points, but then lost all his remaining games and once again remained without a prize. He put his queen en prise against Blackburne. Such blunders haunted Chigorin in nearly every competition.

In the great double-round tournament at Vienna 1898, his shared 6th-7th place with Burn was a success. Nevertheless, Chigorin was dying to take part in every contest. The day after Vienna had ended he was already in Cologne for the next of the regular congresses of the German Chess Federation. Amongst the competitors, there was neither Lasker, nor Tarrasch, nor Pillsbury, nor Maroczy. The line-up was by no means top class. A possible winner was reckoned to be Janowski, Charousek or Chigorin, but it turned out to be Burn. Chigorin shared 2nd-3rd-4th places with V Cohn and Charousek. In London 1899, Chigorin came 7th. With his participation in the Paris tournament of 1900 (result – 6th prize), Chigorin concluded the second stage of his creative activity.

***

Chigorin was a true artist of chess, to which he gave, without a break, his whole life. A big book is necessary, in order to give a comprehensive account of the characteristics of Chigorin's artistic ideas. Laying no claim to completeness, this book nevertheless presents many illustrative combinations, through which Chigorin endeavoured to express his chess ideas. For Chigorin, combinations were like beacons lighting up the creative path. Dearest of all to Chigorin, however, was truth. In particular, therefore, his combinations were not tinsel, not a chase after outward show, not adventurous dash, but a valuable form, combining
brilliant, beautiful sacrifices with deep idea-content and correctness of artistic expression.

Winawer, making use of his world fame, rendered valuable assistance to Chigorin in securing his compatriot’s first appearance abroad in Berlin 1881. And in their personal encounter, Chigorin, as White, chose the King’s Gambit and won in under twenty moves.

Chigorin decided his encounter with Pollock, New York 1889, with an uncomplicated, but nevertheless elegant combination. On the other hand, in his game with Bird at the same tournament, with a surprising sacrifice of a rook Chigorin forced a ten-move combination ending in mate. Bird’s king went on an intricate route-march, h7-g7-g6-f5-e4-e3-e2-d3-e2-e3-d4-c4.

The pearl of the match between Chigorin and Gunsberg is rightfully considered to be the second game, where Chigorin, as Black, concluded a consistent and finely conducted attack with a deeply calculated and, above all, irresistible combination, which also involved the sacrifice of a rook.

Amongst the brilliant ideas demonstrated by Chigorin at the Budapest tournament of 1896, particular attention is attracted by the combinational attack with the white pieces in his game with Walbrodt. Already in the opening, Chigorin sacrificed a bishop for two central pawns.

One difficult partner for Chigorin was Schlechter. After meeting him first at Hastings 1895 and gaining victory in a long ending, Chigorin lost to him later in Nuremberg, Budapest, Berlin and, after three draws, once again in the first half of the London tournament of 1899. In the second half, Chigorin played with white and, after 1 e4 e5, offered the King’s Gambit. Schlechter, who usually declined such ‘Greek gifts’, this time surprisingly accepted the gambit, possibly inspired by his past victories. The game, however, lasted in all... 17 moves, and was concluded with an incisive combination.

In the tournament at Paris 1900, Chigorin received a special prize for brilliant play in his game against Mortimer. Chigorin, as White, chose the very sharp Steinitz Gambit, in which the king, already on the 5th move, sets off on a journey via the e2-square.

* * * *

In the creative work of Chigorin, one cannot find many games in which combinations were not present or were not concealed in the form of a threat. Therefore, for this reason, both his contemporaries and historians of chess regarded Chigorin’s creative work and his style combinational.

But nevertheless it is necessary to firmly oppose the attempt – and there were such attempts – to portray Chigorin as a one-sided master of combination, of attack.

Chigorin played the endgame finely and with inspiration. His rook endings against Tarrasch (18th game of their match and the tournament encounter at Budapest 1896), Schlechter (Hastings 1895), Marshall (Barmen 1905) and many others, have gone into the history of chess as classic examples of their kind.

The main thing, however, is the fact that Chigorin was an outstanding positional chess player, who produced scores of examples of logically conducted positional
games, as that against Teichmann at Hastings 1895. 'The whole game is an excellent example of play in the spirit of the modern school', remarked Tarrasch. We would say that this game is characteristic of Chigorin's realistic style of play. The brightest reflection of this style is to be found in the games of his match with Tarrasch and in international tournaments of the years 1895-1900.

Chigorin's realistic play consisted of directing his thoughts to a comprehensive penetration into the secrets of every position. With this thinking process it would be impossible to entice even a real weakness on one part of the board, while a concrete, in the broad sense, examination of all other possibilities had not been made and primarily the prospects of creating an attack on the king's flank. Chigorin strived for this in every game, it was the main stimulus of his creative aspirations, and therefore he had exceptional skill in being able to detect even very latent chances of such attacks. But then again, when there was no possibility of organising an attack on the king, Chigorin, with no less zeal and profundity, directed the spearhead of his thoughts to any weak point in the opponent's position, while, if it proved necessary - even to the defence of his own weaknesses. For Chigorin, the position was a complicated mechanism, into the workings of which he endeavoured to penetrate, as a skilled mechanic does in his working hours.

In addition to this, his thoughts often took an experimental course. Chigorin could not stand stereotype and was at times prepared to dare and risk, in order to reveal parts of the work mechanism, previously not investigated. And if in five cases out of ten his experiment proved to be justified, then this gave his creative daring new strength.

Chigorin expressed his realistic approach to a position very well in the following words: 'The ability to combine skillfully, the capacity to find in each given position the most purposeful move, soon leading to the execution of a well-conceived plan, is higher than any principle, or, more correct to say, is the only principle in the game of chess which lends itself to precise definition.'

* * * *

Chigorin left a noticeable track on the theory of the openings. Indeed, he had a great dislike for the very word 'theory'. 'Not infrequently', said Chigorin, 'theoretical is a synonym for the stereotyped. For this 'theoretical' in chess is nothing more than that which can be found in the manuals and to which players try to conform, because they cannot think up anything better or equal, anything original.' But none the less, Chigorin enriched the theory of the openings with many interesting ideas, which even to the present day are included in the weapons of the best chess players.

There was a great deal of analysis in the area of the King's Gambit and the Evans Gambit, which was deep in content and broad in its scale and deservedly won him fame as a peerless master of these favourite openings of his.

But the need to work out a worthy method of struggle against the Spanish Game and the Queen's Gambit induced him also here to open with a system of play which entered into opening theory under his name.

In the Queen's Gambit, after 1.d4 d5 2.c4, the systems with 2...e6x6 and 2...g4 are Chigorin's ideas. However the system which had the richest development was that
connected with the moves ...c7-c6, ...e7-e6, ...\textit{f6} and ...\textit{d6}, and a subsequent counterattack in the centre by means of ...c6-c5 or ...e6-e5.

The very broad and successful practical application of this method of play, including his classic victories over Janowski (Budapest 1896) and Maroczy (London 1899), naturally linked it with Chigorin’s name.

And, as regards the Spanish Game, then it was enriched by the un tarnished Chigorin pawn-chain ‘a6-b5-c5-d6-e5’ and the elastic knight retreat, ...\textit{d7}, in the Steinitz Defence.

About the move 2.\textit{e2} in the French Defence we have already spoken.

In his last few tournaments, Chigorin repeatedly employed as Black an opening set-up which, in contemporary opening theory, is called the King’s Indian Defence, and which is now perhaps the most popular method of play against 1.d4.

It is interesting that not one of Chigorin’s opening ideas has been refuted by the theory of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. They are all alive today.

****

Entering now into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the last eight years of life for Chigorin were likewise a way of crusade. To him was not given the joy of summing up the results of his selfless life’s work. He was grieved by the early onset of old age, sickness, and failing strength. Time and again, Chigorin was overcome by anxious feelings with the prospect of an eternal parting with his beloved art paining him. Under conditions of autocratic social stagnation, where even in chess any public activity was stifled and killed off, for Chigorin, as also for many prematurely deceased people, there could not but arise the oppressive question: for what had he spent his life, in the name of what had he squandered his best dreams and given without a break all his strength? But Chigorin did not give way to sorrow and, with all his passion and energy, to his last days promoted chess art, attracting new followers under its banner and uniting the not numerous, but nevertheless growing chess forces. 'Under such conditions', said Chigorin not long before his death, 'it is difficult to do anything for our art. Though I personally may not have been able to actually achieve what I have been striving for, if I have succeeded in leaving after myself ten others, truly captivated by our art – from these might arise hundreds and thousands.' Hundreds of thousands and millions – we might have corrected Chigorin today.
Amongst Russian chess players, Chigorin was able to remain undefeated. In the All-Russia championships, he invariably occupied first place (1st – 1899; 2nd – 1900/1901; 3rd – 1903), while in 1906 he won a match for the championship of Russia against Salwe, winner of the 4th championship. (Chigorin felt obliged to withdraw from participation in this competition after four rounds, because of an unfair loss on time to Izbinsky, against which even Izbinsky himself and other competitors protested.) In the 5th Championship of the land, which took place in the last months of his life, Chigorin was by then unable to make an appearance.

From 1901 to 1907, Chigorin took part in 11 international tournaments, out of which a great celebration for him proved to be the Gambit Tournament in Vienna 1903 (all games in it were played with the King’s Gambit Accepted). Here, Chigorin was in his element, and neither Teichmann, nor Maroczy, nor Pillsbury, nor Schlechter, nor Marshall could deny him his ‘right’ to take first prize. But this was the last international success for Mikhail Ivanovich.

In a few tournaments (Cambridge Springs 1904, Nuremberg 1906), he still managed to hold his ground in the middle of the table. However, in Ostende 1905, he was second to last, while in the Ostende match tournament 1907, even last. The swan song of Chigorin’s creative work was the Carlsbad tournament of 1907. The mortally ill Chigorin could not expect success. But also here, even in lost games, his thoughts time and again were illuminated with beautiful ideas.

Chigorin passed away on 12 January 1908. He died in Lublin in the circle of his family.

* * * *

The best Chigorin traditions even today inspire chess players of our country. The understanding of chess as a craft with rich artistic content, the tireless striving for the new, boldness and experimentation in creative decisions, a deep realistic approach to the evaluation of a position – these are the basic features which constitute Chigorin’s legacy to Soviet chess players.

The memory of the great organiser of the Russian chess school, Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin, will live for ever.

P.A. Romanovsky
Moscow 1960
## Chigorin’s Tournament and Match Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location/Match Type</th>
<th>Played</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Lost</th>
<th>Draw</th>
<th>Handicap/Winawer</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874/75</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Petrovsky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>St. Petersburg (1st Winawer)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>St. Petersburg (1st Asharin)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876/79</td>
<td>St. Petersburg v Moscow Corr. Match</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878/81</td>
<td>Correspondence Match v Kharkov</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878/79</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, All-Russia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Play off v Alapin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Schiffer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Von Schmidt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Von Schmidt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Von Schmidt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Von Schmidt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Merchants Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Play off v Schiffer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Schiffer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Alapin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880/81</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Strongest Players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Play off v Alapin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Paris, Match v De Rivièr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match v Nolde</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Odds of pawn and move)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Kharkov</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If drawn, the first two games of each match did not count, a third game was played, which counted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Played</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Draw</th>
<th>Lost</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Kharkov, Match v Beklemishev (Odds of pawn and two moves)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Kharkov, Consultation Games</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Moscow, Match v Solovtsov</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Handicap (25 players)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Correspondence Universal Illustrated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Match v Nolde (Odds of pawn and move)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>St.Petersburg v London, Telegraph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Havana, Match v Steinitz</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Havana, Consultation Games with Ponce, Gavilan, and Steinitz</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>New York, Play off v Weiss</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Havana, Match v Gunsberg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Telegraph Match v Steinitz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Handicap</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Havana, Training Games v Vasquez and Golmayo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Havana, Consultation Games with Cuban masters v Steinitz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Riga, Match v Asharin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Handicap (Chigorin did not qualify for winners group)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>St.Petersburg, Match v Belin (Odds of pawn and move)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Solovtsov did not continue the match.
** The 1st game in the second half did not count, if drawn, and a second game was played which did count.
*** One game remained unfinished and was adjudicated a draw – a decision challenged by St.Petersburg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Played</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st All-Russia Championship

1899/1905 Correspondence tournaments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Played</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd All-Russia Championship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Played</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11½*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Game totals and points totals do not correspond. Initial games, if a draw, counted ¼ and were replayed. If the replayed game was drawn, both players won another ¼. The winner of a replayed game got ½, the loser 0.

** 2 games by default.

*** 1 game by default.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Played</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Strongest Players</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Moscow, Exhibition Game with Pillsbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Vienna, Gambit Tournament</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Brighton, Match v Lasker with Rice Gambit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Kiev, 3rd All-Russia Championship</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Cambridge Springs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Strongest Players</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Strongest Players, Rice Gambit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Ostende</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Barmen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, 4th All-Russia Championship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Lodz, Match v Salwe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>Won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Lodz, Match-Tournament 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Ostende***</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Match-Tournament.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Ostende</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 game by default.
** Chigorin withdrew after the 5th round due to a disputed loss on time.
*** This event was played in five qualifying stages. Chigorin did not get beyond the 2nd stage.
Tournament and Match Data

1881 Berlin tournament
Blackburne 14; Zukertort 11; CHIGORIN, Winawer 10⅔; Mason, Wittek 9⅔; Mackwitz, Schwartz 8⅔; Berger, L.Paulsen 8; W.Paulsen 7⅔; Schallopp 7; Ehlmann, Wemmers 6⅔; Noa 5⅔; Schmid 3⅔, Schütz 1⅔.

1882 Vienna tournament
Steinitz, Winawer 24; Mason 23; Zukertort, Mackenzie 22⅔; Blackburne 21⅔; Englisch 19⅔; L.Paulsen 18⅔; Wittek 18; Weiss 16⅔; Hruby 16; CHIGORIN, Schwarz 14; Meitner 13; Bird 12; Ware 11; Noa 9; Fleissig 7.

1883 London tournament
Zukertort 22; Steinitz 19; Blackburne 16⅔; CHIGORIN 16; Mackenzie, Englisch, Mason 15⅔; Rosenthal 14; Winawer 13; Bird 12; Noa 9⅔; Sellman 6⅔; Mortimer, Skipworth 3.

1883 Paris: Match v De Rivièrè
Won 5 Lost 4 Drew 1

1889 Havana: Match v Steinitz
Won 6 Lost 10 Drew 1
0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 ½

1890 Havana: Match v Gunsberg
Won 9 Lost 9 Drew 5
1 1 0 ½ 0 1 ½ 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 ½ 1 ½ 1 ½ 1 0 1 0

1899 New York tournament
CHIGORIN, Weiss 29 (a play-off for outright first place ended in four draws); Gunsberg 28½; Blackburne 27; Burn 26; Lipschütz 25⅔; Mason 22; Judd 20; Delmar, Showalter 18; Pollock 17½; Bird, Taubenhaus 17; D.Baird 16; Burille 15; Hanham 14; Gossip, Martinez 13½; J.Baird 7; Macleod 6¼.

1890/91 Telegraph match v Steinitz
Won both games.

1892 Havana: World Championship Match v Steinitz
Won 8 Lost 10 Drew 5
1 ½ ½ 0 ½ 0 1 1 ½ 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 ½ 0 0
1893 St.Petersburg: Match v Tarrasch
Won 9 Lost 9 Drew 4
0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 ½ 0 ½ ½ 0 ½ 0 1 1 1 0 1

1895 Hastings tournament
Pillsbury 16½; CHIGORIN 16; Lasker 15½; Tarrasch 14; Steinitz 13; Schiffer 12; Von Bardeleben, Teichmann 11½; Schlechter 11; Blackburne 10½; Walbrodt 10; Burn, Mason, Janowski 9½; Bird, Gunsberg 9; Albin, Marco 8½; Pollock 8; Mieses, Tinsley 7½; Vergani 3.

1895/96 St.Petersburg match-tournament
First half: Pillsbury 6½; Lasker 5½; Steinitz 4½; CHIGORIN 1½
Second half: Lasker 6; CHIGORIN 5½; Steinitz 5; Pillsbury 1½.
Overall result: Lasker 11½; Steinitz 9½; Pillsbury 8; CHIGORIN 7.

1896 Nuremberg tournament
Lasker 13½; Maroczy 12½; Pillsbury, Tarrasch 12; Janowski 11½ Steinitz 11; Walbrodt, Schlechter 10½; CHIGORIN, Schiffer 9½; Blackburne 9; Charousek 8½; Marco 8; Albin 7; Winawer 6½; Porges, Showalter 5½; Schallopp 4½; Teichmann 4.

1896 Budapest tournament
CHIGORIN, Charousek 8½; Pillsbury 7½; Schlechter, Janowski 7; Walbrodt, Winawer 6½; Tarrasch 6; Albin, Maroczy 5; Marco 4½; Noa 4; Von Popiel 2.

1897 Berlin tournament
Charousek 13½; Walbrodt 13; Blackburne 12; Janowski 11½; Burn 11; Schlechter, Marco, Alaph 10½; Caro 10; CHIGORIN 9½; Schiffer 9; Metger 8½; Cohn, Winawer 7½; Sichting 7; Teichmann 6½; Englisch, Zinkl 5½; Albin 2.

1898 Vienna tournament
Tarrasch, Pillsbury 27½; Janowski 25½; Steinitz 23½; Schlechter 21½; CHIGORIN, Burn 20; Lipke, Maroczy 19½; Alaph 18; Blackburne, Schiffer 17; Marco 16½; Showalter 15; Walbrodt 14½; Halprin 14; Caro 12½; Baird 8; Trenchard 5.

1898 Cologne tournament
Burn 11½; Charousek, CHIGORIN, Cohn 10½; Steinitz 9½; Schlechter, Showalter 9; Berger 8; Janowski 7½; Von Popiel, Schiffer 7; Gottschall 5½; Albin, Heinrichsen 4; Fritz 3½; Schallopp 3.

1899 London tournament
Lasker 23½; Maroczy, Pillsbury, Janowski 19; Schlechter 18; Blackburne 16½; CHIGORIN 16; Showalter 13½; Mason 13; Steinitz, Cohn 12½; Lee 10½; Bird 8; Tinsley 7; Teichmann (withdrew after four rounds) 2.
1899 Moscow: 1st All-Russia tournament
CHIGORIN 12; Schiffer 9½; Levitsky 9; Lebedev 8½; Jankovich 8; Gelbak, Nenarokov 7½; Gennik, Kulomzin 7; Abaza 5½; Boryakov 5; Falk 3½; Kalinsky, Parvago 0 (both withdrew after a few rounds).

1900 Paris tournament
Lasker 14½; Pillsbury 12½; Maroczy, Marshall 12; Burn 11; CHIGORIN 10½; Marco, Mieses, Schlechter 10; Showalter, Janowski 9; Mason 4½; Brody 4; Rosen 3; Mortimer 2; Didier, Sterling 1.

1901 Moscow: 2nd All-Russia tournament
CHIGORIN 16½; Schifers 14; Janowski 13½; Goncharov 12½; Nenarokov 11; Grigoriev 9; Frenkel 9½; Kulomzin, Lebedev, Sharov 9; Rozenkrantz 8; Fokin 6½; Gennik 5½; Tereshchikov 5; Duz-Khotimirsky 4½; Boryakov 4; Jankovich 3; Antushev 2.

1901 Monte Carlo tournament
Janowski 10½; Schlechter 9½; CHIGORIN, Schewe 9; Alapin 8½; Mieses 7; Blackburne, Gunsberg 6½, Marco 6; Marshall 5½, Reggio 4½, Mason 4¼; Winawer 4; Didier ¾.

1902 Monte Carlo tournament
Maroczy 14½; Pillsbury 14½; Janowski 14; Teichmann 13½; Wolf, Tarrasch, Schlechter 12; CHIGORIN 11½; Marshall 11; Gunsberg 10½; Napier 9½; Mieses 9; Mason 9; Albin 8½; Marco 7½; Von Popiel 7½; Von Schewe 5; Eisenberg 4½; Reggio 2½; Mortimer 1.

1902 Hannover tournament
Janowski 13½; Pillsbury 12; Atkins 11½; Mieses 11; Wolf, Napier 10; CHIGORIN 9; Olland 8½; Marshall, Swiderki 8; Levin, Gottschall 7½; V.Cohn 7; Von Bardeleben, Suchting 6½; Gunsberg 6; Mason 5½; Von Popiel 5.

1903 Vienna gambit tournament
CHIGORIN 13; Marshall 11½; Marco 11; Pillsbury 10; Mieses, Maroczy, Teichmann 9; Swiderski 8½; Schlechter 7; Gunsberg 2.

1903 Brighton: Rice Gambit match v Lasker
Won 2 Lost 1 Drew 3
0 1 ½ 1 ½ ¾

1903 Kiev: 3rd All-Russia tournament
CHIGORIN 15; Bernstein 14; Yurevich 13½; Salwe 13; Rubinstein 11½; Lowtsky, Znosko-Borovsky 11; Levitsky 10½; Izbinsky, Lebedev, Schiffer 9½; Rabinovich 8½; Kulomzin 8; Kalinsky 7½; Duz-Khotimirsky 7; Benko 6½; Nikolaev 4½; Shtamm 2; Breiev 0.
1904 Cambridge Springs tournament
Marshall 13; Lasker, Janowski 11; Showalter 8½; CHIGORIN, Schlechter 7½; Mieses, Pillsbury 7; Teichmann, Fox 6½; Lawrence, Napier 5½; Barry, Hodges 5; Delmar 4½.

1905 Ostende tournament
Maroczy 19½; Tarrasch, Janowski 18; Schlechter 15½; Marco, Teichmann 14; Burn, Leonhardt, Marshall 12½; Wolf 12; Alapin 11½; Blackburne 10½; CHIGORIN 6½; Taubenhaus 5.

1905 Barmen tournament
Janowski, Maroczy 10½; Marshall 10; Bernstein, Schlechter 9; Berger 8; CHIGORIN, Wolf, Leonhardt, John 7; Süichting, Von Bardeleben 6½; Burn, Alapin 6; Gottschall, Mieses 5.

1906 Lodz: Match v Salwe to decide All-Russia Champion
Won 7 Lost 5 Drew 3.

1906 Lodz match-tournament
Rubinstein 6½; CHIGORIN 5½; Flamberg 3½; Salwe 2½.

1906 Ostende tournament
Schlechter 21; Maroczy 20; Rubinstein 19; Burn, Bernstein, Teichmann; Marshall 16½; Janowski 16; Perlis 14. CHIGORIN failed to qualify for this winners' group.

1906 Nuremberg tournament
Marshall 12½; Duras 11; Schlechter, Forgacs 10½; CHIGORIN 10; Wolf, Salwe 9½; Cohn 8; Tarrasch, Znosko-Borovsky, Vidmar 7½; Spielmann 7; Swiderski 6; Leonhardt, Fahrni 5½; Janowski, Przewiorca 4.

1907 Ostende tournament
Tarrasch 12½; Schlechter 12; Marshall, Janowski 11½; Burn 8; CHIGORIN 4½.

1907 Carlsbad tournament
Rubinstein 15; Maroczy 14½; Leonhardt 13½; Nimzowitsch, Schlechter 12½; Vidmar 12; Duras, Teichmann 11½; Salwe 11; Wolf 10½; Duz-Khotimirsky, Marshall 10; Spielmann 9½; Tartakower 9; Janowski 8½; CHIGORIN, Berger, Mieses 7½; Olland 6½; E.Cohn 5; Johner 4½.
Part One

Mikhail Chigorin
The Creative Chess Genius

by Alexander Narkevich, Alexander Nikitin
and Evgeny Vasyukov
Chapter 1

The Gunpowder Works

The new capital on the banks of the Neva was only twelve years old. It was still a small town, with approximately ten thousand inhabitants. Several important buildings – the Admiralty, the Peter and Paul fortress, the Summer Palace – were lost in the middle of an opening cut out of a thicket in the forest; through this was dug a canal, which, on the least overflow, flooded the lowland and marshes. The single-storey little dwelling houses were built at random to one another on narrow, often unpaved streets. A year before, a decree was issued prohibiting the building of stone houses throughout the whole country, with the exception of the new capital: ‘Stone building has been proceeding slowly here, due to the fact that it is difficult to get stonemasons and other artisans of this trade, and then for a pretty price; because of this, no stone building will be allowed in any state for a few years – for the time being, masons will have to content themselves with building here.’

But, for the present, St. Petersburg was still an almost completely wooden little town, in which working people were gathering from every part of the country, cutting openings, draining the marshland, driving in piles, building military fortifications, dwelling houses and factories.

There was a war going on with Sweden. Both the army and navy, and the new St. Petersburg fortifications, needed gunpowder, and therefore Peter I decreed that a gunpowder mill should be established and constructed on the rapids of the Great and Small Okhta, and that homes be built for the workmen at a safe distance from the works.

On the Okhta, there was to be no construction of monumental buildings, such as were erected in other parts of the town. Here were to be built only poor peasant homes, with land allotted to these workmen ‘for a kitchen garden and common pasture’. And it was here – as far away as possible from the location of the greatest concentration of people – that was founded the Okhtensk gunpowder works.

Originally, the works consisted of several ‘barns’ for crushing the raw materials with pestles, one ‘hut for refining’, another ‘hut for drying the powder’, four ‘barns’ for mixing the powder, saltpetre, sulphur and charcoal, two well-lit offices, and cottages for the residence of the gunpowder workers. These were plain-looking, squat houses, from where could be heard the creak of the machinery and the resounding noise of the runners, in the crushing mill.

Already in 1716, the Russian army received its first gunpowder of Okhtensk manufacture. On 24 July 1721, Peter visited the works and, later on, a trial was made in his presence to satisfy him that Russian powder was the best in the world. The battles commanded by Minikh, Rumiantsev, Suworov, Kutuzov, at Azov and Kunersdorf, Kagul and Ismail, Smolensk and Borodin, were armed with Okhtensk gunpowder. In 1809, a trial was carried out, which showed that of all types, except one, Russian gunpowder was significantly superior to the powder of foreign armies.
Making gunpowder was a dangerous business. Every now and then, grit got into the refining machine, sometimes there was spontaneous ignition, sometimes rock fell off the runner, sometimes a fire-ball developed and blew up the shop floor with the workers.

A folk song was written:

- If you are not tired of being alive
- Leave not the gunpowder life
- If you want to stay alive
- Leave the gunpowder life.

Order in the works was strict, as on each factory and mill lay the strength of the country. Discipline was maintained by harsh measures. In 1841, works under-manager, Tikhanov, was suspected of taking absence without leave in a neighbouring village, Murin, where there happened to be a public house. He had actually been sent to the village to repair a bridge. The commander of the works, Major-General Golovachev, ordered that Tikhanov be punished by flogging. This was carried out, but after Tikhanov got on his feet, he staggered and had to be taken to the sick-bay, where he was bathed with warm water. From the sick-bay, the unfortunate man went home, drank a quarter of a glass of vodka, half a cup of coffee, ate two boiled potatoes, and, after taking a stroll, laid on the floor and, after a quarter of an hour, died. This was his widow's own account of what happened.

Also on General Golovachev's order, the staff-doctor Bakhturov reported that Tikhanov's death was due to apoplexy, which the deceased brought upon himself by constant drinking. As proof of this, the sick-bay book was produced, in which there were many notes about the attendances of Tikhanov in an intoxicated state. The investigators paid attention to the fact that all these notes were made between the lines, while there was even a replacement page for one which had been torn out. Witnesses, who knew Tikhanov well, and the post mortem which was carried out on the body, did not confirm that he was a hard drinker. It became clear that there had occurred the murder of an innocent man and there was evidence of an attempt to cover up the traces.

So flagrant was this business, even for the period of Nicholas I, that the court martial sentenced General Golovachev to be stripped of his rank and orders, as punishment for the unlawful acts. But, on the very next day, 'in respect of his previous excellent service record, he was most graciously restored to the rank of Major-General, with discharge from service'.

The name of Chigorin first appeared in the Okhtensk gunpowder works at the time of Alexander I. The grandfather of the famous chess player – soldier Ivan Chigorin – was attached to service at the works. In 1817, a son was born to him – Ivan Ivanovich, who, in 1837, after graduating with distinction from the pyrotechnical school at the works, became a gunpowder master first class, and an instructor at the same school.
This soldier’s son must have possessed outstanding ability. In 1843, he became senior gunpowder master, and in 1853, he was entrusted with the management of the works’ school, while the following year he was appointed assistant bookkeeper. On 31 October 1850, a son was born to him, Mikhail – the future great chess player.

On 12 April 1856, the head of the works, Major-General Faleev, reported to the inspector of the gunpowder works: 'Now, taking into account the well-grounded knowledge of titular councillor Chigorin, gained by him in the school and in practice over a ten-year period, his promotion to clerical duties, involving both writing and accounts, and particularly, technical work, I am indeed convinced... that I should direct titular councillor Chigorin... to take over all the duties of the office and fully participate in the administration.'

This report was acted upon. Ivan Ivanovich was appointed as head of the office of the Okhtensk gunpowder works. His infant son was obviously also expecting firstly to go to the pyrotechnical school at the works and then to work there, where the fairly high position and irreproachable reputation of his father might provide him with support.

But over a three-year period, two tragedies occurred. In 1856, Chigorin’s 34-year-old mother, Natalia Egorovna, who came from peasant stock, died; while Ivan Ivanovich himself only outlived her by three years. The nine-year-old was left alone in the world.

An application was submitted for the enrolment of ‘a complete orphan, the son of a titular councillor, Mikhail Chigorin’, in the Gatchina Orphans Institute, and, after three months, when a free place came up in the Institute, a reply was received that Chigorin ‘has been nominated for acceptance in the Gatchina Orphans Institute, according to the register of 30 July 1859.’
Chapter 2

Gatchina Orphans Institute

Founded in 1806, in Gatchina, a small town in the province of St.Petersburg, the Orphans Institute, in its lifetime, underwent many reforms and changes and even attracted the attention of the highest powers. However, it cannot be said that the results of these continual reforms were very successful.

A commission was set up following an imperial resolution, to change the aims and tasks of this institution, but, as time passed, it became clear that things were not going well and again the whole basic structure had to be altered. A machine, which got under way by imperial decree, creaked, misfired, and at times was threatened by dangerous explosions.

In 1837, Nicholas I ordered the Institute to accept only 'orphans of army officers and civil service officials, up to the 9th grade, inclusive, preferably those bereaved of father and mother, i.e. a total orphan.' On finishing their education, these orphans were obliged to work for six years in a government department to which they would be assigned on discharge.

Ten years passed, during which, as a historian of the Institute mentioned with satisfaction, the percentage of deaths of pupils decreased to a quarter. But as far as the teaching and pupils were concerned – they had to admit it was the same story – that successes here were far from being so positive, while frequently there were none at all.'The reason for this could be seen in the fact that amidst the pupils were very few people who combined education with humaneness and love of their work.

'The brutal masters', wrote another historian of the Gatchina Institute, subjected the children only to fear and continuous punishment and in this way engendered in them, at a very early stage of their life, deep hatred towards their whole environment and forever separated them from society... out of the enormous number of children... only a tiny fraction subsequently had a happy future: a hundred, a thousand, disappeared, never to return, many of these, even on leaving the Institute and finding a permanent position, felt lonely.'

After finishing the Institute, only a few went to university, medical surgical academy or to some other educational establishment; the overwhelming majority became writers and craftsmen. This did not justify the great financial expenditure. As a result, in 1847, Nicholas I, with his own hand, wrote a note about the Gatchina Institute's maintenance expenses in relation to its little success. From now on, the Institute was ordered to occupy a middle place between a school for office assistants and a college for science of law – a privileged educational institution of that time – and served a special purpose: it prepared students for civil service in specially designated departments. It was decided to list the subjects which were to be taught and the amount of time to be allotted them; in particular the need to increase the lessons in penmanship was mentioned – 'in order to produce beautiful as well as cursive handwriting, which is necessary for civil servants.'
But the hope of obtaining from the Gatchina Institute 'experienced bureaucrats for different fields of civil service' was not justified. Out of there did not come either enlightened lawyers or experienced bureaucrats. By now, the place of Nicholas I had been taken by Alexander II, while in 1862 the Education committee once again ascertained that the reformist activities in the Institute had been a failure.

At this time, Chigorin was 12 years old and he had already lived for three years in the Gatchina Institute. Unfortunately, in the very year of his admission — in 1859 — the Institute abandoned the services of the great Russian pedagogue, K.D. Ushinsky, who for a few years previously had been an inspector there. 'Ushinsky', wrote his Soviet biographer, 'undertook a great reorganisation of the educational department, which gave rise to much discontent on various sides and led, after Ushinsky's transfer to Smolensk Institute, to a whole series of accusations against him. On the experiences of Ushinsky's work in the Institute were formed his basic pedagogical ideas, which he elaborated in his articles and text books.'

Director of the Institute was I.F. Doliivo-Dobrovolsky. 'Here was a strict, pedantic Head. When he arrived at the Institute, a trembling ran through the whole building, beginning with the caretaker and ending with the teachers. Everybody smartened themselves up, did up all their buttons, stood to attention. He was rather hard with regard to the pupils, his enormous connections in palaces throughout the world offered him the opportunity to see himself on an inaccessible height... Alexander II was the godfather of one of the children of Doliivo-Dobrovolsky.'

The order of the day in the Institute was as follows: the pupils got up at 6 o'clock and stood in groups for common prayer, after which they went to the dining room to drink shcher — the community used a cheap drink made with honey (on Sundays and holidays, they were given barley coffee with milk). Then, up to 8 o'clock, they took a walk and prepared for their lessons. From 8 to 11 — two lectures with a ten minute interval, at 11 — breakfast and a break until 12 o'clock. From 12 to 3 studies, from 3-3.30 again a break, at 3.30 dinner. Between 5 and 6.30 time was set aside for general preparation of lessons, the period between 6.30-8.00 was allocated 'for various physical activities: marching drill, gymnastics, dancing and also music and singing.'

On paper, all this possibly looks quite smooth, but in reality the picture was not so happy, particularly in the department which handled the money allocated for feeding the pupils. Leskov wrote in Cadet's Cloister about the model housekeeper, Bobrov, of the First St.Petersburg Military School. During 40 years work in the military school he handled up to 24 million roubles of public money, out of which he did not pocket one kopek, which would have had to be covered up in the accounts. But such an ideal, virtuous housekeeper was a rare exception, whereas many would grab what they could get. For their daily allowance, the pupils of the Gatchina Institute relied on 14 kopeks — not too princely a sum, when it is compared with that which, there and then, in Gatchina, not far away, in a special 'holiday hotel', maintained five little dogs belonging to the Empress of Japan, which were under the supervision of a special 'handler'; for each of these dogs was allotted 20 kopeks every 24 hours.
But in this meagre allocation for the nourishment of the pupils, dipped the hands of plunderers. It is not difficult to guess to what this led. Rancid butter, mouldy bread, watery soup, made up the daily menu of the pupils.

One day, Alexander II, who often visited the Gatchina Institute, arrived there with the Empress and, after the traditional inspection, wanted to taste the food. The Emperor tasted, praised, and swallowed two spoonfuls of soup and passed the spoon to the Empress. She then drew a spoonful to her mouth, but immediately spat it out, proclaiming – 'Very tasty indeed.'

The patience of the long-suffering pupils was exhausted. One day – this was in 1868 –, Ignatius, a rough and brutal master who was particularly appreciated by Dolivo-Dobrovolsky, went over the limit in his outrageous oppression of the students and his demands. On the following day one of the pupils refused to kiss the hand of a priest, when going up to the cross. At the time this was a terrible blasphemy, which entailed arrest for 'profanity'. The exasperated pupils asked the director to free the prisoner and made a complaint to him about Ignatius. Dolivo-Dobrovolsky at first promised to meet them half-way, but on the next day began to threaten to give up the disobedient 'rebel' to the soldiers. During a heated argument between the director and the pupils, in front of the director's office, somebody put out the lamp and the director was beaten unmercifully until he lost consciousness.

This extraordinary incident in the Gatchina Institute aroused the attention of the authorities. A committee of enquiry was set up. Apparently endeavouring to hush up the incident and not attract public attention to it, the commission suggested the injured director should hand in his resignation 'due to ill health', while the nine pupils (amongst whom numbered Chigorin) be expelled.

Thus ended Chigorin's formal education. He was free to go wherever he chose. He was given 60 roubles to equip himself and left to his own resources to make a living. A whole three years passed before Chigorin succeeded in finding a very modest job, carrying out duties for a head of a government department, while, up to this time, he had lived with his aunt Fekla Ivanov in her small house.

However, despite all the depression and oppression which reigned in the Gatchina Institute, it was not without some good people. One of these was a German language teacher, Augustus Augustovich Schuman, a cultured, mild man. He liked chess and taught many pupils to play, which brightened up their miserable lives.

Chigorin was sixteen years old when Schuman acquainted him with the rules of the game. At this age, Botvinnik and Spassky were already masters... Little is known about the chess life in the Gatchina Institute. But not so long ago, in the press, flashed the name of Peter Dimitrievich Ilin – possibly a chess partner of Ulianov in Simbirsk and publisher of a book which came out there in 1975: *Some Analysis on the Game of Chess by a Russian Amateur*.

This Ilin, born in 1845, graduated from the Gatchina Institute. After this he worked as a clerk in gunpowder works in Mogilev, Bikhov, Simbirsk, and Sizran. Probably Schuman also taught him to play chess. The chess activities of Ilin
attracted the attention of the researchers – yet another thread extending the history of Russian chess out of the Gatchina Institute.

Since very little is known about the life of Chigorin outside chess, then it is significant to mention one of his friends from the Institute times – Nikolai Alexandrovich Olferiev. Thirty years later, Chigorin reported that he visited him on a trip to Warsaw, where the former pupil of the Orphans Institute worked as an assistant manager in the Warsaw Treasury. This is one of the few indications Chigorin gave regarding his friendships, about which he was discreet and laconic, and it is significant that this friendship was engendered in the forms of the Institute.

Though we have remembered Chigorin’s years of misery in the Gatchina Institute, amidst the cruelty, despotism, formalism and oppression, some contrast to this gloomy and uninviting picture will be the image of the good-natured German language master, teaching the rules of the ancient game to the young Chigorin in one of the breaks between lessons, and the image of Olferiev – Chigorin’s friend, just like him, an orphan, who cheered him up with his friendship in those grim years.

The young Mikhail Chigorin
Chapter 3

Café Dominic

From the small quiet town where, in the most lifeless three storey building, he had spent nine years of miserable existence as a pupil at the Orphans Institute, Chigorin moved to St. Petersburg.

In the capital of the Russian empire, there then lived about 700,000 inhabitants. This was a city of glaring social and architectural contrasts, rich and poor. A city of palaces, restaurants, private residences, enormously wealthy houses on wide and straight gas-lit roads, and a city of poor shacks. A city of merchants and financiers, ministers, gendarmes, public procurators and lawyers, reactionary and liberal newspapers, a city of intellectuals and the first student agitation and workers' strikes. A city of great Russian people – Nekrasov, Saltykov, Shchedrin, Dostoevsky, Moussorgsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Mendeleev and the young Pavlov.

What does a poor youth do in this hurly-burly capital? A poor youth with a courageous appearance and a thoughtful intelligent face – this is the image projected in the first portrait of Chigorin which is known to us. There is absolutely no information at all on the first three years which he spent in the little house of his aunt Fekla Ivanov. On 29 August 1871, Chigorin started work, and we can only assume that he was not filled with enthusiasm and interest, but nevertheless conscientiously carried out his duties in one of the lower office posts. Over a five-year period, he hardly touched chess.

From 1873, Chigorin became a regular participant in chess competitions. At this time chess players met in the 'Dominic'. Founded in 1841, this restaurant was the focus of chess life in the 1870s. For twenty kopeks an hour, visitors could obtain a board and pieces there.

They played exclusively for money. Amongst the St. Petersburg chess players were amateur category hustlers – 'Dominicans', habitués of the Dominic who came there in search of regular partners who could be taken for a few 'francs' (a franc, in the argon of the Dominicans, was the term for the standard stake – 25 kopeks). Also tournaments with an obligatory handicap were arranged. Employing a complicated system – the very strong would give odds to the second category of pawn and move, the third category – pawn and two moves, the fourth category – knight on h1, the fifth category – rook; second category would give third, pawn and move, fourth – pawn and two moves etc. Later on, this long since forgotten form of competition found a certain place for itself in the chess biography of Chigorin. He did not receive odds for very long, and subsequently went over initially to first category and, after that, was already considered a chess player 'beyond categories'.

The conditions at the Dominic were not attractive for chess players. 'The club played in a highly comfortable and very spacious room, but what strong nerves, what a hard head a chess player had to have to play at the Dominic! If a famous player at times attributed the reason for his defeat on his mood or that he felt unwell, he would say so, or better still, that it was because they were playing in a
stuffy, smoky atmosphere, amidst the noise of players of other games (dominoes, billiards). It is hard to imagine that playing in such unfavourable conditions would be a combination of correctness and grace.' (Chess Sheet 1876, No.1, page 14).

We might add that the inevitable companion of players in the restaurant – alcohol, to which the players treated themselves, also does not adorn the picture painted by Chigorin. The harmful influence of the Dominican conditions could not but have an adverse effect on the nervous system and sporting endurance of Chigorin.

But who was the strongest representative of St.Petersburg chess in the 1870s, a chess player, with whom in the not too distant future, Chigorin would cross swords?

By this time, Ilya Stepanovich Shumov, born in 1819, was already growing old; he was a talented combinational player who was convinced that his tactical talent made a study of theory superfluous for him. Shumov was the author of 'Scaccography', problems in which the arrangement of the pieces portrayed some kind of topic or symbol ('Death in the dungeon', or 'Key without a key-bit' or 'In memory of Vladimir Lensky' or 'Capture of Kars' or 'Marching through the Balkans'). In 1867, Shumov turned out a whole volume of these Scaccographic problems. From 1869 to 1881, Shumov edited the chess column in the weekly magazine Universal Illustrated. For the first seven years, until the beginning of Chigorin's Chess Sheet, this was the only chess organ published in the country.

As far back as 1851, Shumov's reputation in the chess world was so great that he was invited to participate in the London tournament – the first international chess tournament in history. But Shumov did not go there, since he could not get leave from his work (in the Department of the Admiralty).

Though disregard of book theory had a disadvantageous effect on the results of Shumov, often the strongest players of the day fell victim to his ingenious combinations: Kolisch, S.Urusov, Winawer. Also the young Chigorin at times felt the strength of play of the old, but all the same dangerous opponent. The first time a game of Chigorin's appeared in print was his loss, in St.Petersburg 1874, to Shumov, who gave his inexperienced opponent pawn and move. Then, in April 1876, by now on equal terms, Chigorin lost as Black to Shumov's excellent play in an unsuccessfully played Sicilian Defence. With the black pieces, Chigorin seldom played the Sicilian, and, in general, he rarely met 1.e4 with anything else than 1...e5. Subsequently, he stopped employing the Sicilian, though he had a favourable opinion on this defence: 'This opening', he wrote, 'is one of the favourite of all the “close” openings (the half-open and closed openings were called 'close' at that time). The move 1...c5 gives an absolutely equal game.' (Chess Sheet 1879, No 4, page 120).
The encounters between Chigorin and Shumov were also interesting in that, against Shumov, Chigorin for the only time in his practice played the Danish Gambit and won the game in 26 moves – February 1876). In general, however, he regarded the Danish Gambit unsympathetically and wrote in 1891: 'Strong players act with good reason when they do not risk offering the Danish Gambit in serious competition against the strongest players. The beautiful games we come across in the press show us only weak defence by Black, as a result of which White's attacks are concluded brilliantly.' (New Times, 22 September 1891)

In two games against Mieses – a principal supporter of the Danish Gambit in the 20th century – in Hannover 1902 and Cambridge Springs 1904, he won by demonstrating an excellent form of defence for Black: he also won with Black in this opening against A.Rabinovich in the 3rd All-Russian tournament at Kiev 1903.

In the 1870s, one of the strongest chess players in St.Petersburg was Emanuel Stepanovich Schiffer, who was the same age as Chigorin (1850-1904).

This man was a talented chess player and a great connoisseur of theory. Later on, with his tournament successes, he became widely known in Russia and abroad. His excellent chess column in the supplement to Field, and also his columns in the newspapers, News and St.Petersburg Gazette, gained great popularity, as did his Teach Yourself Chess, which was reprinted time and again. In the prime of life Schiffer was a danger to the strongest players in the world. His sixth prize in the famous Hastings tournament of 1895 was his most important success, while he put up the most stubborn resistance against Steinitz in their 1896 match: +4 -6 =1.

Schiffer was the first person in Russia to get around to giving lectures on chess. These lectures began in 1889 and enjoyed great success. A reviewer of St.Petersburg chess life wrote: 'These lectures were attended by up to a hundred people, who would listen with pleasure to the lecturer, unearthing in some occasionally dry theoretical opening a lively, entertaining game, and brightening up his speech with a chance, witty remark. For the convenience of the public, in the hall of the Society (at Moika 40), serving as an auditorium, were placed two vertical boards with movable pieces, on which the lecturer also illustrated the talk. Generally speaking, these lectures, tried for the first time in Russia, had great and well-deserved success.' (Chess 1890, No.1, page 21). The lectures were often repeated by Schiffer and were an effective and original form of popularising chess.

Schiffer was a man of various cultural interests; he occupied himself with mathematics, natural science, and drew skillfully. His noble, benevolent character gained for him universal sympathy.
In all of the thirty years Schiffer and Chigorin were acquainted, nothing could ever cloud their relationship. At first, Schiffer gave Chigorin odds of a rook, then a knight, then pawn and move, finally he had to go over to equal terms. In 1878, the first match between Chigorin and Schiffer took place. Chigorin won: +7 -3 =0.

In 1874, in St.Petersburg, a handicap tournament of 15 players was held. This was the first tournament in which Chigorin participated. He played in the second category, receiving from the first, pawn and move. There were four first category players. Winner of the tournament was Schiffer, second was Shumov, third Chigorin, an honourable result for him as was reported in Universal Illustrated.

‘… Third prize was gained by the young second-category chess player, who in a very short time has made brilliant progress, and, to the astonishment of the amateurs competing in the fifth category, who not long ago were still beating him on equal terms, he now joins battle with them without a knight, while with players of the first category – on equal terms.’

In 1875, Chigorin first encountered a player of grandmaster strength (the term ‘grandmaster’ itself came into use considerably later than the depicted times). This was one of the strongest chess players of the time, Simon Winawer (1838-1919), an extraordinary man and very distinctive both on the board and in life itself. Already his own tournament debut had occurred under unusual circumstances. In 1867, in Paris, in connection with the World Fair, was organised a tournament with the participation of practically all of the strongest chess players. By chance, Winawer was in Paris at this time on commercial business (he was a merchant). In his spare time, he played chess in a café. The organisers of the tournament happened to notice the play of the visiting merchant and, deciding that perhaps the mysterious ‘commercial traveller’ might prove a worthy partner to the participants of the tournament, Winawer was invited to compete in it. He agreed.

At this time, in Paris, lived S.Rosenthal – a strong chess player, who had emigrated to France after the Polish uprising of 1863, in which he took part. Rosenthal was a distant relative of Winawer and went to school with him.

Rosenthal met Winawer in the café and, when he learned that he had agreed to participate in the tournament, the following conversation took place:

Rosenthal: Well then, you are also a chess player?
Winawer: And why not indeed?
Rosenthal: Do you mean to say that you really know how to play chess properly?
Winawer: I am able to play chess. That is all I know.
Rosenthal: Have you ever heard of the name Morphy?
Winawer: Morphy? Yes! I believe he is also a chess player.
Rosenthal (smiling): Is it really possible that you do not know that Morphy is the very strongest chess player around today? He beats everybody.
Winawer (calmly): Is that so? Then he would also win against me, and I will be no worse than the other competitors.
Rosenthal: If you like, let us play, and I will give you to understand how to play chess in Paris.
Rosenthal and Winawer left the café and made their way to Rosenthal’s home. There they sat down at a board, set up the pieces and, without saying a word, Rosenthal removed his queen’s knight. Winawer did not show any sign of surprise at all. ‘You want to give me a knight start? Very well. I have no objection.’

Rosenthal quickly lost two games, after which he had to admit: ‘I cannot give you a knight start. Now I am tired, and it is too late to play on equal terms. Never mind, we will meet in the tournament.’ And they did meet. Winawer scored 1½ out of 2 against Rosenthal (this is on a modern calculation; in the Paris tournament a draw was counted as a loss for both opponents) and took second prize, exceeding the wildest expectations of the organisers. Rosenthal had to content himself with tied 9th-11th place. (Winawer only allowed one player to pass him, the Hungarian Ignatz Kolisch (1837-1889), who, after gaining this victory – the most important in his chess career – then surprisingly gave up tournament competition forever. From time to time, banker Kolisch, at his own expense, allocated prizes to tournaments, as a donation to his former love.)

The biography of Winawer, generally speaking, contained rather a lot of unusual incidents. His quaint behaviour reflected both his character in life as well as his, at times, quaint moves in chess. In 1883 Winawer was making his way to Vienna. After getting as far as Nuremberg, he began to suffer from an acute toothache and was forced to interrupt his journey. Leaving the train, he walked down the street to find a dentist and came across the famous chess player, Mason, who had arrived in Nuremberg to play in the international tournament. Mason took him to a dentist and informed the organisers of the tournament that Winawer was in town. When Winawer, after visiting the dentist, set off for the station to continue his interrupted journey, the members of the tournament committee came up and begged him to take part in the tournament. It had not crossed his mind to play, but Winawer gave way to persuasion, stayed in Nuremberg and won first prize!

Though he became a famous chess player overnight with his brilliant debut in Paris, Winawer nevertheless continued to regard chess as a side-line. At times he gave it up for long periods. There were ‘intervals’ such as after his remarkable victory in Nuremberg – from 1883 to 1892. It is interesting that when a certain young chess player, wanting instruction from a famous master, went to his home one time, he found out that the famous master did not have a chess set! We are reminded of the sadly ironic words of Winawer telling another young chess player: ‘At your age I was still not a master, but I had a bank. Now I am a master but for a long time now I have not had a bank!’
Mikhail Chigorin, the Creative Chess Genius

At the board, Winawer was a cunning tactician, a past master at the endgame, a lover of unusual positions. He not infrequently chose to employ opening variations with bad reputations, and often came out unscathed. Winawer also developed some interesting openings. For example, the famous move 3...h4 in the French Defence was his idea and the strength of this system was tested on Chigorin himself in particular. The exchange variation of the Spanish Game, which was later employed with much success by Emanuel Lasker, was also worked out earlier by Winawer. Contemporaries of Winawer were delighted with his artistry in the endgame. 'We can boldly state that in endgame play he has no rival' - wrote the magazine Chess (1890, No.4, page 108). Winawer may be called the forerunner of A.Rubinstein.

Winawer was twelve years older than Chigorin. In 1875, he already had a series of strong international tournaments behind him. In the 1870s Winawer was in the prime of life and his visit to St.Petersburg (this was, by the way, virtually the only trip he made to St.Petersburg; generally speaking, Winawer's chess activity occurred mainly in Warsaw and abroad) was a great event in the chess life of the capital. Winawer won a match against Shumov with the score +5 -2 and took first place in a small tournament in which Schiffers, Shumov, Chigorin and Asharin participated. Schiffers took second place.

Winawer estimated Chigorin's talent at true worth. He tried to interest foreign chess players in Chigorin's play. Getting ahead of our story, it was thanks to Winawer's recommendation in 1878 that Chigorin was invited to compete in the Paris international tournament (but he was unable to take up this invitation due to his work).
Chapter 4

Chess Sheet

The year 1876 arrived. The time spent since the moment of Chigorin's first appearance at the Dominic was not in vain. He felt both an increase in his chess strength and a heightening of his theoretical knowledge and understanding of the game. The chess player, who not so long before was receiving odds from the strongest players of the capital, had, like a fairy-tale hero, grown before everyone's eyes.

But how dissatisfied he was with the chess life in St. Petersburg! The unattractive, stuffy conditions in the Dominic, the disorder and disconnection of the chess players, who did not write down their games and avoided participation in real contests, and the lack of camaraderie. What was the reason for all this? — Chigorin put the question to himself and replied: in the sluggishness, in the dissociation. From now on, one of the main vital tasks of Chigorin, and one of his principal services to Russian chess culture, would be his energetic, selfless struggle for the solidarity of Russian chess players, for their unity. On top of this, he came across not only the sluggishness and inactivity on the side of the chess players themselves, but also the opposition of the authorities, who regarded with suspicion the slightest display of initiative.

On 23 April 1876, Chigorin made an application to the head of the government department for the press, for permission to publish the magazine Chess Sheet. On 18 June Chigorin was issued with a permit. In September 1876 the first number of the new magazine came out. Already at the very beginning, it became clear that the modest 26-year-old St. Petersburg bureaucrat, in boldly undertaking this publication despite all his inexperience, was possessed with undoubted literary talent and correctly understood the objectives of a magazine.

By giving his magazine the name Chess Sheet, Chigorin wanted to perpetuate the memory of the first Russian chess magazine, published between 1859-1863, and bearing the same name. There was, however, also an important difference. The first Chess Sheet was financed by one of the richest men in Russia — the great lover of chess G.A. Kushelev-Bezbordko, while Chigorin's magazine came out of the scanty means of its publisher. This did not auger well for the new publication.

The magazine opened in lively style.

'Acquire, acquire, acquire! This is the cry which rings out on all sides in our practical, very practical age, amidst a whirlpool of speculation, stock-broking, amidst the roar, the noise of machines... amidst the rattling of dice and the rustling cards of countless numbers of games of chance, on which the practical contemporary man spends all his free time, his leisure.'

In describing a particular position, which distinguished chess from games of chance, the introductory article showed the great significance of theory for success in chess: 'People who want to really know how to play chess, must be acquainted at least with the most commonly used openings... Often one theoretically incorrect
move, made at the beginning of a game, involves the loss of the game against a player with a knowledge of theory and capable of profiting by it.' These words were intended for those who were not strong, who, in their spare time, 'pushed' the pieces, but never looked at magazines or text books. Then followed a promise: 'In the magazine will be featured a guide to chess, which gives subscribers of Chess Sheet the chance to have quite a full course on the game. Chigorin began to carry out this promise in the very first number, by commencing publication of his 'Course on the Openings'. The author presented his own likes and dislikes and also a contemporary classification of the openings, with these words:

'With this line of play is obtained the so-called “open game”, in contrast to the second group, which bears the name “closed” or “close” game, in accordance with the character of play which it very often will assume. In open games, on both sides play develops quickly and lively interest ensues. For purposes of study, we consider it more useful to at first familiarise oneself with the analysis of open games, since they are the most interesting and frequently met in practice.'

In a series of articles ('Chess in Russia', Chess Sheet 1876, No.3, 1877, Nos.2-3, while also the same theme appeared in the article 'Russian and foreign chess players' published eight years later, Chess Herald 1885, Nos.3-6), Chigorin consistently and purposefully 'to a T' unfurled, one after the other, pictures of the disorganisation, the dissociation of Russian chess players, and pointed out ways to overcome this. These articles had enormous historical significance, even if they did not bring immediate success in Chigorin's struggle for the solidarity of Russian chess players.

Chigorin could not help but see that the sluggishness and narrow-mindedness of chess players, their indifference to public chess life, was determined by the general political climate of Russia. Of course he did not make deep political inferences from this, but his own life, activity, and the development of events, compelled him to think about this connection. It became obvious that even chess, this 'innocent' game, formed part of the spiritual property of the people and therefore from it would be echoed (even if only partially) that ordeal of spiritual life which fell to their lot.

Soon after, Chigorin made a bold attempt to express his doubts out loud, having recourse to the 'people living in the provinces' (actually existing or just imagined by Chigorin?). Somebody asked him about the reason for the paucity of information on their chess life: 'Not lack of interest in chess should explain the deadly silence which, to our dissatisfaction, has been maintained by the provinces. No, there are other reasons, quite a number of reasons here. If the various social and economic needs, which clearly affect the vital sphere of the provinces, do not arouse in them the desire to share their knowledge with society, to report their needs and wants, or to take up a pen in defence of their interests, then you are greatly mistaken if you suppose that the provinces will change their habits and customs for our magazine and entrust you with their chess knowledge. Believe me, they are refraining from imparting information to you not because they want to, but simply on account of their unsociability... With all my heart, I have a personal interest in better performances by the political and administrative establishments.
introduced into our country. We want these, we want them for the good of everyone, but at the same time do you think we can stand up for violation of rights or breach of interests by political or administrative factions? Not at all. Are we just being critical with these facts we are reporting about them for general information, a warning so that such events will not happen again? But again, no. It is true that we read, with satisfaction, some correspondence expressing a similar violation of our interests, but even then we were far from refusing to suspect the motivations of the correspondent in question, while still pursuing our endeavours to serve the right cause...

But excuse me, what has all this got to do with chess! -- Oh, good gracious! You will understand that this lack of desire to examine the fact publicly shows a narrow political development, or, as I said above, political unsociability... It would appear that the matter is very relevant to them, but, instead of hearing a ready answer to the question -- why don't you report on what is happening with you? --, from the majority you hear the reply: it is not my business. This lack of community interest, which is expressed in such political, chess and country reticence, is unfortunately the sole reason why the spirit of general responsibility and mutual benefit has not, up to now, been developed.'

Clearly, it was more difficult to speak in the censored press. The authorities, more than anything, were afraid of allowing 'community interests' -- anything at all resembling collective activity, whatever sphere of public life it touched upon. Not only to forbid by administrative measures, but also to eradicate, annihilate the very striving for activity -- this is what Prishibeev wanted to enforce in the country.

In giving this explanation of the cause of provincial sluggishness, Chigorin asked the question: 'Can it be that our magazine is destined to be limited to the life of the capital? This is a question which torments us and the answer to which must be left to the future.' At times he was on the point of giving way to despair, and, quoting the inscription on the gates of Hell, according to Dante: 'Hope springs eternal', added: 'It seems that we will also make the same inscription as a heading to a column devoted to provincial chess life.' But this was only a passing mood. Chigorin got over it and once again strived for his goal.

He endeavoured to publish in his magazine anything which might serve, even if only partially, fragmentary, to light up Russian chess life. Anything that was important, anything that ought to be emphasised, in order to arouse, to excite the interest of the chess amateurs, scattered throughout a huge country.

Chigorin's magazine featured news, at times, willy-nilly, conjectural ('We have been informed that in the town of Novogeogiev in Kherson province will be founded a chess club.' Chess Sheet 1877, Nos.2-3, page 58) from Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa, Tbilisi, Elizabethgrad, Krasnoyarsk, Lomza, Zhitomir, Veliki Ustyug, Elista, Osh. There was even included a curious game which had been sent from Uroslov

1 'Under Prishibeev' was a story by the Russian writer Chekhov. Corporal Prishibeev represented the ultimate in oppression and suppression -- a veritable killjoy, he even made laws that wouldn't allow people 'under him' to sing and dance!
province, with an earnest request to publish it. The game was played terribly badly, but who knows, perhaps it encouraged and had a beneficial effect on the Uroslav players? In order to give a representative example of the play of Samarkand chess players, applying his national principle, he featured two games of the best local players.

At this time, in several countries, for example in Italy, the rules of play were not yet finally established: there they played without taking en passant, with restricted right to promote a pawn (only to one of the captured pieces), castling was 'free'. But it turned out – as was reported in Chigorin's magazine – that in Russia, in Kazan province, there were amateurs playing to highly original rules: the king, in moving up to the eighth rank, obtained the right, besides its usual move, to jump over one square in any direction. For example, a white king placed on f8, thereafter could move to d6, then to d4, d2 etc. Try catching such a leaping king!

This is what Chigorin, the journalist, came up against at the beginning of his career.

On the whole, the content of Chigorin's magazine was rich and varied. Very valuable for the readers was Chigorin's 'Course on the Openings' and 'Course on the Endings'. In the magazine were published the best games from international matches and tournaments, with annotations by Chigorin, and also interesting articles on chess history.

But who carried out the difficult work of compiling, editing, correcting and turning out the magazine? All this heavy burden fell upon the shoulders of Chigorin, who gave to it not only his energy and unselfish enthusiasm, but also his own slender means. These of course were not sufficient. The publication of the magazine ran into insurmountable difficulties. Already in 1877, Chigorin wrote: 'The conditions under which we have to publish Chess Sheet are quite different from those under which foreign chess magazines find themselves, to say nothing of all the other periodical publications; virtually the whole job of publishing lies exclusively with me.' The entire five-year history of Chess Sheet was accompanied by material difficulties, losses, a vain search for resources, and attempts to think of some ways to increase the number of subscribers. In 1878 Chigorin had to interrupt publication for half a year.

'The reason', explained Chigorin, 'lies in insufficient capital and also in such a small number of subscribers, whose subscription fee does not even pay for the typographical expenses and the cost of paper... To keep Chess Sheet going, we need at least 250 subscribers, whereas last year there were around 120.'

In 1879, the subscriptions increased somewhat, but only to 191 subscribers (a list of those was published in the magazine – this was also the policy of other pre-revolutionary Russian chess magazines).

In 1881, after five years of difficult struggle, Chigorin was forced to cease publication.

So the reality of the character of public chess life in Russia was confirmed by the fate of Chess Sheet.
Amongst the very few collaborators with Chigorin on Chess Sheet could be named the outstanding Russian chess writer, Mikhail Konstantinovich Gonyaev (1849-1891), who lived in distant Elizabethgrad (now Kirovograd). Gonyaev was a lawyer by profession, the author of an extensive work on civil proceedings of the Justice of the Peace, but his true interest lay in chess and draughts. He wrote both historical articles and theoretical works, and talked on chess topics. To him belongs the first work on the history of chess in Russia, and also a valuable chess bibliography.

At the end of 1877, Chigorin wrote to Gonyaev: 'I ought to tell you the truth, that the main workers on Chess Sheet are you and I, I and you – nobody else.'

A complete set of Chigorin's Chess Sheet, from 1876-1877, was the first chess literature finding itself in the hands of the young Botvinnik. 'Studying this magazine', recalled Botvinnik, 'was very beneficial to me. There were very good analyses of the open games by Chigorin; as I mastered the notation, I played over every one of the great number of games and in about two months I had got through the whole book.'

Botvinnik emphasised that 'Chigorin was already a highly skillful analyst at this time and when reprinting games from foreign magazines he nearly always found mistakes by the annotators, including even Steinitz. Already in the first year of his literary career in Chess Sheet, Chigorin showed that quality which was formulated in full measure in his future journalistic works.'
Chapter 5

Match victories against fellow Russians

The years 1878-1880 were filled with intensive match struggles against the top Russian chess players. This was a natural consequence of Chigorin’s chess development: after joining the ranks of the strongest, he had to be measured against their strength. In these years, Chigorin played nine matches – four with E. Schiffer, four with E. A. von Schmidt, and one with S. Z. Alapin.

After winning, in 1878, his first match with Schiffer by a big score (+7 -3 =0), Chigorin, the same year, began to play another match with him, which was organised under the same conditions – to seven wins. It seems the result of the first match made Chigorin too complacent and he underestimated his opponent. Besides this, one of the most serious shortcomings of Chigorin’s character – uneven sporting form – began to tell. He started the match with two wins. After ten games the score stood at +5 -3 =1. The 10th game was won by Schiffer, while in the 11th, Chigorin achieved a winning position, but lost through a blunder. After this, Chigorin again went ahead by winning the 12th game, but then lost the 13th and 14th games; the last, Schiffer won the match with the score +7 -6 =1.

By losing the match, Chigorin once and for all rid himself of underestimating Schiffer’s strength and henceforth played against him ‘with full efficiency’. As a result, he beat him in the following year with the score +7 -4 =2, and in 1881 with the score +7 -1 =3. Not until the very last year of his life were any doubts raised as to Chigorin’s superiority over all his Russian rivals.

In 1879, Chigorin played three matches against E. A. von Schmidt (1821-1905), who was a well-known opening theoretician, the author of many articles and analyses. However, he was also a strong practical player and one of the best chess players in Moscow. Against Von Schmidt, Chigorin won three matches (+6 -0 =2; +4 -2 =0; +3 -0 =1). Another contest finished in a draw (+2 -2 =2). These took the form of casual games, played in one evening.

In 1880 took place the last of the matches played in these three years by Chigorin against Russian masters. This time his opponent was S. Z. Alapin (1856-1923).

From time to time, Alapin achieved quite good results in international competitions. But Chigorin’s relationship with Alapin was not free of complications and friction, the cause of which was creative antagonism and rivalry. If there are not sufficient grounds for considering Alapin the ‘evil genius’ of Chigorin, pursuing him all his life, then one must admit that a series of acts by Alapin are indicative of evident ill-will towards him.

Chigorin won the match against Alapin with the score +7 -3 =0. Particularly outstanding was the tenth game, in which Chigorin, as Black, played very well against the Queen’s Gambit (in the 1880s this was a rare occurrence for him) and quickly obtained the initiative.

Chigorin’s matches against the strongest Russian chess players demonstrated his considerable strength in all stages of the game, particularly in a combinative
middlegame, and his superiority over all his main rivals throughout the country.

One can draw the same conclusion on the basis of the result of a tournament held in St. Petersburg at the end of 1878 and the beginning of 1879.

The organisers had large-scale plans: they intended to take advantage of the Christmas holiday to arrange an All-Russia tournament and to attract the participation of all the strongest players in Russia. Invitations were circulated to players of other towns, but Winawer was not able to come, nor also the strong Samarkand player, Andrey Nikolaevich Khardin, whose name crops up not only in the history of Russian chess, but also in the biography of V. Lenin. The young Lenin was assistant barrister to the attorney A.N.Khardin and also his chess partner. Lenin played against Khardin, both by correspondence and over the board. Khardin – one of the most attractive and noble figures in Russia’s chess past – possessed outstanding chess strength and was able to successfully join battle with the strongest chess players of his time. There are preserved and published games won by him against Chigorin, Schiffer and Alapin. ‘Ah, this player has devilish strength’, said the young Lenin about Khardin. Only his professional full-time work prevented him from finding more time for chess. Because of this, Khardin did not come to the St. Petersburg tournament. But, all the same, the line-up of the tournament proved to be strong; besides Chigorin, Schiffer, Alapin and Von Schmidt, also competing were Asharin and Solovtsov; two very strong chess players of that time.

Andrey Alexandrovich Asharin (1843-1896) was a strong Baltic chess player, who had lived in St. Petersburg for a long time. He was a versatile, gifted man. He wrote humorous stories with a chess theme and translated into German the works of Russian poets and prose writers. The Muscovite, Alexander Vladimirovich Solovtsov (1847-1923), was an even stronger player. An outstanding pianist and teacher, Solovtsov seldom appeared outside Moscow and gave up chess comparatively early. In 1884, he scored an excellent win against Chigorin in the first game of their match (which remained unfinished with the score at +1 –1).

The tournament began on 25 December 1878. There was an unusual point about the rules; games won through an opponent overstepping the time limit were considered drawn, whilst games ending in a draw – a loss. The tournament demonstrated the superiority of Chigorin, who, indeed, had to prove himself in a stubborn fight by winning the decisive game for first prize against Alapin.

1 Evans Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
N. Yakubovich

Correspondence game 1879
1.e4 e5 2.Obsolete f3 Oc6 3.Oc4 Oc5 4.b4
Oxb4 5.c3 Oc5 6.0-0 d6 7.d4 exd4

A continuation which was very popular at the time. Black tries to drive away the white pieces from the a2-g8 diagonal, even at the cost of a delay in development.

10.Og5!
White does his utmost to increase his advantage.

10...f6 11.Oh4

Only the retreat to f4 gives White the possibility of fighting for the initiative. Later on, Chigorin himself recognised 11.Of4 as being the best move. It is
difficult for Black to play ...c7-c6 since the d6-pawn becomes weak and its advance would lead to an exposed position.

11...\texttt{Qxc4} 12.\texttt{Qa4+} \texttt{Wd7} 13.\texttt{Qxc4} \texttt{Wf7} 14.\texttt{Qd5}

For the sacrificed pawn, White has obtained a strong centre, the better development and the initiative. Black must not only prevent the breakthrough e4-e5, but also repulse the positional pressure on his queen's flank. To do this is not altogether simple. Thus, on 14...\texttt{Qe6}, strong is 15.\texttt{Qa4+} \texttt{Qd7} 16.\texttt{Qa3!} \texttt{Qc8} 17.\texttt{Qxb6} axb6 18.e5!, and on 14...c6 could follow 15.\texttt{Qxb6} (15.\texttt{Qa4} \texttt{Qd8}) 15...axb6 16.\texttt{Qb4} \texttt{Qe7} 17.\texttt{Wxd6} 0-0 18.\texttt{Qg3}, and again White has the advantage.\footnote{In fact after 18...\texttt{Qg4} the position is about level and if anyone has an advantage it is Black.}

14...\texttt{Qh6} 15.\texttt{Qa4!}

Also 15.a4 deserves attention.

15...\texttt{Qg4} 16.\texttt{Qc1!} \texttt{Qxf3} 17.\texttt{Qxf3} 0-0!

Black succeeds in completing his development. Now Chigorin could win a pawn by 18.\texttt{Qxf6+} \texttt{Qxf6} 19.\texttt{Qh6}, but after 19...\texttt{We6+} 20.\texttt{Qxg6+} hgx6, the game is completely equal.

18.\texttt{Qh1} \texttt{Wh5}

White threatened 19.\texttt{Qxf6+}.\footnote{Black can also decline the knight and play \texttt{Qh8!}, when after 19...\texttt{Qd5} \texttt{Qf5!} or 19...\texttt{Qg4} \texttt{Qxg4} 20.fxg4 \texttt{Wf3} he is on top.}

19.\texttt{Wf4!}

White makes a heroic effort to sharpen the game and hold on to the initiative, which is slipping away. For this, he provokes the move 19...\texttt{g5}, intending the attack 20.\texttt{Qxf6+} \texttt{Qxf6} 21.\texttt{Wxf6} \texttt{Qxh4} 22.\texttt{Qg1} \texttt{Qf7} 23.\texttt{Qg4} \texttt{Qh6} (23...\texttt{Wh5} 24.\texttt{Qdg1} h6 25.f4 and White wins) 24.\texttt{Qxg5+} \texttt{Qxg5} 25.\texttt{Qg1}. Also quite acceptable for White are the complications following 19...c6 20.\texttt{Qxf6+} \texttt{Qxf6} 21.\texttt{Exf6} \texttt{Qxf6} 22.\texttt{Wxf6} \texttt{Qf7}. However, Black makes a quiet move which will underline the solidity of his position.

19...\texttt{Qh8} 20.\texttt{Qxf6}?!\footnote{Actually Black can allow this capture since after 18...c6 19.\texttt{Qxf6+} \texttt{Qh8} followed by \texttt{Qd8}...\texttt{Qf5}...\texttt{Qg8}, depending on White's reply, he would remain with the advantage.}

The only, though also a risky continuation of the attack. However, White has no choice since 20...\texttt{g5} is threatened, for example 20.\texttt{Qg1} g5 21.\texttt{Qxg5} fxg5 22.\texttt{Qxg5} \texttt{Wxf3+}.

20...\texttt{Wf7}

Not a very successful square for the retreat of the queen, since the \texttt{Qh6} is left undefended. The retreat of the queen to g6 seems dangerous because of the open g-file, but it is precisely the move
20...\text{\texttt{g6}} which could place under doubt the correctness of White's attack, e.g.
21.\texttt{\texttt{g1}} \texttt{\texttt{x6!}} or 21.e5 \texttt{\texttt{gxf6}} (also possible: 21...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x4}}}) 22.\texttt{\texttt{g1}} \texttt{\texttt{fxe5}}! 23.\texttt{\texttt{xg6}} \texttt{\texttt{xf4}}
24.\texttt{\texttt{xh6}} \texttt{\texttt{g7}} 25.\texttt{\texttt{h5}} \texttt{\texttt{xd4!}}.

21.e5!

21...\texttt{\texttt{dxe5}}
Black safely avoids the trap: 21...\texttt{\texttt{xd4}}
22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x4}}}} \texttt{\texttt{dxe5}} 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e3!}} \texttt{\texttt{f5}} 24.\texttt{\texttt{e4!}}}
and White is left with an extra piece, since on 24...\texttt{\texttt{e6}} follows 25.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xd7}}}. But none less his move is a serious inaccuracy since the d-file is opened for the white rooks. Quite acceptable is the defence 21...\texttt{g8}! 22.\texttt{g1} \texttt{\texttt{xf6}}! 23.\texttt{\texttt{xf6}}
\texttt{\texttt{gxf6}} 24.\texttt{\texttt{g2}} \texttt{f5!}.

22.dxe5 \texttt{g8}
After 22...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d8}}}}, White would reply with 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e4}}}, saving the knight.

23.\texttt{\texttt{g1!}} \texttt{\texttt{gxf6}}
If 23...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xf6}}}, then 24.\texttt{\texttt{xf6}} \texttt{\texttt{gxf6}} 25.\texttt{\texttt{d7}}
\texttt{\texttt{e6}} 26.\texttt{\texttt{f6}} and White wins.

24.\texttt{\texttt{e8}}\texttt{g8+}! \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g8}}}}
It is necessary for Black to go in for the dangerous, although apparently defensible position after 24...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g8}}}}
25.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g1}} \texttt{\texttt{e6}} 26.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h6}} \texttt{\texttt{e7!}}}.
The point is that, after 27.\texttt{\texttt{xf6}} \texttt{\texttt{e7}} 28.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g7}}}, there is the sole retort 28...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f5+}}} while the variation 28.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g7+}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g7}}}} 29.\texttt{\texttt{xg7+}}
\texttt{\texttt{g8}} 30.\texttt{\texttt{xf8}} \texttt{\texttt{xf8}} 31.\texttt{\texttt{d1}} brings about a game with an approximately equal ending.

25.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f6}}} \texttt{\texttt{g7}} 26.\texttt{\texttt{g1}} \texttt{\texttt{g8}}
27.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h6!}}} \texttt{\texttt{c5?}}
Up to now it has been thought that, in this position, Black can no longer be saved, but the following analysis places this judgement in doubt: 27...\texttt{\texttt{f2}}
28.\texttt{\texttt{e7}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g7}}}} 29.\texttt{\texttt{e6}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f8}} 30.\texttt{\texttt{e7}} \texttt{\texttt{e7!}}}
or 28.\texttt{\texttt{g4}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c5!}} 29.\texttt{\texttt{e6}} (29.\texttt{\texttt{h4}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f6!}}}
30.\texttt{\texttt{xf6}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e7}} \texttt{\texttt{wins}}}) 29...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f8}}, and it is not easy for White to carry out the attack.

28.e6 \texttt{\texttt{f8}}

29.\texttt{\texttt{f4!}}
Now White weaves a mating net around the black king, while Black can do nothing.

\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d3}}}} and \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d1+}} are retorts, too!}
7. \texttt{\texttt{d7}}, threatening mate in four, is an even better defence since it also counterattacks. If then 29.\texttt{\texttt{g2}}, 29...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e1}} keeps the attack going or forces an advantageous exchange of queens by...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d2+}}.}

5 Better is 24...\texttt{\texttt{d6}}.
29...\textit{e}7 30.\textit{a}1! b5
With the faint hope of 31...\textit{a}8+ and 32...\textit{f}8, but...
31.f3! c5 32.f5! b4 33.\textit{g}3 c4
Black lacks the one saving tempo.
34.\textit{x}xh7+! 1-0
After 34...\textit{x}xh7 35.\textit{h}3+ \textit{h}4 36.\textit{h}xh4 he is mated.
A game which is remarkable, not only for the extraordinary position with its cluster of pinned black pieces, but also for Chigorin’s skill in exploiting every possibility to preserve a dying flame of attack.

2. Queen’s Indian Defence
A. Vigiliansky and Nicolai Miasnikov
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1880

1.c4 \textit{f}6 2.d4 e6 3.e3 d5 4.\textit{f}3 b6 5.a3
As is shown by the further course of the game, White does not play the move a2-a3 in connection with a definite plan, but only to be sure to prevent the move ...\textit{b}b4. A similar scheme of development was revived in our times by former World Champion, Petrosian. He played it with the move order 1.c4 \textit{f}f6 2.d4 e6 3.\textit{f}3 b6 4.a3 \textit{b}b7 5.c3, and after 5...d5, exchanged 6.cxd5, so as after 6...exd5 to play 7.\textit{g}5 and only then e2-e3.

5...\textit{b}7 6.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}6

7.\textit{d}3
Again rather casual. 7.cxd5 was necessary.
Chigorin also considered that ’better was 7.cxd5 exd5 8.\textit{d}3, though in this case, after 8...0-0 9.0-0.c5, Black obtains a somewhat freer game.’ Also nothing is changed by 8.\textit{b}5+ c6 9.\textit{d}3, since after 9...0-0 10.0-0 \textit{b}bd7 11.b4 a5, Black again stands well.
It is interesting that the first five moves were repeated in the 11th game of the 1969 World Championship Match, Spassky-Petrosian. Playing White, Spassky chose 6.\textit{c}3, but after 6...\textit{b}d7 7.cxd5 exd5 8.\textit{e}2 \textit{d}6 9.b4 0-0 10.0-0 a6 11.\textit{d}3 \textit{b}b3 \textit{e}7! Black obtained the better prospects in the centre.

7...0-0 8.0-0 \textit{e}4
’Black’s game is better since the bishop on c1 is badly placed’ said Chigorin.

9.\textit{xe}4?
White, prematurely and without any necessity, determines the pawn structure in the centre. Since playing to undermine the e4-pawn involves great risk, then White, deprived of any kind of active play, ought now endeavour to strengthen his position in anticipation of the attack. Instead of 9.\textit{xe}4, he should play 9.\textit{xc}2 f5 10.cxd5 exd5 11.\textit{e}5 and then f2-f4.

9...\textit{xe}4 10.\textit{d}2 f5 11.f4
And so White starts to build a fortress. On 11.f3 would have followed 11...\textit{Wh}4, and 12.g3? is not possible because of \textit{12...\textit{Qxg3} 13.hx\textit{g3} \textit{Wh}xg3+ 14.\textit{Qh}1 \textit{Hf}6.}

11...\textit{Qd7} 12.b3

12.b4 would have been considerably more active.

12...c5 13.\textit{Qe2} \textit{Qf6} 14.\textit{Qe1} \textit{Qg4} 15.\textit{Qf1} \textit{W}h4 16.g3 \textit{W}h3 17.\textit{Qa2} \textit{Hf6}

Black is captivated by the creation of direct threats on the king and does not want to lose time on the move 17...\textit{Rad8}.

\textbf{18.\textit{Qc3}?}

Now Black’s attack develops without hindrance, whereas after the unexpected 18.dxc5 \textit{Qx}c5 19.\textit{Wd7}, White might keep pace with the coming threats and even perhaps seize the initiative, for example, 19...\textit{Qf7} 20.\textit{Wxe}6 \textit{Qd8} 21.b4 \textit{Qf8} 22.bxc5 \textit{Qf6} 23.\textit{Qd4!} \textit{Qxd4} 24.\textit{Qxf6+ Qxf6} 25.exd4.

18...\textit{Qxd4} 19.\textit{exd4}

On 19.\textit{Wxd4} or 19.\textit{Qb5}, equally strong is 19...\textit{e5!}.

19...\textit{Qg6} 20.\textit{Qe2}

Realising all the dangers from the threat ...h7-h5-h4, White hastens to exchange queens and strives to transfer the queen to g2.

\textbf{20...e3!}

A brilliant pawn sacrifice to open the diagonal for the bishop on b7.

21.\textit{Qf3xe3}

On 21.\textit{Qxe3}, the simplest of all is 21...\textit{Qxh}2 22.\textit{Wxh2} \textit{Qxg3+} 23.\textit{Qg2} \textit{Wxh2+} 24.\textit{Qxh2} \textit{Qxc3} 25.\textit{Qxe6} \textit{Hd8}.

21...\textit{Qe8} 22.\textit{Qd1} h5 23.\textit{Qd3} h4 24.\textit{Qc1}

Black’s pieces are extremely active and White’s extra pawn is of no account. Before going over to a decisive action, Black, taking advantage of the opponent’s helplessness, could transfer the rook to the h-file by playing 24...\textit{Qf7}.

Another good continuation of the attack would be 24...\textit{Qf6}. Chigorin chooses the spectacular, but less strong...

\textbf{24...e5!?}

It seems that White cannot take the brave pawn. Chigorin gives the variation 25.\textit{fxe5} \textit{Qxe5} 26.dxe5 \textit{Qxe5}

\textbf{8} Instead, 23...\textit{Qc8} should be played, with material advantage.
27.\text{Wh}5 (27.\text{Fe}3 f4! or 27.\text{Fe}3 \text{Fc}5 followed by ...f5-f4) 27...\text{Cc}5+! 28.\text{Fe}3 \text{Hxe}3! 29.\text{Hxe}3 \text{Hxg}3+ 30.\text{hxg}3 \text{Wh}1+ winning the queen. Black's initiative looks very threatening, with all his pieces aimed at the king, but White nevertheless has sufficient defensive resources, and, if he covers the a8-h1 diagonal by 25.\text{Cd}5!, then the success of Black's attack would be very conjectural, e.g. 25...\text{e}4 26.\text{Cc}3 \text{Hxg}3 27.\text{hxg}3 \text{e}3! 28.\text{Hxe}3 \text{Hxf}4 (28...\text{Ge}6 29.\text{Gf}3!) 29.\text{Hxf}4! \text{Hxe}2 30.\text{Hxe}2.

25.\text{b}4 \text{e}4 26.\text{Cd}1 \text{e}3!

Now already nothing is impossible for this pawn and White's defence quickly falls apart.

27.\text{d}5

If 27.\text{Hxe}3, then 27...\text{Hxe}3 28.\text{Hxe}3 \text{Hxg}3 and Black wins.

27...\text{Hxg}3 28.\text{Dxg}3

On 28.\text{Hxg}3, decisive is 28...\text{Hf}2.

\[\text{\text{\footnote{Instead, 27...\text{He}1 is a killer.}}}\]

28...\text{Dxh}2 29.\text{Wh}xh2 \text{Hxg}3+ 30.\text{Dg}2 \text{e}2! 31.\text{De}1 \text{Hxg}2+ 32.\text{Wxg}2 \text{Dxc}3

0-1

Of course, White did not put up a very tenacious defence, but the breakthrough of Black's pawn on the e-file not only makes a striking impression but is also highly instructive.
Chapter 6

First trips abroad: Berlin 1881 – Vienna 1882 – London 1883

Chigorin’s victories in the matches and the St. Petersburg tournament elevated him to first place among Russian chess players. Though, up to now, he had not yet once played abroad, his name was beginning to be well known there as well. At the beginning of 1881 he was included in the ‘brilliant triumvirate’ of Russian chess players (together with him were named Schiffers and Alapin), mentioned in an article about Russian chess life in the Deutsche Schachzeitung. In the same year, Chigorin was invited to play in the international tournament in Berlin.

The German Chess Federation, which unified the chess players of Germany, was founded in 1877. Commencing in 1879, the Federation began to hold regular congresses, once every two years, which incorporated several tournaments with the participation of both German and foreign chess players. Many masters acquired international fame in the tournaments of the German Chess Federation. During the years 1879-1914 this was a very regular event in international chess life. In 1914, the last of these tournaments – Mannheim – was conducted only up to the 11th round and remained unfinished because of the outbreak of the First World War. Leading in the master tournament of this (the 19th in succession) congress, at the moment it was interrupted, was the young Alekhine.

The Berlin tournament of 1881 has a particular significance for us in the history of chess competition. With it began the continuation of more than a quarter of a century of international chess activity by the great Russian chess player.

The line-up of the tournament was very strong. Amongst the competitors, only Steinitz was missing out of the best chess players of the time. Coming together in Berlin were the leading figures: Blackburne, Zukertort, Winawer, L. Paulsen, and Mason.

In the first round, 29 August 1881, Chigorin happened to meet one of the representatives of Austro-Hungary, Wittek.

Probably, Chigorin, as a debutant, was unsure of himself and, quite naturally, nervous. Besides this, it seems he underestimated his little-known opponent, and lost the game. But he did not lose heart and from then on began to score one victory after another. He crushed Winawer in 17 moves and won an outstanding game against the famous German chess player L. Paulsen.

A long time before, in the 1850s, as a twenty-year-old young man, Louis Paulsen went across to the USA and began to work there as an inspector of a tobacco plantation. In 1857, in the first American Congress, L. Paulsen met Morphy in a match and lost to him with the score +1 -5 =2. Returning to his native land, he gained several important victories: he won two matches against Anderssen and gained a victory in a tournament at Leipzig 1877. Paulsen became one of the most prominent positional chess players of the period, a connoisseur of a system in the Sicilian Defence which is popular even today. And it was precisely in this opening
that Chigorin employed against him a striking plan of play, with the capture of the d4-square. Many of his games, which delighted chess players of the 1870s and 1880s, have faded and now seem naïve and old fashioned, but Chigorin's victory over Paulsen, after more than a hundred years, has lost none of its freshness and instructive value. It pointed a way, along which, later on, many games in various opening systems were to travel.

In the 13th round, Chigorin met the leader of the tournament, Blackburne. One of the most brilliant attacking players of the 19th century, Blackburne, this time chose a quiet variation, apparently not being averse to a draw. Chigorin, as Black, replied with an impetuous attack and ought to have won, but made a mistake, then several times rejected a draw, and in the end lost.

As a result, Chigorin tied with Winawer for 3rd-4th prize. His result, and above all the excellent quality of his play, was rated highly by chess players. Zukertort wrote:

‘Russia’s representative, Mr. Chigorin, is generally admitted to be the coming man. His style is dashing, his combinations very ingenious, but a little too daring. We congratulate him on his splendid debut. Mr. Chigorin is the editor of the Russian chess magazine, Chess Sheet, and we knew him only as a local celebrity. With one leap he has bounded into the ranks of the masters... we feel confident Mr. Chigorin will be a formidable opponent in future contests.’

After the Berlin tournament, Chigorin was a welcome participant in every international competition. But only in 1882 and 1883 did he take part in such tournaments – in Vienna and in London. After this followed a six-year break.

The Vienna tournament of 1882, as several other tournaments at the end of the 19th century, was impressive by its sheer size – 18 participants playing each other twice. But, at that time, such enormous tournaments, which made great demands on the endurance of the players, were not a rarity. In the future, Chigorin had many opportunities to play in such competitions: London 1883 (14 participants, double-round), New York 1889 (20 participants, double-round, the champion of giant tournaments), Vienna 1898 (19 participants, double-round), London 1899 (15 participants, double-round). Moreover, at the London tournament of 1883, the first two draws were replayed, while in New York, all draws in the second half were replayed! In the last tournament, the winners – Chigorin and Weiss – played in addition a match of four games! And the day after the end of the Vienna tournament 1898, Chigorin and seven other of the competitors set out from the capital to play in another international tournament – in Cologne!

Later on, Chigorin got used to these giant tournaments. But the Vienna tournament of 1882 proved to be the greatest failure out of all the tournaments in which he competed, whilst at the height of his creative powers. He tied for 12th-13th places with Schwartz, after scoring a total of 14 points out of a possible 34.

But also in this tournament ought to be mentioned several excellent Chigorin games. Chigorin won very well against Mackenzie and Zukertort. But, of course, the most important out of all the 34 games were the two against Steinitz. With these began a 17 year long battle rivalry of the two great chess players.
the 12th round, Steinitz and Chigorin sat down opposite each other at the
clockboard. Steinitz offered the sharp and intricate Salvio Gambit (1.e4 e5 2.f4
fxe4 3.g4 g5 4.h4 g4 5.e5 h4 6.gxf1). Chigorin replied 6...c6. Soon
there arose immense complications, typical of gambit play. Chigorin committed
an inaccuracy and fell victim to a crushing attack.

In their second encounter (27th round) Chigorin offered the Evans Gambit—a
opening which in the future was to be adopted for a long time by the Russian
master. We recall that Morphy considered the Evans Gambit the most beautiful
of all openings, while in the 20th century, S.Tartakower, who himself successfully
employed the Evans Gambit, said of it: 'This dazzling, attacking opening was
revised in order to force people to believe that chess art is a gift of the gods!'

Chigorin handled this weapon to perfection. He also won the game against
Steinitz.

The 1st and 2nd prizes in Vienna were shared between Winawer and Steinitz.

In 1883, in London, which at that time was the strongest chess centre in the world,
enticing chess players from every quarter, an unprecedentedly strong tournament
was organised. They managed to obtain the participation of all the leading figures.
Fourteen participants had to meet each other twice. The first two draws were
replayed. In this tournament, for the first time, was introduced the newly invented
double chess clock. Up to this time were used clocks with open pendulums, which
would be brought to a halt with a pencil, and also unpaired clocks with mechanical
regulations. 'Chess players will realise', wrote the Deutsche Schachzeitung, 'how every
advantage is brought to them with this clock. Now all the inconveniences, which
have previously hindered the correct calculation of time, will be overcome.'

The London tournament of 1883 ended with the brilliant victory of Zukertort.
Here was a versatile, gifted man, who, for a long time, 'could not find himself'.
The son of a German pastor and a Polish aristocrat, he was born in Lublin, but
studied in Breslau (Wroclaw) at the high school, where mathematics was taught by
Adolph Anderssen—at the board a creator of wonderful combinations (it is less
frequently remembered that he was also an excellent positional player), but in life a
prudent and modest German teacher.

Besides theorems and formulae, the young Zukertort learned from his teacher
many interesting things about the Evans Gambit, Muzio, Salvio and Philidor. Soon
he became the second strongest player in the town, after Anderssen. But, at that
time, Zukertort was thinking about a quite different career. In his own words,
after graduating from the medical faculty,
he became a physician and took part as a military doctor in three wars. Twice he was dangerously wounded and nine times he was decorated with orders and medals. Zukertort also claimed to have had exceptional linguistic ability, with a knowledge of Russian, English, French, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Turkish, Sanskrit, not to mention his native German and Polish. He also boasted of other contemporary talents, he was the best domino player in Berlin, an excellent fencer, could shoot through the ace of hearts at a distance of fifteen paces, and on top of all this, for five years he was the music critic for one newspaper as well as going in for political journalism!

He decided to devote himself to chess in 1872, when he was thirty years old. His varied talents quickly became apparent here also. Zukertort settled in England, played in tournaments and matches, became an authoritative opening theorist and chess journalist. In the 1870s and the beginning of the 1880s he was one of the strongest players of the day. In the list of sporting achievements of Zukertort are featured won matches against Anderssen (1871), Rosenthal (1880), Blackburne (1881), and a victory in the Paris tournament of 1878. But the most brilliant achievement of Zukertort’s chess career was his splendid triumph in the London tournament of 1883. He succeeded in outdistancing by three points the second prize-winner – Steinitz, and created some truly immortal masterpieces of chess art. On his victory over Blackburne. Steinitz wrote in his annotations: ‘No words are sufficient to express our admiration of the high mastery with which Zukertort conducted this game.’

The London tournament of 1883 proved to be the highest peak in Zukertort’s chess biography. After this followed the terrible fiasco in his match with Steinitz and a sharp drop in his chess strength. Was the reason for his defeat against Steinitz, as Lasker considered, Zukertort’s inability to form plans, since, according to Lasker, it was only Steinitz who created the theory of systematic play? Or was it a forcible breaking of style, a failed attempt to employ a style which was alien to himself and which he had not completely mastered, endeavouring, in his match with Steinitz, to make his play – ‘a variation on the Steinitz theme’, a variation in which Zukertort was greatly inferior to his opponent? Or was the reason of a non-chess nature and consisted of the fact that the sickly and frail Zukertort did not possess sufficient nervous endurance for such a difficult and exhausting contest?

Be that as it may, in 1883 Zukertort was in the prime of his life and played wonderfully. In obtaining 4th prize, Chigorin earned general sympathy with his play. The quality of his games was excellent. Against Steinitz he won both games. In the first of these, Chigorin had to defend against the Steinitz Gambit.

The second London game between Chigorin and Steinitz continued their argument in the Evans Gambit begun a year earlier in Vienna. This time the Goring Attack was chosen, which, in the future, Chigorin employed in several of his outstanding games, both as White and Black. And, as in Vienna, the Russian chess player managed to create a powerful attack and finish off victoriously.

In the final round, Chigorin, after a blunder, lost to Mortimer, who tied for the last two places in the tournament, scoring a total of 3 points out of 26. This cost Chigorin 3rd prize.
This was a dangerous sign – carelessness in a decisive game –, whether it be against a strong or weak player. This lack of sporting consistency subsequently made itself felt throughout the whole of Chigorin’s career. How many wins he let slip because of negligence!

The tournament book notes: ‘Chigorin, the winner of the fourth prize, ought to have a great future before him. He has not yet the experience of Zukertort and Steinitz, but he possesses that energy which is requisite to make a great master, and throughout the tournament he played persistently to win and not to draw his games, and happily obtained his deserved reward.’

An interesting opinion on Chigorin’s style was expressed by one of the participants of the London tournament – Henry Bird:

‘Mr. Chigorin, if need be, is capable of accurate and careful calculation, despite the fact that he, as is well known, inclines to enterprising, bold and brilliant play,’

These curiously sounding words are characteristic for the perception of Chigorin’s creative work during his lifetime, and indeed for the general view of chess at that time. ‘Accuracy and careful calculation’ and ‘enterprising, bold and brilliant play’ implies mutual incompatibility and, in any case, a compatibility difficult to imagine. Accurate calculation and carefulness – which attracted Steinitz and his followers – obviously led to rationalism and dryness, while enterprise, boldness and brilliance inevitably involved unconsidered risk and headlong play.

The whole content of Chigorin’s creative chess work refutes this narrow, one sided and primitive notion. Bold and accurate calculation, enterprise and verification by analysis, intuition and reasoning, combined harmoniously in his games during the prime of his chess career and are also combined in his creative legacy.

3 Sicilian Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Louis Paulsen

Berlin 1881 (10)
1.e4 c5 2.d3 c6 3.d4 cxd4
4.\x26#267;xd4 \w_b6 5.\x26#267;b3 \f_6 6.\x26#267;c3
7.e3 \e7 8.\x26#267;e2 0-0 9.0-0 a6
10.\w_d3 \w_c7 11.f4 d6 12.\w_g3 \d_7
13.\e3

On the board we have a classical position of the Schveningen system, which became popular forty years after this game! Later, Chigorin, in reply to 1...c5, played only the Closed System (2.\f_3), but the opening far from always turned out to his advantage. The skill with which he carries out firstly a strategical bind, and then also the attack in this game, makes us regret Chigorin’s voluntary restriction of his opening repertoire, as a result of which he was obliged to frequently play tedious positions quite alien to his style (3.exd5 in the French Defence, 4.d3 in the Italian Game).

13...\x26#267;ad8?

Black considers it necessary to play ...d6-d5. Contemporary theory recommends
that Black carries out operations on the c-file, for which purpose he plays 13... b5 or 13...ac8. Besides, as is shown clearly later on, the other rook should go to d8.

14.\textit{\texttt{Qd2}}

White not so much threatens 15.\textit{\texttt{Qc4}} – it is clear that Black replies either 14...b5 or 14...d5 – as he prepares the transfer of the knight to f3, an idea which is nowadays recommended by theory on the basis of the analysis of later games.

14...d5 15.e5 \textit{\texttt{Qe8}} 16.\textit{\texttt{Qf3}}

Black’s position is clearly worse and this is a consequence of the mistaken advance ...d6-d5 (he should have played 15...b5), as a result of which his knight has been forced to retreat to a passive position (15...d4 is not possible because of 16.exf6 \textit{\texttt{Qxf6}} 17.\textit{\texttt{Qc4}} and wins) and, in addition, his rooks have been disconnected. Paulsen principally prevents the threat of f4-f5, but finds himself in a positional bind.

16...f5 17.\textit{\texttt{Qf2}} 18.\textit{\texttt{Qb6}} 19.\textit{\texttt{Qc8}}

19.\textit{\texttt{Qd3}}

After completely paralysing the opponent’s queen’s flank, Chigorin now prepares the occupation of the d4-square with the knight.

19...\textit{\texttt{Qc7}} 20.\textit{\texttt{Qe2}} 21.\textit{\texttt{Qa8}} 22.\textit{\texttt{Qe3}} 23.\textit{\texttt{Qa5}}

22.b3 b5

Black succeeds in advancing to b5, but this does not ease his situation. There are no squares on the c-file on which to invade and he is obliged to begin a transfer of pieces for defence of his king against the approaching attack.

23.\textit{\texttt{Qh4}} \textit{\texttt{Qb7}}

24.b4!

Splendid! The manoeuvre b3-b4 (after the retreat ...\textit{\texttt{Qb7}}) is seen nowadays in text books in similar positions and credited largely to Bronstein. It turns out that this was played as long ago as Chigorin! Now the \textit{\texttt{Qb7}} is condemned to a miserable existence and the weakness of the c4-square is very difficult for Black to exploit.

24...\textit{\texttt{Qc7}} 25.\textit{\texttt{Qd4}} 26.\textit{\texttt{Qd8}} 27.\textit{\texttt{Qg5}} \textit{\texttt{Qxg5}}
A necessary exchange as if 27...g6, then 28...g3 followed by g4, threatening xh7 or h5. Or 27...h6 28...h7 e8 29...g6 f7 30.f5! and White wins easily. 10

28.hxg5 g6 29...g2 b8
Black wants to bring into play the a8 via b6, and had also hoped to defend the h7-pawn with the queen's rook from the b7-square, after moving the bishop to c8. However, after 30...h1 f7 31...h6 g7 32...h1 c8 33.h4 b7 34...g6 hxg6 35.xg6! White wins. 11

30...h1 f7 31...h6 g7 32...h1 f7 33.e6 h4 f8
He must refrain from 33...b6, as after this would have followed 34.xg1 c4 35.h2 g3 36.xh3 xex3 37.xh7 with a decisive attack.

34.g3 d8 35.xg4

Black's stubborn defence has prevented a quicker defeat, but, all the same, there is not much hope for him to save the game. White has a huge positional advantage and the game can be decided by direct attack on the h-file. Bogoljubow considered that after 35...c8 'Black has no particular fears on the king's flank'; but is there a sound defence for Black after 36.w3? Here are some sample variations:

A) 36...d6 37...xb5! axb5 38...xb6 xb6 39...xh7 b7 40...g6 xh7 41...h7+ f7 42.d3 and Black has no defence; 13
B) 36...f7 37...h6 (threatening 38...xg6) 37...f8 38.d3 d4 39.xd4 xf4 40.c5+ xe8 41.xh7 etc. But all this revolves around 'what might have been'. Paulsen, however, allows a tactical blow, after which the struggle is over at once.

35...b6? 36...h7! xh7 37...h7
The rook cannot be taken because of mate in three moves after 37...xh7 38.xh5+.

37...f7 38...h6 c4 39.xg6+ f8
40.h2 h8 41.w4 h7 42.g8 d7 43.g6 e7 44.wxe7+! 1-0
An elegant finish.

4 Two Knights Defence
Henry Bird
Mikhail Chigorin
Vienna 1882 (4)
1.e4 e5 2...f3 c6 3.c4 c5
4.g5 d5 5.exd5 g6 6.xe5 e6 7.dxc6 bxc6 8.xe2 h6 9.d3 e4
10.e5 w7 h1 d4
This retreat is not considered strong. Instead of making the useful developing move 11.d4 or strengthening the centre by means of 11.f4 (see the game Arnold-Chigorin), White exchanges what is for the present his only active piece.

11...xg4 12.xg4

13 Or 42.g6+ xe8 43.wxh6 d4+ 44.xg3 when Black must return material by 44...f7, as after 44...xe4 there is the combination 45.wxf8+ xfx8 46.g7+ and 47.xe4, winning.
12...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{d6}}}

A move programmed into this system and here quite strong, since it prevents immediate castling by White. However, seventy years after this game, one of the best Soviet masters of attack, Nezhmetdinov, suggested an even stronger plan in which the attack is directed at both the h2 and f2-squares:

12...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c5}}!} 13.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{f2}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{d8}}} 14.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{b7}}} 15.0-0 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{h5}}}! 16.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{d4}}} exd3 17.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{x}}}_{\textit{\textbf{d3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{g4}}}!!.

The game Ciocaltea-Nezhmetdinov, Bucharest 1954, continued 18.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{we2+}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{xf8}}} 19.g3 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{wd7}}} 20.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xe4}}} h4 21.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xf4}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{exh2}}}! and Black won shortly.

13.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{h3}}}

Bronstein, in a training game with Smyslov in 1953, retreated the bishop to h3, in order to transfer it to g2. However, this move costs a great deal of time and allows Black to increase the pressure after 13.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{h3}}} 0-0 14.g3 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{d5}}} 15.0-0 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{a8}}} 16.d3 e3.

14.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c3}}}

Steinitz considered that it is necessary to prevent the transfer of the \textit{\textbf{\texttt{c5}}} to the centre, by playing 14.b3. But this move will hardly improve White’s development and might possibly change the character of the struggle: Black develops very strong pressure on the centre files, e.g. 14...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{ae5}}} 15.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xc3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{xd8}}} 16.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b2}}} e3! 17.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{fxe3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{xc3}}} 18.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xc3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{e4}}}!!.

14...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c4}}} 15.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b3?}}}

White plays the opening too carelessly. The development of the bishop on b2 is mistaken. The principal events must take place in the region of the king’s flank where Black is directing all his pieces; therefore deserving attention is a plan of development such as 15.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b4}}} 16.d3! (16.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{d4}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{g6}}} 17.0-0 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{h4}}}) 16...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{exd3}}} 17.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{cxd3}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{ad8}}} 18.0-0. Of course, even here, Black’s slight advantage in development allows him to keep the initiative, but White’s defense would be far easier than in the game.

15...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{ae5}}} 16.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b2}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{f8}}} 17.0-0

It is too late for White to retreat the bishop to e2 – 17.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{e2}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{f3+}}} 18.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{h1}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{h4}}}; and he hurries to get his king out of the centre even though he loses a pawn.

17...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{exg4}}} 18.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{hgx4}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{wd7}}} 19.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{we2}}}

Defending the g4-pawn would lead to the creation of another weakness: 19.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{c5+}}} 20.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{h1}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{a8}}} 21.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{a4}}} \textit{\textbf{\texttt{d4+}}}.
The turning point. With material equality, it is difficult for White to reckon on a successful defence. But could he take the e4-pawn, exploiting the fact that the opponent does not have the move 20...\(\text{c}5+\)? It seems the risk is great as the pin of the \(\text{c}4\) is very unpleasant and allows Black to obtain the advantage in two ways: 20...\(\text{d}xe4\)

A) 20...\(\text{d}h2+\) 21.\(\text{d}h1\) \(\text{c}7\) 22.\(\text{f}3\)
   23.\(\text{c}c4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 24.\(\text{f}f2!\) \(\text{d}d6\) (for example, 25.\(\text{d}xg4\) \(\text{fxg}4\) 26.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}6\), or;

B) 20...\(\text{f}5\) 21.\(\text{f}3\) (hardly satisfactory is the queen sacrifice 21.\(\text{c}xd6\) \(\text{h}5\)
   22.\(\text{d}xg4\) \(\text{d}xg4\) 23.\(\text{c}xe8\) \(\text{exe}8\) 24.\(\text{f}e1\)
   \(\text{exe}1+\) 25.\(\text{fxe}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 26.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{a}5!\))
   21...\(\text{h}5+\) 22.\(\text{fxg}4\) 23.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 24.\(\text{d}d1\) 25.\(\text{d}xf4\) 26.\(\text{d}f2\) \(\text{e}4\) (Chigorin’s variation). All the same, if he wants to choose the lesser evil, White must look for salvation in this endgame, since, in refusing to take the pawn, he dooms himself to hopeless defence.

20.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{f}5\) 21.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}6\) 22.\(\text{a}e1\)

Exchanging the e4-pawn, by 22.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{exf}3+\)
(22...\(\text{e}5\) 23.\(\text{f}4\)) 23.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{f}3\), does not free White from the attack, after 23...\(\text{h}6!\).

22...\(\text{e}a8\) 23.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{h}5!\)

The win of the exchange, by 23...\(\text{f}3+\)
24.\(\text{x}f3\) \(\text{xf}3\) 25.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{e}1\) 26.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{e}1\)
27.\(\text{d}xg4\) \(\text{e}5\), also guarantees Black victory, but in a longer way. There is still the possibility of strengthening the attack and Chigorin continues his offensive. Now he threatens 24...\(\text{f}3+\),
with the win of a rook, since the \(\text{b}4\) is defended.

24.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{g}6!\) 25.\(\text{d}1\)

It seems that Chigorin has voluntarily retreated his queen to a less powerful position, in order to free the way for an aggressive advance of his f7-pawn. And indeed, 25...\(\text{f}5\) 26.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}4\) would now have given Black an irresistible attack. However, Chigorin has another deadly continuation in mind and demonstrates a surprising combinational possibility.

25...\(\text{e}3!\)

Making it clear that the g3-pawn is not to be defended from the invasion of the black queen, since, after 26.\(\text{c}xe3\) \(\text{c}3+\) 27.\(\text{d}xe3\), would follow 27...\(\text{c}xe3\)
28.\(\text{d}xh5\) \(\text{f}g3+\) and mate on the following move.

26.\(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{f}x\) 27.\(\text{d}xf2\) \(\text{d}xg3+\)
28.\(\text{d}f1\) \(\text{e}xf2\) 29.\(\text{c}e3\) \(\text{c}5\) 30.\(\text{d}c3\)
31.\(\text{d}xe3\) \(\text{c}xe3\) 32.\(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{h}4\)
33.\(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{h}3\) 0-1

5 Ponziiani Opening
Arno Helving
Mikhail Chigorin

Correspondence game 1882
1.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 2.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}f6\) 4.\(\text{d}4\)
5.\(\text{e}4\) 5.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{b}8\) 6.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 7.\(\text{d}e5\)
8.\(\text{xd}3\) 8.\(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 9.0-0 \(\text{d}6\) 10.\(\text{d}f3\)
White safely avoids the trap, 10.\(\text{d}b5+\)
11.\(\text{d}xe6\) \(\text{bxc}6\) 12.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{c}7\) 13.\(\text{d}d8\)
16.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{b}5\).\(^1\)

16 In this analysis, on move 13. White has the surprising 13.\(\text{d}xh8\)!, when after 13...\(\text{xd}8\)
14.\(\text{d}x\) \(\text{d}8\) he emerges a pawn to the good.
10...\(\text{d}d7\) seems best.
10...0-0 11.c4 \$d7 12.\$c3

The opening phase of the game has ended in Black’s favour. The reason for this lies not in the advantage of the two bishops, but in the possibility of further strengthening his position. White’s pieces are not badly placed and, thanks to the d5-pawn, he controls more space; but there does not appear to be any plan to further activate his men. Meanwhile, besides the routine deployment of his forces by 12.\$c5
13.\$c2 \$f6 14.\$hl a5 15.\$e3 g6, Black has at his disposal an interesting possibility of organizing an attack on the king’s flank.

12...f5! 13.\$e1

White prevents the exchange of the knight on e5 and the formation of a dangerous pawn pair, but there follows an unexpected reply after which it becomes clear that Black’s plan is impossible to stop.

13...\$f6! 14.\$e3

White resigns himself to the impossibility of preventing the move 14...\$e5 and prepares, after 15.\$xe5 \$xe5, to play 16.f4!. However, Chigorin, exploiting the stabilisation of the centre, begins a pawn attack on the king’s flank.

14...g5!

Black’s intention is absolutely clear: ...f5-f4 and then ...g5-g4. The correctness of this idea could be placed under doubt only on the course 15.\$xf5 \$xc3 16.\$e6+ \$g7 17.bxc3. Chigorin considered that Black wins by means of 17...\$e5 18.\$xg5 \$f6, but all is not so simple: instead of 18.\$xg5, stronger is 18.\$d4!, and in the event of 18...\$e8 19.\$xg5 \$xg5 20.\$xe8 \$h3 21.\$e6+ White wins. But, for all that, the f5-pawn cannot be taken – he need only move the knight to f6 on the 17th move, after which 18.\$xg5 (or 18.\$d4) is refuted by the effective 18...\$g6!!.

15.\$d4 g4 16.\$d2 \$e5 17.\$e2 f4!

18.f3 \$xd4+ 19.\$xd4

Chigorin: Zukertort considered that best now was 19.\$xd4, and if 19...\$e5, then 20.\$xf1.

19...\$e5!

The black knight occupies an impregnable position and, under its cover, Black is able to regroup his forces for an attack on the king. The organisation of the decisive attack is carried out by Chigorin with great skill.
20...\textbf{Qxf4}

Chigorin: Other continuations were also Black's favour, for example:

1) 20.fxg4 f3 21.gxf3 $\textbf{Qxf3}$ 22.f1 $\textbf{Qxe3}$ 23.$\textbf{Qxf4}$ $\textbf{Qxg4}$ 24.$\textbf{Qg3}$ $\textbf{Qh3}$ 25.$\textbf{Qf2}$ $\textbf{Qf8}$ and, after the exchange of queens, Black's game is better; if, however, 26.$\textbf{Qxe4}$, then 26...$\textbf{Qxd2}$! 27.$\textbf{Qxf8+}$ $\textbf{Qxf8}$ with a winning position for Black 28.$\textbf{Qf1}$ $\textbf{Qxb2}$, threatening ...$\textbf{Qf3+}$;

2) 20.$\textbf{Qf1}$ gxf3 21.$\textbf{Qxf3}$ $\textbf{Qg4}$! 22.$\textbf{Qxf4}$ $\textbf{Qxf4}$ 23.$\textbf{Qe6}$ $\textbf{Qxe7}$ 24.$\textbf{Qxf3}$ 24.$\textbf{Qxf8}$ $\textbf{Qg7}$! 24...$\textbf{Qxf3}$ 25.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{Qf6}$ 26.$\textbf{Qg1+}$ $\textbf{Qh8}$, and Black, threatening 27...$\textbf{Qf2}$, has a significantly better game. For example: 27.$\textbf{Qxc7}$ $\textbf{Qc8}$ 28.$\textbf{Qxa7}$? $\textbf{Qf2}$ and Black wins.\footnote{At the end of this line, much more powerful than 28...$\textbf{Qf2}$ is 28...$\textbf{Qd3}$, threatening 29...$\textbf{Qf2+}$, which either wins White's queen or mates in a few moves. One possible continuation is 29.$\textbf{Qg3}$ $\textbf{Qf1+}$ 30.$\textbf{Qxf1}$ (or 30.$\textbf{Qg1}$ $\textbf{Qf3#}$) 30...$\textbf{Qxf1}$+ 31.$\textbf{Qg1}$ $\textbf{Qf2+}$ 32.$\textbf{Qxf2}$ $\textbf{Qxf2}$ etc.}

21...$\textbf{Qg5}$ 21.g3 $\textbf{Qxf3}$!

Chigorin: In this pawn, defended by the knight, lies the whole strength of Black's game.

22.$\textbf{Qf1}$ $\textbf{Qg4}$

23.$\textbf{Qf2}$

Chigorin: Or 23.$\textbf{Qe4}$ $\textbf{Qxf4}$! (if the queen retreats, then 24.$\textbf{Qf2}$ and White's game is better) 24.$\textbf{Qxf4}$ $\textbf{Qxf4}$ 25.$\textbf{Qad1}$ $\textbf{Qf8}$!

26.$\textbf{Qf2}$ (or 26.$\textbf{Qf2}$ $\textbf{Qh3}$ 27.$\textbf{Qg3}$ $\textbf{Qg5}$ 28.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{h5}$ threatening 29.$\textbf{Qg4}$ and also 29...h4; if 29.$\textbf{Qe4}$, then 29...$\textbf{Qg2+}$) 26...$\textbf{Qg5}$ 27.$\textbf{Qxg4}$ (27.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{Qh3}$) 27...$\textbf{Qxg4}$ 28.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{Qe3}$ 29.$\textbf{Qg1}$ $\textbf{Qg2+}$! 30.$\textbf{Qxg2+}$ $\textbf{Qxg2+}$ 31.$\textbf{Qg1}$ $\textbf{Qf1+}$ and 32...$\textbf{Qxf1}$ $\textbf{Qf1}$ mate.

23...$\textbf{Qae8}$

Chigorin: White's intention was to play with advantage his knight to d3, after which Black would have difficulty in satisfactorily defending the f3-pawn. The move in the game indirectly prevents White's plan.

24.$\textbf{Qh1}$

Chigorin: If instead:

(1) 24.$\textbf{Qd3}$ c5! 25.$\textbf{Qxc6}$ $\textbf{Qxc6}$ 26.$\textbf{Qd5+}$ $\textbf{Qxd5}$ 27.$\textbf{Qxd5}$ $\textbf{Qc4}$ 28.$\textbf{Qf4}$ $\textbf{Qe2+}$ 29.$\textbf{Qxe2}$ $\textbf{fxe2}$ 30.$\textbf{Qxf8+}$ $\textbf{Qxf8}$ 31.$\textbf{Qf2}$ $\textbf{Qe5}$ 32.$\textbf{Qc4}$ $\textbf{f5+}$ 33.$\textbf{Qe3}$ $\textbf{Qd5}$ and Black is left with an extra pawn;

(2) 24.$\textbf{Qxa7}$ $\textbf{Qf4}$! 25.$\textbf{Qxf4}$ $\textbf{Qxf4}$ 26.$\textbf{Qe1}$ $\textbf{Qh3}$ 27.$\textbf{Qe3}$ $\textbf{Qg4+}$ 28.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{Qg2+}$ 29.$\textbf{Qg1}$ $\textbf{Qf8}$ 30.$\textbf{Qe4}$ $\textbf{Qh3+}$ 31.$\textbf{Qg3}$! h5 32.$\textbf{Qh1}$ $\textbf{Qg2+}$ 33.$\textbf{Qg1}$ h4 34.$\textbf{Qe4}$ $\textbf{Qh3+}$ etc.

24...$\textbf{h5}$!

Chigorin: White threatened 25.$\textbf{h3}$; now, after this, would follow 25...$\textbf{h4}$! White does not prevent the move 25...$\textbf{h4}$! by

18 Missing the resource 32.$\textbf{Qh6}$, preventing 32...$\textbf{h4}$ on account of 33.$\textbf{Qe4}$ and preparing to meet 32...$\textbf{Qd3}$ with 33.$\textbf{Qe7}$. 73
25.\textit{g}1, in view of the variation 25...\textit{h}4
26.\textit{e}6 \textit{xe}6 27.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{xf}g1+ 28.\textit{xf}g1
\textit{h}3 (threatening ...\textit{f}4) 29.\textit{e}3 \textit{e}7
30.\textit{e}1 \textit{ff}7 31.\textit{g}3 \textit{f}4, and Black
must win.
If 25.\textit{h}4 \textit{xf}4! and now:
(1) 26.\textit{gxf}4 \textit{xf}h4+ 27.\textit{h}2 \textit{h}3
28.\textit{g}1+ \textit{g}2+ 29.\textit{xf}g2+ \textit{f}xg2+
30.\textit{xf}g2 \textit{xf}g4+ 31.\textit{h}h1 \textit{g}6 32.\textit{f}2
\textit{xf}4 33.\textit{g}1 \textit{f}7 34.\textit{f}f2 \textit{xf}4+ 35.\textit{h}2
\textit{e}1 etc.
(2) 26.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 27.\textit{gxf}4 \textit{d}3
28.\textit{xf}3! (if 28.\textit{ff}1, then 28...\textit{f}2
29.\textit{g}2 \textit{e}2 30.\textit{b}3! \textit{xf}4+ 31.\textit{g}3
\textit{d}3 and Black must win) 28...\textit{xf}3+ 29.\textit{xf}3
\textit{xb}2 30.\textit{b}1 \textit{e}2 etc.

25.\textit{e}4 \textit{xf}1! 26.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{xf}4 27.\textit{g}1
Chigorin: This move accelerates his defeat.
Better was 27.\textit{d}4; then 27...\textit{h}3 and
as afterwards as indicated above.
27...\textit{d}7 28.\textit{e}1
Chigorin: Or 28.\textit{h}3 \textit{xe}4 29.\textit{xd}2 \textit{xc}4
30.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 31.\textit{hxg}4 \textit{hxg}4 32.\textit{a}3 with
...\textit{e}5 to follow and an easy win.
28...\textit{c}5! 29.\textit{xe}2
Chigorin: An interesting position is
reached after 29.\textit{f}6+ \textit{f}7!! and Black
wins.

29...\textit{e}5!
Chigorin: Together with this move were
sent the following variations:
A) 30.\textit{w}3 \textit{xe}4! 31.\textit{xf}4 \textit{f}2+ 32.\textit{g}1
\textit{h}3+ 33.\textit{h}1 \textit{xf}4 34.\textit{xe}5
\textit{dxe}5 35.\textit{g}1 \textit{f}2+;

B) 30.\textit{f}6+ \textit{xf}6 31.\textit{xe}5 \textit{dxe}5
32.\textit{xe}5 (32.\textit{xe}5 \textit{f}7 and ...\textit{f}3-\textit{f}2)
32...\textit{xe}5 33.\textit{xe}5 \textit{f}2 34.\textit{g}2 \textit{h}3+
35.\textit{xf}2 \textit{d}3+;
C) 30.\textit{e}3 \textit{f}2 and Black wins.
White resigned.
This game is not only a classic example
of the carrying out of an attack in a
complicated position, but also would be
a credit to any grandmaster today.

6 Vienna Gambit
Wilhelm Steinitz
Mikhail Chigorin
London 1883 (3)
1.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{f}4 \textit{exf}4 4.\textit{d}4
\textit{w}h4+ 5.\textit{e}2

An astute opening, which was
introduced into tournament practice
by Steinitz in 1867. White voluntarily
deprives himself of castling and, in
addition, his king takes up a quite
unaesthetic position. In return, he
obtains a powerful pawn centre
and prospects of winning several tempi
by \textit{f}3 and \textit{d}5. Nevertheless, by
ergetic play, Black has good chances
of undermining the centre and
commencing an immediate attack on
the king, by exploiting White’s difficulty
in developing his pieces on the king’s
flank. Chigorin liked to enter such non-
stereotyped, very sharp variations, and
was happy to play this position and with white or black. Actually, P. Chigorin, as White, chose the Doubled pawn Gambit in the 21st game of the match with Steinitz.

5...d5!

It suggested this move over a hundred years ago and even today is considered the most dangerous for White. The idea of it is absolutely clear: Black must open the centre files quickly as possible. Another equally deep plan, connected with the opening of the centre, was suggested by Steinitz (1895): 5...d6 6.exf3 g4 7.exf4

Then the thrust 8...d5 would immediately lose its strength because of 8...e5. On 8.exf5, Black simply castles 0-0; the pawn advances 8.d5 but 8...e5 do not look very dangerous, thus the move 8...e5 cannot be taken seriously, as, after 8...xf3! White is forced to make a third move with the king; 9.e5xf3, and furthermore, after 9...e5 White has to retreat his bishop to c1.**

6.exd5

After 6...exd5 g4+ 7.e5f3 0-0 0-8.c3 White clearly loses the skirmish in the centre.

6...e7+

In several years after this game it established that Black obtains a clear advantage with the continuation 8.g4+ 7.e5f3 0-0 8.dxc6 e5

White is forced to move his king to h5! 10.cxb7 b8 11.d1 when White’s king cannot hide from the black rooks on the centre files.

7.e2 h4+ 8.g3

Firstly to avoid perpetual check on the move.

8...fxg3+

9.g2

From being a target, the king suddenly becomes an active piece, by setting up the threat 10.hxg3. Chigorin (playing White) often made the rook sacrifice 9.hxg3. In the event of the acceptance of the sacrifice, 9...hxh1 10.g2 h2 11.dxc6 d6 12.f3, White obtains a very active position, and by not taking the rook, 9...fxd4+, Black likewise gives up the initiative: 10.e3 fxh1 11.d1 e5 12.d4 d6 13.e1 f6 14.f3.

9...d6!

Already in the opening, a beautiful tactical struggle is under way. Black leaves the b6 under attack, though, after 10.dxc6 gxh2 11.f1 h1+ 12.xg1 xd4+ 13.e3 f6 14.g2 b6 15.b5 e5, the complications are not unfavourable for Black.

10.e1 c7

If 10...e7 11.g5 f6 (11...xel 12.xel+ c8 13.hxg3, followed mostly by c4 etc) 12.dxc6 fxg5 13.b5 b6 14.d5 xel 15.xel+ f8 (15...c7 16.xe7+) 16.hxg3 with the superior game', Steinitz.

11.hxg3 xd4
A critical position in this opening. White has definite compensation for the pawn, since his pieces are able to quickly come into play. Now the natural move, 12.\textit{Qf3}, deserves serious attention, in order to leave the opponent behind in development after 12...\textit{Wf6} 13.\textit{Gg5} \textit{Wg6} 14.\textit{Bb5+}. Incidentally, Chigorin himself played this way in a correspondence game in 1900. Steinitz makes a move, which not only does not advance the development of his pieces, but also contributes little to the strengthening of his position.

12.\textit{Nh4} \textit{Wf6} 13.\textit{Ge4} \textit{Wg6} 14.\textit{Ad3} \textit{Af5} 15.\textit{Qxd6+}

It is already difficult for White to find a plan to further strengthen his position and also, after deciding to exchange the \textit{Qd6}, he hurries to do this now so as to close the d-file to the black rooks. On 15.\textit{Qf3} 0–0 0 16.\textit{c4}, Chigorin gives the convincing retort 16...\textit{Qf6!} 17.\textit{Qxd6+} \textit{Bxd6} 18.\textit{Qxe7?} \textit{Qe8!} 19.\textit{Qxf5+} \textit{Wxf5} etc.\textsuperscript{10}

15...\textit{Qxd6} 16.\textit{Ab5+} \textit{Qf8!}

White has not achieved much: the black king, though also deprived of castling, does not find itself in any danger.

At the same time, Black threatens to occupy the e4-square with his pieces after ...\textit{Qf6}. Steinitz defends the attacked pawn, but thereby shuts his light-squared bishop out of the game.

17.\textit{c4} \textit{Qf6} 18.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qg4}

Another plan is 18...\textit{Qe4} and then ...\textit{a7-a6} and ...\textit{b7-b5}.

19.\textit{Qd4} \textit{Qf5} 20.\textit{Qxf5} \textit{Qxf5} 21.\textit{Qf4}

White seems to be creating some threats, but there is actually only one, by the bishop on f4. All the other pieces are uncoordinated and do not take an active part in the game: therefore the surprising reply is fully justified.

21...\textit{Qg5!} 22.\textit{Qxd6+} \textit{Qg7} 23.\textit{Bxg4}

The only way to fight for the initiative. With an exchange sacrifice, White attempts to disorganise the opponent's attack and complete the mobilisation of his pieces. In the event of 23.\textit{Bh2}, Black would achieve a decisive superiority by 23...\textit{a6} 24.\textit{Qa4} \textit{b5!} and 25...\textit{Bae8}.

23...\textit{Qxg4}
24. \( \text{Wc3} + \)
The white queen must keep control over the activity of her opposite number, and therefore White should play 24.\( \text{We2} \) \( \text{h5} \)\( \text{f1} \). Steinitz reckoned that in this way he could have made at least a draw, but he is hardly right. Of course here White has generally more prospects of complicating the game, for example:
25...\( \text{He8} \) 26.\( \text{Hxe8} \) \( \text{exe8} \) 27.\( \text{Hxf5} \)\( \text{xe2} + \) 28.\( \text{Hf1} \) (28.\( \text{Hf3} \) \( \text{e3} + \) 29.\( \text{g2} \)\( \text{g6} \) 30.\( \text{Hf3} \) \( \text{e2} + \) 31.\( \text{g1} \) \( \text{xb2} \), and if 32.\( \text{b3} \), then 32...\( \text{Hxa2} \) 33.\( \text{xb7} \)\( \text{e3} \) etc.), but, all the same, Black’s chances remain better: 25...\( \text{Hg6} \) 26.c5 \( \text{Hae8} \) 27.\( \text{Hxe8} \) \( \text{exe8} \) 28.\( \text{Hxe8} \) \( \text{Hc2} + \) 29.\( \text{Hf3} \) \( \text{h2} + \) 30.\( \text{Hc3} \) \( \text{xf1} + \) 31.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xb2} + \) etc.

24...\( \text{f6} \) 25.\( \text{Hf1} \) \( \text{He4} + \) 26.\( \text{Hg1} \)
Only 26.\( \text{Hf3} \) \( \text{e3} + \) 27.\( \text{Hh2} \) provides a longer resistance.\(^{21}\) Now follows a decisive invasion by the black pieces.

---

21 26.\( \text{Hc2} + \) 27.\( \text{Hh3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 28.\( \text{Hg2} \) \( \text{Hxg2} + \) 29.\( \text{Hxe2} \) \( \text{e3} + \) 30.\( \text{Hf2} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 31.\( \text{Hxf1} \) leaves Black two exchanges ahead but faced with the bishop pair.

26...\( \text{He2} \) 27.\( \text{He3} \)

27...\( \text{He8!} \) 28.\( \text{Hxe8} \) \( \text{exe8} \) 29.\( \text{Hc5} \)
\( \text{Wh2} + \) 30.\( \text{Hf1} \) \( \text{He2} \) 0-1

Here Black had a mate in two by 30...\( \text{Hh1} + \) 31.\( \text{Hg1} \) \( \text{Hh3} \# \).
A very sharp and non-stereotyped played game by both partners. The tactics which Chigorin introduced to the game, in a sharp position, were very instructive.
Chapter 7

Chess professional

On 22 February 1883, Chigorin took a very important and vital step. He handed in to the head of his office the statement: 'Due to my domestic circumstances, I am no longer able to carry on with the duties of my post as a registration clerk and ask you to accept this application and make arrangements to release me from office.'

Thus began a quarter century – until his very dying day – of service to chess by Chigorin, which brought him much joy but also disappointment.

The significance of this step was very great. For the first time in the list of legitimate professions in Czarist Russia: bureaucrat, teacher, merchant, judge, lawyer – there appeared a new profession – chess player. Chigorin’s choice was indicative of the radical change in the estimation of the social significance of chess. Petrov combined chess with work. Jaenisch was an assistant professor of mechanics. Shumov – an official in the Admiralty. All these brilliantly gifted players gave only their spare time to chess. Chigorin’s decision to devote himself exclusively to chess implied both belief in himself and a realisation of the fact that chess was so rich and many-sided that it could fill his whole life. Necessary was a passionate love of chess, necessary was an enthusiastic and fighting temperament, necessary was the steadfast awareness of being a patriot and a citizen, in order to travel his whole life, without stumbling, on the difficult path he had chosen for himself.

As far back as 17 October 1881 – shortly after the death of Shumov – Chigorin took over his position as editor of the chess department of Universal Illustrated. But a small column in a weekly magazine could not fully satisfy Chigorin, who had not stopped dreaming about a chess magazine. In 1885, he made a second attempt to publish the magazine Chess Herald – the so-called new edition –, which was the organ of 'The St. Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs'.

The predecessor of this association was the 'Society for Chess Amateurs' (also situated in St. Petersburg, but without the word 'St. Petersburg' in the title), which was often called 'Chigorin's Club'. Its regulations were established on 31 October 1879 (Chigorin’s birthday), but because of insufficient means, the society closed down. In 1884, Chigorin, who was continually thinking about the organisation of Russian chess players, founded a new chess club. Chigorin was unanimously elected chairman of this club, which was called the 'St. Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs', while his brother-in-law, A.N. Dubravin, became the assistant chairman. By 1885 the Society had more than 80 members.

In the editorial column of Chess Herald was quoted a letter from one of the subscribers: 'The revival of the St. Petersburg Chess Society is of great interest to us, and especially interesting in that one of the main results of it can be expected to be a revival of the Russian chess magazine, the need for which is undoubtedly felt by Russian amateurs, who are stronger and more serious than five years ago... Having first become acquainted with theory in these years (thanks to Chess Sheet), I have the right to express my opinion... Can it be for much longer that all chess
activity in our beloved native land, which has received such a serious stimulus to its
development, will be able to confine itself to the limits of Universal Illustrated?"

This was valuable evidence, and Chigorin, with satisfaction, duly published it in
the first number of his new magazine, though it did underline the continuing and
also fatal conditions for pre-revolutionary Russian chess magazines. Already, the
first number began with an appeal to ‘Chess Amateurs’, calling upon ‘true lovers of
our noble art’ to use all means at their disposal to circulate the magazine far and
wide.

Just as in Chess Sketch, also in the new magazine Chigorin fought tirelessly for the
unification of chess players. He could not agree with the opinion that in Russia,
in contrast to Western countries, there were few chess players. No, ‘Chess has been
known to Russians since olden times, and it would be astonishing to suppose that
there are no chess players in Russia. It is easily possible that there are sufficient
chess players in Russia and even more than sufficient, but only a few chess players
who are not ashamed to play publicly... Those who have seriously come to uphold
the idea, cited above, about the comparatively numerous chess players in Western
Europe, would be shown their very ignorance of the facts. The chess players there
are probably no greater in number than in our country, but all of them are visible,
all act publicly. Four chess amateurs, getting together in a small German town, can
immediately establish themselves as a “club”, “society”, which is then affiliated
to the “German Federation” and everybody is counted. That is why it seems there
are such a particularly great number of them. This is well-known to anyone who
happens to look closely at the chess life of the West. And the majority of Russians,
assuming that there are chess clubs in every town in Germany, do not have a clear
idea of the fact that this “club”, much to their surprise if they found out – has a
total of only four members... We have a firm basis for remaining with our assertion
that the lack of Russian chess playing public hides the true essence of the matter,
the true attitude of the Russian man to our noble game.’

Chigorin cited facts from the chess life in several Russian towns and came to
this conclusion: ‘In St.Petersburg, to all appearances, chess players are trying to get
organised, but there is no public chess life; in Moscow there are a great number
of chess players, but a poor chess life, while in Tula – the chess players, though
“weak”, do exist, but there is a total lack of chess life.’

‘What then is necessary’, Chigorin asked the question, ‘in order to arouse and
maintain interest in the game of chess, to overcome the indifference to it, which
not infrequently arises in the chess clubs themselves and leads to their collapse? Is it
really not possible for us, in our Russian clubs, to conduct what is basically a simple
chess life, such as tournaments, matches, competitions; is it really not possible in
our Russian clubs to be interested in the general success of chess life in the whole
country and in all the world? Even if experience teaches them22 to understand that
chess societies will not be established if they do not offer each member something
which they cannot achieve by themselves, and that it is necessary to develop in

22. Russian chess players.
them an expedient form of life and activity... the inference for Russian chess... for its future – is obvious.’

Here we come to the very heart of Chigorin’s articles on the disorder of Russian chess life and about immediate measures to tackle the reigning confusion in it...

‘Organisation and activity! – this is the password and slogan of those who work for the future of chess in our land. It is not enough to love and study chess; all chess enthusiasts must unite in order to achieve common aims... If it were a matter of our personal opinion, of our aspirations, then we would initiate right away, without vacillation, the proposal of a radical, very valid, foundation of an all-Russia Chess Union with annual congresses and tournaments held in turn by different cities.’

Following the disclosure of his basic idea, Chigorin made public a draft of the regulations of this Russian Chess Union and also a circular, in which it was announced that the editorial staff were proceeding with the organisation of the Union and needed help in attracting members and collecting membership fees.

But with the selfless champion for the organisation of Russian chess players in full swing, his noble struggle ran across insurmountable obstacles.

This was a time when the revolutionary situation at the end of the 1870s had given way to the period of the ‘unruly, incredibly senseless and brutal reaction’ of Alexander III.

A man, so far removed from political activity as Lev Tolstoy, summed up the measure of reaction of the 1880s like this:

‘Alexander III changed the government, restricted the jury; did away with the Justice of the Peace; university rights, changed the whole system of teaching in high schools; revived military schools, even executed for the selling of wine, installed Heads of District Councils; legalised the birch; virtually did away with the District Councils; gave uncontrolled power to the governors; encouraged executions, intensified administrative procedures for imprisonment and political capital punishment; carried out new religious persecutions, tried to stupefy the people to the last degree with wild superstitions of Orthodox belief... determined punishment for lawlessness through a Police State with deaths by execution a normal order of events...’

After the assassination of Alexander II and the destruction of the people’s freedom, three pillars of reaction – Pobedonostsev, Dmitri Tolstoy and Katkov – gained exceptional influence in the country. Exploiting his great influence over the Czar, Pobedonostsev was the initiator of protective, prohibitive measures, blocking the way of anything that might present even just a hint of danger for the well-being of the landed nobility.

Pobedonostsev, a professor of civil law, was a bitter enemy of the freedom of the press. ‘It is impossible to make a good start’, he wrote, ‘while there is no restraint on the newspapers. Have we not had enough of the false and depraved propaganda in important magazines and newspapers? To what, if not to an intensification of this evil would the freedom of the press lead? In today’s grave times for the government it is above all necessary to quieten the minds, to calm the thoughts of the people,
then the confusion, rebellious agitation — in order to stop the ridiculous twaddle, which everyone engages in, so there is less idle gossip. This is why I have always been of the opinion that it is impossible to undertake anything firm and important for the establishment of order, while there remains full, unbridled freedom... for newspapers and magazines.'

Pobedonostsev saw sedition in everything — even in the fact that, in Saratov, the educational institutions held a requiem for I.S. Turgenev, and in the fact that, to mark the centenary of the visit of Catherine II, a scholarly crowd came together for a jubilee convention(!) and in the fact that 'lately all the paper shops are selling note-paper and envelopes of a repulsively red colour... It seems to me that the innovation has some hidden design...'.

And all these terrible dangers Pobedonostsev reported at once to the minister of the interior, Dmitri Tolstoy, who was as fierce a reactionary as himself, or indeed the Czar. It is not surprising that if they paid attention to the colour of letter-paper, then chess did not escape the vigilance of the reactionaries. In 1885, Chigorin published in Chess Herald the revealing account of P.U. Arnold's attempt to organise a summertime chess tournament at a health resort.

'After receiving agreement from three amateurs to definitely take part in a tournament, I wrote down the conditions and drew up a poster with huge letters, which I already intended to put up in a visible place in the concert hall. But there was one problem. In order to hang up the poster, I had to ask the permission of the authorities of this venue.

When I arrived at the office and showed the poster and the conditions of the proposed tournament, I was given a very suspicious look. Probably the word tournament appeared suspicious, and I did not obtain the expected permission — I was told to wait a few days, while they negotiated with the governor, but if they considered it necessary then it would be up to the governor-general. And the more I tried to explain the total innocence and full trustworthiness of the proposed sporting event, the more intractable the authorities became, and the stronger their suspicion towards me personally, as also to my request for the tournament.'

In the end, permission to hang up the poster about the tournament was obtained, not only after two weeks and only after the threat to send the governor a telegram of complaint.

The raging reaction, the hounding of radicals, the prohibition of progressive magazines (we recall that, in 1884, the first democratic magazine of that time, Home Report, was closed down), the closing of educational institutions — all these
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attempts to 'freeze Russia' could not but have an effect on the psychology of Russian societies.

Contemporaries witnessed the increase in sluggishness, indifference, despondency, selfishness and callousness amongst the intelligentsia in the 1880s. 'Afraid of talking loudly, sending letters, making acquaintances, studying books, afraid of helping the poor to learn to read and write' – recalled Chekhov in one of his stories. One must not forget this, when reading about the tenacious, heroic and yet frequently unsuccessful struggle of Chigorin against the apathy and passivity amongst chess players.

He did not succeed in creating an All-Russia Chess Union. If the innocent poster about the tournament at the health resort was met with such suspicion, then it could be expected that the projected organisation of an All-Russia Chess Union would be linked with an attempt to undermine the foundations of the State. It is not surprising that the draft of the regulations of the Union and the circular, which were published in Chess Herald, gave rise to this enquiry by the censorship committee to the St.Petersburg city governor:

'The editorship of the magazine Chess Herald, which is propagating the idea of forming a "Chess Union", wants to print a circular, in which is announced the fact that they are already setting about the organisation of a Union and need help (1) in the attraction of amateurs to membership of the Union, and (2) in the subsequent collection of membership fees.

The censoring committee does not know whether to approve the regulations of the afore-mentioned Union, a draft of which has appeared in the January number of the magazine, and whether it is proper that such a circular should appear before permission is obtained from the government regarding the establishment of the afore-mentioned Union.

Therefore, also bearing in mind that the present circular, which does not contain anything literary, is subject rather to permission by the police authorities, than the general censor, the committee, in forwarding a proof direct, has the honour of asking your excellency to report your decision as to whether it can be printed.'

As a result, Chigorin had to experience the dashing of his hopes. At the end of 1886 he was obliged to inform the readers of the magazine:

'For the present there can be no progress with the matter of the organisation of a "Russian Chess Union". The printed circular, which we mentioned in No.7 of Chess Herald, cannot be distributed due to circumstances "independent of us". However, we do have evidence that the Union meets with great sympathy amongst Russian chess players; we have been sent quite a lot of statements about it, both on a personal level and also with regard to spreading the news of it and attracting members. With regard to the regulations, they will be drawn up and presented for approval at the beginning of next year, 1887. Until the regulations are approved, however, we cannot, for the present, openly and freely take steps to carry out our plan.'

Needless to say, Chigorin's regulations for the Union likewise did not receive final approval. The idea of any, even chess, public activity, society, arrangement of some
sort of Union, organisation, would be unacceptable to the ruling circles. The dream of the great chess player that 'all chess amateurs must unite for the achievement of a common aim' was not realised in his lifetime. But, even though he abandoned the idea of an All-Russia Chess Union, Chigorin did not stop looking for other ways to achieve the solidarity of Russian chess players and the flourishing of Russian chess.

In the St.Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs he arranged handicap tournaments in which he took part himself, and -- such was already the feature in the way of all contests where odds are given -- he did not always take first place in these tournaments. Thus, in the handicap tournament of 1884/85, first was the second-category player Otto, runner up, another second-category player, Polner, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Chigorin; in the handicap tournament of 1885/86, the winner was Zhibin (third category), 2\textsuperscript{nd} was Sinitzky (third category), 3\textsuperscript{rd} Chigorin. But Chigorin knew very well that the chance to come ahead of him in a tournament, even if handsome odds were received, would attract players to the tournament, and therefore he was not averse to playing in these competitions.

Tours were another form of activity by Chigorin, directed at the development and flourishing of chess in Russia. In 1884 he visited Kharkov and Moscow, where he gave exhibitions, playing in consultation games and in tournaments. Such a strong impression was made everywhere on the chess players by the strength and brilliancy of Chigorin’s play, together with the fascination of his personality, that more than half a century later, one of the Kharkov amateurs, who met Chigorin during his stay in Kharkov in 1884, recalled with excitement: 'Many years have passed since then, but I, now a very old man, even to this day cannot forget that evening and that spiritual bond, which was at once established between the genius-like virtuoso and us, humble chess players. With Chigorin’s arrival in Kharkov, the chess life became intensely animated. All the Kharkov players, and particularly our chess youth, expressed true enjoyment and benefit.'

Chigorin’s future tours in different Russian towns were invariably accompanied by great success and promotion of the spreading of chess throughout the country. Chigorin knew very well how great a propaganda value had these performance tours, and also the attitude both to him and his genuine creative activity. 'And it had to be seen', wrote the Moscow chess player D.N.Pavlov about an exhibition of Chigorin in Moscow 1891, 'how, according to the state of play, this at first so calm face was transformed and turned into glowing colour with blazing dark eyes and an intense frown, every time Chigorin thought up some sort of stunning combination or complicated manoeuvre! It was obvious that he was totally absorbed by the progress of play, that the exhibition was not tedious hack work for him, as for the majority of chess professionals, but a new field for the manifestation of his creative nature. It is therefore understandable that Chigorin’s exhibitions enjoyed enormous success, greater perhaps than the exhibitions of any other famous master. And, in fact, his exhibitions were always exceptionally interesting, not so much in the sporting, that is to say, the ‘points’ result of it, which usually would also be very successful (though Chigorin did not attach much significance to this), as in the quality of the games, richly imbued with creative ideas and brilliant combinations,
which was all the more remarkable in view of the short amount of time he had to think over the moves in conducting an exhibition.'

'During the exhibition', recalled G.P. Volchenko—an eye-witness of Chigorin's stay in Reval (Tallinn) at the beginning of the 20th century, Mikhail Ivanovich turned into a completely different person, similar to some kind of great actor on the stage. Therefore his performance was not laboured, tedious, but resembling a spectacular firework... Both in exhibition and consultation games, his play was lively, brilliant—in Chigorin style—with sacrifices and beautiful surprising combinations, which made an enormous impression on all those present.'

It is not surprising that the effect and efficiency of Chigorin's tours was exceptionally great, while sometimes staggering, and could not but give Chigorin a feeling of satisfaction and legitimate pride. Returning after a tour to the Baltic at the end of the 1890s, Chigorin jokingly said: 'For so many years I have intended to get chess life going there, and then I organised, in each town, a club in one day.' The Baltic Chess Union, founded in 1898, was a spontaneous result of an upsurge of chess in the Baltic, stimulated by Chigorin's tour.

But, possibly, Chigorin's performance in correspondence play had even greater significance for the spreading of chess. In a huge country, it was difficult to organise systematic meetings of chess players, living far away from each other, and so correspondence play acquired a special significance. Readers will see in this book several games played by Chigorin by correspondence. In 1884, Chigorin, as editor of the chess department of Universal Illustrated, organised a correspondence tournament with twelve participants (double round), which lasted up to 1886. The tournament ended in a victory for Chigorin, who conceded only two draws. In collections of the best games of Chigorin, it is usual to feature a few correspondence games. Moscow and St.Petersburg, Smolensk and Piatigorsk, Trostyanetz and Gatchina, Yalta and Novokhopsk, Penza and Kovno (Kaunas) — this is a far from complete list of locations of chess players involved in the competitions.

Among Chigorin's correspondence partners, the reputation of one in science far exceeds his chess reputation, though he was a chess player of considerable strength (first category). We are referring to the famous mathematician Andrey Andreyevich Markov (1856-1922). In his youth, this scholar found quite a lot of time for chess. In 1890, a correspondence match took place between Chigorin and Markov, devoted to an analysis of variations of the Evans Gambit and the Two Knights Defence. The match ended with the score +2 -1 =1 in favour of Chigorin. The score shows how serious an opponent was the Russian academic. We mention,
incidentally, that amongst Chigorin’s partners in various St.Petersburg tournaments were the Professor of Mathematics and first category chess player B.M. Koyalovich (1877-1942) and the microbiologist and later academician, V.L. Omelyansky. There is documentary evidence that Chigorin also played against Mendeleev, who won the game out of thirteen against him. In Mendeleev’s archives was a cutting from Chigorin’s chess column in New Times with notes by the great academic.

Without doubt, not one of the great chess players gave so much time and attention to correspondence play as Chigorin. ‘In correspondence play’, wrote Emanuel Lasker on Chigorin, ‘he had no equal.’ Such hindrances as lack of time, nervousness, noise in the hall by spectators, all sorts of everyday burdens, cares and woes, lost their significance. Of more decisive significance was the incomparable analytical talent of Chigorin, his exceptional feeling for a position and ability to discover hidden combinational continuations.

In 1886/87, Chigorin’s mastery in correspondence play was tested for the first time in an international competition. The St.Petersburg Chess Society challenged the London Chess Club to a telegraph match of two games. From St.Petersburg the play was to all intents and purposes conducted by Chigorin, since the participation of the other members of the committee appointed for this purpose, was nominal later, several of them even resented Chigorin for this...

The course of the match was not entirely regular. After getting into a difficult position in both games, London stopped replying. The arbiter was the famous Kolisch, runner up in the Paris tournament of 1867.

We have already mentioned that, after this tournament, Kolisch abandoned chess for the sake of a banking career. Great success awaited him in this walk of life. After carefully studying the methods of French banks and then improving them, Kolisch made a huge fortune in Austro-Hungary. In the depicted times he was already a millionaire, had retired from business and lived in his luxurious villa in the environs of Vienna, where, from time to time, he held dazzling parties. Society columns reported on the fact that, in 1881, he received the Austrian emperor, together with his two brothers and Princess Marie of Bavaria, while in 1882 – all the participants of the international tournament in Vienna were presented with their prizes to the strains of music: the orchestra played and the Vienna choir sang by special invitation.

After not receiving a reply from London, Chigorin appealed to Kolisch, who was obliged to tear himself away from his social activities and rush off to London. London replied that they would resign one game, while the other, they proposed to consider a draw. Chigorin, in an analysis of this position featured in the French magazine La Stratégie (June 1888), demonstrated that, also here, the English should lose. The complications arising in this game in the rook endgame, in which there was little material, but many hidden fine points, proved so great that even Chigorin’s analysis, which made such a strong impression on his contemporaries, did not exhaust all the complexities of the position. In any case, the win against the strongest chess club in the world at that time, was an important victory by the Russian chess player, and was achieved thanks to Chigorin’s exceptional mastery of correspondence play.
Things did not turn out well with Chess Herald. Though the magazine was rich in content and interesting, the list of subscribers featured in it was evidence of the far too small an increase in subscriptions. In No.1 of 1886, the editorship was forced to express a few sad thoughts: 'If, to judge by the numerous comments made to the editorship, there is a need for a magazine, it enjoys general sympathy. But though these comments are undoubtedly dear to the editorship, not everybody is in that need of a magazine. The amount of money in hand from the new subscribers hardly covers the cost of printing, and nothing is to be gained by improving and expanding sections of the magazine, nor even is there recompense for the highly difficult work of compiling it. The editorship takes the liberty of turning to all chess amateurs, with the reminder that both the existence of a magazine and also the realisation of the projects of the editorship, which are aimed at the spreading and development of the game of chess in Russia, depends on the active, moral and material participation in these matters and the enterprise of everybody who would have his own interests at heart. The time must finally pass, when one can only be amazed at the full sympathy of all the good words spoken.'

Following this, the magazine came out for another year, but after No.1 of 1887, it was discontinued. Once again the energy and enthusiasm of Chigorin proved insufficient for victory over the passivity of the readers who, though kindly disposed, did not give the necessary effective material help.

7 Two Knights Defence
P.U. Arnold
Mikhail Chigorin
St.Petersburg 1885 blindfold simul (+8-1=1)
P.U. Arnold also played blindfold
1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qf6
4.Qg5 d5 5.exd5 Qa5 6.Qb5+ c6
7.Qxc6 Qxc6 8.Qe2
Blumenfeld: Weaker is 8.Qa4 h6 9.Qf3 e4 and White cannot play 10.Qe5 because of 10...Qd4 with a double attack, as taking on c6 would lead to the loss of a piece.

8...h6 9.Qf3 e4 10.Qe5 Qc7 11.f4

The attitude of theory to this move has changed several times. Now it is regarded as the most reliable.
Blumenfeld: Later on, Black very skillfully exploits the shady side of this natural move, which implies the following:
A) a somewhat weakened position of the white castled king;
B) in the event of the knight on e5 moving away, the f4-pawn will be exposed to attack.
It would be better to play at once 11.d4.

11...Qd6 12.d4

The excellent reputation of the move 11.f4 is based on the variation 12.0-0!

12.0-0 13.Qc3 Qxe5 14.fxe5 Qxe5 15.d4
exd3 16.Qxd3 Qg4 17.Qf4! Qc5+
18.Qd4, in which White, by giving back the pawn, obtains the advantage of the two bishops and better placed pieces.

12...0-0 13.0-0 c5!

White must resolve the problem of the d4-pawn. On 14.Qc3 could follow 14...
16. \textbf{b5}

This tempting intermediate move allows a mating attack. However, the position is far from clear after the simple 16.cxd4. The continuation 16...\textbf{xa3} 17.bxa3 \textbf{c}c3 seems strong, but after 18.d2! \textbf{xd}4+ 19.h1, Black loses material: 19...\textbf{b}6 20.\textbf{xa}5 \textbf{xa}5 21.\textbf{c}6. It seems that Black should reply 16...\textbf{c}6. The continuation 17.b5 would reveal Black's principal threat: 17...\textbf{xb}5 18.\textbf{xb}5 \textbf{d}xd4, with a very sharp position (for example, 19.\textbf{e}e2 \textbf{c}c2!

20.\textbf{b}1 \textbf{d}8, or 19.\textbf{c}3 \textbf{xe}5 20.fxe5 \textbf{x}c4 21.exf6 \textbf{a}6(4). If, however, White spends time on 17.h1, then after 17...\textbf{xa}3 18.bxa3 \textbf{e}7!, Black's knight succeeds in taking up an ideal position in the centre. Possibly best of all for White is 17.\textbf{xc}6, though, after 17...\textbf{xc}6 18.\textbf{c}4 \textbf{d}5, the position would be double edged, despite White's extra pawn.

16...\textbf{xb}5! 17.\textbf{xb}5 \textbf{b}6 18.a4

Blumenfeld: Not 18.c4, since White wants to retain the c4-square for his knight.

18...d3+ 19.h1

19.a6!

Even without forced variations, it is clear that two connected passed pawns in the centre give Black compensation for the exchange. Chigorin strengthens his position still further, forcing the exchange of the strong knight on e5 for his unfortunate opposite number standing idle on the edge of the board.

Blumenfeld: Black could also play the prosaic 19.\textbf{xe}5 20.fxe5 \textbf{g}4, winning back the sacrificed material with interest. Chigorin, however, playing blindfold, finds a more energetic continuation.

\footnote{However there seems nothing wrong with 19.\textbf{xd}4 as 19...\textbf{xd}4+ 20.cxd4 \textbf{xb}4 is met by 21.\textbf{a}3.}

\footnote{But White still seems to be on top: 22.\textbf{f}2 \textbf{d}3 23.h2 \textbf{e}3+ 24.h1.}
20.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c4}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c4}} 21.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xc4}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g4}}
The g4-square serves as an ideal jumping off point for the invasion of the black pieces.

22.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a5}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a7}} 23.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a4}} 24.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e1}}
Blumenfeld: Threatening the famous mate by 25...\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f2+}} etc. White's reply is therefore forced.

25.h3 \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f2}} 26.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d2}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c5}}
Six moves are required by Chigorin to demonstrate the hopelessness of further resistance.

There follows a desperate burst of activity by White, which is punished by a beautiful mating finale.

Blumenfeld: 26...\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g3}} is just as quickly decisive, but the text continuation is more beautiful. White's following sacrifice staves off the inevitable for a few moves.\textsuperscript{16}

27.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xh7+}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xh7}} 28.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e8+}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{h8}}

29.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf7}}
Blumenfeld: 29.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe4+}} g6 30.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g3+}}! is equally hopeless. Now follows a spectacular study-like ending, with a queen sacrifice and mate with the minor pieces.

29...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xg2+}}! 30.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xg2}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f1+}} 31.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g1}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h2#}}
Blumenfeld: This elegant little game enjoyed particular popularity at the time, and was featured in many chess magazines throughout the world.

8 Queen's Pawn Opening
London
St.Petersburg
Correspondence match 1886/1887 (2)
1.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f3}} d5 2.d4 \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g4}}

The problem of the development of the bishop on c8 in the Queen's Gambit is complicated: it is necessary to decide both where this bishop is developed and also when to do this. Chigorin tried several times to solve this problem directly. Contemporary theory, however, regards the move 2...\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g4}} with scepticism, considering that the weakening of the queen's flank and, above all, the b7-pawn, could give rise to new difficulties for Black.

Chigorin: In choosing this move, we intended, above all, to avoid the usual mode of development in the present position. In the variation 1.d4 d5 2.\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f3}} \textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f6}} 3.e3, the move 3...\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g4}} is not considered good for Black,
although practice does not confirm this opinion.

3.\( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{h5} \)

This continuation is not better than 3...\( \text{Qf5} \), which is discussed in the notes to the game, Consultants-Chigorin, Havana 1891. White, in his struggle for an opening advantage, ought to play 4.c4.

4.g4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 5.h4 e6!

In his pursuit of the bishop, White has recklessly advanced his flank pawns, but Chigorin, not fearing ghosts, makes a useful developing move which invites White to advance his h-pawn even further. After 6.h5 \( \text{Qe4} \) 7.f3 f6 8.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 9.\( \text{Qxd3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \), Black does not stand worse.

Chigorin: And if here 8.\( fxe4 \) \( fxe5 \) 9.\( dxe5 \) \( \text{Qe7} \), Black has a strong attack and can win back the pawn.

6.\( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{f6} \)

Now the bishop is ready to defend the h4-pawn from the g3-square, and as the complications arising from 6...\( \text{Qe4} \) 7.f3 f6 8.\( fxe4 \) \( fxe5 \) and 9...\( \text{Qe7} \) are unfavourable for Black, he is forced to exchange the e5-knight.

7.\( \text{Qxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 8.\( \text{Qd3} \) g5 9.\( \text{Qg3} \)

Pawn grabbing could lead to a catastrophe: 9.\( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 10.\( \text{Qxb7} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 11.\( \text{Qxc7} \) \( \text{Cc8} \) etc.

9...\( \text{Cc6} \)

Chigorin: It is not this move which changes White’s position for the worse; weaknesses had appeared even earlier, due to the advance of the g- and h-pawns. On 10.\( \text{Qd2} \), as on 10.\( \text{a3} \) or 10.\( \text{c3} \), Black would reply 10...\( \text{Qd6}! \), then 11.\( \text{c3} \) (if 11.0-0-0 \( \text{gxh4} \) 12.\( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{hxh4} \) 13.\( \text{Qxh4} \) g5 14.\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 11...\( \text{Qxg3} \) 12.\( \text{Qxg3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13.\( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{cx6} \) 14.\( \text{Qf3} \) e5, and, in my opinion, Black, threatening to win a pawn, would have obtained a quicker and superior advantage to that which he has after the critical move 10.\( \text{Qg6} \).

10...\( \text{Qd7} \)

As well as having the better development and an elastic pawn chain in the centre, Black does not suffer any inconvenience from the king being on d7. Moreover, it is dangerous for White to play 11.\( \text{Qf7+} \), since, after 11...\( \text{Qe7} \), his queen finds herself in a trap (12...\( \text{h6} \) 13.\( \text{Qh5} \) g6).

11.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{Qe8} \)

Chigorin: After 12.\( \text{Qxe8} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \), Black’s position would be still stronger. On 12.\( \text{Qc2} \), Black would reply 12...\( \text{Qd6} \), in order to divert the bishop from defence of the h4-pawn.

12.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qge7} \)

The basic aim of this move is to force the exchange of queens and transpose the game into a complicated ending, where the black knight will be stronger than the bishop.

13.\( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{gxh4} \) 14.\( \text{Qxh4} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \) 15.\( \text{Qxh4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 16.\( \text{Qxg6} \)

Black threatened not only to take the g4-pawn, but also, after 16...\( \text{Qh6} \), to break through to c1. Therefore the exchange of queens is forced.

Chigorin: And if 16...\( \text{h3} \), then 16...\( \text{Qc2} \).

16...\( \text{Qxg6} \) 17.\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 18.\( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \)

10.\( \text{Qg6} \)
Chigorin: All the white pieces which had been brought into action have now been exchanged. The black king, knight and pawns are excellently placed. Though, at this moment, his advantage is still not perceptible, it is, however, already clear that sooner or later it can be realised. The game now enters a new phase in which the attack passes to Black.

19.e3 ♜h8 20.♕f1 e5

Chigorin: This move is linked to a complicated plan of attack, crowned by an exchange sacrifice on the 33rd move. It is not difficult to see that most of White’s following moves are simply forced. Black would also obtain a good game with the manoeuvre ...♗d8-f7-g5, which does not involve a weakening of the d5-pawn.

21.♗d2 ♜h4 22.f3

Black reckoned precisely on this natural reply, when playing his last move. Meanwhile, White could have played simply 22.♗f3, forcing the rook to retreat. Black would then have to prepare the advance ...e5-e4.

22...exd4 23.cxd4 ♖b4 24.♖f2

Chigorin: Black was threatening 25...♖c2.

24...b6 25.b3 ♜h8!

Chigorin: This move is necessary, in order, after 26.a3, to ensure the incursion 26...♗d3+. If the rook remains on h4, White, on 25...♗d3+, would have replied 26.♖g3, and ♜f1.

26.a3 ♖d3+!

27.♕e2

Chigorin: As a result of this plan of defence, Black’s rook dominates the open file, and considerably limits the mobility of the enemy king and knight. However, Black, in making his 20th move, had in mind, above all, the defence by 27.♖g3, which would lead to extremely interesting variations. The principal variation was 27.♖g3 ♜e8 28.♗f1 e5 29.dxc5+ bxc5 30.♖d1 c4 31.bxc4 dxc4 32.♖d2 ♖c5 33.♖e4+ ♖xe4 34.fxe4 ♖e5 35.♖f1! ♖b5. It is clear that, after the sacrifice of the exchange, Black has at least an equal game.

Vasyukov/Nikitin: Though grandmaster Kotov subsequently showed that, in the basic continuation of Chigorin’s analysis, 36.♖xd3 ♖xd3 37.♖f3 ♖a4 38.♕e2 ♖b3 39.♖xd3+! cxd3+ 40.♖xd3 g5, White could make the strong move 41.e5!, the evaluation of the position remains as before, since, apparently, taking the white bishop with the pawn is stronger – 36...cxd3, and indeed also 40...g5 seems a loss of an important tempo, instead of the natural 40...♖xa3.

27...♗h2 28.♖xd3

White is forced to give up the second rank, since, on 28.♖g1, strong is 28...♗c1+, as pointed out by Bogoljubow.

28...♗xg2
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Chigorin: There is no doubt that, in this position, White can defend only in two ways: immediately prevent the advance ...c7-c5 by playing 29.b4, or occupy the h-file with the rook... The weak side of White’s position undoubtedly lies in his unfavourable pawn formation and the limited mobility of his king and knight. Finally, also the white rook cannot take up a good position, if the black rook dominates the h-file. Black’s plan of attack is to divert the white king and knight away from the defense of the e- and f-pawns; this plan is realised by the further manoeuvre of his knight. If White, anticipating this, plays for the opening of the a-file, by continuing 29.b4 \[h2\] 30.a4 \[\text{c}7\] 31.a5 (31.b5 c5 32.bxc6 \[\text{x}c6\] 33.\[\text{F}1\] \[\text{B}1\] \[\text{c}7\], followed by ...a7-a5 and ...\[\text{B}b4+\]) 31...\[\text{d}c6\] 32.axb6, then there follows 32...\[\text{B}x\text{b}4+\] 33.\[\text{c}3\] axb6. If White were to attack, not with the a-pawn but with the b-pawn, then he cannot prevent the knight from establishing itself on the c4-square: 29.b4 \[h2\] 30.b5 \[\text{c}7\] and, after a further ...c7-c5 and bxc6, would follow the transfer ...\[\text{B}xc6\]-a5-c4. But if, finally, White does not advance either the a- or b-pawns, then Black transfers the knight to b6, via e7 and c8, and then weakens the c4-square and also occupies it with the knight. To conclude, it is necessary to mention that Black’s most accurate way to the win lies in the immediate occupation of the h-file by the rook.

29.\[\text{h}1\] c5! 30.\[\text{h}7\]

There is no sense in exchanging on c5, since the pawn should remain on d4, so as not to allow the black knight to e5. Therefore White is forced to submit to a further weakening of his pawn chain. Chigorin: If 30.dxc5+ bxc5 31.\[\text{h}7\], then 31...\[\text{e}5+\] 32.\[\text{c}3\] d4+, winning the knight.

30...\[\text{x}d4\] 31.\[\text{x}d4\] \[\text{f}4+\] 32.\[\text{c}3\] \[\text{e}3\]

32...\[\text{e}6\] 33.\[\text{d}3\] a5 34.\[\text{e}3\]

34...\[\text{g}1\]!

This fine manoeuvre, in conjunction with the following combination, guarantees Black a quick win. Black could win a pawn by 34...\[\text{x}d4\] 35.\[\text{xd}4\] \[\text{xd}2+\] 36.\[\text{c}3\] \[\text{f}2\] 37.\[\text{x}g7\] \[\text{x}f3+\]; but, after 38.\[\text{c}2\], the rook ending can hardly be won. Chigorin considered that another way to win the game was by 34...g5; however, he noted that ‘the win is not achieved so quickly and will be far more difficult’.

35.\[\text{h}8\] \[\text{c}1\] 36.\[\text{b}8\]

Chigorin: On 36.\[\text{d}3\], Black intended to reply not 36...\[\text{f}4+\], but 36...g5!, forcing the king to return to the e3-square,
because of the threat of 37...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}4+} and 38...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}1+}.

36...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}3+} 37.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}2} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xd}4} 38.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{xb}6+} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}5} 39.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}7} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}4}

\textbf{40.g5}

Chigorin: Or if 40.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}g7}, then 40...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}3} 41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}2+} 42.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xf}3+} 43.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}2} and wins. Or 40.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}7} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}3} 41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}2+} 42.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}2} 43.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}d}5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xf}3}, followed by ...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}3}.

\textbf{40...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}3}}

White resigned.

Chigorin: For if 41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}g7} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}5!} 42.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}6} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}2+} 43.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}3} 44.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}7} (if 44.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}2} or 44...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}2}) 44...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}d}2, and mate in a few moves; and if 41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}2+} 42.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xf}3+} 43.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}1} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}2} and wins.
Chapter 8

The first match with Steinitz

The dark times in which Chigorin lived and worked were an age of reaction for Russia which did not pass without leaving its mark on the country's history and the development of its culture. Despite all the severe repression and governmental oppression, the progressive-minded people did not despair, did not capitulate, and, in intolerably difficult conditions, continued their struggle for the future development of Russian science and culture. 'We know', wrote V.I. Lenin, 'that the form of public movement is changed, that a period of radical political work of the collective masses is changed, in the history of a period when outward calm reigns, when the downtrodden and crushed remain silent or dormant (or apparently dormant) about the drudgery of work and the needs of the masses, when modes of production get revolutionised particularly quickly, when the thoughts of progressive representatives of the people sum up the past, create new systems and new methods of investigation... In short, "a change of thoughts and minds" sometimes ensues in a historical period of mankind, just as it does in the erudite work and research of a political activist during a period of imprisonment.'

We are obliged to remember with gratitude all the creative work in Russia in the 1880s. The creative works of the foremost representatives of Russian science and art, despite all the restrictions and obstacles, distinguished themselves as the most important achievements of that time, rightfully forming part of the pride of Russian culture.

Mendeleev and Butlerov, Mechnikov and A. Kovalevsky, Sechenov and Pavlov, Timiryazev and Ivanevsky, Lyapunov and Sofia Kovalevskaya, Przhevalsky and Semenov-Tyanshansky, Botkin and Zakharin, Popov and Dolivo-Dobrovolsky - here is a far from complete list of creative workers in this age of great Russian academics, inventors and artists, each of whom made immense contributions to the treasure house of world knowledge. The family name of one of these - Dolivo-Dobrovolsky - we already know. Yes, indeed, one of the sons of the strict and callous director of the Gatchina Orphans Institute became an outstanding Russian electro-technician, whose discoveries laid down the beginning of a new era in electro-technology.

World renown rightfully belongs to Tchaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, Repin and Surikov, Leviton and Serov, Chekhov and Korolenko, Ermolov and Fedotov, Lensky and Uzhin. Russian artists, just like Russian scientists in the 1880s, gave the world many great productions in spite of reaction.

Chess formed a modest, but integral part of the general culture of the people. The activities of Chigorin, his struggle for the solidarity and unity of Russian chess players, his brilliant chess creativity, stood in the same ranks as the achievements of Mendeleev, Tchaikovsky, Repin, Chekhov and others of his outstanding contemporaries.

Beginning in 1889, the character of Chigorin's career completely changed, in comparison with the period 1884-1888. In the course of 1884-1888, he took
part in the St.Petersburg handicap tournaments together with unknown amateurs, gave simultaneous exhibitions, played by correspondence, and persistently but unsuccessfully tried to increase the subscriptions to Chess Herald. Not once, during these five years, did Chigorin travel abroad.

From 1889 – there was a complete change. Chigorin fought for the World Championship, played matches against the strongest players in the world, took part in first class international tournaments. Each of his performances attracted universal attention and his games were published in magazines and newspapers throughout the whole world. He was in the prosenium of chess life. This period when he was at the height of his chess powers extended from 1889 to 1896.

What was the spur for such an abrupt change? The paradoxical fact – a challenge to a match, making him pretender to the World Championship! This extraordinary phenomenon was preceded by the following events.

Steinitz expressed great satisfaction from the fact that he had beaten Zukertort, in 1886, by the score of +10 -5 =5. But Zukertort was completely demoralised towards the end of the match and Steinitz’s victory did not receive due recognition with the majority of chess players of the day.

It is true that Steinitz was proclaimed World Champion, but the overwhelming majority of voices in the press were far from enthusiastic. The newspaper New York Staatszeitung wrote enigmatically:

'The match is over. Zukertort has lost ignominiously. Steinitz is declared the strongest player in the world (world champion). True friends of chess art, who closely followed the match from the beginning, lost interest as it progressed, and at the end of it were disappointed and dissatisfied. Expecting a battle of giants, and finding on both sides only a cautious 'trial', which was far from indicative of talent, the spectators were left dissatisfied, seeing, in the majority of games, victories achieved only as a result of oversights of the opponent, witnessing, finally, one of the giants suffering from mental and physical weakness, when it was necessary to fight, and an inability to win.'

The press of the time was of such opinions. The Deutsche Schachzeitschrift commented on the games of the match ironically. And one distinguished German chess player expressed his feeling of dissatisfaction. ‘As soon as this great struggle ended, the voices of discontented critics were heard. They were deceived in their expectation of beautiful combinations and now expressed a frank sense of disillusionment, being depressed by the course of the match.’

These critics, for the most part, were unfair, but Steinitz had to reckon with the chorus of discontent.

Two years after his match with Zukertort, during a stay in Havana in 1888, Steinitz received a proposal from the Havana Chess Club to play a match with any one of the strongest players in the world. He was to decide his future opponent himself. (Such a procedure for arranging a match – the title holder naming the rival – was a phenomenon, unprecedented in the history of chess competition and from this time not repeated.) The choice of the World Champion fell on Chigorin.
Steinitz, speaking about himself in the third person, gave these reasons for his decision.

Steinitz chose, as his opponent, the Russian master Chigorin, whom he had already met twice before. The first time was in the international tournament in London 1882. At that time, Steinitz tied with Winawer for 1st and 2nd prizes, and Chigorin was left without a prize, but, in their personal encounters, each of them won one game. The second time was in the international tournament in London 1883; then in the final standings of the tournament, they came far closer to one another: Steinitz took 2nd prize, Chigorin 4th. In their personal encounters, Chigorin this time was winner in both games.

Chigorin enjoys universal recognition as a first class master; particularly admirable is his style of play, the characteristic feature of which is rare energy and brilliant combinations whilst conducting an attack on the king’s flank, and also accurate calculation in the endgame.

In this way, Steinitz challenged Chigorin, having in mind both his bad personal score against the Russian chess player and, chiefly, his style of play, which had made his name popular everywhere. Of the strongest chess players of that time, Blackburne and Mackenzie had already been defeated by Steinitz in matches, Winawer was busy with his commercial activities, and he played little chess and had no intentions at all of contending the World Championship. Though he had not competed in an international tournament since 1883, Chigorin, without doubt, was Steinitz’s strongest rival.

And so, Chigorin set off for Cuba. In the Atlantic Ocean, the steamship on which he was sailing ran into two storms. Chigorin could not sleep at all and arrived in Havana, jaded and weary. ‘In Havana – said Chigorin after returning to St. Petersburg – I could not rest right away either, because the local club was hurrying to start the match, as they wanted the governor, who was on the point of going away, to
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inaugurate it. The local climate and food immediately began to have a harmful
effect on my health and I was obliged to play in a half-sick condition. At times,
I would feel faint during play, to which I almost became oblivious, and it was a
terrible effort for me to concentrate my attention on the games. Several of these
I lost simply through drowsiness. Once, turning up for the next session of the
match, I looked so ill that the master of ceremonies postponed the game and sent
me home to receive treatment. But there was no possibility at all of postponing the
match: it would then have had to be completely abandoned.'

As regards the conditions of the match, play was to be for the best of 20 games.
It lasted from 20 January to 21 February 1889.

Upon an analysis of the result of the match, which finished with the score +10
-6 =1 in Steinitz's favour, one is struck by the fact that this was essentially a match
of two openings. Out of 17 games, 8 were opened with the Evans Gambit, which
was offered by Chigorin in every game which he played with white (except the
3rd, a Spanish). Steinitz, however, began all the games with the move 1.e4. In
the games where Chigorin played White, the result was +5 -3 =1 in his favour. The
Evans Gambit justified itself. But his result with black was +7 -1 in Steinitz's favour.
What was the reason for such a colossal superiority? The fact of the matter is that
Chigorin, unfortunately, retained too many pleasant memories of the London-St.
Petersburg telegraph game and did not want to miss the opportunity to try this
defence in the match. The result, as we see, was a sorry sight.

The time control was 15 moves per hour. Our attention is drawn to the almost
totally decisive results of the games. The only draw (the fighting 17th game, in
which both Chigorin and Steinitz missed wins) was also the last game.

In the match came to light the weak side of Chigorin — the sportsman. He ought
to have set himself the task, long before, of finding a correct system of play as
Black against 1.d4. In 1889, as indeed also later, he placed too many hopes on
improvisation at the board.

Generally speaking, however, the right methods of preparation for chess players
in competition had not been worked out in the least at that time. Later on, Emanuel
Lasker said that only Pillsbury, for the first time, began to prepare beforehand for
competitions. But this was a matter for the future, while, for the present, the leading
figures treated preparation light-heartedly, considering that their own superior
talent ought, in itself, to guarantee them victory at the board.

Despite the result of the match, Chigorin gained general sympathy in Cuba with
his brilliant play and personal charm.

'There were always a great number of spectators', Chigorin said later, 'so that
our match was positively the evil of the day in Havana. I could not show myself
anywhere — neither in taking a walk, nor in a shop — without being surrounded by
people, quite unknown to me, showering me thick and fast with questions...they
were as kind as could be and it seemed that all sympathies were on my side.'
Greek: One of the extremely rare occasions when Chigorin played the Spanish as White – of course, in the present game, he expected the 'Steinitz Defence', which, in Chigorin's opinion, gives Black 'well-known difficulties'. Later, regarding the Steinitz Defence in the Spanish Game, Chigorin wrote, 'Steinitz, in choosing the defence ...d7-d6, always combined it with the move ...e5xe7, in order not to be forced to take the pawn on d4 with his e5-pawn. It presents well-known difficulties; and it is well-known that Steinitz’ skill overcomes these difficulties.'

Also on Steinitz' later treatment of this defence, in a somewhat modified form, with the development of the king's knight not on e7 but on f6, Chigorin did not have a favourable opinion: 'I consider the move 5...e5f6 – after 3...d6 4.d4 h6d7 5.0-0 – to be inadequate because of the following continuation: 6.Qc3 Se7 7.Qxc6 Qxc6 8.dxe5 dxe5 9.Wc2 0-0 10.Kd1 and then, for example, if 10...Wc8 11.Qg5. Black's position, despite the two bishops – to which many are inclined to attach an exaggerated importance – in my opinion cannot be regarded as good.'

Of course, the Steinitz Defence would not appeal to Chigorin, since it contained no basis for counterplay and allowed simplification; the main point of this defence – the passive stability of the black position – had little attraction for Chigorin. Though Chigorin considered the Steinitz Defence in the Spanish favourable for White, and gained an important victory in the beginning against this variation in the present game, he did not in the future, at any time, choose to play the Spanish, probably considering that the Evans Gambit would give him an even greater advantage in practical play against Steinitz. And, indeed, out of 8 games of this match, begun with the Evans Gambit, Chigorin won 4, lost 3 and drew one – and all this despite the fact that on Steinitz' side were all the advantages of a novelty: all systems of play with the move ...Wf6 were thoroughly prepared by Steinitz in deep secrecy, specially for the present match, and Chigorin refuted the fruits of Steinitz' analyses at the board. There is no justification this time for Alekhine's expressed opinion that 'after a novelty, there usually follows a mistake.' It is interesting to record that the sum total of games between Chigorin and Steinitz, opening with the Evans Gambit, shows a decisive superiority to Chigorin: out of 23 games, Chigorin won 12, lost 6 and drew 5. In the whole of his life, Chigorin played, in general, few Spanish Games. The reason for this lies not only in the fact that he obtained a game more in keeping with his creative nature from other openings, but also in that Chigorin willingly deviated from all that was universally
adopted in chess — and, at the time, the Spanish was a very popular opening. On the other hand, the Evans Gambit was not only played comparatively little, but greatly condemned; Steinitz himself maintained that the Evans Gambit was an ‘incorrect’ opening, in which Black, by giving back the gambit pawn, could obtain the better game. And so, as pointed out above, Chigorin was all the more willing to play this ‘incorrect’ opening in his encounters with Steinitz and other principal opponents — and with great success. Among the rare number of Spanish Games played by Chigorin were a few outstanding examples: the present match game with Steinitz, a brilliant game won against Pillsbury at St.Petersburg 1895/96, and a win against Tarrasch at the Budapest tournament 1896.

3...d6 4.d4 ♖d7 5.dxe5 dxe5 6.0-0 ♖d6 7.♗c3 ♖ge7 8.♖g5! f6
Steinitz: Better was 8...0-0, and only after 9.♖d5 f6.

9.♗e3 0-0 10.♖c4+ ♗h8

11.♗b5
Chigorin: Here, there is another attack: 11.♗h4, followed by ♗h5 or ♗xf3 and ♗f5. This direct attack on the king's flank would have been even stronger after the move 11.♗b5, which provokes the reply 11...♖c8.

11...♖c8 12.♖d2 ♖e8
Steinitz: The more defensive 12...♖e7 was probably better.

13.♖ad1!

13...♖g4 14.♖e2 ♖d8 15.c4 ♖e6 16.h3!
Chigorin: In order to divert the bishop from defence of the knight on e6, or to provoke an exchange of pieces.

16...♖h5 17.c5

17...♖e7
Steinitz: Black could have won the queen here temporarily for only two minor pieces, but his game would have been so much disorganised as to become indefensible, e.g. 17...♗xf3 18.gxf3 ♖xc5 19.♖xc5 (if 19.♖xc7, then 19...♖g6+ 20.♖h2 ♖xe3 and Black wins) 19...♖f4 20.♖xf4! (if 20.♖h2 then 20...♖h5 and, though White may now capture the knight and afterwards take the rook with the bishop, Black will be able to make a better fight than in the line of play we propose?') 20...♖xf4 21.♗xf4 ♖xf8 22.♖xc7 (threatening 23.♖e6) 22...♗b6 23.♖xa8 followed by ♖d2 and doubling rooks, with an easily won game.

18.♖d5 ♖c6

27 But White has 21.♖d7 since 21...f5 is met by 22.♖xf5 due to the back-rank mate.
Chapter 8 - The first match with Steinitz

Chigorin: After 18...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}f3}}, White would have the choice of taking the bishop with the pawn or the bishop. In the first case, after 19.gxf3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5} 20.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}7}! (20.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5? \texttt{\texttt{f}4}!) 20...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}7} 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5}, White has a small advantage in position; secondly, after 19.gxf3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}b}5} 20.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6} – more significantly so (20...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5} 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}5}).

\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}

19.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}4} \texttt{\texttt{e}6}}

20.a4!

Ge	exttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}v}:} Lasker recommended here, 20.b4, and considered Chigorin’s move, 20.a4, a mistake, which, in his opinion, Steinitz did not exploit. Lasker thought that, on 20.a4, Steinitz ought to have continued 20...a6 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}6} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}6} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6} axb5 23.axb5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}b}5}, and 'Black has quite a good development'. We cannot agree with Lasker’s opinion, as, on the reply 20...a6, White could continue with the stronger 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6}! instead of 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}6}: (1) 21...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6} axb5 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}5} and White’s game is better (23...c6 24.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}3} bx}\texttt{\texttt{a}4} 25.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a}1}); (2) 21...axb5 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}6} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}6} (22...\texttt{\texttt{b}6} 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}3}) 23.axb5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}4} 24.\texttt{\texttt{a}1}! and White seizes the open a-file and obtains the better game; Black must exchange rooks or continue 24...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}8} (not possible is 24...\texttt{\texttt{a}7} 25.c6 b6 26.\texttt{\texttt{a}2 with the win of a piece). From this discussion, it is obvious that Chigorin’s move, 20.a4, is by no means a mistake.

20.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5}

Steinitz: An error which costs the exchange. Black might have obtained a defensible game by 20...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}d}5} 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}d}5 (if 21.\texttt{\texttt{e}5}, then 21...\texttt{\texttt{b}5} 22.axb5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5 with advantage to Black) 21...c6 (but not 21...\texttt{\texttt{x}b}5, for, as Chigorin rightly points out, White would then obtain the advantage by 22.axb5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5 23.\texttt{\texttt{c}1 etc.) 22.\texttt{\texttt{x}e}6 cxb5 23.\texttt{\texttt{d}5 \texttt{\texttt{c}6 etc.}}

21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c}5} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}6} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}6}}

23.\texttt{\texttt{c}7} 24.\texttt{\texttt{b}3}

Chigorin: Or 24.\texttt{\texttt{d}5 \texttt{\texttt{x}a}4 25.\texttt{\texttt{c}1 \texttt{\texttt{b}6}} 26.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}a}8 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a}8}}. It seems to me that it is better for White that Black should obtain an extra pawn on the king’s flank, rather than on the queen’s side. White wins the exchange for a pawn, but in either case, winning the game is very difficult.

24...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}e}4} 25.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}a}8} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}f}3} 26.\texttt{\texttt{gxf}3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a}8}}

As a result of a tense strategical battle, White has managed to achieve a small material advantage, by winning rook for knight and pawn. The absence of pawn weaknesses in Black’s camp, and, on the other hand, the weakness of his own pawns on the king’s flank, make a realisation of his advantage exceptionally difficult. Moreover, Black’s pieces, although not very active, are deployed in such a way that all points of invasion by the white rooks
are covered. It is interesting to observe how consistently Chigorin strengthens his position and realises his minimal material advantage. First and foremost, he makes his rooks more active and ties Black’s pieces to the defence of the d6.

27.\(\text{d5}\) b6 28.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d8}\)

An interesting moment. Steinitz and, later, Bogoljubow, commenting on the game, noted that it is now worthwhile for White to open another line for his rooks, by playing 29.a5. But Chigorin plans to delay the advance of the a4-pawn, and even allow Black’s pawn to go to a5, considering that this is in his favour, since White has at his disposal also the possibility of replying with an exchange sacrifice on c5, with a subsequent win of the a5-pawn.

29.\(\text{g2}\) a5 30.\(\text{c2}\) g6 31.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g7}\)

32.f4!

Chigorin strives for a fresh, favourable change in the position by opening the e-file. Black cannot prevent this by 32...\(\text{d4}\) since, after 33.\(\text{fxe5}\) fxe5 34.f4! \(\text{f6}\) 35.\(\text{fxe5+}\) \(\text{xex5}\) 36.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e6}\)

37.\(\text{b3}\), White wins.

32...\(\text{exf4}\) 33.\(\text{f3}\) f5 34.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{f6}\)

35.\(\text{b3}\) h6

36.h5!!

A very fine and, at the same time, very strong move. White prepares the invasion of his rook to e6, under the most favourable conditions. In this case, the h5-pawn would play an important role in White’s attack, by giving him a strong point on g6. After 36...g5+ 37.\(\text{f3}\), Black could not prevent the seizure of the e-file by the white rooks, for example: 37...\(\text{d7}\) 38.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{e7}\) 39.\(\text{xe7}\) \(\text{exe7}\) 40.\(\text{e5+}\). And so he must break up his well-formed pawn chain.

36...\(\text{gxf5}\) 37.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{e7}\) 38.\(\text{e5+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 39.\(\text{xf5+}\) \(\text{xe7}\) 40.\(\text{e5+}\) \(\text{d7}\)

41.\(\text{f3}\) h4 42.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{g8+}\) 43.\(\text{xh4}\)

\(\text{g2}\) 44.\(\text{f5+}\) \(\text{c6}\)

White’s pieces are excellently placed. Black has lost a pawn, but nevertheless the win is still a long way off for White: there are only a few pawns left on the board. Moreover, White must give up another pawn. Which? It seems the b2-pawn: is it not the f-pawn which is passed? But Chigorin, on the contrary, retains the b-pawn, because its loss could entail the elimination also of the a-pawn, and then Black would have two connected passed pawns, while it is quite difficult to advance the f-pawn.

45.\(\text{b3}\)!

Steinitz says of Chigorin’s decision, ‘A profound move. White perceives the exigencies of the position with an acumen that hardly finds its equal in any ending previously played over the board.’
45...\texttt{xf2}+ 46.\texttt{wh3} \texttt{gg3}+ 47.\texttt{wh2} \texttt{xf3} 48.\texttt{fg2} \texttt{gf4}!

Black is not tempted by the series of exchanges, 48...\texttt{xf5} 49.\texttt{xd6+} \texttt{xd6} 50.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{e3}, since, after 51.\texttt{f3}, White transfers his king to the centre and obtains a technically won endgame.

49.\texttt{e6}!

Here, the attempt to win with little bloodshed, by 49.\texttt{f1}, ends in failure, since Black manages to exchange another pair of pawns: 49...\texttt{xf5} 50.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{xf2}+ 51.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{d4} 52.\texttt{e3} 53.\texttt{d3} \texttt{baa4}! 54.\texttt{baa4} \texttt{c5} with a draw. Therefore Chigorin avoids exchanges and endeavours to increase the activity of his pieces.

49...\texttt{c5} 50.\texttt{d5+} \texttt{d7} 51.\texttt{e6} \texttt{f5} 52.\texttt{c4+} \texttt{c7} 53.\texttt{d3} \texttt{h5} 54.\texttt{b5} \texttt{g4+}

Black apparently overestimated his chances, otherwise he would have chosen the continuation 54...\texttt{f2}+ 55.\texttt{h3} \texttt{d6} 56.\texttt{e2}! \texttt{f4} 57.\texttt{c3+} \texttt{c5}, after which the unfortunate position of the white king gives him good chances of a draw.

55.\texttt{h2} \texttt{h4+} 56.\texttt{h3} \texttt{d6}+ 57.\texttt{g2} \texttt{g4+} 58.\texttt{f1} \texttt{g3+} 59.\texttt{f2} \texttt{h4}

It seems that Steinitz aimed for this position, when making his 54th move. He has managed to disconnect the white rooks, while one of them is also severely restricted. However, the cage for the \texttt{h3} proves to be fragile, and Steinitz, stubbornly trying to keep the rook on \texttt{h3} behind bars, allows the position of his own pieces to deteriorate, and in the first instance it is his king that suffers.

60.\texttt{h6}! \texttt{h4+} 61.\texttt{g2} \texttt{e7} 62.\texttt{c6+} \texttt{b7} 63.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f8} 64.\texttt{d4} \texttt{c8} 65.\texttt{d7} \texttt{d8} 66.\texttt{h2}!

With the threat of 67.\texttt{h3}, White forces the knight to retreat.

66...\texttt{e4} 67.\texttt{g7}

Obviously, the knight is heading for \texttt{c5}, where it will be defended by a pawn. Therefore White removes the rook from attack beforehand, and, by preventing 67...\texttt{g8}, prepares to free the \texttt{h2} by \texttt{g1}. The variation 67...\texttt{f2}+ 68.\texttt{g1} \texttt{hxh2} 69.\texttt{xh2} does not hold out any hopes at all for Black, since, by placing the rook on \texttt{h7}, White directs his king to the vicinity of the \texttt{d5} or \texttt{c6}-squares, and wins easily.

67...\texttt{c5}

Now this retreat leads to liberation of the rook.

68.\texttt{h3} \texttt{f6} 69.\texttt{g6} \texttt{d8} 70.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f4}

71.\texttt{f3}!

White, by threatening to exchange, forces the black rook to leave the \texttt{f}-file and provides for the ex-prisoner, formerly confined to \texttt{h3}, a beautiful square of invasion on \texttt{f7}.
71...\textit{Ed}4 72.\textit{Eg}7 \textit{Eb}8 73.\textit{Ef}f7
White has achieved maximum activation of his rooks and has unpleasantly cut off the king. But Black’s defence seems solid: the knight defends the b7 and d7-squares, the bishop – the c7-square, and likewise the b6- and h4-pawns. However, Chigorin finds a flaw in this defensive set-up; he transfers his bishop onto the h1-a8 diagonal and creates a mating threat by \textit{E}f7-a7-a8. In order to defend against this, Black must demolish his own fortress.

73...\textit{Ed}6 74.\textit{Eh}3 \textit{Ad}2 75.\textit{Ah}7 \textit{Ed}6 76.\textit{Af}1 \textit{Ec}6!
If 76...\textit{Ex}b3, then 77.\textit{Ab}7+ \textit{Ec}8 78.\textit{La}6 with the threat of \textit{Bc}7+ and \textit{Ec}8 mate.

77.\textit{Ed}7!
The experience of old battles keeps Chigorin away from the hasty check 77.\textit{Ab}7+. After 77...\textit{Ec}8, White is surprisingly faced with an unpleasant choice, since the knight not only threatens the rook on h7 by 78...\textit{Eg}5+, but also the rook on b7 by 78...\textit{Ec}7!. After this move it becomes clear why Chigorin, despite the little material, managed to successfully carry out an attack and soften up the strong defensive structure erected by his opponent. The basis of White’s attack lay in the threat to exchange rooks and transpose into a technically won endgame. It was precisely these threats which allowed Chigorin to break through (and he did this very skillfully and directly) when Black’s defence seemed impregnable. Also now, in this way, he neutralises the threat of a knight fork on g5. The endgame, after 77...\textit{Ec}5+ 78.\textit{Ec}g4 \textit{Ex}h7 79.\textit{E}x\textit{d}6, is lost for Black, for example: 79...\textit{Ec}7 80.\textit{Ah}6 \textit{Ec}6+ 81.\textit{E}f5 \textit{Ed}7 82.\textit{Ab}5 \textit{Ec}5 83.\textit{Ec}5 \textit{Ex}b3 84.\textit{Ah}7+ \textit{Eb}8 85.\textit{Ed}6 etc.

77...\textit{Ec}6 78.\textit{Ec}4 \textit{Ec}7

79.\textit{Ec}4!
Note this ‘shuttle’ manoeuvre. On the 76th move, the withdrawal of the bishop to f1 wrecked one black stronghold. Its return demolishes the last of the fortifications, and all hopes of salvation. And again this is not mere chance, but clearly Chigorin’s masterly technical method. On the 66th-68th moves he freed his rooks in just the same way.

79...\textit{Ex}c4+ 80.\textit{b}xc4 \textit{E}c8 81.\textit{Ed}6
\textit{Ec}5 82.\textit{Ec}6+ \textit{Ab}8 83.\textit{E}h8 1-0
On 83...\textit{Ab}7, decisive is 84.\textit{E}xb6 followed by \textit{E}xb7+. An amazingly fine game by Chigorin, who managed to create an attack on the king in the ending and successfully drive it through to the end, despite Steinitz’ very stubborn defence. This endgame is a classic example of the realisation of a minimal material advantage.
Chapter 9

New York 1889

The passionate, cordial and outgoing Cubans had grown so fond of Chigorin that they suggested to Steinitz that he, right away, without delay, play another match with the Russian champion. But the cautious Steinitz declined the proposal. Instead of a match, three consultation games were played, in which each of the famous rivals played in partnership with the Cuban players. The score was +1 -1 =1.

Only a month after the end of the match for the World Championship, there began the New York tournament of 1889 – the longest tournament in the whole of chess history. Taking into account the replays (in the second half, all draws were replayed) and the play-off match for first prize, Chigorin had to play 46 games!

A very dangerous rival in New York proved to be the Austrian chess player, Max Weiss (1857-1927). He was one of the most prominent representatives of the ‘Vienna school’, notable for its solid, reliable play and not nurtured on aversion to the draw.

After finishing university, Weiss at one time taught mathematics, but later took up chess seriously and, in the 1880s, achieved several good tournament results (Hamburg 1885, 2nd-6th; Frankfurt on Main 1887, 2nd-3rd). The brilliant victory in New York surprisingly marked the end of his chess career. Just like Kolisch, that is, after his finest achievement, Weiss gave up chess for the sake of a banking career, though, admittedly, in a far more modest role. After obtaining a position in the Vienna bank of Rothschild – the famous millionaire and chess benefactor –, Weiss, in the future, limited himself to a few appearances in local Viennese competitions, never again travelling to a tournament outside Vienna, and soon afterwards gave up competitive play. Weiss’s chess career both developed and came to an end in the spirit of the ‘Vienna school’!

Chigorin treated with respect the chess strength, persistence and deep positional plans of his main rival in the New York tournament, but he could not at times refuse himself a harmless joke… When, in 1890, Chigorin happened to be passing through Vienna, where a local tournament was in progress, he enquired from Weiss about his position in the tournament: ‘How many draws have you made so far?’

But, in New York, Weiss did not have too many draws (though not one of the other competitors surpassed him in this department) and he was amongst the leaders for practically the whole tournament, and finished it at the top, being equalled only by Chigorin – with 29 points out of a possible 38. Against Weiss, in his attempts to find a breach in the fortifications of his careful opponent, Chigorin took great risks, even, as Black, striving to sharpen the play. Weiss was on the alert and vigilantly parried all of Chigorin’s threats. Out of their seven encounters in New York (including one replay and four games of the play-off match for first place), six ended in a draw. But, for all that, Chigorin managed to win one of these – in the 28th round – although this was a most stubborn struggle, which went on for 80 moves.
In this game, Chigorin managed to make something out of nothing: the great Russian chess player was an outstanding master not only of the impetuous sharp attack, but also of the slow manoeuvring game. One day, not without reason, Chigorin formulated one of the most important of his creative principles, which emphasised that, in a position without a clearly pronounced positional weakness, one must be careful and unhurried. 'Only by a gradual development of one's forces and highly circumspect play, are little by little to be gained certain advantages in the position, and then already will appear the possibility of going over to a decisive attack against the opponent.' (New Times, 28 January 1897).

Chigorin — a positional chess player! Only in the merging of the combinational and positional did the Russian master begin to see the essence of chess art, and it was not his fault if the commentators (even some sincere admirers of him) candidly numbered him amongst the 'old' romantic school. But, in the case when the positional play of Chigorin led to victory, commentators condescended to remark: 'The game is an excellent example of the modern school of play.' (Tarrasch's remark with regard to the game Chigorin-Teichmann, Hastings 1895)

Out of many excellent games played by Chigorin in the New York tournament, one should give pride of place to his win with white against Pollock — a classic example of attack, a genuine pearl of bold combinative play.

Chigorin's result in New York was one of the most outstanding achievements of his chess career, both in the sporting and also in the creative sense. But, you know, Chigorin took part in this massive tournament shortly after the tiring and difficult match with Steinitz! Incidentally, Steinitz also received an invitation to play, but preferred to annotate the games of the tournament. By the way, in the tournament book, he rated Chigorin's play extremely highly.

Chigorin — a real chess artist, an unselfish enthusiast, who most of all valued the creative side of chess, was revolted by the greed of some of the participants of the New York tournament: nobody, however, was surprised in the transatlantic republic. 'The majority of the players who assembled in New York', said Chigorin, according to a newspaper reporter on his return to Russia, 'came there only for the dollars, very few were glad for the game of chess itself.'

In spite of all his creative antagonism with Steinitz, Chigorin always acknowledged that Steinitz gave himself to chess and not to financial profit. 'As a player, Steinitz also has his weaknesses', continued Chigorin in the same interview. 'He is rather capricious, over-particular... but Steinitz loves chess, as a game, not just as a means of making good money; it seems that the majority of the other international chess players look at the game of chess completely differently.'

Such bounty hunters Chigorin could not abide, and astutely associated the most predominant style of play with the change in the conditions and the role of a professional chess player in the midst of bourgeois societies.

The original tournaments differed from the most recent ones in their intrinsic character. For the participants of these — the majority of whom were usually first-class players — the inspiration was exclusively a love of chess art, with cares not about winning, be that as it may, but about the elegance and strength of their play,
striving for supremacy and the gaining of glory under these circumstances. In the last ten years, commercial interests have imposed their heavy stamp even in the chess world. The very character of play has changed. Many players neither create their games with ease and inspiration, nor are ashamed of the results of that, even continually choosing just one or two openings, which are attended by little risk and give most of all chances, first and foremost, of a draw. Not without profit, participation in tournaments little by little has become a profession, attracting strong and weak players, travelling from tournament to tournament.’

10 Scotch Game
William Pollock
Mikhail Chigorin
New York 1889 (4)
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 3.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 4.d4 exd4 5.\(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{b4}\) 6.\(\text{xc6}\) bxc6 7.\(\text{d3}\) d5 8.e5?

An unfortunate idea. The worry over defending the e5-pawn very rapidly ties down White’s pieces. 8.exd5 was correct.

8...\(\text{g4}\) 9.0-0 0-0

White is already in difficulties. It seems that the e5-pawn can be defended by the move 10.\(\text{f4}\), the more so as 10...\(\text{e8}\) 11.\(\text{e1}\) d4 is not dangerous, because of 12.a3 \(\text{a5}\) 13.b4. However, instead of 10...\(\text{e8}\), good is 10...\(\text{f6}\)! 11.exf6 \(\text{xf6}\) 12.\(\text{xc7}\) \(\text{xf2}\), with a very strong attack. Pollock decides to exchange the ill-fated e5-pawn for the h7-pawn, allowing his opponent the two bishops, which are also aimed at the white king’s position.

10.h3 \(\text{xe5}\) 11.\(\text{xe7}\) \(\text{g8}\) 13.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{e8}\)
14.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{f5}\)

Black’s advantage is beyond question. In addition to 15...\(\text{xc2}\), he threatens also the move 15...d4, after which the black rook invades on e2.

15.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{d7}\) 16.\(\text{a1}\) \(\text{e6}\)?

A careless move after which White forces the exchange of bishop for knight and thereby somewhat reduces the opponent’s attacking potential. Simply 16...d4 17.\(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 18.\(\text{f4}\) c5 19.\(\text{xc6}\) cxd6 20.b3 \(\text{e2}\) would consolidate Black’s advantage.

17.\(\text{f4}\)!

The exchange of the unfortunately placed knight on c3 is of course to White’s advantage.

William Pollock
17...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xc3 18.bxc3 $e_2$!
Black is still left with the better prospects, and the opposite-coloured bishops can only help him in his attack. Now White should exchange the active black rook, by playing 19.$f_1$. Black can maintain his advantage, not with 19...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}e8 because of 20.$x$e2 $x$e2 21.$d$8!, but by 19...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}x$e$1+ 20.$x$e1 f6 21.$h$4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xc2 22.$g$3 c5! 23.$w$xc7 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xc7 24.$h$xc7 d4.
19.$w$a4? \textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}e8!

Now Black's domination of the e-file is assured, he begins to play exclusively for the attack. How can White conduct the defence?

Steinitz considered that the continuation 20.$w$xa7 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xh3 21.$f$4 (21.gxh3 is not possible because of 21...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xh3 22.$w$xc7 $c_8$e5! 23.$f$4 $h$5 24.$h$2 $a$e6 25.$h$1 $w$3f3+ etc.) would give quite good chances of repulsing the attack. At first glance, the strongest threats for Black are created by 21...$w$g4 22.$g$3. Tempting is the queen sacrifice 22...$w$g3?! 23.$x$g3 $f$x$g$2+ 24.$h$1 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}e2, but the whole idea is 'spoilt' by the counter-sacrifice 25.$w$g1! after which White can play for the win - 25...$x$g1+ 26.$x$g1 $f$5 27.$g$e1 $e$4+ 28.$g$1 $g$2+ 29.$f$1 $x$g3 30.a4! $x$xc3 31.a5, and if 31...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xc2, then 32.$f$2!! Beautiful also is the other combinative attack, 22...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}8e3! 23.$w$xc7 $x$f2!! 24.$xf$2 $x$g3 25.$w$xf7+ $h$7, but the calm 26.$w$4! $x$g2+ 27.$h$1 enables White to defend.
All the same, it seems that the action after 20.$w$xa7 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xh3 21.$f$4 is not defensible for White. Former World Champion, Spassky, suggested this plan of attack: 21...$w$f5 22.$g$3 $e$8e6 23.$w$xc7 (23.$w$d4 $h$6 24.$f$4 $h$5?) 23...$x$g2 24.$x$g2 $w$e4+ 25.$g$1 $h$6 26.$h$2 $g$6+ 27.$g$3 f5! etc. Since it is too late to return the queen with 20.$w$4, if only because of 20...f6 21.$h$4 g5, Pollock still hopes to exchange the rook on e2, but...

20.$g$3

20...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xh3 21.gxh3
If 21.$f$1, then White is mated after 21...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}e4! and 22...$w$g4.
Romanovsky: 21.$h$4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}x$g$2 22.$x$g2 $f$8xe3.

21...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}8xe3! 22.$c$e1
Tantamount to surrender, but also 22.fxe3 $x$h3 is no better.
Romanovsky: Clearly, 22.$w$g4 $w$g4+ 23.hxg4 $x$xc3 does not save him.

22...$w$xe3 23.$x$e$2$ $d$e$2$ 24.$h$b1 $e$4 0-1
On 25.$b$4 would follow 25...$e$1#.
A splendid example of the creation of an attack in a position with opposite-coloured bishops.
11. Evans Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
William Pollock
New York 1889 (23)

1.e4 e5 2...f3 Qc6 3...c4 Ac5 4.b4
Axb4 5.c3 Ac5 6.0-0 d6 7.d4 exd4
8.cxd4 A b6 9. Ac3 Aa5 10.Ag5 f6
11.Ag4

11...Ah4 was played in Chigorin-Yakubovich, correspondence 1879, and Pollock-Chigorin, Hastings 1895, given in this book.

11...Axc4 12. Wa4+ Af7 13.Wxc4+
Ae6

In this move lies Pollock's idea. White is practically forced to block the important diagonal, after which his pawn centre is immobilised for a long time.

14.d5! Ad7

If Black moves the bishop to g4, he must reckon with the sacrifice of a piece for an attack: 15.e5! fxe5 16.Axe5+ dxe5
17.Axe5,\(^{28}\) and also with a positional offensive after 15.Axd4 followed by a2-a4.

15.Ae2 We8

White's plan is clear: to free the way for the advance of the f-pawn to f5, and then to transfer the knight via d4

---

\(^{28}\) But what does White have for the piece after 17...Af6 ? E.g. 18.Axf6 Wxf6 19.Wg4 (or 19.Ac4 Wg6) 19...Axc3 20.We6+ Af8 21.d6 Wf6 etc.

to e6. But all this takes a long time and is not so simple; in the meantime, Black manages to complete his development. In this respect, his last move seems superfluous and its advantage over 15.Ae7 is not clear.

16.a4! Ae7 17.Ae3!

A very good positional move, with the idea of weakening the defence of the c7-pawn. Black is obliged to defend the pawn by 17...Wd8, in order, after 18.Axb6, to have the reply 18...axb6. This would in fact mean going over to passive defence, and be quite out of keeping with Pollock's aggressive style. He prefers to weaken the d6-pawn, hoping to exploit the newly opened c-file.

17...Ag6 18.Axb6 cxb6 19.Wb4
We7 20.Ag3 Whc8 21.Ad4 Ee5
22.f4 Mac8 23.Wd2

Both players logically carry out their respective plans: Black seizes the c-file. White concentrates his forces for an attack on the king. His knight on d4 prepares to jump to e6, while, for the time being, not allowing the black rook to invade on c2, and thus considerably reducing the effectiveness of Black's counterplay. On 23...Af8, White, not worrying about the weakness of the a4-pawn, would transfer the rook to the centre, 24.Mae1, and also create the
dangerous threat 25.\textit{g}f5 and, when the opportunity presents itself, e4-e5.

23...\textit{Ec}4 24.\textit{Ce}6!
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24...\textit{Ch}4

Black defends the f5-square, but perhaps it is worth trying to disorganise the attack by giving up the exchange: 24...\textit{Ec}2 (if 24...\textit{Xe}6 25.dxe6+ and, if the queen retakes, he loses a piece by f5) 25.\textit{Wxc}2! (after 25.\textit{Wd}1 \textit{Xe}6 26.dxe6+ \textit{Wg}8 27.\textit{Wg}4, Black has an extra tempo compared to the game) 25...\textit{Xc}2 26.\textit{Wf}5 \textit{Xe}6 27.\textit{Xe}7 28.\textit{Xe}7 28.dxe6+ \textit{Wx}6.

25.\textit{Wd}1 \textit{Xe}6 26.dxe6+ \textit{Wg}8

Again he could not retake with the queen, on account of f4-f5 followed by \textit{Wh}5+.

27.\textit{Wg}4!

Dangerous for Black would also be the continuation 27.f5, cutting off the way of retreat of the \textit{Ch}4. After 27...\textit{g}5 28.\textit{Xf}2 (also good is the simple 28.\textit{fx}6), White creates the threat 29.\textit{Xd}2 followed by e4-e5. Chigorin chooses a plan of attack which looks very strong. By invading on f5, the white knight keeps under threat both basic objects of attack – the d6 and g7-pawns – and the e6-pawn.

The culminating moment of the game. Thus Black has not been able to set up counterplay on the c-file, capable of diverting White from his preparations for attack on the king. Chigorin now has at his disposal several tempting attacking continuations, the basic motif of which is clearly the threat of mate on g7. Tempting is the direct 29.h4, with the threat of 30.h5 and then 31.e7, but Black has the defence 29...\textit{Xe}4 30.h5 \textit{Ce}5! 31.\textit{Wg}3 \textit{Cc}4 and ...\textit{Wc}5+. However, the march of the h-pawn is logical and it is also possible to prepare this with the move 29.\textit{Xa}e1!. It seems in this case Black would be defenceless. Chigorin decides first to cut off the black queen from the g7-square and only then to advance the h-pawn.

29.e7!

'Everything is geared to the aim of attacking the king. The knight on g6 is pinned and threatened by the terrible h4-h5. However, many masters of the latest 'careful' times would hardly have decided to break contact with the passed pawn by this distant advance, which will serve to guarantee victory’ – Spielmann.

29...\textit{Wf}6 30.\textit{Wf}4 30...\textit{Wx}e6 31.\textit{Wg}5 31...\textit{Wg}8 32.\textit{Wd}4+ 30.\textit{Wh}1, Black has 30...\textit{Wxa}1!!.

29 Not true! After 26...\textit{Xe}6 27.f5 \textit{Wd}5 28.\textit{Wh}5+ \textit{Wg}8 29.\textit{Xh}4 \textit{Wd}4+ 30.\textit{Wh}1, Black has 30...\textit{Wxa}1!!.

108
29...\texttt{f7}?

He cannot capture the e4-pawn by means of 29...\texttt{xe4}, because of 30.\texttt{xd6}, but Black could put up a stubborn resistance by at once giving up the exchange – 29...\texttt{xe8} 30.\texttt{h4 \texttt{e7}} 31.\texttt{h5 \texttt{f8}} 32.\texttt{xe7+ \texttt{xe7}}. The unavoidable loss of the e4-pawn would force White to play solely for the attack, for example: 33.\texttt{ac1 \texttt{xe4}} 34.\texttt{ce1! \texttt{d4+}} 35.\texttt{h1}, though the outcome of the struggle remains unclear. Pollock, however, chooses an apparently active plan of defence, but even his first move allows White to prepare an effective breakthrough in the centre.

30.\texttt{ad1 \texttt{c5+}} 31.\texttt{h1 \texttt{c6}}

'This move weakens the back rank. Now White carries out a genius-like breakthrough' – Spielmann.

However, Black defends the d6-pawn and now threatens to take the e4- and a4-pawns. Apparently he is prepared to sacrifice the knight on g6, reckoning on also being able to capture the e7-pawn, for example, 32.\texttt{h4 \texttt{xe4}} 33.\texttt{h5 \texttt{d5}} 34.\texttt{hxg6+ \texttt{xg6}} 35.\texttt{h4 \texttt{f5}} 36.\texttt{xf5 \texttt{xf5}} 37.\texttt{xf5+ \texttt{xe7}} 38.\texttt{xd5 \texttt{e6+}}.

Of course, the variation is not forced and the method of defence not reliable, but there is a small chance and Pollock does not want to let it slip.

32.\texttt{e5!}

To break through at the strongest point is a sign of supreme mastery of the art of attack.

32...\texttt{xe5}

The e5-square is defended four times, but it is no good taking the pawn:

A) 32...\texttt{dxe5} 33.\texttt{d8 \texttt{e6}} (33...\texttt{xe7}
34.\texttt{xg7+ \texttt{e6}} 35.\texttt{xe7, with the threat of f4-f5+, winning}) 34.\texttt{xf8+}
35.\texttt{yg7+};

B) 32...\texttt{xe5} 33.\texttt{yg7+};

C) 32...\texttt{xe5} 33.\texttt{xd6+ \texttt{xd6}}
34.\texttt{xe5 \texttt{yg4}} 35.e6, or 34...\texttt{xd1}
35.\texttt{xc4+}.

33.\texttt{xd6+! \texttt{xd6}} 34.\texttt{f5+ \texttt{e6}}
35.\texttt{e8+! \texttt{xe8}} 36.\texttt{d7+ \texttt{f8}}
37.\texttt{xf6}

Black resigned.

This game justly belongs to the golden treasury of chess. Chigorin’s splendidly conducted attack was enthusiastically praised by Spielmann: ‘Chigorin’s grandiose ingenuity is fascinating: each of his moves breathes creative strength and irresistible will to win.’
Chapter 10

Chigorin-Gunsberg match 1890

The Cuban hosts not only expressed great interest in Chigorin but also felt sympathetic towards him. So, during his match with Steinitz, the Havana Chess Club suggested that he play another match with a favourite opponent. As in 1888 with Steinitz, now Chigorin was given the right to name whoever he wanted to meet.

Undoubtedly, the most interesting opponent for Chigorin would have been once again Steinitz, but since it was not possible at that time to arrange a match with him, Chigorin announced the name of Gunsberg.

In the chess firmament of the 1880s, the now half-forgotten Isidor Gunsberg (1854-1930) was a star of the first magnitude. A native of Budapest, as a 13-year-old boy he arrived with his father in Paris, at the time of the international tournament in 1867. His strong play, which was mature for his age, and his judgments on other people’s games, attracted attention. The lad was even called a second Morphy. After settling in England, Gunsberg began to seriously think about a chess career. In 1878, an adroit businessman living in England, the German, Gumpel, suggested that he play the role of the chess automaton ‘Mephisto’. In the same year, at the London ‘Aquarium’, took place Gunsberg’s first performance as the automaton – a role which he continued to play for five years – until 1882. There was no doubt about the chess success. Gunsberg/Mephisto defeated his opponents in the overwhelming majority of games, but from the material point of view the business was rather worse. Possibly the shrewd Gumpel cheated his companion. Gunsberg decided to part company with Gumpel and also with Mephisto and to become a chess professional, since at that time chess was very popular in England.

After a bad debut in Nuremberg 1883, where he occupied one of the bottom places, Gunsberg came out winner in the Hamburg tournament of 1885. Just before the final round, the leader was 23-year-old Tarrasch, but in the last game, Blackburne confidently outplayed him, and Gunsberg, by winning his game, went ahead to first place, outdistancing a group of five chess players, who remained only half a point behind. With this little boost, he made his fame. In 1887, he defeated Blackburne himself +5 -2 =6, in a match effectively for the title of Champion of England, while in the following year, he took first prize by a wide margin in the tournament at Bradford.
Despite his wonderful strength of play and excellent sporting achievements, Gunsberg's popularity in England was far inferior to that which always surrounded the name of Blackburne. Gunsberg suffered from the fact that he was a foreigner, an immigrant with little command of English, and that the very style of his play was cautious, solid, tenacious – the style of a practical professional. Gunsberg can be numbered amongst the followers of Steinitz; we recall how one could profit from the techniques of positional play, worked out by Steinitz, but avoiding the exaggerations and extremes of Steinitz himself. He was an eclectic, who achieved great strength and was a danger to anyone, but he did not possess a strongly pronounced chess individuality.

In the tournament in New York, Gunsberg took 3rd prize, only half a point behind Chigorin and Weiss. He won both games against Chigorin.

The match, playing up to ten games won by one side, began 1 January 1890. Chigorin won the first two games, of which the second brought forth enthusiastic praise: 'A combination of rare beauty and depth' (Steinitz); 'This whole combination could have been created only by a great master' (Gunsberg). Even now, over a hundred years later, the beauty of this remarkable game has not faded at all.

Chigorin also played several excellent games later on (6th, 20th and others). It was evident that, in richness of ideas and scale of planning, Chigorin was superior to his opponent.

But one must also be fair to Gunsberg. In the words of N.D. Grigoriev, he 'never expected the recognition of posterity', resisted to the last possible chance and, not infrequently, was rewarded for his persistence.

'Gunsberg', wrote Chigorin afterwards, 'was sure he would lose the match, he said himself that he was weaker than me, and therefore, feeling he had nothing to lose, played fearlessly. "Why did he make such and such a move?", I thought, and began to see at the board things that did not exist, to see ghosts... and let the win slip.'

On 16 February 1890, the match finished as a draw +9 -9 =5.

Deutsche Schachzeitung rightly wrote about the match: 'Chigorin was not careful enough and Gunsberg was too careful', and also explained the result in this way: 'In our opinion, the favourable outcome of the match for Gunsberg was due to his more suitable temperament for the chess struggle, and his great self control, though Chigorin surpassed him in chess strength.'

Chigorin played with the white pieces in the odd-numbered games. There were special conditions attached to the match; neither player had the right to play one and the same opening more than twice. With this clause, the organisers wanted to avoid monotonous openings, such as had occurred in the Chigorin-Steinitz match of 1889. But Gunsberg found a way to get round this ban: he opened games with the move 1.e3, and, by a transposition of moves, reached the Queen's Gambit Declined!

The inspired Gunsberg challenged Steinitz to a match and played it in 1890/91 with the respectable result +4 -6 =9. But after this, for reasons which are unclear, his results declined sharply. He lost the most valuable of his qualities, which were
present in his prime: endurance and tenacity. He spent the last years of his life in severe need. Only the British remembered the 75-year-old Gunsberg, the famous chess player of olden times, and somewhat eased his last days.

12. Spanish Game
Isidor Gunsberg
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, Havana 1890 (2)
1.e4 e5 2.\(\textit{c}f3\) \(\textit{c}c6\) 3.\(\textit{b}b5\) a6 4.\(\textit{a}a4\)
\(\textit{c}c6\) 5.d3 d6 6.c3
Chigorin: This move, in conjunction with the following manoeuvre \(\textit{b}1-d2-f1\), was recommended by Steinitz.

6...g6 7.\(\textit{c}d2\) \(\textit{g}7\) 8.\(\textit{f}f1\)
Chigorin: The chain of knight moves is made with a view to supporting a pawn attack on the king’s flank, from \(e3\) or \(g3\) (after \(g2-g4\)). However, White, forced into defence, does not achieve this.

8...0-0 9.h3
Nowadays, this scheme of development, in which White advances the g-pawn before castling, is not very popular. The reason for this unpopularity becomes clear after a study of this game.

9...d5!

10.\(\textit{we}2\)
The game turns out in Black’s favour after 10.\(\textit{x}c6\) bxc6 11.\(\textit{x}e5\) \(\textit{wd}6\) (12.\(\textit{f}4\)? \(\textit{h}5\) wins) or 11...\(\textit{we}8\)!

10...\(\textit{b}5\) 11.\(\textit{c}2\)
As a result of this retreat, the bishop remains shut out of play until the end of the game. Probably he had intended retreating to b3, and, only on the reply ...\(\textit{a}5\), to withdraw the bishop to c2. In this case, it would be more difficult for Black to occupy the d4-square.

11...d4!
Chigorin: This move constrains White sufficiently to force him to take the d4-pawn, and thanks to this the d3-pawn will be weakened.

12.\(\textit{g}4\) \(\textit{wd}6\) 13.\(\textit{a}1\)d2
Because of the threat 13...\(\textit{wc}5\), White is forced to observe d4, and therefore gives up his intended \(\textit{g}3\) and returns the knight to d2.

Chigorin: White wants to prevent the move 13...\(\textit{wc}5\), forcing him to take the d4-pawn; however, after Black’s reply, this is virtually forced.

13...\(\textit{xe}6\) 14.\(\textit{xd}4\)
Chigorin: After 14.0-0, Black could reply 14...\(\textit{h}5\) at once, or later after a preliminary ...\(\textit{ad}8\); in either case, White’s position is cramped.

There is no other useful move to be seen for White. The pawns on the king’s flank are badly placed for castling.

14...\(\textit{xd}4\) 15.\(\textit{xd}4\) \(\textit{xd}4\) 16.\(\textit{f}3\)
\(\textit{wb}4+\)
17.\(\text{d}f1\)
Bogoljubow: 17.\(\text{d}d2\), as recommended by Steinitz, is no better: 17.\(\text{d}d6!\) and if 18.\(\text{d}d4?\) then 18...\(\text{e}xd4\) 19.\(\text{x}d4\) (19.e5 allows 19...\(\text{e}c6!\) 20.\(\text{e}e2\) \(\text{c}c4!\) 21.\(\text{d}d3\) \(\text{d}d5\)) 19...\(\text{xe}4!!\) 20.\(\text{w}xe4\) \(\text{d}d5\) 21.\(\text{we}2\) \(\text{xb}2!!\) 22.\(\text{xb}2\) \(\text{ae}8\) and wins.

17...\(\text{d}d6\)
The opening stage of the game has ended clearly in Black's favour. White lags behind seriously in the mobilisation of his pieces and it is this in particular which does not allow him to play 18.\(\text{d}d4\), to somewhat liberate himself. After 18...\(\text{c}c4\) 19.\(\text{d}d3\) \(\text{xd}3\) 20.\(\text{x}d3\) \(\text{d}d7\) 21.d5 \(\text{c}6\), it is difficult for him to hold on to the \(\text{d}5\)-pawn.

18.b3 \(\text{c}5\) 19.\(\text{b}b2\) \(\text{d}d7!\)
Beginning a fine positional manoeuvre, which has the aim of increasing his control over the \(\text{d}4\)-square.

20.\(\text{g}g5\)
It is hard to blame White for this exchange, since otherwise there would follow 20...\(\text{f}5\) and Black opens the f-file with even greater effect.

20...\(\text{b}b8\) 21.\(\text{x}xe6\) \(\text{fxe}6!\) 22.\(\text{g}g2\) \(\text{a}a7\) 23.\(\text{h}h1\) \(\text{e}a7\)

24.\(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 25.\(\text{d}d2\)
26.\(\text{a}ad1\) \(\text{w}e7\) 27.\(\text{w}e1\) \(\text{f}f6\)
By tying down the bishop on \(\text{b}2\) to the defence of the \(\text{d}4\)-square, Black takes under control also the dark squares on the king's flank.

Now 28.\(\text{c}c1\) cannot be played because of 28...\(\text{h}h4\) 29.\(\text{c}c3\) (29.\(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{d}d4\)) 29.\(\text{x}f3\) 30.\(\text{x}f3\) \(\text{x}f3\) 31.\(\text{d}xf3\), then 31...\(\text{f}6\) + 32.\(\text{g}g2\) \(\text{f}2\) + 33.\(\text{h}h1\) \(\text{f}3\) + and mate in three moves.

28.\(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{h}h4\) 29.\(\text{b}b1\) \(\text{h}5\) 30.\(\text{a}3\)
\(\text{hxg}4\) 31.\(\text{hxg}4\) \(\text{w}g5!\)
Now he threatens 32...\(\text{xf}3\) 33.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{xg}4\). On 32.\(\text{c}c1\) would follow the exchange sacrifice 32...\(\text{d}d4\) 33.\(\text{d}xf4\) \(\text{xf}4\) 34.\(\text{b}b2\) \(\text{xf}3\) 35.\(\text{h}h1\) \(\text{xg}4\) 36.\(\text{g}g2\) \(\text{h}5\) and Black wins.

32.\(\text{h}h3\) \(\text{f}8\)!

White is doomed in view of the weakness of the dark squares and his poorly placed pieces. His bishop on \(\text{b}2\) is tied to the defence of the \(\text{d}4\)-square, and the \(\text{b}1\) and \(\text{d}1\) play the role of an 'extra'. The greatest danger is threatened.

30 35.\(\text{e}e1!\), an interference move, is stronger still.
from $33...\text{h}7$, and the move $33...\text{c}1$ does not in the least change Black's plan of attack: $33...\text{h}7$ 34.$\text{xf}4$ $\text{g}3+$! 35.$\text{g}2$ $\text{h}2+$ 36.$\text{g}1$ $\text{xf}4$ etc. White tries to divert his opponent from the attack by an assault on the c5-pawn, but in vain...

$33.\text{c}1$

Chigorin: If the move $33.\text{c}1$ gives Black the opportunity of the following beautiful combination, with a rook sacrifice quickly deciding the game, then nor would any other move save White's position. Thus, for example, White cannot prevent the other black attack: $33...\text{d}4$ 34.$\text{xd}4$ exd4 35.e5 (Black threatened 35...$\text{e}5$ and then $\text{g}4$) 35...$\text{h}7$ 36.$\text{g}2$ $\text{f}8+$ and after $\text{f}4$ he must win the game. But now another attack is possible...

$33...\text{h}6$ 34.$\text{g}2$ $\text{h}7$

Romanovsky: This move creates the threat of 35...$\text{e}1$.

$35.\text{h}1$

Romanovsky: On $35.\text{g}1$ would follow the same reply as in the game.

$35...\text{xf}3!!$

A terribly strong blow. The weakness of the dark squares is, after all, White's downfall. The d2-square is already found to be quite unexpectedly fatal for him.

31 In fact the simple 34...$\text{xf}4$ mates more quickly.

Chigorin: 'A combination of uncommon beauty and depth', says Steinitz. 'Combinations of this kind can be made only by a great master', remarks Gunsberg. 'A combination of genius, concluded in masterly fashion! The pearl of the match!' exclaimed numerous commentators on this game.

$36.\text{xf}3$

$36.\text{h}4$ loses to both $36...\text{g}3+$! 37.$\text{g}3$ $\text{h}4+$ 38.$\text{f}3$ $\text{h}3+$ 39.$\text{f}2$ $\text{f}7+$ 40.$\text{e}1$ $\text{g}3+$ 41.$\text{d}1$ $\text{f}2$, with win of the queen, and also the simple $36...\text{h}4$.

Romanovsky: If $36.\text{xf}3$, then $36...\text{f}4+$ and mate in four moves.

$36...\text{d}2+$ 37.$\text{g}1$

$37...\text{f}2+$!

Bogoljubow: Elegant and at the same time necessary. Not 37...$\text{xb}2??$ because of 38.$\text{f}1$.

Romanovsky: In this beautiful check and also the following knight move, lies the basis of the whole combination.

$38.\text{f}1$

Romanovsky: The only move. On 38.$\text{g}2$, mate is forced by 38...$\text{e}3+$.

Chigorin: If 38.$\text{xf}2$, then 38...$\text{xh}1+$ 39.$\text{g}2$ $\text{h}2+$.

$38...\text{d}4!$

The final blow. This time based on the overloading theme. The $\text{b}2$ has to abandon the rook on c1.
Black consistently carries out his intended plan, though worthy of serious attention is 6...exd4 7...xd4 8..f6, striving to hold on to the extra pawn.

7...xc6 bxc6 8...xe5 9...d6
8...e7 looks essential, in order to leave the d6-square for the retreat of the knight; however, Chigorin intends another arrangement of his forces.

9.f3 8xe5 10.dxe5
As will be seen later, with this move White takes a first step towards meeting his opponent's plan. If Gunsberg had played 10.fxe4, a double-edged tactical struggle would unfold, for example: 10...8d6 11...f3 0-0! (11...e6 12.e5 8e7 13...g3!) 12.exd5 cxd5 13...xd5 8b8.

Chigorin: If 10.fxe4 8f6 11.e5 8e7, and the white centre pawns can be later undermined by ...c6-c5 and ...f7-f6.

10...8c5

![Diagram of the position after 10...8c5]

The weakened and immobilised black pawns on the queen's flank also give White grounds to count on an advantage. It is quite obvious that success in this game will depend on whether White can establish his domination over the dark squares, and, in the first instance, over the c5-square. Besides this, threats for Black are concealed in the advance of the f-pawn. The basic pivot in Black's defence must be in the blockading manoeuvre of 8...e6 followed by ...f7-f5.
If White allows this set-up, then his chances are sharply decreased. Therefore now he should make a responsible decision by choosing an order of moves upon which, in reply to ...f7-f5, he could advantageously play exf6. Worthy of attention is this plan of development: 11.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d3}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e7}}}\) 12.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d2}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{c6}}}\) (12...0-0 13.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b4!}}}\) 13.f4 g6 (13...f5 14.exf6! \(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf6}}}\) 15.f5! and 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d4}}}\)) 14.c4.

11.b3
This natural move has one serious drawback, which has a direct bearing on the previous discussion – it weakens the a1-h8 diagonal and facilitates Black’s intended blockading set-up.

11...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{c6}}}\) 12.f4
The development of the bishop on a3 does not change the character of the struggle, since castling king’s side is not obligatory for Black. In reply to 12.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{a3}}}\), he could, in addition to 12...f5, also play 12...f6, and likewise exploit the departure of the bishop from the c1-h6 diagonal by bringing the queen to g5.

12...f5

Now the shady side of White’s 11th move is revealed – after 13.exf6 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf6}}}\), the \(\text{\textbf{\textit{a1}}}\) finds itself under attack; and so there is nothing else left for White but to resign himself to the blockade of his central pawns. Several times in his practice, Chigorin achieved success by blockading the e5- and f4-pawns with a knight on e6 and pawn on f5.

13.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xa3}}}\)
White, all the same, prevents king’s side castling. Direct play on the weakness of the c5-square would not be successful: 13.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xc3}}}\) 0-0 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{a4}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e7}}}\) 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{c3}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{fd8}}}\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b4}}}\) a5!.

13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h4}}}\) 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d2}}}\)
A tempting, but possibly not the best continuation. A display of activity in the centre is worth a try: 14.c4 d4 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf3}}}\), or 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xc3}}}\), since if 14...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf4}}}\), possible is the attack 15.g3 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h3+}}}\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g2}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g4}}}\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{gxg4}}}\) fxg4 18.e6! \(\text{\textbf{\textit{xe6}}}\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{a1}}}\).
Chigorin: On 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d2}}}\), Black would reply 14...d4, and, if 15.c3, then 15...c5.

14...h5!
An original idea. Black prepares the transfer of the queen to g6, followed by an advance of the h-pawn. He chooses to get to this position via the g4-square, considering that the exchange of queens there will give him extra chances in view of the open h-file. He could, in addition, also take the pawn – 14...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf4}}}\), not fearing a sharpening of the game. After 15.e6 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{xe6}}}\) (15...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xe6}}}\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e1}}}\)) or Chigorin’s 16.g3 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h3+}}}\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g2}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g4}}}\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e1}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f7}}}\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf3}}}\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{xf5}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d4+}}}\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h1}}}\) 0-0-0, or 15.g3 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h3+}}}\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g2}}}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g4}}}\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{gxg4}}}\) (17.e6 \(\text{\textbf{\textit{xe6}}}\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e1}}}\))
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17...fxg4 18.e6 hxg6 19.ae1 Qg5 20.Ke5 h6, the white knight is a long way from the c5-square and Black succeeds in beating off the attack.

15.g3

An unnecessary weakening of the position. The move 15.Wf3 would be more useful.

15...Wg4

Chigorin: 15...Wh3 would be weaker, in view of 16.Qf3.

16.a2 g2 c5 17.h3 Wg6 18.Wh2 0-0-0 19.h4

For the present, the f4-pawn is defended by the rook, and the threat of ...h5-h4 is not to be feared by White since he could reply g3-g4 and then g4-g5, locking the position. However, Gunsberg wants to transfer the knight to f3 and therefore radically prevents the move ...h5-h4.

19...Cc6 20.Qf3 &b7! 21.Wd2 d4

22.Qe1

It is quite obvious that, on a quiet course of events, the initiative will very quickly pass to Black and the threats on the a8-h1 diagonal will give him a strong attack. Could White not change the course of events? The apparently active move 22.Wa5 would lose by force – 22...Wg4! 23.Qg1 g5! 24.fxg5 We4!.

Perhaps only by an exchange of knights, 22.Qg5 Qxg5 23.fxg5, could White knock the opponent off his attacking rhythm, though after 23...Ed5! 24.Wf4 f8, his position remains difficult. Gunsberg builds up counterplay by an attack on the c5-pawn, but it proves insufficient, and the removal of the knight from the king's flank is deeply felt.

22...We8 23.Qd3

Chigorin: White cannot play for the win of a pawn with the move 23.Wa5, as then would follow 23...Cc6 24.Wxa7 d3 and if 25.cxd3 Qxd3 and Black has a strong attack.

23...Cc6!

Black regroups his forces, setting up a powerful battery strike on the a8-h1 diagonal. Now he has to reorganise his rooks in order to carry out the breakthrough ...g7-g5 more effectively.

24.Qf2 Edg8

Chigorin: Black intends to play ...g7-g5, and, after sacrificing the knight, to decide the game with the move ...h5-h4; in addition to this he has another idea in mind: to transfer the knight via d8-f7-h6 to g4.

25.Qaf1 Eh6 26.Wa5

26...Wb6!

The exchange of queens, 27.Wxb6 axb6, is in Black's favour, and therefore White is forced to retreat the queen, giving up the attempt to threaten the c5-pawn. Before returning with the queen to c6, Chigorin strengthens the position of his rooks.
Chigorin: After the exchange of queens, Black’s position would be undoubtedly better; the knight could have been transferred to g4, the black pawns on the queen’s flank would be very strong, and in addition he would have the open a-file.

27.\textit{We}1 \textit{Ag}6 28.\textit{c}4 \textit{Ag}4 29.\textit{c}1 \textit{Wc}6! 30.\textit{Ag}1 \textit{Hh}8

The basic drawback of White’s position is his total lack of any counterplay whatsoever. It seems that a passive contemplation of Black’s preparation for the decisive breakthrough \ldots g7-g5 does not suit Gunsberg and he decides to hasten events.

31.\textit{Hb}2

Chigorin: I do not think that White can prevent sooner or later the move \ldots g7-g5, or some other threat, for example, the sacrifice of the knight on f4—a square which could be attacked again by the queen. Generally White’s position is very cramped and he can only defend: the move made only accelerates the end.

31...\textit{Wf}3

Chigorin: Black wins at least a pawn.

32.\textit{Ef}2

On 32.\textit{We}2, strong is simply 32...\textit{Eg}xg3, and then 33.\textit{Wxf}3 \textit{Exf}3 34.\textit{Ee}1 \textit{Ec}3 35.\textit{Ed}2 \textit{Ee}4! 36.\textit{Exc}3 \text{dxc}3, followed by 37...\textit{Ed}4 or 37...\textit{Ed}8, according to White’s move, (37.\textit{Ef}2 \textit{Ed}8!) and White will have to give up the knight for the c-pawn.

\begin{center}
\textbf{32...g5!!}
\end{center}

The beginning of a well-prepared conclusive attack on the king. Black’s threats have become irresistible:

A) 33.\textit{fxg}5 \textit{f4! 34.\textit{Exg}4+ \textit{hxg}4}

35.\textit{Ag}2 (35.\textit{Wf}1 \textit{fxg}3++; or 35...\textit{Exh}4+ 36.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{g}3+ 37.\textit{Wh}3 \textit{Exg}5+! 38.\textit{hxg}5 \textit{Hh}5 mate) 35...\textit{Exg}5 36.\textit{Gg}1 (36.\textit{Exf}4 \textit{Exh}4+ 37.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{Wh}3+ 38.\textit{Gg}1 \textit{Gf}3+) 36...\textit{Wxg}2+! 37.\textit{Xg}2 \textit{Gf}3+ 38.\textit{Gf}1 \textit{Gxe}1 and wins;

B) 33.\textit{Wf}2 \textit{gxh}4 34.\textit{Wxf}3 \textit{Exf}3 35.\textit{Exg}4 \textit{hxg}4 36.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{Exh}4+ 37.\textit{Gg}3 \textit{Gh}3+ 38.\textit{Gf}2 \textit{Gf}4 39.\textit{Gxe}1 \textit{d}3 followed by \ldots \textit{Ed}4 with a quick win.

33.\textit{Exg}4 \textit{hxg}4 34.\textit{Wf}1

Chigorin: Black threatened 34...\textit{Exh}4+ and 35...\textit{Hh}3 mate.

34...\textit{Exh}4+!

Now also the point of the manoeuvre 30...\textit{Hh}8 becomes clear. From an ambush position, the rook makes a decisive attack.

35.\textit{gxh}4 \textit{g}3+ 36.\textit{Gxh}3 \textit{Wxf}1

Here we have the result of the splendidly carried out attack. Black has obtained a great material advantage and kept the initiative.

\begin{center}
33 An attempt at defence lies in 34.\textit{Wxf}4 \textit{Exf}4

35.\textit{Hd}1 \textit{Wxd}1 36.\textit{Hxd}1 \textit{Gf}6 37.\textit{Exg}4 \textit{hxg}4

38.\textit{Gg}6 \textit{Gg}5 39.g7 \textit{Gf}3+ 40.\textit{Gg}2 \textit{Gxe}5+ 41.\textit{Gf}2

\textit{Gg}8 but Black still has the better game with two pieces for the rook.
\end{center}
37.\textit{\text{f}}g1  \textit{\text{w}}f3  38.\textit{\text{f}}xg5  \textit{\text{d}}f4  39.\textit{\text{a}}xf4  \textit{\text{w}}xf4+  40.\textit{\text{h}}h3  \textit{\text{a}}f3

Gunsberg continued the useless resistance for another 15 moves. 41.\textit{\text{f}}f2  \textit{\text{g}}g4+  42.\textit{\text{g}}g2  \textit{\text{e}}e4+  43.\textit{\text{h}}h2  \textit{\text{w}}e3  44.\textit{\text{g}}gg2  d3

Chigorin: Stronger than 44...\textit{\text{h}}h3+ 45.\textit{\text{g}}g1  \textit{\text{w}}xh4; then would follow 46.\textit{\text{g}}g6  \textit{\text{g}}g5  47.\textit{\text{g}}g7  \textit{\text{w}}xg7  48.\textit{\text{f}}xf5.

45.\textit{\text{g}}g6  \textit{\text{w}}xe5+  46.\textit{\text{g}}g3  \textit{\text{d}}d4  47.\textit{\text{d}}d2  \textit{\text{w}}f6  48.\textit{\text{d}}dxd3  \textit{\text{w}}xh4+  49.\textit{\text{g}}g1  \textit{\text{g}}g5  50.\textit{\text{g}}g2  \textit{\text{w}}xg6  51.\textit{\text{e}}f2  \textit{\text{w}}f6

52.\textit{\text{d}}d5  \textit{\text{w}}h4+  53.\textit{\text{g}}g1  f4  54.\textit{\text{d}}dd2  \textit{\text{w}}e1+  55.\textit{\text{g}}gh2  \textit{\text{f}}f3  0-1

A deep positional game. Chigorin prepared his attack on the white king and carried it out very effectively and accurately.

14 Spanish Game
Isidor Gunsberg
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, Havana 1890 (20)
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\text{c}}c3 \textit{\text{c}}c6 3.\textit{\text{b}}b5 a6 4.\textit{\text{a}}a4
\textit{\text{d}}f6 5.d3 d6 6.\textit{\text{c}}c3

The seemingly quiet continuation 5.d3 serves to introduce a quite aggressive set-up, which Anderssen and Steinitz liked to employ. After strengthening the centre, White intends to play h2-h3 and g2-g4, followed by transferring the \textit{\text{g}}b1 to g3, and placing the rook on g1; after this he can either prepare the

sacrifice \textit{\text{g}}g3-f5, or further advance the g- or h-pawns. But this plan requires a great deal of time and Black succeeds in obtaining sufficient counter-chances in the centre.

On the 6th move, Anderssen usually parted with his bishop − 6.\textit{\text{h}}xc6+. Steinitz, on the other hand, preserved it by playing 6.c3. Gunsberg does not object to exchanging the bishop, only not at the cost of opening the b-file, upon which Black’s counterplay might distract his opponent from preparing an attack on the king’s flank.

6...\textit{\text{g}}g6 7.\textit{\text{e}}e3 \textit{\text{d}}d7 8.\textit{\text{d}}d2 \textit{\text{g}}g7 9.\textit{\text{h}}h3

0-0 10.\textit{\text{g}}g4 \textit{\text{h}}h8 11.\textit{\text{b}}b3 \textit{\text{a}}a5 12.\textit{\text{e}}e2
\textit{\text{b}}b3 13.axb3 \textit{\text{w}}e7 14.\textit{\text{g}}g3 \textit{\text{g}}g8

15.\textit{\text{g}}g1 c6

Chigorin has achieved a harmonious deployment of his forces in the centre and on the king’s flank, and, though White has realised the planned arrangement of his pieces, their aggressive intent for the present is not felt, and, what is more, Black can begin play in the centre by ...\textit{\text{d}}d6-d5 or ...f7-f5, or, if White castles queen’s side, he can advance the a-pawn. Gunsberg decides to leave his king in the centre, and gain space also on the queen’s flank.

16.c3 \textit{\text{h}}6

It would seem that Black, particularly after the weakening of the white pawn chain on the queen’s flank, should
play 16...f5; however, after 17.gxf5 gxf5 18...g5! Wh7 19.h4, White, at the expense of his pawns, seizes the g5-square and really obtains an attack. Therefore Chigorin does not hurry with a decisive action but continues to strengthen his position.

17.b4 Wh7 18.We2 f6

Chigorin's opening strategy becomes clear. He keeps the double-edged move ...f6-f5 in reserve, for example in reply to 19...d2 Wh8 20.h4 f5! and, by consolidating his king's flank, he gradually switches active operations to the other side of the board.

Chigorin: Black's move prevents 19.g5 h5 20...h4 and a sacrifice of the knight for the h5-pawn.

19.Wf1 Wh7 20...h4 d5! 21.f3

Black's first success. Gunsberg gives up the attempt to create an attack and begins to construct a defence. However it was still necessary for him to put right the lack of coordination of nearly all his pieces, while the very good interplay of the black men allows Chigorin to quickly seize the initiative on the queen's flank.

21...Efd8

An accurate plan. Black threatens to play 22...Ee8 and, by thus freeing his queen from defence of the g6 and h5-squares, after ...dxe4, to transfer it to b3 and double rooks on the d-file. Therefore White must at once drive away the rook from the d-file, although the position of his bishop on b6 gives Black extra time for regrouping.

22...b6 Ae8 23.Wg2 e7 24.Ac5 Ac8 25.We2 b6 26.Af2 Af8 27.0-0 d4

Black could prepare the continuation ...f6-f5 by playing 27...d6 followed by ...c7, ...e7 and ...f6-f5, but Chigorin consistently controls the open line on the queen's flank.

28...d2

Chigorin: On 28.cxd4 would follow 28...xb4+ 29.d2 Wb3, and, if 30.b1, then 30...c2.

28...c5 29.bxc5 bxc5 30.c4

The operation on the queen's flank will begin under conditions which are favourable for Black, he is on the point of establishing himself on the b-file and attacking the b2-pawn. White has no counterplay and, for the present, manoeuvres in his own camp.

30...b6 31.d1 a5

Chigorin: If at once 31...Aeb8, then 32.Aa5 We8 33.b3; now however, on 32.b3 would follow 32...a4.

32.Eg2 Aeb8 33.Ee2

Opening the game by 33.f4 exf4 34.Exf4 Ad6 would be in Black's favour.
33...\textit{We}8 34.\textit{Wc}2  \textit{Qa}4
Now, in order to defend the b2-pawn, he is forced to bring over the rook on g1, which signifies White’s total transfer to defence.

35.\textit{Hg}b1
On 35.\textit{Ha}2 would follow 35...\textit{Hb}4 followed by ...\textit{Hab}8; but now, on 35...\textit{Hb}4, possible is 36.\textit{Ha}3  \textit{Hab}8 37.\textit{Hb}3 followed by  \textit{Hf}1. However, by fine manoeuvering, Chigorin lines up his heavy pieces on the b-file in a situation favourable for himself.

35...\textit{Ha}6! 36.\textit{He}1  \textit{Hb}7! 37.\textit{He}f1
It is interesting to note that here Gunsberg proposed a draw.

37...\textit{Hba}7 38.\textit{He}d2  \textit{He}b6 39.\textit{Gg}3  \textit{Ha}4
40.\textit{Hh}1  \textit{He}8 41.\textit{Hhf}1
41.h4 would be worth a try, with some hopes of revitalising his pieces; however, as before, White concerns himself only with defence.

41...\textit{Hb}7 42.\textit{He}h1
Chigorin: In order to defend the b2-pawn, as will be apparent from the continuation of the game.

42...\textit{Hab}6 43.\textit{Hc}1  \textit{He}7 44.\textit{If}2  \textit{Wb}8
45.\textit{Ed}1  \textit{Cc}6!

Black’s pressure increases with each move. He intends to transfer the knight to b3 and, after the exchange ...\textit{Cc}xc1, threatens a sacrifice of the exchange on b2.

46.\textit{Jf}2  \textit{Jc}5
On 46...\textit{Mb}3, White would probably have hit upon the reply 47.\textit{Je}1  \textit{Mb}4 48.\textit{Wc}2, when the weakness of the a4-pawn does not allow Black to play 48...\textit{Je}6 (in order to prepare the sacrifice ...\textit{Cc}xd3).

47.\textit{Jg}1  \textit{Mb}3 48.\textit{Jb}1  f5!
Black plays ...f6-f5 at the right moment, when the white king has gone over to the king’s flank and any pawn exchange on f5 is unfavourable for White.

49.\textit{Wc}2 14
A necessary move, since Black intends to open the h-file by ...h6-h5. This cannot be prevented since, after 50.\textit{Ha}4  \textit{Je}7, White cannot do anything against the opening of lines on the queen’s flank (after ...\textit{Cc}xc1 and ...\textit{a}4-a3).

50.\textit{Je}1

50...\textit{Je}7!
The tempting sacrifice of the exchange, 50...\textit{Cc}xc1 51.\textit{Cc}xc1  \textit{Mb}2 52.\textit{Jxb}2  \textit{Mb}2, is not clear because of 53.\textit{Wd}1  \textit{a}3 54.\textit{Jf}2. But Black, as previously, is hurrying nowhere and can, without risk, continue to strengthen his position.

51.\textit{Cc}2
Chigorin: If White returns the knight to g2, in order to prevent ...\textit{Jh}4, then Black has a strong position with open a- and b-files, after ...\textit{Mb}6, ...\textit{Cc}xc1 and ...\textit{a}4-a3.
51...\$h4 52.\$d2
White decides to rid himself of the threat of the exchange sacrifice on b2, after ...\$xc1. On 52.\$a3, Black could also play simply 52...h5.
Chigorin: On 52.\$a1 would have followed 52...\$xc1 53.\$xc1 \$xb2 54.\$xb2 \$xb2 55.\$d1! a3 56.\$c2 \$b4! 57.\$g2 (57.\$xb2 axb2 58.\$c2 \$c3?) 57...\$a4 58.\$c1 \$c3! and White is forced to exchange queens: 59.\$xc3 (59.\$h2 \$g3 60.\$g2 g5!) 59...dxc3 60.\$c1 a2!.
52...\$xd2 53.\$xd2 \$g7
White is absolutely helpless. His pieces on the queen’s flank are tied to the defence of the b2-pawn and can only watch as Black, by preparing to open the h-file, creates an attack on the king.
54.\$a1
Chigorin: White cannot free either the rook or the knight from the defence of the b2-pawn. On 54.\$a3 could follow 54...\$g3 55.\$a1 h5 with the threat of the above-mentioned exchange sacrifice: after ...hxg4 the h-file is still opened.
54...h5 55.\$a2 g5 56.\$e2 \$g3 57.\$a3 hxg4 58.\$xg4
Chigorin: If 58.hxg4, then 58...\$h6 followed by ...\$h8.

58...\$h6!
Suddenly it turns out that White might just as well surrender. His pieces, scattered over the first two ranks, are unable to go over to the help of the king. An instant end to the struggle is a completely natural result.
59.\$g2
To add to his troubles, even the rook on f1 does not manage to take part in the defence of the h3-pawn – the last support of White’s position. On 59.\$g2 the quite straightforward combination 59...\$xh3 60.\$xh3 \$h8+ 61.\$g2 \$h2+ 62.\$f3 \$h3! (threatening 63...\$xg4 mate) decides the game.
59...\$wh8 60.\$b5 \$xh3 61.\$d6 \$h2 62.\$w3 \$xg4 63.\$e8+ \$g6 0-1
A splendid wholehearted strategical game.

34 Even better is 60.\$xg2+ 61.\$xg2 \$xd3.

Shortly after the end of the match with Gunsberg, there occurred a great change in Chigorin’s life, which at last improved his very sensitive material situation and gave him broad scope for chess propaganda. From 30 April 1890, Chigorin edited a chess column in one of the most widely-read Russian newspapers — New Times.

New Times was the most important newspaper of Czarist Russia, and its owner — A.S.Suivorin — was called the ‘Napoleon of the newspaper and book trade’. He was a talented and clever man, who, however, in pursuit of success, for influence, for wealth, changed the progressive ideals of his youth and placed his talent at the service of the masters of the land. Lenin summed up his characteristics comprehensively.
A poor man, a liberal and even a democrat at the beginning of his life — a millionaire, an arrogant and shameless bourgeoisie boaster, grovelling before any turn of political powers that be, at the end of it.

Suvarin's characteristic, remarkable ability to identify the needs of the public did not let him down. He noticed the growing popularity and fame of Chigorin. A regular chess column under the editorship of the famous chess player might promote an increase in circulation of the newspaper. Indeed, the issues of NewTimes, with Chigorin's chess column, were bought by chess amateurs in all countries.

Needless to say, Chigorin's part in NewTimes was limited exclusively to conducting the chess column and had nothing in common with the political lines of the newspaper. Chigorin's column, which appeared twice a week — on Mondays and Thursdays — was extensive and interesting.
Chapter 11

Steinitz and Chigorin – creative antagonism

In the international tournaments in Paris 1867 and Baden-Baden 1870, amongst the other participants was playing a talented combinational player, Wilhelm Steinitz. In both tournaments he was counting on a victory, but was obliged to be content with 3rd place in Paris and 2nd in Baden-Baden.

Under the influence of his relative failures, Steinitz – as he stated himself in the story of the development of his chess ideology – began to doubt the correctness of the combinational style in which he himself played and set about drawing up new principles of chess strategy.

‘I came to the conclusion’, said Steinitz, ‘that combinative play, though giving at times beautiful results, did not, in essence, guarantee lasting success.’

In the 1870s and 1880s, Steinitz worked on the creation and formulation of his rules of strategy. In annotations to games of various competitors, and, later, in 1899, in the first part of his manual The Modern Chess Instructor, he expounded the basic principles of the new approach to play.

Steinitz’s system was rarely like that which occurred with important ideological improvements in any sphere of ideological life: both sides – attacker and defender (and even the founder himself of the new trend) at times took, for the determining principles of the new systems, not important, substantial elements, but minor points, which did not have serious significance. Thus it was also with the ‘new school’ of Steinitz. The founder of it himself emphasised that the main difference of the ‘new school’ from the ‘old’ – consisted of the fact that the king was a strong piece.

‘The modern school’, wrote Steinitz, ‘differs from the teaching and practice of the old theoreticians and masters, particularly in its view of the strength of the king. The basic idea, which gives rise to a change in systems, consists of the fact that the king is recognised as a considerably strong piece, fit not only for defence, but also attack.’

This thesis was, for a long time, considered the main sign of the ‘new school’, while the provocative Steinitz Gambit was seen as an opening symbol of the new tendency.

But time changed proportions and everything was put in its place. It became obvious that the founder of the new tendency was mistaken and placed in the forefront a factor that was secondary and unimportant in his system.

What, however, was it, above all, in Steinitzism, that was actually new, that Steinitz contributed to the development of chess? The theory of Steinitz is that it is the right factor, the right item, the right basic element of estimating the position, which ought to guide the chess player.

Steinitz was the great atomist of chess. He strived to understand its deep conformity to laws, bringing order to the kingdom of chess, setting up landmarks and reference points, so as to make the intricate journey easier for the traveller.
He changed the very approach to the game. Not intuition, but a rational analysis, based on a consistent regard for the elements of a position, not sharp lightning attacks on the king with sacrifices and combinations, but an unhurried, slow manoeuvring struggle, exploiting insignificant weaknesses in the enemy position. 'Very best play on both sides', wrote Steinitz, 'consists of a solid development without any sacrifice of material, of circumspect attention to the balance of forces and the situation in all phases of the game and of the accumulation of small advantages.'

The attack should be undertaken only after preparing a positional basis. Do you have visions of getting to the enemy king? Wait, said Steinitz, make sure, first of all, that your position is ripe for attack, carry out a preliminary calculation of the positional pluses and minuses and find out whether there is a sufficient accumulation of positional advantages.

Is the defence of your own or the enemy king strong? In the position is there a doubled pawn, a passed pawn, open lines, weak squares? All defects in the pawn structure should be taken into account.

The pawn majority on the queen’s flank has very great significance. A pawn advance promises success, since it is far more complicated for the opponent to exploit the extra pawn which he has on the king’s flank; an advance of the pawns there would weaken the security of the king. Besides this, in the endgame, your king can contend with the pawns, while the enemy’s is situated far away from your own pawns.

One cannot forget about an advantage in development. If the opponent falls behind in the mobilisation of his forces, then it will be possible to obtain an advantage in force on the important frontal sector.

If there is an open line on the board, try to take possession of it. Occupation of an open line opens the way for an invasion into the enemy camp.

Two bishops attack, in different directions, more squares than two knights or bishop and knight. Therefore, for both attack and defence, it is an advantage to have two bishops, the strength of which tells both in the middlegame and the endgame.

Be careful with pawn moves. Remember that pawns do not move backwards. Usually pawns, advancing further than the fourth rank, become weak, and the nearer to the endgame, even weaker. In the endgame, it is advantageous to have as many pawns as possible on their original squares in order to preserve the possibility of choice – whether to advance the pawn one or two squares.
One should not hurry with an attack, but, if the position is ripe for attack, if there is a sufficient accumulation of positional advantages, then you are obliged to attack. Otherwise your advantage will disappear or go over to the opponent.

Such were the main theses of Steinitz's teaching. Nowadays, some of these appear to be exaggerated (for example, about the danger of advancing the pawns), several others, on the other hand, undoubtedly, even trivial. But one cannot forget that the first to formulate and systematically expound these was Steinitz.

The teaching of Steinitz, it goes without saying, contributed to the development of chess thought, even if not to such an extent as was thought by the reformer himself and several of his admirers. Steinitz built, as it were, a trusty lighthouse on the banks of a rapid stream, showing the fairway. The danger of dashing, but groundless attacks was sharply decreased. Admittedly, the number who were willing to undertake such attacks, also sharply decreased.

The theses of Steinitz had most success when the preference was for achieving victory by simple, modest, so to speak, 'humdrum' means, on the superiority of 'solidity' over 'brilliance'. To chess players with weak combinative gifts, there was almost total conversion, while their more gifted colleagues, yielding to the general mood, suppressed their combinational talent. Tournament books, magazines and chess columns came to be filled with careful, solid, but not very interesting games.

The epoch, the general character of the spiritual life of the 19th century, left its mark also on chess. The teaching of Steinitz somehow reminds us of the ideological tendency of that time: positivism, mechanism, rationalism in philosophy, theory in biology, denying qualitative changes and leaps and recognition of only slow, gradual change, naturalism in literature. Steinitz was a true son of his time, both in his achievements and discoveries, as well as in the limitations of his doctrine. He was unaware of this limitation, and was inclined to consider it an expression of absolute truth in chess.

The chess world reacted to Steinitz's theory in different ways. It was not lacking in supporters — such were the majority of the strong players of the age. Rather appreciable were the 'archaic opposition': they totally disclaimed the teaching and yearned for 'the good old days', the days of romanticism. (We note, incidentally, that such a clear-cut era never existed, since there always were outstanding masters with a bent for positional play — Philidor, Staunton, L.Paulsen, and others, but the past frequently was drawn into the romantic world.)

The deepest critics of Steinitz's teachings gathered on Chigorin's side. Chigorin rated highly Steinitz's qualities and did not deny the usefulness and importance of his contributions, but his searching spirit of an artist, his continual striving for the new, did not allow him to agree with these, which reduced the whole essence of chess to Steinitz's doctrines. No, chess was far more complicated, and, if one always followed recipes, then the result would be routine, colourless play, to order, which did not penetrate very deeply into the individual peculiarities of each position.

Chigorin's dictums and also his creative practice — games in which were embodied his principles, allow us to present the main points of the creative argument between Chigorin and Steinitz.
Steinitz: The correct method of play is the accumulation of small advantages. The opponent's combinations can always be forestalled by simple means. Solid and sound play is preferable to brilliance and beauty. Beautiful combinations are made possible only by a mistake of the opponent.

Chigorin: Combinations are an integral part of chess. At the present time, Steinitz considers elegant, pure creative combinations to be unattainable, and replaces them by cold calculation, strategical manoeuvring with various preparatory moves... However, should one agree with Steinitz? Should one not, on the other hand, consider the fact that his thinking has become prejudiced, making the game colourless?

Steinitz: The assessment of a position is based on the calculation of its elements (advantage in development and in space, weak points, open lines, pawn majority on the queen's flank, pawn formation, two bishops, etc.)

Chigorin: At the basis of the game ought to lay a creative, concrete approach to the chess position. The enumeration of Steinitz's elements has, in itself, only relative value. Everything will depend on the specifics of a position.

Chigorin maintained that 'Steinitz himself did not escape the influence of his own ideas, not infrequently becoming a victim of them.' Meanwhile, in some positions 'were concealed possibilities, disclaimed by Steinitz, of beautiful, brilliant and complicated combinations, with favourable results.'

Chigorin did not deny the importance of the 'brick' elements in evaluating a position, which were formulated by Steinitz. But the mind of Chigorin was attracted neither to correct nor to general principles, but to the concrete position, to a unique combination of elements, to creative dialectics, comprehensible to him. His play, as rightly noted by Emanuel Lasker, was based 'not on the universal logic which was generally accepted for everything, but on individual evaluations and judgments.' The correlation of Chigorin's creative thought and Steinitz's teaching, was a correlation of elemental dialectics and formal logic, which produced useful chess principles, the complexities of which, however, were far from being exhausted.
Chapter 12

Steinitz-Chigorin telegraph match 1890/91

A classic example of a creative clash of the ideologies of two chess players was furnished by the famous telegraph match, of two games, between Steinitz and Chigorin (1890/91). The outward reason for staging it was a disagreement in the appraisal of two opening variations (one for Black in the Evans Gambit, the other for White in the Two Knights Defence), recommended by Steinitz.

It is unusually interesting to read again Steinitz's annotations, which throw light on his conceptions and appraisals.

Before the start of play, Steinitz wrote:

'It will be noticed that in each of these games I am a pawn ahead and, theoretically, I maintain I ought to have a won game in each. Of course, Mr. Chigorin is evidently of a different opinion, and he probably speculates on some hidden king's side attack, which, however, according to the principles which I have followed in practice and theory for over twenty years, ought not to succeed by best play on my own side. Anyhow, I feel morally sure that I ought at least to win one game and draw the other, which would win the match for me, and I invite subscriptions toward my stakes with the fullest confidence that I shall not disappoint my supporters.'

The last sentence reminds us of the fact that, at this time, stakes in important matches were collected by subscription, while in the event of the victory of his favourite, those who took part would receive a share of his winnings.

In both games of the telegraph match, with each move, Steinitz's position came inevitably closer to ruin, but it is not easy to suspect this from the annotations of Steinitz, which appeared in the American press.

In the Evans Gambit

After Black's 12th move:

'...In general, I may remark that my antagonist's attack is of the same description as in most of the games which we have played together and it is representative of the old school. He believes in advancing the pawns, and sacrificing one or more of them in order to create difficulties on the king's side, or for the purpose of blocking his opponent's pieces; whereas I maintain that the king is a strong piece that can usually take care of itself, and that in his style of attack Chigorin has to employ powerful pieces, in order to block inferior ones. In the end, I opine that as usual my minor pieces will thoroughly develop, while his far-advanced pawns, which cannot retrace their steps, will form weak marks for my own ultimate counter-attack. For the present I am a pawn ahead, but I am likely to lose it, as on previous occasions, in order to rectify my position.'

After Black's 17th move:

'My own idea is that I have still the best of the game, which means that I am even better off now than I was at starting, and if I feel inclined to sport I should still lay
2 to 1 against my opponent winning the game; that is to say that I engage myself
to draw the game at least.'

After Black's 18th move:
'At any rate, I hope to make a hard fight for at least a draw.'

In the Two Knights Defence

After White's 13th move $\mathcal{C}h3-g1$:
'This move seems to be set down by some people as belonging to the slow
Fabian Cunctator tactics, which the modern school is charged with practising at the
expense of brilliancy and lively activity... But my move involves one of my leading
principles... The chess strategist has to look far ahead for the brilliancies and to fight
and counteract them by simple and dry looking means.'

Steinitz's statement concerning the fight against the possibility of brilliant
combinations is sometimes interpreted in our literature as meaning that the
question was not about brilliant combinations from the opponent's side, but
about his own refusal to conduct them. But Steinitz, as he repeatedly wrote about
this, had in mind both one and the other. He considered that simple means were
sufficient to render the opponent's combinations harmless or even make them
impossible. On the other hand, it was his conviction that really scientific play
did not need combinations, since the way of slow and gradual exploitation of
small advantages led to victory. In this manner, the theory of Steinitz would lead
to a complete banishment from chess of combinational elements. And this was
approved by a chess player, who was gifted with remarkable combinatorative talent, a
creator of amazingly beautiful games! Steinitz, the practical player, often refused
to contradict Steinitz the theoretician.

To return to Steinitz's annotations. After Black's 19th move, he wrote: 'White's
pieces seem still cramped, but most probably I shall offer battle in the centre at
once, in order to raise the siege.'

After Black's 21st move: '21...f3, giving up the pawn again, was absolutely forced,
and he could not in another way continue the attack, which, no doubt, will be very
troublesome for White during the next few moves (and therefore, afterwards all
the trouble should pass).' 

After White's 22nd move: 'If I am destined to lose this game as the prophets so
confidently predict (on which point I am at liberty to be sceptical), I, at any rate, hope
to make a better struggle than that presented in the variation pointed out by them.'

These annotations of Steinitz are a very interesting and rare event where we
get the chance to become acquainted with the chess player's own account of the
purpose of his moves and his appraisal of the prospects of the game at the
time the moves are played. It has to be stated that the World Champion wrongly
appraised the positions in the games and his partner's chances. Steinitz justified
his imaginary advantage, with the abstract reason that Chigorin's pawns were
far advanced, while, on the other hand, Steinitz's six pawns were standing on their original squares. But this, as also the presence of an extra pawn for Steinitz, proved to be quite immaterial, it was Chigorin's advantage in development and his initiative which decided the outcome of the struggle. But the result of the match did not have any visible influence on Steinitz. He lost both games? So what? Since his principles could not be wrong, then it was proved that the result of the match – was a new triumph for him! So here, Steinitz, on the one hand, held Chigorin's play in high regard, and, on the other, gave to understand that his, Steinitz's principles, prevailed! 'Chigorin's play – he wrote in his magazine at the end of the match – was admirable throughout... Without disparaging in the least the credit which my opponent deserves for his victory, I do not accept my defeat as conclusive evidence against the application of my theories in the two disputed positions, and still less as proofs against the doctrines of the modern school... But so far from the play in the cable match being a proof contrary to the doctrines of the modern school, I think that impartial experts will have to recognise that the Russian master's tactics seem to show a conversion to the new ideas, or at any rate that the modern principles have made their impression on his style, just like on that of most players of the new generation... I feel sure that the match will not affect the modern school which is accepted in theory and in practice amongst first class masters.'

Steinitz had completely forgotten about his own words spoken before the start of the match, that Chigorin's attack contradicted the principles of play, which he, Steinitz, had followed over the course of twenty years. Now the World Champion maintained something completely opposite: 'This was a slow struggle and a wrestling for position, in which the Russian master gained ground on the most approved principles of modern warfare in chess.'

But the attempt to hide the principal significance of the match would not be successful. The victory of Chigorin signified namely the superiority of his strategy, his principles. Chigorin replied to Steinitz's reasoning, which we quoted, with these very characteristic words: 'I do not consider myself belonging to this or that 'school', I am guided not by abstract theoretical considerations on the comparative strength of pieces, etc., but only on the data as it appears to me in this or that position of the game, which serves as an object of detailed and possibly accurate analysis. Each of my moves presented themselves as a feasible inference from a series of variations in which theoretical "principles of play" could have only a very limited significance.'

Alien to dogmatism, Chigorin approached the appraisal of a position with a broad, unbiased, comprehensive view. For him, a priori, abstract evaluations and judgments had no significance. He wrote: 'The ability to combine skillfully, the capability to find the most expedient move in each given position, quickly leads to the fulfillment of a well-conceived plan, which is superior to any principle, or, to put it more accurately, that is what is the only principle in the game of chess, and it does not lend itself to accurate definition.' In those words are to be found the most concisely expressed creative credo of the great Russian chess player.
Chigorin had a critical regard to the theory of Steinitz. He even had doubts as to whether Steinitz himself had presented the essence of his teaching precisely. In 1900, replying to a question of one provincial chess player, he wrote: 'It is difficult for me, in a few words, to reply to your question about the essential (alleged) difference between the 'old' and 'new' schools of chess art. Comparing the games of the former leading chess players, the geniuses, Labourdonnais, Morphy, Anderssen and others, who, not long ago, the late Steinitz attached to the 'old' and he himself, in his declining years, to the new school, with games of several of our contemporary masters, we actually notice differences in style of play, but these very differences in style existed also in the contemporaries of the above-mentioned persons, for example in Williams and Wyvill, who were playing as early as the first international tournament in London 1851. Even Steinitz himself, who was the first to begin to speak about a 'new' school in the game of chess, would have hardly given a totally clear and definite reply to your enquiry.' The meaning of this reply is clear; there have always been chess players, who played solidly, carefully, positionally. Such existed long before Steinitz, and, in Chigorin's view, Steinitz did not introduce anything principally new in this division of styles of play, which had begun to show itself long ago.

But, though he rejected the 'catechism' of Steinitz — the theoretician Chigorin always valued highly the remarkable practical player Steinitz. Chigorin very keenly felt his duality, contradictoriness. 'He was undoubtedly a genius chess player', said Chigorin, 'and also, what I respect most of all in him, is that he had a high regard for chess just as an art. But, at the same time, he personally, when seated at the board or writing about chess, switched to his scientific treatment side. He himself acknowledged this duality, which he explained by the fact that every art ought also to have a scientific foundation. Well, perhaps he was right there, but, you know, if a chess player, who plays in competitions, constantly thinks about foundations, then when will he get around to the building itself... Steinitz, undoubtedly, is one of the greatest chess players who has appeared up to this time, but I personally am unsympathetic to the exaggerated dogmatism in him.'

Chigorin was impressed with Steinitz's originality and the individuality of a great artist, a fanatical devotion to truth, as he understood it. Steinitz might have been mistaken (and he was mistaken) when he exaggerated the universality of the principles discovered by him and their conformity with laws, but he really was convinced of the truth of his teaching. After the end of the telegraph match, Chigorin wrote to Steinitz: 'True friends of chess must be thankful to you for the interest which you constantly awake with your innovations and for your aversion to routine-like play. As known to you, I do not share your theory and principles completely, which, however, does not prevent me from appreciating them. But you are doing me an injustice, dear Mr. Steinitz, when you ascribe to me a one-sided view about the treatment of the king's flank. After all, we are probably both right in our views about the conduct of the game. In some of your own best games, you have also not denied to yourself the attack on the royal flank.'
In the history of chess, the Chigorin-Steinitz telegraph match remains a unique event. Never since, despite the intense development of postal play, have the leading figures of chess met in single combat by correspondence.

15 Evans Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
Wilhelm Steinitz
Telegraph game 1890/91
1.e4 e5 2.\f3 \c6 3.\c4 \c5 4.b4
\xb4 5.c3 \a5 6.0-0 \w6

In his first match with Chigorin in 1889, Steinitz played only this defence. Despite its artificiality and his success against it in practice, Chigorin emphasised that White could only obtain an advantage by an energetic and ingeniously conducted attack.

7.d4

7...\h6

In the above-mentioned match, Steinitz played 7...\e7, but Chigorin, in the last game, found the correct way: 7...\e7 8.d5 \d8 9.\w4! \b6 10.\g5! \w6 11.\a3! c6 12.\ad1 \b8 13.\xe7 \xe7 14.d6+ \w8 15.\w4 f6 16.\b3, and obtained a winning attack.

After this, Steinitz, in the first part of his Modern Chess Instructor, recommended 7...\h6 as the best defence to the Evans Gambit. At the same time he also recommended the retreat of the knight, 9.\h3, in the Two Knights Defence. Chigorin maintained that both these innovations were bad. And so there arose the idea of organising two thematic games by telegraph, in which each of the two chess giants could demonstrate the correctness of their opinions.

Later Steinitz considered that the most accurate way of repulsing White's attack lay in the move 7...h6, which he tried successfully in his match with Gunsberg. However he did not choose to employ this in the return match with Chigorin.

After the return match, Chigorin showed the most active method of attack, also after 7...h6. Here it is: 8.\e3! \b6 9.dxe5! \w6 (9...\xe5 10.\xe5 \xe5 11.\d4! 10.\bd2 \xe3 11.fxe3 \e7 12.\h4 etc.

8.\g5 \w6

Steinitz plays to hold on to the gambit pawn, whereas, in Bogoljubow's opinion, he could quietly obtain an equal game by giving up the pawn: 8...\w6 9.d5 \b8 10.\xh6 \xh6 11.\xe5 0-0 12.d6 \c6. But this appraisal is questionable. In our opinion, after 13.\g4 \w6 14.\e1, White stands better.

9.d5 \d8 10.\w4 \b6 11.\a3 c6

Realising that the \a3 will soon transfer to c4, Steinitz prepares to drive it away with the move ...b7-b5. The attempt to develop his pieces a little by 11...0-0 would lead to a miserable position after 12.\d3 \w6 13.\c4 f6 (13...d6 14.\e7!) 14.\xb4 cxb6 cxb6 15.\e3.

12.\e2!
12...\textit{c7}

Black consistently carries out his plan and, in addition, the bishop defends the e5-pawn. After 12...\textit{c5}, White would obtain a very strong attack by means of 13.\textit{c4} \textit{w8} 14.\textit{x8d} \textit{x8d} 15.\textit{cxe5} \textit{f6} 16.\textit{dxc6}! \textit{f8} 17.\textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 18.\textit{ad1} \textit{e7} 19.\textit{xe5}, e.g. 19...\textit{d6} 20.\textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 21.\textit{xd6} \textit{xd6} 22.\textit{ad1} and wins.

13.\textit{c4} \textit{w8}

Chigorin writes: 'Other moves of the queen are weaker: 13...\textit{c5} 14.\textit{d6}! and the pawn cannot be taken because of \textit{e3} winning the queen, and if 14...\textit{b8} 15.\textit{e3} \textit{b5} 16.\textit{c2}, threatening \textit{b6} winning the queen or the rook; if 13...\textit{g6} 14.\textit{xd8}! \textit{xd8} 15.\textit{fxe5} \textit{f6} 16.\textit{a3} \textit{e7} 17.\textit{d6} Black moves, 18.\textit{d3} b5 19.e5 with an excellent game.'

14.\textit{d6}!

An exceptionally strong and unexpected blow.

Black has no choice: 14...\textit{b8} 15.\textit{e7}! or 14...\textit{b5} 15.\textit{dxc7} \textit{b7} 16.\textit{b3} \textit{c5} 17.\textit{b4} \textit{xc4} 18.\textit{b8}!.

14...\textit{xd6} 15.\textit{b6} \textit{b8} 16.\textit{xa7}

Here we see the first result of the breakthrough 14.\textit{d6}! – White steals up close to the immobilised black pieces on the queen’s flank.

It becomes clear that Black finds himself limited in his choice of moves and has a hopelessly compromised position. White has several natural ways of strengthening his position, whereas it is difficult for Black to find a plan of defence. Very soon attention will be focused on the \textit{d6}, the only defender of the \textit{b8}. If White succeeds in driving it away from the d6-square, then the fate of the rook and therefore also the bishop on c8 will be decided, since the retreat \textit{...c7} does not help because of the effective reply \textit{a8}.

16...\textit{e6}

In a game against Gunsberg, played in 1891, Steinitz chose 16...\textit{g4} 17.\textit{h4}! \textit{e6} 18.\textit{xe4} \textit{xg5} 19.\textit{f5} \textit{e6} 20.\textit{ad1} \textit{c7} 21.\textit{a8}! \textit{x8a} 22.\textit{xa8} \textit{d8} 23.\textit{xd7}+. The move 16...\textit{e6} seems more advisable, since, after 17.\textit{hxh6} \textit{gxh6} 18.\textit{h4} \textit{g7} followed by \textit{...e7}, Black could hold on.
17. **\( \mathbb{A}c1! \)**
A brilliant move. The threatened loss of the exchange after 18. **\( \mathbb{A}a3 \)** forces Black into a further weakening of his position. Later, Steinitz, in his annotations to the games of the match, wrote about the move 17. **\( \mathbb{A}c1! \)**: 'Amazing. This move, as also the 12th and 14th moves of White, bears the stamp of genius.'

**17...** **\( \mathbb{G}g8 \)** 18. **\( \mathbb{A}a3 \)** **\( \mathbb{C}c5 \)**
White threatened to win by the move 19. **\( \mathbb{W}xh8 \).**

19. **\( \mathbb{A}ad1! \)**
Once again White revolves the play around Black’s necessity to defend the bishop on d6.

**19...** **\( \mathbb{G}f6 \)**
On 19... **\( \mathbb{C}c7 \)**, Chigorin had prepared the forcing variation 20. **\( \mathbb{A}b5 \)** **\( \mathbb{G}f6 \)** 21. **\( \mathbb{A}d5 \)** **\( \mathbb{C}d6 \)** (best if 21... **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** 22. **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** **\( \mathbb{G}f4 \)** or **\( \mathbb{G}d8 \)** 23. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5 \)** or 23. **\( \mathbb{A}d6 \)** and wins)
22. **\( \mathbb{A}h4! \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** 23. **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** **\( \mathbb{C}c7 \)** 24. **\( \mathbb{G}f5 \)** **\( \mathbb{G}g6 \)** 25. **\( \mathbb{A}fd1 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xe5 \)** 26. **\( \mathbb{A}xd7 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xd7 \)** 27. **\( \mathbb{A}xd7 \)** **\( \mathbb{W}h6 \)** 28. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xc5 \)** 29. **\( \mathbb{W}xc5 \)** **\( \mathbb{C}c1+ \)** 30. **\( \mathbb{A}d1!\# \)**

20. **\( \mathbb{A}c4 \)**
It would have been bad to play 20. **\( \mathbb{A}a8? \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xa8 \)** 21. **\( \mathbb{W}xa8 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}e7 \)** 22. **\( \mathbb{A}h4 \)** **\( \mathbb{G}6 \)** and Black’s king is in a safe position. Black could then attempt an attack by ... **\( \mathbb{W}h6 \).**

20... **\( \mathbb{A}c7 \)**
It is difficult to suggest a plan of defence here. Black, threatened thick and fast, for the present makes a move which does not lose at once. Thus, after 20... **\( \mathbb{A}xe4 \)**, decisive would be 21. **\( \mathbb{A}xc8 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xc8 \)** 22. **\( \mathbb{W}xb7 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}c6 \)** 23. **\( \mathbb{A}xe5 \)**, and, on 20... **\( \mathbb{A}e7 \)**, he achieves his goal by 21. **\( \mathbb{A}xe6 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xe6 \)** 22. **\( \mathbb{A}c4 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}c7 \)** 23. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5 \)** and 24. **\( \mathbb{A}d6+ \).**

21. **\( \mathbb{G}d5! \)**
The strongest and at the same time most elegant continuation of the attack.

21... **\( \mathbb{A}d6 \)** 22. **\( \mathbb{A}h4! \)**
It was already possible here to reap the fruits of his play by 22. **\( \mathbb{A}xf6+ \)** **\( \mathbb{G}xf6 \)** 23. **\( \mathbb{A}xe6 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xe6 \)** 24. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}c5 \)** 25. **\( \mathbb{W}xb8 \)**, but Chigorin sees the possibility of still further strengthening his position.

22... **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)**
Black is powerless against the invasion of the knight on f5. On 22... **\( \mathbb{A}b5 \)**, Chigorin again gives a forcing variation: 23. **\( \mathbb{A}f5 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** 24. **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}b7 \)** 25. **\( \mathbb{W}a6! \)** **\( \mathbb{A}e8 \)** 26. **\( \mathbb{A}xb5 \)** (threatening 27. **\( \mathbb{A}xd7+ \)**) 26... **\( \mathbb{A}c7 \)** 27. **\( \mathbb{W}xc8+ \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xc8 \)** 28. **\( \mathbb{A}xd7 \)** (threatening **\( \mathbb{A}d6+ \)**) 28... **\( \mathbb{W}g8 \)** 29. **\( \mathbb{A}d1 \)** **\( \mathbb{A}f8 \)** 30. **\( \mathbb{A}d8+! \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xd8 \)** (if 30... **\( \mathbb{A}xd8 \)** 31. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5+ \)** and mate next move) 31. **\( \mathbb{A}xd8+ \)** **\( \mathbb{A}xd8 \)** 32. **\( \mathbb{A}xc5+ \)** **\( \mathbb{A}d6 \)** 33. **\( \mathbb{A}xd6\# \).**

23. **\( \mathbb{G}f5! \)** **\( \mathbb{G}6 \)**
Black can no longer endure the growing pressure and decides to immediately clarify the situation.

24. **\( \mathbb{A}d6+ \)** **\( \mathbb{W}xd6 \)** 25. **\( \mathbb{A}xd5 \)**
It seems an even quicker conclusion to the game could be reached by 25.exd5 cxe6 26.\(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c5 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)c7 27.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b5 followed by \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c5; however, the reply 27...\(\text{\textit{a}}\)a8 leads to approximately the same position as in the game.

25...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 26.\(\text{\textit{xe}}\)x6 fxe6 27.\(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c5 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a8

Because of the threat of 28.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6, Black must give up the exchange.

28.\(\text{\textit{w}}\)xa8 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c5 29.\(\text{\textit{wa}}\)a4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d8
30.\(\text{\textit{ed}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c7

Steinitz has managed to avoid a quick rout, but his position is lost. Chigorin brings the rook on f1 into play and this soon decides matters. The final attack is combined with the threat to transpose into a winning endgame.

31.\(\text{\textit{eb}}\)1! \(\text{\textit{zd}}\)d8 32.\(\text{\textit{eb}}\)b5 \(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c6 33.\(\text{\textit{wb}}\)d4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6

White has restricted the advance of the d-pawn to the d6-square.

34.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)a4! \(\text{\textit{we}}\)8

The bishop cannot go to d7; 34...\(\text{\textit{zd}}\)7 35.\(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d6 etc.

35.\(\text{\textit{eb}}\)b6 \(\text{\textit{wf}}\)8 36.\(\text{\textit{wa}}\)a5 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d5

If 36...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)8 37.\(\text{\textit{db}}\)2 (threatening mate in two moves by 38.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)a6 and 39.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)a8) 37...\(\text{\textit{f}}\)f4 38.\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b7+ \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)7 39.\(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d8+ and mate in a few moves, as given by Chigorin.

37.exd5 \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)8 38.d6

Black resigned. Chigorin concluded: 'It was certainly useless to continue the game.

Steinitz could not play 38...\(\text{\textit{wf}}\)4 because of 39.\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b7+ \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)7 (if 39...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b7 40.\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b2+ and mate in a few moves) 40.\(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d8+ \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a7 41.\(\text{\textit{wa}}\)5+ \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b8 42.d7 followed by 43.\(\text{\textit{db}}\)b7+ etc. And if 38.\(\text{\textit{ed}}\)d7 39.c4 \(\text{\textit{wf}}\)4 40.c5 \(\text{\textit{we}}\)e4 41.h3 and Black, not being able to prevent either c5-c6 or \(\text{\textit{db}}\)2 threatening \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a6, is forced to sacrifice his queen for the rook, or the rook for the d-pawn. And if Black had continued 38...\(\text{\textit{wa}}\)6, in order to defend the rook and the e-pawn, the conclusion would have been 39.\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b7+ \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)7 (if 39...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b7 40.\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)b2+ \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c6 41.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b6+ \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)7 42.\(\text{\textit{wb}}\)5#) 40.\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7+ \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a7 41.\(\text{\textit{db}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b8 42.\(\text{\textit{wb}}\)b6+ and 43.\(\text{\textit{wa}}\)a5+ and mate on the following move.'

This game serves as an object lesson in breaking through chess 'concrete'. Chigorin's attacking manoeuvres, between the 12th and 22nd moves, make a striking impression.

16 Two Knights Defence

\textbf{Wilhelm Steinitz}

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

Telegraph game 1890/91

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{\textit{c}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c6 3.\(\text{\textit{sc}}\)c4 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)6
4.\(\text{\textit{g}}\)g5 d5 5.exd5 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a5 6.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b5+ c6
7.dxc6 bxc6 8.\(\text{\textit{le}}\)2 h6 9.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)h3

This position was also the object of a creative argument. Later on, each of the opponents brings into play his pieces in accordance with his creative opinion.
Chigorin endeavours to concern himself with activating his position. Steinitz, however, ardently refrains from moving his pawns and is not in any hurry to castle, in order to leave the g1-square free for the knight.

9...\(\text{\&c}5\)

Chigorin: I did not play 9...\(\text{\&}d6\) because of the reply 10.d4; the text move, 9...\(\text{\&}c5\), is more aggressive and forces White to later play some moves, e.g. \(\text{\&}a4\), which do nothing to strengthen his position. I no longer wanted to take the knight because my bishop is needed for the attack, while the knight will soon be forced to go back to g1. That seemed to be all the more favourable for me as I could, for a long time, prevent the knight coming to f3, and it is only after this move that White can develop properly.

10.d3 0-0

11.\(\text{\&}c3\)

Chigorin: Steinitz said that he did not play 11.c3 because of the continuation 11...\(\text{\&}b8\) 12.b4 \(\text{\&}x\text{b}4\) 13.c\text{xb}4 \(\text{\&}d4\) 14.b\text{xa}5 \(\text{\&}x\text{a}1\) 15.\(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}x\text{a}2\) etc., which is unattractive for White. However, on the move 11.c3, I would not have replied 11...\(\text{\&}b8\), since this move is useless in the variation 12.\(\text{\&}g1!\) \(\text{\&}b6\) 13.d4 \text{exd}4 14.b4, winning a piece for two pawns. I would consider that it is absolutely necessary to not allow the white king’s knight to go to g1 and then f3, because White, being then able to castle, would have easily repulsed the whole attack. I intended to reply to 11.c3 by 11...\(\text{\&}b7!\), when White could play neither 12.b4, because of 12...\(\text{\&}x\text{b}4\) 13.c\text{xb}4 \(\text{\&}d4\), nor 12.\(\text{\&}g1\), because of 12...\(\text{\&}b6\) 13.d4 \text{exd}4 14.b4 \(\text{\&}d6\) 15.\(\text{\&}x\text{d}4\) \(\text{\&}x\text{d}4\) 16.c\text{xd}4 \(\text{\&}x\text{b}4\), regaining the pawn with a good position.

11...\(\text{\&}d5\)

The knight on h3 is so badly placed that to exchange it for the bishop on c8, which will certainly prove useful for the attack, would mean relieving White’s game. Chigorin frees the way for the f-pawn.

12.\(\text{\&}a4\)
If Steinitz intends to retreat the knight to g1, then the text move is absolutely necessary since the bishop must be driven away from attacking the f2-square. Of course, the knight's position on a4 is not exactly aesthetic, but is the position of the knight on a5 any better?

12...\text{d}6 13.\text{g}1 \text{f}5

Steinitz wrote, 'On my side are six unmoved pawns which, according to my theories, are a great advantage, especially for the ending, where it is important to retain the option of moving either one or two squares. Moreover, not a single piece of mine will be within reach of either of my opponent's pawns for a long time to come. His only point of attack lies in advancing his f-pawn to f3, and this point is now well-guarded.' Chigorin also considered the retreat of the knight to g1 the best, but now his whole game revolves around encouraging the exit of the knight to f3! Thus, on 14.\text{f}3 now, could follow 14...e4 15.\text{d}4 \text{d}7 and it is clear that the ill-fated knight stands even worse on d4 than on g1.

14.c3 \text{d}7

Again it is not possible to bring out the knight: 15.\text{f}3 e4 16.\text{d}4 c5 17.dxe4 cxd4! 18.exd5 \text{e}8! and Black's attack becomes dangerous. But, by playing 14.c3, Steinitz had apparently decided to establish a pawn outpost on d4.

15.d4 \text{e}4

Chigorin does not fear the formation of a mobile pawn chain on the queen's flank, and logically carries out his plan. Now that White has out of play the knight on g1 and rook on h1, and also his king stuck in the centre, Chigorin prepares a further advance of his centre pawn, aiming to open the e- and f-files. On 15...exd4, Steinitz suggested the defensive set-up 16.cxd4 \text{e}7 17.\text{f}1, followed by \text{f}3, \text{d}3 and \text{d}2.

16.c4 \text{e}7

Just this way, so as firstly not to block the f-file, and secondly to bring the knight to f4 (via g6) or to f5 (after ...f5-f4).

17.\text{c}3 \text{e}6

18.b3

Steinitz sticks to his principles and does not weaken his position on the king's flank; meanwhile, by making use of the immune c4-pawn (18...\text{xc}4? 19.\text{b}3 \text{b}8 20.\text{xc}4! \text{xb}3 21.\text{xe}6+ and 22.\text{xb}3), he could either endeavour to bring out the knight, 18.\text{h}3, and then castle, or prevent the further advance of the f-pawn by playing 18.f4. It seems that, on both these moves, equally strong would be the reply 18...\text{b}8 (on 18.\text{h}3, also good is 18...g5!) with threats on both the c4-pawn and the pawns on the king's flank. Thus after
18.f4 \textcolor{wht}{\textit{W}}b8 19.\textcolor{red}{W}a4 \textit{W}b4! 20.\textcolor{wht}{c}5 \textit{W}xa4
21.\textit{Q}xa4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}c7 22.g3 \textcolor{wht}{\textit{Q}}f5, Black’s pieces occupy very menacing positions.

\textbf{18...\textit{Q}b4 19.\textit{Q}b2}

\textbf{19...\textit{Q}f4!}

Black consistently carries out his plan and in the quickest possible time intends to open the game with a sacrifice of the f-pawn. White already has no satisfactory continuation. On 20.\textit{Q}f1, strong is 20...f3! 21.gxf3 exf3 22.\textit{Q}xf3 \textcolor{wht}{\textit{Q}}g6 followed by \ldots\textcolor{wht}{\textit{Q}}h4, and, on 20.a3, good is 20...\textit{Q}xc3+ 21.\textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}xc3 \textcolor{wht}{\textit{Q}}f5 22.\textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}g4 \textit{b}b8. Steinitz gives up his centre pawn, hoping to exploit the vis-a-vis of the \textit{b}2 and \textit{d}4.

20.\textcolor{wht}{\textit{W}}c2

This is, all the same, an admission of the bankruptcy of White’s opening strategy. The pawn sacrifice, which Black must accept in order not to allow his opponent to castle queen’s side, does not change the character of the struggle – the threat of \ldots\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}4-\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}3 cannot be averted.

\textbf{Chigorin:} If 20.a3 the continuation would have been 20...\textit{Q}xc3+ 21.\textit{Q}xc3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}f3
22.\textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}g4 \textit{b}b8! and not 22...\textit{Q}b8 as indicated by Steinitz. And if 20.\textit{Q}f1, the strongest reply seems to be 20...e3, so as after 21.fxe3 or 21.\textit{Q}f3 to be able to play 21...\textit{Q}f5.

20.\textcolor{wht}{\textit{W}}xd4 21.\textit{Q}f1

The choice is miserable for White. After 21.a3 he would find himself under a terrible attack by 21...\textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}3! 22.gxf3 e3! 23.fx e3 \textit{Q}h4++. It seems there would be some chances of salvation in 21.\textit{Q}d1 \textit{W}f6
22.a3 \textit{Q}xc3+ 23.\textit{Q}xc3 \textit{W}g6 24.\textit{Q}f1. Steinitz endeavours to quickly unpin the \textit{Q}c3 in order to uncover the \textit{Q}b2, but leads his king directly into trouble.

\textbf{21...\textit{Q}f3!}

\textbf{Chigorin:} This attack seemed very strong to me and more interesting than the continuation 21...\textit{Q}f5, which would equally give an advantage in position: 21...\textit{Q}f5 22.\textit{Q}d5 \textit{W}c5 (White would not obtain any advantage by continuing 23.\textit{Q}xf4 because of the reply 23...\textit{W}xf2+ 24.\textit{Q}xf2 e3+ 25.\textit{Q}xe3 \textit{Q}xc2). A detailed analysis of the present position convinced me that Black must win.

22.gxf3

The sacrifice of the bishop, 22.\textit{Q}xe4 fxe2+ 23.\textit{Q}xe2 \textit{W}b6, would somewhat revitalise the white pieces, but not for long: 24.\textit{Q}f6+ \textit{g}7! or 24.c5! \textit{W}b5! 25.\textit{Q}xb5 cxb5 26.a3 \textit{Q}xb3 27.axb4 \textit{Q}xa1 28.\textit{Q}xa1 a5!.

22...\textit{exf3} 23.\textit{Q}xf3

23.\textit{Q}xf3 is no better. Chigorin intended to continue the attack by 23...\textit{Q}h3+ 24.\textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}xf3! 25.\textit{Q}xf3 \textit{Q}e8 26.\textit{Q}e2 (he was threatened with \ldots\textit{Q}d5+) 26...\textit{Q}g6
27.\textit{Q}d1 (if 27.\textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}xe2+) 27...\textit{W}f6. An analysis of this variation shows that Black very soon obtains a great material advantage.
23...\textit{\textit{f5}}

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

24.\textit{\textit{c4}}

After 24.\textit{\textit{d1}}, Black retains the attack by moving the queen to f4 or h4.

Chigorin: If 24.\textit{\textit{d1}} \textit{\textit{h4}} 25.\textit{\textit{c4}} (if 25.\textit{\textit{e2}} \textit{\textit{g6}} etc.) 25...\textit{\textit{e8d8}} 26.\textit{\textit{xd8}} \textit{\textit{xd8}} 27.\textit{\textit{we2}} (he was threatened with 28.\textit{\textit{d2}} followed by 28...\textit{\textit{xe4}}, and if 27.\textit{\textit{c1}} \textit{\textit{xd4}} etc.) 27...\textit{\textit{g6}} (now White has no other move) 28.h3 (to prevent the two variations 28.\textit{\textit{we3}} \textit{\textit{xe4}} 29 \textit{\textit{xe4}} \textit{\textit{e1+}} and wins, or 28.a3 \textit{\textit{e4}} 29.\textit{\textit{xe4}} 30.\textit{\textit{ch3}} \textit{\textit{ch3+}} 31.\textit{\textit{g1}} \textit{\textit{h4+}} and mate next move) 28...\textit{\textit{f4}}! and White, in order not to lose a piece by 29...\textit{\textit{h4}}, must sacrifice the exchange by 29.h4 \textit{\textit{ch4}} 30.\textit{\textit{ch4}} \textit{\textit{xe4}}.

At first sight it seems that White has succeeded in achieving his aim – his dark-squared bishop comes into play and, by driving the bishop away from b4, he can move his queen to the a1-h8 diagonal. But the logic of chess does not like exceptions. Up to now Black has consistently carried out his attack, with no letup, and so the initiative must lie with him. There will just come a time when he must find an accurate and perhaps also the only move.

24...\textit{\textit{xe4}}! 25.\textit{\textit{we2}}!

Of course not 25.\textit{\textit{xe4}} \textit{\textit{xb2}} 26.\textit{\textit{b1}} \textit{\textit{xa2}}, or 25.\textit{\textit{xe4}} \textit{\textit{xf2+}} 26.\textit{\textit{xf2}} \textit{\textit{xe4}} 27.\textit{\textit{xf3}} \textit{\textit{f8}} 28.\textit{\textit{g2}} \textit{\textit{g6}} (and not 28...\textit{\textit{f5}} on which White would reply 29.\textit{\textit{xf1}} saving the exchange) 29.\textit{\textit{h1}} (if 29.\textit{\textit{h1}} \textit{\textit{xf3}}) 29...\textit{\textit{xe1}} 30.\textit{\textit{xe1}} \textit{\textit{ch4+}} 31.\textit{\textit{xh4}} \textit{\textit{xf3+}} 32.\textit{\textit{g1}} \textit{\textit{f4}}, winning the queen or mating.

25...\textit{\textit{xf3!!}}

Here is the outcome of events, which Black must undoubtedly have foreseen when making his 24th move. Black could give up the queen in a different way: 25...\textit{\textit{c3}} 26.\textit{\textit{d1}} \textit{\textit{xf3}} 27.\textit{\textit{we6+}} (27.\textit{\textit{xf3}} \textit{\textit{g4}} 28...\textit{\textit{xc3}} \textit{\textit{h3+}} etc.) 27...\textit{\textit{xf7}} 28.\textit{\textit{xd4}} \textit{\textit{xd4}} 29.\textit{\textit{xf3}} \textit{\textit{xb2}}; however, the way chosen by him is more effective, since it keeps more pieces on the board, which is to Black's advantage.

26.\textit{\textit{we6+}} \textit{\textit{ch7}} 27.\textit{\textit{xd4}} \textit{\textit{xe1}}

28.\textit{\textit{wh3}} \textit{\textit{f5}} 29.\textit{\textit{xe5}} \textit{\textit{ae8}}

35 Also Black could have just remained a piece ahead by 27...\textit{\textit{f6}}.
30. $\text{f4}$
White is mated beautifully after 30.f4 $\text{xe5}$ 31.fxe5 $\text{g3}\#$. Black has a material and positional advantage, and, of course, not just one way to victory.
Now there is an effective win after 30...$\text{e4}$ 31. $\text{e2}$ $\text{xe2!}$ 32.$\text{xe2}$ $\text{d4+}$ 33.$\text{d3}$ $\text{xf4}$, or 33.$\text{e3}$ $\text{c2+}$ (Chigorin continues the variation with 34.$\text{d3!}$ $\text{xa1}$ 35.$\text{f1}$ $\text{xf4}$ 36.$\text{xh1}$ $\text{xb3}$ 37.$\text{xb3}$ $\text{xf2}$ 38.$\text{b1}$ (threatening $\text{e3+}$) 38...$\text{g8}$ 39.$\text{e4}$, when 'Black certainly must win, but the text move seemed to me to be more decisive.')
Chigorin chooses a no less correct way, at the same time taking his bishop out of the corner.

30...$\text{d4!}$ 31.$\text{d3+}$ $\text{e4}$ 32.$\text{xd4}$ $\text{xf4}$ 33.$\text{f3}$
The pawn cannot be taken at once — 33.$\text{xa7}$ $\text{g4}$ 34.$\text{f3}$ $\text{d3+}$ 35.$\text{f2}$ $\text{g5}$ followed by 36...$\text{c5+}$ (Chigorin's variation).

33...$\text{ef8}$ 34.$\text{xa7}$ $\text{c5!}$ 35.$\text{c7}$
Chigorin: If 35.a3, the reply would be ...$\text{c6}$ and the game does not change much from the text continuation; and if 35.$\text{d1}$, there would follow 35...$\text{c6}$ 36.$\text{c7}$ or b6 $\text{d4}$ or e5 and Black will win easily by taking the f-pawn with the knight or with the bishop.

35...$\text{c6!}$ 36.a3 $\text{xf3+!}$ 37.$\text{xf3}$ $\text{xf3+}$ 38.$\text{g1}$
If 38.$\text{e2}$ $\text{d4+}$ and 39...$\text{f1}$ mate, while 38.$\text{g2}$ would lose the queen by 39...$\text{f7+}$.

38...$\text{d2!}$

0-1
Chigorin: Black’s last move threatens to win the queen by 39...$\text{e3+}$ 40.$\text{g2}$ $\text{f7+}$. White can save his queen only by 39.$\text{b6}$, but then follows 39...$\text{e3+}$ and 40...$\text{f5+}$ with a mate in five moves at most. If 39.$\text{h4}$ $\text{d4}$ and wins the queen or mates in a few moves. There remains only one defence, which leads to an interesting end to the game: 39.$\text{g3}$ $\text{e3+}$ 40.$\text{g2}$ $\text{f5+}$ 41.$\text{h3}$ $\text{h5+}$ 42.$\text{g4}$ (if 42.$\text{h4}$ $\text{f5+}$ 43.$\text{g3}$ $\text{xe4}$ 44.$\text{xe4}$, Black mates in two moves) 42...$\text{e5+}$ 43.$\text{xh5}$ $\text{g5}$!! and, in order to delay the mate for a move, White is forced to take this pawn with the queen. This mating position is very rare in an actual game: after 44.$\text{xe3}$ $\text{g6#}$; with the exception of the c-pawn, all Black's pieces and pawns are needed to execute the mate.
Such an abundance of exclamation marks at the end, when the result of the game was clear, is no mere coincidence — Black's way of realising his advantage was very elegant.
Chapter 13

The return match with Steinitz

The victory over Steinitz, in the telegraph match, made a strong impression on the chess world. 'Steinitz's chess championship title', wrote the new Moscow magazine *Checkered Board*, in its first number, 'for the first time in a whole quarter-century, has been shaken in full view of the entire chess world, which now looks forward to a new and definitive struggle between the two chess giants, for the possession of the world chess crown.'

On 1 May 1891 – three days after the end of the telegraph match – the St. Petersburg Chess Society sent Steinitz an invitation to play a match with Chigorin in St.Petersburg. But already, on the following day, a telegram was received in St. Petersburg, from the Havana Chess Club, with an offer to play the match in Havana. Steinitz, who, as World Champion, was allowed the choice of venue, chose Havana.

Chigorin set out for Havana on 12 November 1891, via Paris, Le Havre and New York, playing, en route, a few casual games in Paris with the best Parisian players. In Havana, before the match, he gave several exhibitions and played four games apiece against the strongest local players – Vasquez and Golmayo, and also several consultation games. One of these the reader will see in this book.

Chigorin's second match with Steinitz was one of the most dramatic events in chess history. This was a most stubbornly contested struggle between the two great chess players – creative antagonists, who produced many very sharp games, even if at times not without mistakes, and it came to an end with a tragic finale. Both partners brought out their favourite opening systems and conducted an uncompromising struggle. In the 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th games, Steinitz tried to vindicate his system with the retreat of the knight to h3 in the Two Knights Defence. However, after winning the 6th game, he lost the other three, and preferred to go over to a more reliable opening – the Spanish. Chigorin did not succeed in countering it with a good system and the result was +3 -0 =1 in favour of Steinitz. Also against 1.e4 e5, as in 1889, Chigorin had not prepared a satisfactory reply and lost all three games which opened with this move.

On the other hand, in the Evans Gambit, as also in the Two Knights Defence, success was on Chigorin's side: +4 -1 =3. This opening, and its role in the match, deserves a special discussion.

In the 19th century, the Evans Gambit was very popular. It was analysed thoroughly and there were theoretical discussions on it. It was even said that, one day in Vienna, in the presence of Kolisch, a spiritual séance was held with the aim of obtaining a theoretical consultation... with Labourdonnae! What was the best continuation for White on the 9th move in the 'normal position' of the Evans Gambit? – for the sake of this question, they disturbed the spirit of the great French chess player. The spirit, alas, was unprepared and did not impart a solution to the problem, which might only be solved by heated arguments, flaring up in the chess press.
One of the most active theoreticians, working through the pages of German, English, French and Russian chess magazines, was S.Alapin, who considered that the Evans Gambit could be refuted by means of the so-called Alapin-Sanders Defence, 7...dxc4 8.xd7 (Sanders, an English chess player, recommended this move as long ago as 1871, but Alapin was unaware of this).

On the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 10\textsuperscript{th} November in St.Petersburg, in the Economist’s Club, Alapin delivered a comprehensive lecture on this defence. In Havana, Steinitz told Chigorin that he had received from Alapin, his analysis.

In the 7\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} games of the match, Steinitz employed this defence (the 7\textsuperscript{th} game he lost, the 9\textsuperscript{th} ended in a draw), after which (in the 13\textsuperscript{th}, 15\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} games) he went over to other variations. Chigorin said this about the Alapin-Sanders Defence: 'There has not yet been born a man, who could, by means of one piece of analysis, for the most part, as always happens, one-sided, prove the failure of the viability of the Evans Gambit. Well-known players, the objective Anderssen, Zukertort etc., having occupied themselves with an analysis of this opening, simply acquainted the readers with its difficulties, when presenting a general judgment, but never gave a decisive verdict on this highly complex opening, as does S.Alapin.' Later on, Chigorin had to play against the Alapin-Sanders Defence to the Evans Gambit in the telegraph match, St.Petersburg-Paris, 1894/95, and in a consultation game against the very inventor of this defence – Alapin, playing jointly with Schiiffers (1897), and he was able to show that the Evans Gambit was far from being refuted – both these games were won by Chigorin (White).

Alapin’s letter to Steinitz, which was sent before the actual World Championship match, aroused Chigorin’s indignation and could not but shock him, at the time of the most important contest of his life.

The match began on 1 January 1892, in the new, recently built, premises of the 'Centro Asturiano' Club. In the first game, Chigorin offered the Evans Gambit and, on the 19\textsuperscript{th} move, made a beautiful sacrifice of a knight, which also led to a win. It is interesting that this sacrifice required from Chigorin a total of 15 minutes reflection, while the controversy regarding its correctness lasted for decades.

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} games of the match were drawn. The 4\textsuperscript{th} game (Spanish) was won in excellent style by Steinitz, who concluded with a beautiful rook sacrifice.

In the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} games, Chigorin played badly, making a draw with difficulty in the 5\textsuperscript{th}, and losing the 6\textsuperscript{th}. The 5\textsuperscript{th} game was even carried over to the following day because Chigorin was feeling ill.

Steinitz had taken over the lead in the match, but Chigorin mustered his strength and, in the next four games, scored 3½ points. After his victory in the 6\textsuperscript{th} game with his own variation in the Two Knights Defence, Steinitz again tried it in the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 10\textsuperscript{th} games, that is, on the 8\textsuperscript{th} move (after 1.e4 e5 2.f3 c6 3.d4 d6 4.g5 d5 5.exd5 c5 6.b5+ c6 7.dxc6 bxc6), he retreated the bishop to f1 -- a move which astonished all the commentators of the day by its eccentricity and which is no longer employed, although, in Chigorin’s view, it is not without basis, since the e2-square remains free for the queen, while the bishop, in several
variations, is transferred to g2. But, in any event, Black obtained the initiative here, and, after losing both games, Steinitz did not retreat his bishop to f1 again.

The score of the match had reached +4 -2 =4 in Chigorin’s favour. He lost the 11th game, with the white pieces in a Spanish Game, in which Steinitz played his favourite defence 3...d6. The most expedient continuation for White against the defence, allowing White to obtain a free position, which is full of initiative, had still not been found at that time.

In the 12th game, Steinitz once again employed the Two Knights Defence, but on the 8th move this time retreated the bishop to e2. Chigorin won this game in excellent style. After this, Steinitz finally laid this variation to rest and switched to more solid openings.

The 13th and 14th games were won by Steinitz, the 13th was his only victory in the Evans Gambit. The scores drew level, but Chigorin won the 15th game and again went ahead. From the 15th to the 20th games, White won each time. Upon each of Steinitz’s wins which equalised the score, Chigorin replied with a victory and again took the lead. After the 19th game, the score was +8 -7 =4 in Chigorin’s favour, but in the following three games, Steinitz scored 2½ and went ahead.

An extraordinary outcome to this great contest came about in the 23rd game, played on 28 February 1892. At this point, the score was +9 -8 =5 in Steinitz’s favour. The outcome of the 23rd game was to decide the result of the match. If Chigorin won it, then, according to the regulations, the match would continue until one of the opponents had scored three more victories.

Both opponents were very nervous during this game, and the scales were subjected to great fluctuations. For the first time out of all their encounters, Chigorin offered Steinitz the King’s Gambit. Instead of some sort of universally adopted at that time system with 3...g5, Steinitz defended with the then rarely used move 3...c5.

The queens were quickly exchanged and an endgame was reached, which seemed to be turning out in Black’s favour. But Steinitz was also a man of flesh and blood. He carried out a bad manoeuvre with his knight, and, on the 23rd move, was forced to give it up. As Steinitz himself wrote: ‘Being attracted by a rather seductive attack with his h-pawn on the 22nd move, he allowed his knight to be imprisoned and he had then probably no better resource than the one adopted on the next move, namely to sacrifice that piece for an attack which appeared very perplexing. Chigorin was short of time at that stage but he made the best moves up to the 26th.’
At the 26th move, White had an easily winning position. On the 28th and 29th moves, Chigorin could have at once forced a win, and even after he had committed an inaccuracy, the win was still there. After Black's 31st move, was reached this position, which is one of the most famous in the history of chess.

The time control had already been passed (on the 30th move). But, at the decisive moment, Chigorin's nerves betrayed him. Instead of the winning 32.\texttt{Exb7}, Chigorin, after pondering for twenty minutes, made the suicidal move 32.\texttt{b4}?! and, after 32...\texttt{Exh2+}, resigned.

As Chigorin said later on: 'The match was lost in the last game, when I had an extra piece and my position was winning. Only through extreme fatigue could I have allowed myself, in such a position, to be mated in two moves.'

The well-known researcher of the life and career of Chigorin, N.I. Grekov, produced data on the results of Chigorin's last games in competitions, in which he took part during his prime (1883-1903). It was shown that, out of 15 games played over three years in the last rounds of tournaments, Chigorin won only 2, made 4 draws, and suffered 9 losses, which included several games with serious oversights in winning positions. There was a similar picture also in matches, namely, that in these decisive lost games, increased nervousness and lack of staying-power of the great Russian player had an adverse effect on his results.

For the psychology of sport, this problem of the last game is very interesting. Even the history of matches for the World Championship is full of serious oversights, though, for all that, the 32nd move in the 23rd game of the Chigorin-Steinitz match stands out for its drama and irreparable damage.

Chigorin the artist was more brilliant than Steinitz. 'In the understanding of correctness, strength and beauty in chess art, he was far superior to Steinitz' — such was the opinion of Emanuel Lasker, who had an excellent knowledge of both the great adversaries. But, in other respects, Steinitz was undoubtedly stronger than Chigorin — that is in sporting consistency, practicality, evenness, endurance, composure — very valuable qualities, which he had cultivated over decades. And furthermore: at this time Chigorin had not overcome either his personal dislike for 1.d4 — this dislike he did not overcome to the end — or his reluctance to work at an analysis of the openings connected with this first move. Only after several years did
he seriously occupy himself with this area of opening theory, which he so disliked. We present a very interesting sketch from the memoirs of K.V.Rosenkrantz:

'Chigorin did not like the Queen’s Gambit and the Queen’s Pawn Opening, even more than that – he detested these openings, which led to slow pressure on the opponent with a protracted positional struggle. He despised such play as being mediocre, routine. Intuitive to the mind of Chigorin was always to strive for play where there was a possibility of creating plans, definite variations. Nonetheless, Chigorin knew very well the strength of these openings, particularly after he had paid for his scornful attitude to defence in them by a series of defeats in the matches against Steinitz and the loss of the penultimate game in his match with Tarrasch. Later on, Chigorin had an astonishingly good knowledge of the Queen’s Gambit – he studied it as if it were a fearsome enemy, with whom he was to do battle the next day. He created a whole series of interesting systems in the Queen’s Gambit; however, though he knew very well how strong was the Queen’s Gambit – particularly after Pillsbury’s victory in the tournament in Hastings 1895, which was achieved to a considerable extent thanks to a fine knowledge of this opening – he still did not play it himself.

Thus the Achilles heel of Chigorin in the struggle against Steinitz was sporting instability and underestimation of the Queen’s Gambit. It was particularly this underestimation which M.Botvinnik had in mind, when he said: 'I believe that only this rather one-sided attitude of Chigorin can explain the fact that our great chess player did not become World Champion.'

So, the titanic match between two great chess players ended in an unexpected catastrophe. Steinitz himself called his win a 'Pyrrhic victory' and admitted that 'Chigorin finished the match almost as the winner.'

'The fact remains', he said, in summing up the outcome of the match, 'that I was not able to contend with the Russian master as successfully as I did with other great masters, including Zukertort.'

In the life of Steinitz, the 1892 match proved to be his last important victory. Shortly after this, began his sad decline. In the same year, 1892, Steinitz was grief-stricken by the death of his wife and daughter. Two years later, he lost the match for the World Championship to the young Emanuel Lasker. Need and ill health became companions of the great chess player during the last years of his life.

After the second match with Steinitz, Chigorin bid farewell forever to the hospitable Havana. At home, in Russia, he would have memories of his sympathetic friends, the Cuban chess players, three dramatic duels, and the tropical climate, to which a northerner is unaccustomed. Chigorin had occasion to cross the ocean again only once – in 1904.
17 Queen's Pawn Opening

Cuban consulting players

Mikhail Chigorin

Consultation game, Havana 1891

1.d4 d5 2.♗f3 ♗g4 3.c4!

The most logical reply. Without this move, White cannot reckon on achieving much. The exchange 3...♗xf3 4.gxf3 is not to be feared since White's position in the centre is strengthened.

3...e6

The natural reply, but also possible is 3...♘c6, transposing into the Chigorin Defence.

4.♗e5 ♗f5

5.♗c3

Now Black manages to firmly reinforce the d5-pawn and free his queen for defence of the b7-pawn. Therefore more accurate would be an immediate 5.♗b3, forcing Black into the weakening 5...♗c6! 6.♗xc6 (6.♗xb7 ♖xd4 7.e3 ♗b8! 8.♗xa7 ♗c2+ 9.♖e2 ♗e7) 6...bxc6, while after 7.♗c3, probably he must still play a gambit by 7...♗f6 8.♗xb7 ♗b8 9.♗xc6+ ♗d7 10.♗xd7+ ♖xd7 11.e3 ♗e4, with highly problematical compensation for the pawn. In such a closed position, White's advantage in development is immaterial. However, if White had begun to open the game: 9.g4 ♗g6 10.h4 ♗f6 11.♗xg6 hxg6 12.e4!, Black would have experienced more difficulties.

8.axb3 f6 9.♗f3

36 Here, White can win a second pawn by 12.cxd5, as 12...♗xc3 is met by 13.dxe6+. So better is 11...♗c5 or 11...♗b4.
9...\(\text{\$a}_6\)
Black's difficulties do not disappear with the exchange of queens. White's principal threat is not the manoeuvre \(\text{\$c}_3-a4-b6\) (refuted by any move of the \(\text{\$b}_8\)) but the running of both his \(\text{\$}\)-pawns to the \(\text{\$b}_5\)-square. The other move to bring out the rook from \(\text{\$a}_8\) is also insufficient for Black: 9...\(\text{\$d}_7\) 10.\(\text{\$b}_4\) a6 11.\(\text{\$b}_5\). Hardly satisfactory is the stronger 10.e5 11.\(\text{\$b}_5\) \(\text{\$e}_7\)! since, after 12.e3 \(\text{\$g}_4\), White succeeds in reforming by 13.\(\text{\$d}_2\) \(\text{\$f}_5\) 14.\(\text{\$b}_3\), and seizes the initiative thanks to the strong threats of \(\text{\$a}_5\), or \(\text{\$h}_2-a3\) and \(\text{\$g}_2-g4\). Chigorin endeavours to eliminate White's threat. More than this, he intends the aggressive manoeuvre ...\(\text{\$b}_4-c2\).

10.\(\text{\$a}_4\)
White could have set Black new problems with the energetic 10.e4!. Taking the pawn would be bad: 10...dxe4 11.\(\text{\$xa}_6\) bxa6 12.\(\text{\$h}_4\) 0-0-0 13.\(\text{\$xa}_6\), since it leads to a serious weakening of the pawns, for example: 13...\(\text{\$xd}_4\) 14.\(\text{\$xf}_5\) exf5 15.\(\text{\$e}_3\), and then if 15...\(\text{\$b}_4\) 16.\(\text{\$xc}_6\)+ \(\text{\$b}_7\) 17.\(\text{\$e}_6\).

There remains only 10...\(\text{\$b}_4\) 11.\(\text{\$a}_4\) \(\text{\$c}_2+\) 12.\(\text{\$d}_1\) dxe4 13.\(\text{\$d}_2\) \(\text{\$xd}_4\) (13...e3? 14.\(\text{\$de}_4\) \(\text{\$xe}_4\) 15.\(\text{\$xe}_4\) \(\text{\$f}_5\) 16.\(\text{\$xc}_2\)) 14.\(\text{\$xd}_4\) \(\text{\$xc}_5\) 15.\(\text{\$c}_4\) \(\text{\$xf}_2\) 16.\(\text{\$xc}_4\) \(\text{\$xe}_4\) 17.\(\text{\$xe}_4\) 0-0-0+ 18.\(\text{\$c}_2\) \(\text{\$b}_6\) 19.\(\text{\$b}_4\) \(\text{\$e}_7\). Black has a sufficient pawn equivalent for the piece, but some initiative remains with White.

10...\(\text{\$b}_4\)!
Chigorin begins a risky experiment. The quiet continuation 10...\(\text{\$c}_7\) 11.\(\text{\$f}_4\) 0-0 0-0 12.\(\text{\$c}_3\) a6 13.\(\text{\$a}_4\) \(\text{\$e}_8\)! 14.\(\text{\$b}_6+\) \(\text{\$d}_8\) would have retained the tension of the position in the centre and on the king's flank.

11.\(\text{\$d}_1\) \(\text{\$c}_2\) 12.\(\text{\$a}_2\)

12.e5
After 12...\(\text{\$b}_4\), White could not avoid the draw. In the event of 13.\(\text{\$a}_3\) \(\text{\$c}_2\) 14.\(\text{\$b}_6\)? \(\text{\$xa}_3\) 15.\(\text{\$xa}_8\) \(\text{\$b}_5\) 16.\(\text{\$f}_4\) e5! 17.dxe5 \(\text{\$xc}_5\) 18.e3 a6 19.exf6 \(\text{\$xf}_6\) 20.\(\text{\$xb}_5\) axb5 21.\(\text{\$d}_4\) \(\text{\$d}_7\) 22.\(\text{\$e}_2\) \(\text{\$f}_7\), Black's advantage is indisputable. However, Black makes an attempt to forcibly upset the natural order of events, apparently trusting in the difference in class of play.

13.\(\text{\$b}_6\)!
Of course not 13.dxe5 fxe5 14.\(\text{\$xe}_5\), since 'after 14...\(\text{\$f}_6\), Black, threatening 15.\(\text{\$e}_4\), obtains a strong attack for the sacrificed pawn' (Chigorin). But also 13.e3 \(\text{\$h}_6\) 14.\(\text{\$h}_3\) would be quite solid.

13.\(\text{\$d}_8\)
Now on 13...\(\text{\$b}_4\) would follow 14.\(\text{\$a}_4\).

14.\(\text{\$xa}_7\) \(\text{\$xd}_4\)

15.\(\text{\$a}_4\)
White considers that this knight has done its business by helping the rook to break through to a7, and now defends
the c5-pawn. He also has at his disposal such tempting continuations as 15...\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 16...\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{xc}5\) 17...\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}3\) 18...\(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{dxe}3\) 19...\(\text{xb}7\) \(\text{dxe}4+\) 20...\(\text{xc}1\) \(\text{xb}6\) 21...\(\text{xb}6\) \(\text{e}7\) 22...\(\text{g}4\), or 15...\(\text{b}4!\) \(\text{h}6\)
(15...\(\text{xb}4\) 16...\(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xc}5\) 17...\(\text{xf}5\); or 15...\(\text{g}5\) 16...\(\text{d}2)\) 16...\(\text{h}3!\) \(\text{xb}4\) 17...\(\text{hxh6}\) \(\text{gxh6}\) 18...\(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xc}5\) 19...\(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{Bb}8\)!
20...\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}8\)! 21...\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{sc}7\) 22...\(\text{xd}5+\).
15...\(\text{g}5!\)
At the cost of a pawn, Black wants to safeguard his \(\text{f}5\), and thereby also the \(\text{c}2\). White must take the pawn, since the \(\text{f}4\)-square is taken away from the white bishop and, on 16...\(\text{b}4\), possible is 16...\(\text{h}6\) 17...\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Bb}8\).
16...\(\text{xb}7\) \(\text{h}6\) 17...\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 18...\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}5\)

The extraordinary position of the pieces makes an evaluation difficult. It is obvious that White’s extra pawn is of secondary importance, while the outcome of the game depends largely on whether it is possible to support the knight on the \(\text{c}2\)-square. The move 19...\(\text{g}4\) seems to give White a favourable reply to both these questions. In any case, in the variation 19...\(\text{g}7\) 20...\(\text{h}4!\)
\(\text{e}6\) (20...\(\text{gxh}4\) 21...\(\text{g}5\) 21...\(\text{hxg}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) (21...\(\text{fxg}5\) 22...\(\text{g}8\)) 22...\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) 23...\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{h}8\) 24...\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{a}1\) 25...\(\text{c}1\), the \(\text{h}b7\), with help from the \(\text{g}5\) and the \(\text{f}6\)-pawn, begins to look threatening. Also favourable for White seems the continuation 19...\(\text{h}4\) 20...\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{h}1\) 21...\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{e}4\) 22...\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 23...\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 24...\(\text{xf}5\), for example: 24...\(\text{d}3\) 25...\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{d}4\) 26...\(\text{e}4\) followed by \(\text{xe}3\). However, after the paradoxical 24...\(\text{d}1!!\), it becomes clear that White needs to counter the threats of 25...\(\text{xa}8\) and 26...\(\text{xb}3\). In the variation 25...\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xe}7\) (26...\(\text{d}4\) would revitalise the \(\text{f}1\), while 26...\(\text{d}7\) is dangerous because of 27...\(\text{h}6\) \(\text{h}6\) 28...\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{h}5\) 29...\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{a}7\) 30...\(\text{d}1)\) 27...\(\text{b}4\), arise puzzling complications in which White has quite good chances. By not exploiting this opportunity, he once and for all lets the initiative slip.
19...\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{a}1\!\)
White’s pieces, standing on the first rank, lack mobility and it is clearly not in Black’s interest to exchange any of them.
20...\(\text{g}1\)
20...\(\text{h}8!\)
The deep significance of the move 19...\(\text{d}1\) becomes clear. The result lies not so much in winning a pawn after ...\(\text{xb}3\) and ...\(\text{xa}4\) as in the subsequent invasion of the black rook on \(\text{a}1\).
21...\(\text{g}4\)
The \(\text{f}5\) must be driven back, though it transfers via \(\text{g}7\) to the splendid \(\text{e}6\)-square. Chigorin pointed out a beautiful variation in the event of the somewhat ‘cooperative’ 21...\(\text{f}3\). Then 21...\(\text{b}1\) 22...\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{a}2\) (it seems that this is not chess but the familiar children’s...
Black has achieved a great deal. His knight, perched on a1, is still not threatened with danger. More than this, it poses an unpleasant threat to the b3-pawn. The bishop on e4 occupies a strong position, and indeed also the a8 is ready to enter the game. However, his king’s flank is still not developed and without its help it is difficult to create decisive threats. Chigorin considered that White's game is not good because of the weak pawns on b3 and c5, but examined only 22...g3 e6 23.gxd3 gxd3 24...xd3 (or 24.exd3 xc5) 24...xc5, or 23.b6 a2 24.c1 h5 b4 (if 25.gxh5 f5 and then 26.f4) 25...hxg4 26.hxg4 h1 27...g2 xg2 28.xg2 b3, in both cases with a clear advantage for Black.

The greatest difficulty in developing Black's initiative arises if White were to combine the endeavour to mobilise his slumbering king’s flank with the struggle for the centre squares. The manoeuvre 22.f3 g6 23.e4! meets these requirements. Black cannot play 23...dxe4 because of 24.fxe4 xe4 25.c4, and must take the path 23...dxe3 24.xe3. All the same, after 24...xb3 25.xb3 xa4 26.d3 e6! Black takes over the initiative, since it is difficult for White to find a rational plan to develop his pieces. After 27.f5 xf5 28.gxf5 g7 29.f4, the simple 29...h6 is strong, while 27.b8+ xd7 28.b4 is refuted by the effective 28...xc5! 29.xb8 xe3.

22.b6 a2 23.d7
White hopes not only to defend the c5-pawn, but also to create threats to the f6-pawn. But...

23...e7!
A very strong move, emphasising the erroneousness of the manoeuvre a4-b6-d7. After 24.b8+ xd7 25.xh8, all White’s pieces are left badly placed, while, on other moves, his rook is tied to the defence of his knight on d7. On the other hand, Black’s rook has broken through to a2.

24.g3?
White is too submissive in giving up his position: 24.c1 would be more tenacious.

24...xb2 25.g2 e6 26.xe4
White has no useful moves.

26...dxe4 27.b4 d8 28.a7 b1+ 29.c1 b3
The win of a piece by 29...d3 30.xd3 xd3 31.a3 b3 32.c2 xc1+ (32...xc1? 33.3e1!) 33.xb3, would somewhat revitalise White’s pieces.

30.xb3 xb3 31.c2
Chigorin has calculated precisely the consequences of the eight-move combination. The extra passed pawn and the weakness of the h3-pawn guarantees Black an uncomplicated win. Probably White could hold out longest by 39.\textit{d}d4 \textit{e}6 40.\textit{e}e3 dxe2+ 41.\textit{f}xe2, so as, on the natural 41...\textit{f}f4+, to continue 42.\textit{d}d2 \textit{x}h3 (42...\textit{d}d6 43.\textit{h}4) 43.\textit{c}c3 followed by \textit{d}d4. However, after 41...\textit{d}d6 42.f3 \textit{e}5, followed by ...\textit{f}f4, Black would win a second pawn. The variation 39.exd3 exd3 40.\textit{d}d2 \textit{d}e4+ 41.\textit{d}d3 \textit{x}f2+, followed by 42...\textit{x}h3, is also bad for White.

39.e3

White decides to prevent the transfer of the knight to f4, but now Black has two strong passed pawns, whilst it is also possible to attack the h3-pawn from another square.

39...\textit{b}b3 40.\textit{c}c3 c5 41.\textit{e}e1 \textit{d}d6 42.\textit{d}d1 c4 43.\textit{e}e1 \textit{c}c1 44.\textit{d}d2 \textit{e}e2 45.\textit{b}b4 \textit{g}g1 46.\textit{c}c3 \textit{d}d5 0-1

An exceptionally puzzling and unsterotyped game. The depth and originality of Chigorin's ideas is amazing.

18 Evans Gambit

Mikhail Chigorin
Wilhelm Steinitz

World Championship match, Havana 1892 (1)

In the World Championship match games, the time control was set at 2 hours for the first 30 moves and 1 hour for each subsequent 15.

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}f3 \textit{c}c6 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{c}c5 4.b4 \textit{x}xb4 5.c3 \textit{a}a5 6.0-0

6.d4 seems more accurate than castling, since after 6...d6 7.\textit{b}b3, Black cannot get into the defence ...\textit{b}b6, suggested by Lasker. But when this game was
...d6. Lasker had just begun his professional career.

6...d6

The first moral victory for Chigorin.

Though stubborn in his convictions (and jealous), Steinitz rejects the system of defence invented by him, 6...Wf6, which up to now he had regularly played in matches with Chigorin (see Chigorin–Steinitz, Telegraph Game 1890/91).

7.d4

7...Ng4

Chigorin wrote: 'It is well known that this move, after the exchange of pawns (dxe5, cxd4), hampers Black's defence, forcing him to forfeit castling after b5, Wf8. By playing the move Ng4 before the exchange of pawns, Steinitz aims to prevent White supporting his pawn centre with the development of the knight to c3; this he actually achieves, but the knight on b1 plays a not unimportant, even a more significant role by transferring to c4 via a3.'

Steinitz endeavours to fight for the e5-square. The romantic Evans Gambit disappeared from Chigorin's opening repertoire shortly after its appearance in 1895 of Lasker's defence 7...b6.

Against this, Chigorin could not find a reinforcement of the attack for White and suffered two painful defeats:

Chigorin–Lasker, 1895; 7...b6 8.a4 (better is 8.dxe5 followed by Wb3)


8.Wb5 exd4 9.cxd4

White forces a favourable exchange due to the threat of 9.d5. It is true that, with the departure of the bishop to b5, the threats against the f7-pawn are weakened.


9...Wd7 10.Wb2

White maintains an elastic pawn centre and completes his development. 'The plan of attack with the move d4-d5 and a later e4-e5 seems premature to me, even with a preliminary Wa4 to defend the bishop on b5', Chigorin.

10...Wf7

A questionable decision. Black falls behind in development. In subsequent games of the match, Steinitz improved the defence and played 10...Wf6.

11.Wxd7+ Wxd7

'The 'prophets' predicted that White's attack would end with the exchange of bishops, whereas after White's 12th and 13th moves it is in fact only beginning', said Chigorin.

The threat of 15.a5 forces Black to advance his c7-pawn, since 14...a6 is clearly bad because of 15.\textit{b}b3!, or 14...a5 because of 15.\textit{d}xb6 cxb6 16.\textit{b}b3 \textit{c}c8 17.d5 with an enormous positional advantage for White. The advance of the c7-pawn leads to a weakening of the d6-square, which Chigorin exploits with exceptional skill.

14...\textit{c}6 15.e5

Chigorin rejected the recovery of the pawn by 15.d5 0-0 16.\textit{d}xb6 axb6 17.\textit{f}d4 \textit{f}6 18.\textit{b}b6 \textit{cxd}5 19.\textit{exd}5 (19...\textit{cxd}5 20.\textit{b}b3), since then White's attack is weakened.

15...d5

The weakness of the d6-square gives White a great advantage also in the event of an exchange of queens: 15...\textit{d}xe5 16.\textit{dxe}5 \textit{xd}1 17.\textit{e}x\textit{d}1 0-0 18.\textit{d}7. After 15...\textit{c}c7, Black is destroyed by the pin on the e-file: 16.\textit{exd}6 \textit{cxd}6 17.\textit{cxd}6+ \textit{xd}6 18.\textit{a}3 and 19.\textit{e}1.

16.\textit{d}d6+ 17.\textit{a}3 \textit{g}8 18.\textit{b}1!

A subtle move, placing Black in a critical position. White not only threatens the moves a5 or e6, but also gains time for the transfer of the rook via b3 to the king's flank. Black might be able to hold the position here by playing 18...\textit{b}8, whereas 18...\textit{c}8 would lose after 19.a5! \textit{cxd}6 20.\textit{exd}6 \textit{xa}5 21.\textit{e}e5 \textit{c}8 22.d7 (Chigorin also gave 22.\textit{h}5

f6 23.d7 \textit{d}8 24.\textit{xb}7! \textit{fxe}5 25.\textit{dx}e5 and White's pawns decide the game) 22...\textit{c}7 23.\textit{h}5 \textit{b}6 24.\textit{e}7 etc.

The move made by Steinitz not only does not prevent White's idea, but weakens the f7-square, allowing Chigorin to sharply change the character of the play with a direct attack on the black king.

18...\textit{h}5

19.\textit{xf}7!

Of course, also 19.a5 leads to an overwhelming advantage for White, and Chigorin undoubtedly saw this—all White's previous play was based on the threat of a4-a5. But such a great artist cannot let pass a combinative and forcing decision in the position.

Romanovsky: How many exclamation marks were bestowed upon this move in the press! Chigorin himself also accompanied it with this mark. And only Emanuel Lasker expressed the opinion that 19.a5 would have led more rapidly to the goal. Chigorin intended to play this in reply to 18...\textit{c}8; but when he saw a beautiful way to victory with the sacrifice of a knight, after 18...\textit{h}5, then he chose this possibility. Later analysis showed that the move 19.a5 also ought to have led to a win, but in no way can this take anything away from Chigorin's brilliant combinative idea.

19...\textit{xf}7 20.e6+ \textit{exe}6 21.\textit{e}5
magazine Chess in the USSR (No.3), in which a forced win for White was shown after 23...\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7 (23...\textbf{\textit{W}}xe7 24.\textbf{\textit{Q}}g4+) 24.\textbf{\textit{W}}f3+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}e6 (if 24...\textbf{\textit{Q}}g5, then 25.h4+ etc.) 25.\textbf{\textit{Q}}f7+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}d7 26.\textbf{\textit{W}}g4+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}c7 27.\textbf{\textit{W}}f4+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}d7 (27...\textbf{\textit{Q}}c8 28.\textbf{\textit{Q}}d6+) 28.\textbf{\textit{W}}d6+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}c8 29.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7, was the debate put to an end. It is worth mentioning that Bogoljubow, in his book on Chigorin published in 1926, indicated that 21...\textbf{\textit{W}}e8 was bad because of 22.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7.

Grekov commented: 'Though Lasker's Manual was printed in many thousands of copies and taught countless numbers of chess players, the first refutation of Lasker's variation was found only ten years after its publication, and the second, simpler refutation after another ten years. How slow is the birth of truth in chess analysis!'

22.\textbf{\textit{Q}}e1 \textbf{\textit{Q}}f6 23.\textbf{\textit{W}}h5! g6

Black could avert the mate (24.\textbf{\textit{Q}}g4) also with the move 23...\textbf{\textit{Q}}g6, but then 24.g4 decides the game due to the terrible threat of g4-g5+.

24.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7

He could not take with the knight because of 25.\textbf{\textit{Q}}h4+ g5 26.\textbf{\textit{Q}}g4+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}f7 27.\textbf{\textit{W}}xg5 and White wins easily, since if 27...\textbf{\textit{Q}}e8 there is a mate in two moves.

25.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xg6++ \textbf{\textit{Q}}f6 26.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xh8

37 Also perhaps 21...\textbf{\textit{W}}c7, e.g. 22.\textbf{\textit{Q}}e1 \textbf{\textit{Q}}f6 23.\textbf{\textit{W}}f3 h5 24.\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7+ \textbf{\textit{Q}}xe7 25.g4 g6.
The outcome of the game is already decided. Over the next few moves, the black king, deprived of pawn cover, is pounced upon by the heavy pieces and his only defence is the knight on f5. Since 26...\textit{\textbf{W}}xh8 loses at once after 27.\textit{\textbf{E}}e5 \textit{\textbf{W}}c8 28.g4, Black must choose between 26...\textit{\textbf{W}}d7 (27.\textit{\textbf{B}}b3! \textit{\textbf{E}}xh8 28.\textit{\textbf{F}}f3 \textit{\textbf{G}}g8 29.\textit{\textbf{E}}e5 \textit{\textbf{G}}g5 30.\textit{\textbf{W}}h6+ \textit{\textbf{G}}g6 31.\textit{\textbf{F}}xf5+ \textit{\textbf{W}}xf5 32.\textit{\textbf{W}}f8+) and 26...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xd4, but in both cases White's final attack is decisive.

26...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xd4\textsuperscript{38} 27.\textit{\textbf{B}}b3 \textit{\textbf{W}}d7 28.\textit{\textbf{F}}f3 \textit{\textbf{E}}xh8 29.g4 \textit{\textbf{G}}g8 30.\textit{\textbf{W}}h6+ \textit{\textbf{G}}g6 31.\textit{\textbf{F}}xf5+ 1-0 After 31...\textit{\textbf{W}}xf5 32.\textit{\textbf{W}}f8+, Black loses his queen. This game is one of the most celebrated masterpieces of chess art.

19 Two Knights Defence

\textbf{Wilhelm Steinitz}

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

World Championship match, Havana 1892 (12)

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c6 3.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 4.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g5 d5 5.exd5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a5 6.\textit{\textbf{Q}}b5+ c6 7.dxc6 \textit{\textbf{B}}xc6 8.\textit{\textbf{E}}e2 h6 9.\textit{\textbf{Q}}h3

\textsuperscript{38} This is too much of a luxury. 26...\textit{\textbf{W}}d7 should be played.

Steinitz played this move several times in games with Chigorin, but without success. The idea of it is simple: the exchange of the c8-bishop weakens Black's attacking potential, while White's two bishops defend the pawn weaknesses on the king's flank. In addition, the light-squared bishop could be used to threaten the c6-pawn from f3 or g2.

In modern times, Fischer has shown the viability of Steinitz' idea.

9...\textit{\textbf{Q}}c5!

Of course, Black should not hurry with the exchange of the knight on h3.

10.0-0!

\textbf{Chigorin:} In the telegraph game, Steinitz played here 10.d3.

\textbf{Romanovsky:} In the game by telegraph, play went 10.d3 0-0 11.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d5 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d6 13.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g1 f5, and Black obtained an attack. In the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 10\textsuperscript{th} games, Steinitz retreated the bishop on the eighth move to f1, but he was not able to guarantee the security of his king. In the present game he tries to shield his king from attack by means of king's side castling. However, with the position of the knight on h3 (instead of f3), this standard method of defence does not achieve its aim.

10...0-0
Chapter 13 - The return match with Steinitz

11.c3
This move has more drawbacks than assets. White takes away a good square for his knight and the black knight is driven away to a more fortunate location. Fischer revitalised Steinitz's system by making the more useful move 11.d3. He played this move against Euwe in 1963: 11...hxh3 12.gxh3 d7 13.f3! fxh3 14.d2 e4 15.g2 f5 16.e1 f8 17.e4! and White gradually took over the initiative.

1969, the position after 11.d3 was again met in the game Platonov-Geller, in which Black also was not able to cope with a similar plan: 11...d5 12.c3 xh3 13.bxc3 g4 14.xh1 xh3 15 gxh3 xh3 16.f3 d6 17.g2 h4 18.f3 with a clear positional advantage for White.

11...b7 12.wa4
The idea of White's previous move becomes clear; Steinitz intends to transfer the queen via a4 to h4 (where it will defend the king's flank against the attack ...hxh3 followed by ...d5 and ...h4) and he consistently carries out his plan. Also deserving attention here is 12.d3, or even 12.d4 exd4 13.f4 with an equal game.

Rumanovsky: In Chigorin's opinion, Steinitz, even in domestic analysis, intended this manoeuvre, the idea of which is to bring the queen over to the defence of the king's flank. But, as is seen from the game, this plan proves to be a failure; therefore some people considered that the best continuation here would be 12.d3. One can object to this since the d3-pawn would be doomed after 12...f5, followed by ...d7 and ...d8. In our opinion, Steinitz had to play 12.d4! exd4 13.f4 and White has quite a few resources in the struggle. It was not in the spirit of the World Champion, however, to give back a gambit pawn without compulsion - this would be a violation of one of the principles proclaimed by him.

12...xh3 13.gxh3 w66!
White's h3-pawn is easy to defend and so Chigorin refrains from the attack by 13...d7 and intends to transfer the bishop to c7.

14.d3 d5

15.f3
White begins to experience difficulties with the development of his pieces on the queen's flank, whereas Black has various possibilities of strengthening his position.

Chigorin: In the Deutsche Schachzeitung it is stated that Steinitz considered this move a mistake. Actually, Steinitz remarked, 'A weak move. Far better would be 15.d1 followed by 16.xd2.' And also 17.d1, adds the Deutsche Schachzeitung. Of course the term 'weak' and 'mistaken' move
are not one and the same. Thus, in the present example, after 15.\textit{d}d1 f5, the move 16.\textit{e}d2 indicated by Steinitz and the Deutsche Schachzeitung can be considered a 'mistake' because they overlook the reply 16.\textit{e}f4 (with the threat \textit{f}g6+) after which Black wins the h3- and f2-pawns. Steinitz frequently makes such mistakes in annotations – but not in the actual game.

15...\textit{b}6

Chigorin: In order to transfer the bishop to \textit{c}7, so as also to attack the h2-square.

16.\textit{wh}4 \textit{c}7 17.\textit{d}d1

17...\textit{f}5

Black does not hurry with the move ...\textit{e}5-\textit{e}4, and strengthens his position still further. Steinitz does not want to allow the opening of the f-file, for example in the variation 18.\textit{a}a3 e4! 19.\textit{g}2 \textit{wh}2+ 20.\textit{f}1 f4! 21.\textit{xe}4 \textit{e}3+ 22.\textit{xe}3 \textit{fxe}3, and exchanges the f3-bishop. However, now Black forms a powerful pawn centre and the attack does not cease.

18.\textit{xd}5+

Romanovsky: The only defence against ...\textit{e}5-\textit{e}4.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{39} Not entirely true since White can play 18.\textit{g}3. Then 18...\textit{f}4 19.\textit{g}4 \textit{f}6 may look scary, but after 20.\textit{e}4 \textit{c}5, 21.\textit{d}2 is fine for White. The game continuation didn't prevent ...\textit{e}5-\textit{e}4 being played shortly afterwards anyway.

18...\textit{xd}5 19.\textit{d}2 \textit{f}6 20.\textit{f}1

An admission of failure. It would be more logical to conclude the manoeuvre of the knight by placing it on f1. White's position, it is true, remains extremely difficult. Chigorin indicated this plan of attack – 20.\textit{c}f1 f4!, e.g. 21.f3? \textit{g}6+ 22.\textit{h}1 e4! 23.\textit{xe}4 \textit{b}6 24.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}xe4 25.\textit{fxe}4 \textit{c}5 and White cannot unravel his tangled pieces without loss.

20...\textit{e}4 21.\textit{d}4

Chigorin: White cannot save the game; if 21.\textit{b}3, then 21...\textit{wh}2 (or a preliminary ...\textit{e}e8) 22.\textit{d}4 \textit{d}xe4 23.\textit{e}3 \textit{g}3.

21...\textit{g}6!

‘Black conducts the attack admirably. He now threatens 22...\textit{a}6+ or else 22...\textit{wh}2 followed by ...\textit{g}1+ and ...\textit{g}3’, wrote Steinitz.

22.\textit{wh}5 \textit{g}5!

Concluding the struggle, since the queen not only cannot retreat to e2 – 23.\textit{e}2 \textit{g}1+! – but must also in general let the e2-square 'out of sight'.

23.\textit{wh}4 \textit{a}6+ 24.\textit{c}4 dxc4 25.\textit{f}4 \textit{c}3+ 26.\textit{ef}2 \textit{e}3+

White resigned.

In this game, Steinitz suffered a terrible defeat in a principal creative argument. Many encounters between Chigorin and Steinitz passed in tense combat and their noble rivalry has a worthy place in chess history.
Chapter 14

Chigorin-Tarrasch match, St. Petersburg 1893

And so, Chigorin did not succeed in defeating Steinitz in the match for the World Championship, but the chess world recognised him as one of the strongest chess players. Amongst those was also numbered Dr. Tarrasch.

Proud of his own brilliant successes, in which he had indeed played magnificently, Dr. Tarrasch considered himself to be a chess leader and head teacher of his generation. The duty of all chess players, who were trying to improve their game, was to learn stable laws of chess truth. And, in great detail and most convincingly, were laid down those laws in annotations, articles and books, which bore the name of Dr. Tarrasch.

'Each department of the game', wrote Tarrasch in the foreword to his book The Modern Game of Chess, 'I made the object of a deep study, the results of which I also offer to the reader, before whom, in this way, is revealed a perfect opportunity to understand the game without particular difficulty... I reveal before him (the reader) the intrinsic main points and the inevitability of everything that happens in the chess game; I show how, from one thing, follows another.

I show how every offence is punished, admittedly not on Earth, but, at any rate, on the 64 squares of the board. I do not limit the discussions only to the given games, but I look for the principal cause for the appearance of a move. For the most part, I summarise the individual happenings and set out a mass of principles and rules, a knowledge of which is extremely important for the confident handling of the game.'

Tarrasch was a highly talented chess player, who possessed superb technique of positional play. He cast off all the eccentricities, all the sharp and provocative extremes, which Steinitz at times could not do without. For example, it would never have entered his head to play those opening variations which Steinitz unsuccessfully attempted to defend against Chigorin in the telegraph games. Also alien to him was Steinitz's stubborn 'sitting-out' of an opponent, in cramped positions, which Steinitz was prepared to defend, even if he only had in return one extra pawn as compensation. 'Ugly', 'unesthetic' – this is how Tarrasch condemned all 'unnatural, illogical' moves. Naturalness, common sense was his idol. The ideal, according to Tarrasch, was a course of the game such as this: with natural moves, to gain an advantage in space, cramp the opponent still further, create weaknesses in his position and destroy him with powerful pressure from one's own pieces and pawns. Many such games were won and magnificently annotated by Tarrasch, while he was at the height of his chess powers. His style, his method of positional pressure, which cramped and crushed the opponent, was adopted by many other chess players of the day.

Here are a few characteristic aphorisms of Tarrasch:

- 'Every cramped position already bears the germ of defeat.'
- On the move d4–d5, with a white pawn on e4: 'This move is nearly always bad, if Black subsequently gets the chance to begin a counterattack with the move ...f5.'
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• On the move ...c7-c6 in the Queen’s Gambit: ‘This defence is not quite satisfactory, since, firstly, the best square has been taken away from the knight, and secondly, in the Queen’s Pawn Opening, the c-pawn should be placed on c5 (for White on c4). The formation c6-d5-e6 (or respectively c3-d4-e3) is unfavourable, since it does not exert sufficient pressure on the centre and allows the opponent the attacking position c4-d4-e3 (respectively c5-d5-e6).’

• On the move c2-c3: ‘One must be careful of this move in all openings, since it does not guarantee the further advance of the d-pawn beyond the fourth rank.’

• On the move 3...b4 in the French Defence: ‘This move, even since olden times, has been recognised as bad, since it either leads to the exchange of this bishop or its forced retreat.’

• On the move f2-f3: ‘On the grounds of personal experience, I consider that this move is nearly always bad, since it weakens the whole of the king’s flank.’

These easily understood distinct formulae were firmly entrenched in the heads of a whole generation of chess players. Of course, several of these were under fine control by strong chess players, but Tarrasch presented them in the form of immutable, absolute truths, which did not allow any exceptions. For chess players, who did not like to trouble themselves with independent thought, these precepts of Tarrasch were very tempting, and a great facilitation: it was possible, without thinking, to follow the recommendations of the most prominent authority of the day.

Chigorin regarded such axioms with undisguised scepticism. Each of these statements was correct only within certain, strictly limited boundaries. In cramped positions, which Tarrasch feared most of all in life, it was possible to gradually prepare a dangerous counter-initiative. Chigorin knew this very well. How many times he had himself, in this way, stored up hidden energy, so as later to pounce on the opponent! ‘Also, a cramped position’, said Chigorin, ‘sometimes conceals its advantages for a certain time, which influences the outcome of the struggle.’

Thanks to great natural talent and his ever increasing outstanding art of accumulating minimal advantages, the successes of Tarrasch quickly grew.

In 1889, he won an international tournament for the first time – in his home town of Breslau, which was not only highly satisfying to Tarrasch himself, but also to his compatriots. The fact is that, though many international tournaments were held in Germany over the previous ten years – more than in any other country –, they were invariably won by foreigners. Therefore it is understandable that the Germans were rejoicing in a mood of nationalism.'
The fact that, for the first time since the death of Anderssen, first prize has been taken by a German master, is so novel and important, that it is difficult, right away, to assess its significance. For many years we have grown accustomed to first prizes being taken by foreigners. We have allowed the honour of collecting the money, the honour of taking the prizes, to fall to foreigners. And it is precisely in Breslau, the birthplace of the never to be forgotten Anderssen, that we have obtained satisfaction after many years of quiet hope! (1)

After Breslau, there followed victories in Manchester 1890 (without a single loss, 3 points ahead of the 2nd prize-winner) and Dresden 1892. No wonder that Tarrasch began to have a high estimation of himself and came to believe that there was only one correct system of play – his own.

Like many chess players, Tarrasch made his debut with sharp combinational play. Of his performance at the tournament in Hamburg 1885, Steinitz wrote: 'Tarrasch distinguished himself by exceptional combinational strength, although his positional play is still not sufficiently mature.' But after his victories in international tournaments, Tarrasch came to have a different attitude as to the essential qualities of chess and also his own play: 'I set about the struggle with quite different ideas from those I had before. During previous tournaments, I sat down at the board, convinced that I was going to win the game. Now, however, before each game, I prepare myself indefatigably, so that if I choose a very good, very solid opening, and if I play diligently and with all my strength, then no way ought my opponent beat me. Before, I underestimated my opponents, now, however, I am inclined to overestimate them. If earlier, I regarded a drawn outcome to a game with contempt, then now it is clear to me that if I were to make the strongest moves the whole time, if I were to be playing really ideally, then still in no way ought all this lead to my winning the game, but only to achieving a draw, if my opponent does not make a mistake, and that upon correct play by both sides a draw is inevitable.'

Following Steinitz, Tarrasch declared that combinational play with sacrifices was an anomaly, an over-indulgence; perhaps this was even his own kind of pathology of chess. He considered as normal methods of play, only manoeuvres, siege and 'suffocation' of the opponent. Here was his credo: 'I have always held the opinion that the sacrifice of a piece or pawn hardly ever appears to be a necessary condition of a correct, and, so to speak, normal attack, and that sacrifices to obtain or maintain an attack are necessary only in those cases where a natural continuation of an attack would be an error.'

The practice of Tarrasch was higher than his theory. His play failed to dry up until the end of his life. Sacrifices and combinations are featured in his games, as also, it goes without saying, are brilliant positional plans. But as it will always be in history, undistinguished followers, not having the talent of their idol, saw in Tarrasch's theories only routine, only fixed ideas. The great authority which his precepts enjoyed, the faith with which each of his words, in the chess context, were taken, had an effect on the general standard of chess life at the end of the 19th century and also led to a certain deadening of the game. One after the other, there appeared in tournaments, monotonous, listless, slow-moving, colourless games. The creative
spirit was lacking in these pallid, anaemic productions, and, not without reason. Chigorin was experiencing difficulties in picking out games for his next column. Sometimes he was forced to publish old games from the Anderssen-Steinitz match, or even 'brilliant' inspirations of the past from the match between Labourdonnais and McDonnell. He wrote: 'The editors of chess magazines and columns in daily papers are finding the greatest difficulty in choosing games for their readers. We are talking from personal experience. Looking over games, which have been included for publication in present-day magazines, we seldom come across a game which offers lively interest from beginning to end...'

We cannot but notice with regard to many of the chess players who are now flourishing, that their games from the last five to ten years have been virtually devoid of sharp combinations, deeply conceived plans, and look very ordinary, so to speak, commonplace.' These words relate to 1893.

In their creative aspirations, Chigorin and Tarrasch were antipodes. Antipodes they were also in character: the modest, unpretentious Chigorin, who selflessly gave himself to chess, and the ambitious, self-confident Tarrasch.

But despite all his arrogance, Tarrasch could not but acknowledge that Chigorin was a worthy opponent, and also that, without a victory over Chigorin, his claim to be the strongest in Europe would be without foundation. And indeed, on 18 April 1892, during a dinner at the St.Petersburg Chess Society in honour of Chigorin, who had returned from Havana after his match with Steinitz, was read out a letter from Tarrasch with a challenge to a match.

After virtually one and a half years of negotiations as to where to play the match – in Berlin, in St.Petersburg or in Havana – it was decided that a match of up to ten games, won by either side, would begin in St.Petersburg on 8 October 1893.

The history of international chess competition in Russia begins with this moment. It is not surprising that the first international chess match to take place in Russia, between two of the world's leading players, should attract such enormous interest, both at home and abroad. It was well-known that the New York and Chicago newspapers had sent special correspondents to St.Petersburg to shed light on the contest. There were even reports of large money bets being wagered on the result of the match.

The match with Tarrasch is one of the most significant events in the whole of Chigorin's biography. Chigorin produced here a series of excellent, deep and interesting games.

Chigorin's finest achievements in the match were, particularly, the excellent strategical games: 7th, 8th, 11th (which he lost in an easily winning position) and 19th. Tarrasch gained an excellent positional victory in the 6th game, and handled the attack well in the 17th. Tarrasch also won the 1st and 5th games with beautiful, but straightforward combinations.

The outcome of the 11th game left a marked impression on the sporting course of the match. The creativity in this game, one of the Chigorin masterpieces, was distinguished (right up to the blunder) by its exceptional strength and depth.
Chapter 14 - Chigorin-Tarrasch match, St. Petersburg 1893

In the biography of Chigorin, it belongs to those tragic oversights, which were 
an unfortunate characteristic of his play, such as the 9th game of his match with 
Riinsberg and the 23rd game of the match with Steinitz (1892).

After 17 games, the score of the match stood at +8 - 5 =4 in favour of Tarrasch, 
I already felt certain of victory and gave an appropriate interview. 'Everyone 
considers, and I more than anybody,' wrote Tarrasch, 'that the match has already 
been decided in my favour.' But Chigorin won three games in a row and leveled the 
score. Then the rivals won one game each and the match ended in a draw +9 -9 =4.

In the final, 22nd, game, Chigorin won an excellently played endgame.

Being confident of success still did not prevent Tarrasch from declaring, during 
the match, that Chigorin’s situation was more favourable, since he was playing 
his home town, where he enjoyed general sympathy. But how much support 
actually had in his home town at this time was revealed by the Chess Journal. It 
invited to the fact that Chigorin only had to lose one game, and, even more so, 
in succession, when people who understood nothing about chess began to 
encourage him loudly and with aplomb, saying that Chigorin played weakly, that he 
would lose the match. Such talk, undoubtedly, became known to Chigorin and of 
caused aggravated the extreme nervous strain which he was already under from the 
match. Sufficient to say that already after the first lost game, some gentleman sent 
Chigorin a reproachful, anonymous letter.

The Chess Journal reported on the ‘violent attacks and blatant, vulgar, senseless pranks, 
that he has been subjected to personally, as has also his play’ in several publications 
well-repute.

After 14 games, when the score of the match stood at +7 -4 =3, in favour of 
Tarrasch, St. Petersburg Sheet gloated over his misfortune: ‘Now it is becoming obvious 
that the match belongs to Dr. Tarrasch. It is already possible to confidently predict 
that Mr. Chigorin will lose the match, since Dr. Tarrasch now has an advantage 
in three games... All this, it goes without saying, will reduce to rather low spirits 
the supporters of Mr. Chigorin, who we understand celebrated prematurely, in 
congratulating Chigorin after his two won games in a row (St. Petersburg Sheet 1893, 
Nov 290).

Every other day in its pages, an interview was featured with Dr. Tarrasch, whom 
the newspaper called ‘the chess king, who, with such persistence, is overcoming 
our well-known chess player, M.I. Chigorin.’

In one interview, Tarrasch said plainly and firmly – ‘I dare say... that... victory will 
be on my side.’ But this time Tarrasch’s customary self-confidence let him down. 
Chigorin’s brilliant dash at the end took him completely by surprise.

Chigorin employed two important theoretical novelties in the match. In the 2nd 
game (French Defence), Chigorin, as White, introduced the surprising continuation 
2...e2, which completely changed the character of the opening. After this move, 
the French Defence assumed the character of the King’s Indian (an opening which 
came into being much later) or the closed variation of the Sicilian Defence.

In the match with Tarrasch, Chigorin used his invention 10 times: he won 5 
games, lost 3, and 2 were drawn. Chigorin was also successful with 2...e2 in other
competitions. In the majority of games of the match in which the French Defence was played, Chigorin, thanks to his new system, succeeded in creating positions to his taste. This is what he himself said about the origins of the move 2.\( \text{We}2 \), in connection with the opening system:

"In chess books and magazines, just as in conversation, one continually hears: "Non-theoretical, more theoretical would be... etc." What is usually understood by "theoretical" are the generally accepted, constantly played moves, whose only advantage is that they have been studied more than others. In actual fact, in virtually all openings, it is possible to find moves which are not inferior to the theoretical ones, if an experienced and strong player is able to make them the initial point of a whole combination. The game of chess is far richer than it is represented on the basis of existing theory, which attempts to squeeze it into certain narrow forms.

Take, for example, the French Defence.

The second moves, corresponding to their aims, are recognised in theory and practice to be 2.d4 d5. These are best looked at in the manuals. Meanwhile, a logical development of this opening is allowed by several other moves, on which a player, striving to vary the play, might focus his attention. Only one of these, in essence, brings anything original to the game.

... The moves a2-a3, \( \text{Ce}2 \), and such like, do not have particular significance in the opening of the game. If one took it into his head to subject them to special analysis, then he would risk spending his time on a quite useless venture; if, however, someone had it in mind to christen these with a popular name in honour of he who played it, then he ought to reject the idea, understanding the fact that only an opening which leaves its individual stamp on the future play deserves a particular name.

But there is just such a second move in the French Defence, which is capable of changing its very character of play, getting it out of its usual course. Such, for example, is the move 2.\( \text{We}2 \), which I had occasion to employ in match games against Dr. Tarrasch. I must say that the origin of this move has to be attributed, to a considerable extent, to chance. I pointed it out half in jest during a private conversation with a group of players. Analysing the move later, however, I saw that it did not at all deserve a jesting attitude. I was struck by a remote resemblance to the position in one of my games with Steinitz: 1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{Cf}3 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 3.\( \text{Cb}5 \) \( \text{Cf}6 \) 4.d3 d6 5.c3 \( \text{Gg}6 \) 6.\( \text{Cb}d2 \) \( \text{Gg}7 \) 7.\( \text{Cf}1 \) 0-0 8.\( \text{Ca}4 \) d5 9.\( \text{We}2 \). With this queen move, Steinitz avoided the need to take Black's d-pawn with his e-pawn, which is defended by his own d-pawn. This gave me the idea of the moves g2-g3, \( \text{Gg}2 \), d2-d3, a plan which I later elaborated. I think that, generally speaking, chance will time and again play a significant role in the development of an opening.

The move 2.\( \text{We}2 \), in the first four match games with Dr. Tarrasch, completely deprived the French Defence of its usual character; it added to it a certain individuality also in other ways. I must say, in general, it is quite far from my mind to attach particular significance to this move. No definite decisive opinion on it was formed by either myself or, probably, Dr. Tarrasch, in spite of the fact that, by this time, he was sufficiently acquainted with it. But, in any case, an evaluation can only
be made in connection with the whole plan arising from it, and not in isolation as did the gentlemen chess critics.'

And so, for Chigorin, the main conception of an opening was the notion that the central idea of the opening ought not to be separate moves, but a system linking them closely and connecting the opening to the ensuing middlegame, since the game of chess is one whole. 'There are no strong or weak moves', said Chigorin, as witnessed by one writer of his memoirs, 'but there are favourable and unfavourable variations. Tell me what you intend to do after your move, and I will tell you whether you are playing well.' The researches and elaborations of Soviet theoreticians, who endeavour to find not separate new moves, but constructions of systems which often go very deep into the middle game, fulfil the creative behests of Chigorin.

With a vigilant eye, Chigorin noticed the similarities in positions which arose from seemingly far removed openings—the Spanish and French. Opening theory of that time was characterised by isolated examination of each opening. The bold 'transplanting' of ideas from one opening to another was possible only if one examined the chess game as a whole, if one took into account genuine similarities of positions and not the generally accepted designations of openings. The opening nomenclature of manuals puts together, under the heading of one opening, essentially quite diverse positions and continuations. On the other hand, positions with a closeness of configuration and character might be obtained from different openings. Both these circumstances played their role in the formulation of the system with 2. \textit{Be}2.

Another important theoretical novelty of Chigorin, in the match with Tarrasch, was his system as Black in the Spanish Game, with the move \ldots f6-d7, which has the aim of strengthening the central pawn on e5. This system, employed by Chigorin in six games of the match, created a sensation, as also 2. \textit{Be}2 in the French, amongst the theoreticians of that time. Voices were heard that the new system was 'theoretically incorrect'. In particular, there was sharp criticism of the opening set-up in the 17\textsuperscript{th} game (1.e4 e5 2.\textit{B}f3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{B}b5 a6 4.\textit{a}4 \textit{f}6

A sketch of Chigorin playing Tarrasch during their match in St.Petersburg 1893
5. \( \text{Cc3} \) \text{d6} 6. \text{d4} \text{Cc7} 7. \text{Ce2} \text{f6} 8. \text{c3} \text{Cb6} 9. \text{Cb3} \text{Ca5} 10. \text{Cc2} \text{Ce6}, \) especially Black’s 7th and 9th moves. Chigorin defended his own opening experiment in the press:

“The knight on a5 – say the critics – is badly placed. But why then does it occupy a splendid position on that same square in the Two Knights Defence? The question here is hardly about the position of the knight on a5.

Let the gentlemen critics be astonished by the 7th move. Let them remark “If we look at the significance of this game with a keen eye, then it has to be acknowledged that such a disjointed novelty entails the greatest risk on the part of Chigorin; the weakness of the move ...f7-f6 is so obvious that a theoretician such as Tarrasch will exploit it without difficulty.”

... What concerns me is that I do not see the “weakness” of the move ...f7-f6. Not having had the opportunity to foresee all the perturbations which might occur in an actual game, I naturally wanted to try it out in practice in order to see what will come out of all this... In the opinion of the gentlemen critics the knight on a5 is “badly placed” but I can see perfectly well that White cannot in any way turn this quasi-bad position to his advantage.”

Overall, the result of the application of the system with ...\( \text{Cf6-d7} \) was +4 -2 in favour of Black. Thus, the system with...\( \text{Cf6-d7} \) showed full defensive capability and was subsequently employed with success by Chigorin, while nowadays it is included in the opening repertoire of many of the strongest chess players.

The Chigorin-Tarrasch match made a deep impression on the players’ contemporaries, who gave due credit both to the ‘direct scientific correctness’ of Tarrasch’s play, and the originality, boldness, and distinctive style of the Russian champion. The match was called the most significant chess contest of the era, and a century later we cannot but truly appreciate the mastery shown by both rivals.

20 Spanish Game
Siegbert Tarrasch
Mikhail Chigorin

Match, St.Petersburg 1893 (7)

1.e4 e5 2. \( \text{Cf3} \) \text{Cc6} 3. \text{Cb5} a6 4. \text{a4} \text{Cc6} 5. \text{Cc3} \text{Cc3}

At this time the development of the knight to c3 was rather popular, but it was played usually in connection with the sluggish plan of d2-d3 and the manoeuvre \( \text{Cc3-e2-g3} \).

5... \text{Cxb4} 6. \text{Cc5} \text{Ca5} \text{Ca5}

As the age-old practice of the Spanish Game has proved, also in the system 5.\( \text{Cc3} \) the placement of the bishop on e7 is the most expedient and reliable. However, Chigorin is consistent in the carrying out of his plan and the bishop does not abandon the a5-e1 diagonal.

7.0-0 \text{d6} 8. \text{d3} \text{Bb4} 9. \text{Cc3}

9... \text{Ad7}

The absence of the bishop on e7 forces Black to take measures against
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the unpleasant threat of 10...\textit{g}5; all the same, he should make this move after a preliminary 9...b5 10...\textit{b}3. The manoeuvre ...\textit{e}6-d7, thanks to which Black not only strengthens the support to his centre - the e5-pawn, but also prepares the transfer of the knight to f5, after this game became Chigorin's favourite method of defence in many positions of the Spanish Game.

10.\textit{e}3!

Tarrasch skilfully exploits Black's inaccuracy. The natural 10...\textit{e}3 would allow Black not only to make amends for his negligence, but also, by playing 10...b5! 11...\textit{b}3 \textit{e}7, would drive the white knight away from the centre. Though the move 10...\textit{e}3, undoubtedly, is very unpleasant for Black, deserving attention also is the plan to gain space on the queen's flank, beginning with the move 10...b4.

10...\textit{h}5

A responsible, but forced decision. After 10...\textit{xf}3 11...\textit{xf}3, Black would have difficulty in creating counterplay, and so Chigorin proposes to give up a pawn for the sake of activating his pieces.

11...\textit{xc}6 12...\textit{a}4 \textit{b}6

13...\textit{xc}6 0-0

Black is in no hurry to double the white pawns, since 14...g4 \textit{xe}3 would seriously compromise the position of the white king, and the retreat 14...\textit{d}2 is parried by the move 14...\textit{e}2.

14...\textit{f}5 \textit{c}5 15.d4

An amusing draw was pointed out by Bogoljubow, in reply to 15...\textit{d}1. Then 15...\textit{f}6, and White cannot defend the queen from perpetual chase by \textit{h}5-e8-f7-e8 etc.

15...\textit{e}6 16.dxe5 \textit{xf}3 17...\textit{xf}3
dxe5

And so each side's plans are determined.

White's extra pawn on the queen's flank is, for the time being, not felt, since the immediate developments must unfold on the king's flank, where the weakened pawn cover of the white king gives Black chances of attack. First of all, White must avert the invasion of the black queen into his position, by transferring his queen to e2, for example: 18...\textit{c}4 \textit{f}6 19...\textit{e}2 \textit{h}8 20...\textit{d}1 \textit{g}6 21...\textit{g}3.

The other continuation, 18...\textit{e}3 \textit{xe}3! 19...\textit{xe}3 \textit{g}6 20...\textit{g}3 \textit{d}2, would give Black good counterplay. Apparently, Tarrasch underestimates the two-move queen manoeuvre of his opponent, and chooses a move which allows Black to win back the pawn and retain the activity of his pieces.

18...\textit{h}1?

If White succeeds in playing 18...\textit{g}1, then the threats of \textit{xf}7 or \textit{h}6 will become unpleasant, but...

18...\textit{d}3 19...\textit{e}3
19...\textit{We}2!
A splendid move, forcing White to go over to defence. It is clear that 20.\textit{G}g2 cannot be played because of 20...\textit{G}xe3 21.\textit{G}xe3 \textit{G}g5. Since he cannot give up the f3-pawn (20.\textit{B}xb6? \textit{W}xf3+ 21.\textit{G}g1 \textit{G}f4), the white knight is forced to abandon the excellent outpost on f3.

20.\textit{B}h4 \textit{G}xe3 21.\textit{f}xe3
On 21.\textit{B}ae1, the simplest choice would be the refined queen sacrifice – 21...\textit{W}xe1!! 22.\textit{B}xe1 \textit{W}xf2 23.\textit{G}g2 \textit{G}xe1 24.\textit{G}xe1 \textit{B}ad8, after which the invasion of the rooks into White's position via the d-file quickly decides the game.

21...\textit{W}xe3!
It is this pawn which Black captures, and not the b2-pawn, as he needs the f4-square.

22.\textit{W}c4 \textit{B}fd8 23.\textit{B}f5 \textit{W}d2 24.\textit{B}g1!

24...g6 25.\textit{G}g2 \textit{W}f4
Probably Chigorin failed to take into account the tactical niceties, otherwise it is difficult to explain his rejection of 25...\textit{W}d3, after which Black would retain his domination of the d-file and hold a strong initiative.

26.\textit{B}e7+ \textit{G}g7 27.\textit{B}d5 \textit{W}h6
The threat to the f3-pawn proves to be illusory: 27...\textit{W}xf3 28.\textit{B}f1 \textit{W}h5 29.\textit{C}xc7 \textit{B}f4 30.\textit{B}xa8. By retreating the queen to h6, Chigorin endeavours to retain control over the invasion point (d2) on the d-file.

28.\textit{B}ag1?
A loss of time at a very tense moment – the doubling of rooks on the g-file is absolutely useless. Of course, 28.\textit{B}xc7 would be dangerous because of the forcing variation pointed out by Chigorin: 28...\textit{B}f4 29.\textit{B}xa8 \textit{C}g2 30.\textit{C}c7 \textit{B}h5+ 31.\textit{B}xd8 \textit{W}xf3 32.\textit{B}d1 \textit{W}xe4 33.\textit{B}g1 \textit{B}f4 34.\textit{B}d2 \textit{B}h3+ 35.\textit{B}f1 \textit{B}h1+ 36.\textit{B}e2 \textit{W}xa1, but both now and also on the following move, White should begin to advance the a- and b-pawns, even if it is with the aim of placing the pawn on b5 to thereby hold on to the outpost on d5 and prevent the invasion of the black rooks.

40 Also 30...\textit{W}g5! since after 31.\textit{B}g1 \textit{W}f6, the g2-knight is immune from capture because of mate in a few moves.
28...\textit{d}d7 29.\textit{w}c6 \textit{e}ad8 30.\textit{w}xa6 \textit{d}d6

White once again has obtained an extra pawn, but at too high a price. The invasion on the d-file cannot be averted.
31.\textit{w}e2 \textit{h}h8 32.\textit{w}e3 g5!

Chigorin avoids the exchange of queens, correctly appreciating that, after the inevitable ...c7-c6, he will have more chances to decide the game by direct attack.
33.\textit{w}e1 f6 34.\textit{e}f2 c6 35.\textit{d}e3 \textit{w}h5
36.\textit{g}g2 \textit{d}d3 37.\textit{g}g1

White resigned since, after 43.\textit{b}xc3 \textit{d}d1+ 44.\textit{e}e1 \textit{b}xe1+ 45.\textit{g}g2 \textit{f}f4+ 46.\textit{g}g3 \textit{g}g1+, he is mated. An exceptionally complicated, large-scale strategical game. Chigorin’s method of taking the d-file, and his concluding fine queen manoeuvre, make a striking impression.

21 Spanish Game
Siegbert Tarrasch
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, St.Petersburg 1893 (11)
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{d}f3 \textit{c}c6 3.\textit{b}b5 a6 4.\textit{a}a4
\textit{c}f6 5.\textit{c}c3 d6 6.\textit{b}xc6+ \textit{b}xc6 7.d4
\textit{d}d7 8.dxe5 dxe5

Interesting is Tarrasch’s opinion on this opening system: ‘Now Black has a completely shattered pawn formation on the queen’s flank, and in this respect is doubtless at a disadvantage. Thus far I can agree with all the commentators of this game. But these gentlemen have
forgotten only to take into account the benefits which Black obtains through the exchange on c6: (1) the open b-file; (2) the possession of the two bishops; (3) the immunity of Black’s position from attack. For these reasons I prefer Black’s game.’

9.\(\text{\&e3}\) \(\text{\&d6}\) 10.0-0 0-0 11.\(\text{\&d2}\)
An inappropriate move which takes away d2 from the white knight. Better was an immediate 11.\(\text{\&a4}\).

11...\(\text{\&e7}\) 12.\(\text{\&a4}\)

Applying a method of development known from similar positions. Tarrasch wrote: ‘If the disadvantage of Black’s position, the shattered pawn formation, is to be exploited at all, then it must happen as soon as possible, and this is the point of the following manoeuvre. White will advance the c-pawn, probably to c5. If he achieves this, he would certainly have the advantage. White has no other attacking plan and stands or falls with this queen’s side offensive.’

12...\(\text{\&b8}\) 13.b3 \(\text{\&b7}\)
Chigorin points out another, apparently more promising possibility, 13...\(\text{\&b6}\), after which White would have to agree to the exchange 14.\(\text{\&xb6}\) cxb6, repairing the damage to Black’s pawn structure. The fact of the matter is that 14.\(\text{\&b2}\) c5 15.c4 \(\text{\&b7}\) 16.\(\text{\&c2}\) f5, or even at once 14...f5, would give Black a threatening initiative.

14.c4 \(\text{\&bd8}\)
Even here, Black might have opened the diagonal for his bishop with the move 14...f5!. The continuation chosen by Chigorin allows White to consolidate his position in the centre.

15.\(\text{\&a5}\) c5 16.b4! \(\text{\&e6}\) 17.bxc5 \(\text{\&e7}\) 18.\(\text{\&d2}\)

White has managed to regroup and prepares to meet the break ...f7-f5 with the careful f2-f3. Black’s bishops still lack scope and to open diagonals for them is considerably more difficult than it was four moves ago.

18...\(\text{\&f6!}\)
The best chance. Black provokes the move f2-f3 and again obtains the possibility of increasing the activity of his pieces. If Tarrasch were to play 19.\(\text{\&c3}\) \(\text{\&g4}\) 20.\(\text{\&d5}\) \(\text{\&xe3}\) 21.fxe3, then Black would have to solve more difficult problems.

19.f3 \(\text{\&d3!}\) 20.\(\text{\&f1}\) \(\text{\&fd8}\) 21.\(\text{\&b1}\)
The greedy 21.\(\text{\&xc7}\) is punished at once by 21...\(\text{\&c6!}\).

21...\(\text{\&c6}\) 22.\(\text{\&b2}\)
On 22.\(\text{\&b2}\) would follow the tactical operation 22...\(\text{\&xa4!}\) 23.\(\text{\&xa4}\) \(\text{\&xe3}\)

\[41\] Also 22...\(\text{\&a3!}\) 23.\(\text{\&b4}\) \(\text{\&d7}\) winning the \(\text{\&a4}\).
With his previous threat of 28...\texttt{xf2}+, Chigorin 'pulled' the rook to the second rank and now unexpectedly reveals the danger that lies in wait for White on the first rank. He threatens 29...\texttt{xe4!} 30.\texttt{xe4}+ \texttt{d1}+! and 31.\texttt{e1} cannot be played because of 31...\texttt{xc2}.

29.\texttt{c3} \texttt{h5}!

A fine move, which not only prevents the exchange of rooks – 30.\texttt{d2} \texttt{xd2} 31.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{xf2}+ 32.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{wh2} – but also forces White to make a responsible decision – to admit, with the move 30.\texttt{a5}, that a draw is the best result for him (in reply, Black could undermine the e4-pawn by 30...\texttt{g6} 31.\texttt{c3} f5!), or continue a tense struggle by relying on steadfastness in defence. Tarrasch chooses the second way, but makes a pseudo-active move, abruptly easing Chigorin's task. He moves the same e4-pawn off the diagonal, after which the black bishop increases its influence.

30.e5?

This fourfold manoeuvre, consisting of the short pendulum-style movement of the black queen, makes a striking impression. White at once finds himself

42 Or 30.\texttt{xe4} f3 31.\texttt{g4+} \texttt{xf2}+ 32.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{g4}+ 33.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{d1}.
43 Or 30...\texttt{xe4}!.
in a critical position. An immediate win is threatened by 31...\textit{\texttt{xf3}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xf3}} \textit{\texttt{xc2}}. White cannot defend the f3-pawn: 31...\textit{\texttt{d2}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xf2+}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xf2}} \textit{\texttt{xc2}}! On 31.\textit{\texttt{f1}} would follow 31...\textit{\texttt{d3}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xd3}} \textit{\texttt{xd3}} 33.\textit{\texttt{b2}} \textit{\texttt{e1}} 34.\textit{\texttt{xe1}} \textit{\texttt{xf3}}. There remains a move of the \textit{\texttt{c2}}, but on 31.\textit{\texttt{ce2}} would follow 31...\textit{\texttt{d3}}! 32.\textit{\texttt{xd3}} \textit{\texttt{xd3}} 33.\textit{\texttt{c1}} \textit{\texttt{xf3}} etc. Only after the move 31.\textit{\texttt{b2}} would White parry the threat 31...\textit{\texttt{d3}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xd3}} \textit{\texttt{xd3}} with the crafty 33.\textit{\texttt{cl}}! However, by continuing 31...h5! Black retains his activity, fully compensating for the pawn sacrifice. Tarrasch decides to exchange a pair of rooks and thereby weaken Black’s pressure on the d-file.

31.\textit{\texttt{ed2}} \textit{\texttt{xf3}}!

Chigorin safely avoids the trap 31...\textit{\texttt{xd2}} 32.\textit{\texttt{xd2}} \textit{\texttt{xd2}} 33.\textit{\texttt{xd2}} \textit{\texttt{xf3}} 34.\textit{\texttt{h3}}! \textit{\texttt{xe1}} 35.\textit{\texttt{d8#}}, and, by exploiting the overloaded white queen’s defensive function, carries out a favourable exchanging operation.

32.\textit{\texttt{xf3}} \textit{\texttt{xd2}} 33.\textit{\texttt{xd2}} \textit{\texttt{xd2}} 34.\textit{\texttt{h6}} \textit{\texttt{h6}} 35.\textit{\texttt{xf4}} \textit{\texttt{g5}} 36.\textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{e7}} 37.\textit{\texttt{h1}} \textit{\texttt{xa2}}

And so Black has restored the material equilibrium, retaining a tangible positional advantage. He has an active rook, a distant passed pawn on a6, the \textit{\texttt{e7}} will attack the weak white pawns in the centre, and White’s pieces are tied to the defence of the g2-square – all this ought in the end to yield Black an uncomplicated win.

38.\textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{g5}} 39.\textit{\texttt{b4}} \textit{\texttt{b2}} 40.\textit{\texttt{d5}} c6 41.\textit{\texttt{c3}} \textit{\texttt{b3}} 42.\textit{\texttt{d1}} \textit{\texttt{h7}}

It seems that fatigue, at the end of a very tense battle, makes itself felt. After 42.\textit{\texttt{c2}}! 43.\textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{xc3}}, White would remain a piece down.

43.h3 \textit{\texttt{e7}} 44.\textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{xc5}} 45.\textit{\texttt{e4}} \textit{\texttt{b1+}} 46.\textit{\texttt{h2}} \textit{\texttt{g1+}} 47.\textit{\texttt{h1}} \textit{\texttt{d4+}} 48.\textit{\texttt{h2}} \textit{\texttt{xe5+}} 49.g3 \textit{\texttt{b2+}} 50.\textit{\texttt{g1}}

51.\textit{\texttt{c5}}

51...a5?

Yet another ‘stroke of the brush’ (compare 42.\textit{\texttt{h7}}), but still not letting the win slip. The whole sense of Black’s previous moves lies in driving away the knight from e4, and occupying the seventh rank with his heavy pieces – 51...\textit{\texttt{g5}} 52.\textit{\texttt{e6}} \textit{\texttt{c1+}} 53.\textit{\texttt{d1}} \textit{\texttt{c2}}, to decide the game with a mating attack.

52.\textit{\texttt{d7}}

White’s position is so bad that his only chance consists of this transparent forking threat.

52...\textit{\texttt{c7}}??

An incomprehensible oversight, which cannot be explained even by tiredness. 52...\textit{\texttt{d6}} wins easily.

53.\textit{\texttt{f8+}} 1-0

This is probably one of Chigorin’s most vexing creative misfortunes, before which pales even his famous blunder in
the last game of the return match with Steinitz.

22 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Siegbert Tarrasch
Match, St.Petersburg 1893 (18)
1.e4 e6 2.\textit{\textasciitilde}e2 \textit{\textasciitilde}e7 3.b3 d5 4.\textit{\textasciitilde}b2
\textit{\textasciitilde}f6

5.\textit{\textasciitilde}xf6
Chigorin: In a previous game, I made the move 5.e5. To my mind, both this and the other move give White equally advantages and disadvantages, but 5.e5 creates for him (and possibly also for Black) a more difficult and complicated game – that is to say more abundant in various hidden reefs; at least this is the impression I had from the games of the match.

5...\textit{\textasciitilde}xf6 6.e5 \textit{\textasciitilde}d7 7.\textit{\textasciitilde}g4 0-0
Chigorin: In the 20\textsuperscript{th} game, Dr. Tarrasch played 7...g6, and in the 22\textsuperscript{nd} – again 7...0-0.

8.14 \textit{\textasciitilde}c6
This opening is discussed in detail in the notes to the 22\textsuperscript{nd} game.
Botvinnik: Nowadays, any master would play firstly 8...c5.

9.\textit{\textasciitilde}f3 15.\textit{\textasciitilde}h3 \textit{\textasciitilde}e8 11.\textit{\textasciitilde}c3 \textit{\textasciitilde}f8
12.\textit{\textasciitilde}e2
Botvinnik: A characteristic move for Chigorin. Of course, by continuing

12.\textit{\textasciitilde}b5, pinning the \textit{\textasciitilde}c6, and, in the event of playing \textit{\textasciitilde}xc6, White would insure himself against all danger. But Chigorin preferred to avoid simplification, though at a high price. Now Black begins a dangerous offensive.

12...\textit{\textasciitilde}g6 13.\textit{\textasciitilde}g3 d4
Botvinnik: Driving the knight away from the c3-square, from where it defends the a2-pawn.

14.\textit{\textasciitilde}a4 \textit{\textasciitilde}b4 15.\textit{\textasciitilde}d1

15...d3
Botvinnik: The initial cause of Black’s defeat. He underestimated or simply did not notice White’s 18\textsuperscript{th} move. Tarrasch strives for a forcing variation, but the time has not come for this yet. Correct was 15...b5 16.\textit{\textasciitilde}b2 c5 17.0-0 (17.a4 \textit{\textasciitilde}a6!) 17...\textit{\textasciitilde}b7! (Chigorin examined only 17...\textit{\textasciitilde}d5 18.\textit{\textasciitilde}g5 h6 19.\textit{\textasciitilde}h5! or 18...\textit{\textasciitilde}f8 19.a4!) and Black has an obvious advantage in the centre and on the queen’s flank, whereas the white rooks are still disconnected. It remains to point out that after 15...\textit{\textasciitilde}d5 16.\textit{\textasciitilde}xd4 \textit{\textasciitilde}xd5 17.\textit{\textasciitilde}f3 \textit{\textasciitilde}d7 Black would also have at least an equal game.

16.c4 b5
Chigorin: Wrongfully, the gentlemen critics condemned this move. Dr. Tarrasch saw that White would, either sooner or later, win the d3-pawn and,
with h2-h4, obtain an attack which is dangerous for Black.

Botvinnik: Now White will obviously stand better as the d3-pawn is hopelessly weak.

17.\textit{cxb5} $\textit{\text{d}}5$

18.\textit{\text{d}4}!

Botvinnik: A remarkable move, which could hardly have been envisaged by Tarrasch. If, at first, 18.0-0, then 18...\textit{\text{d}xf4}, and the white knight on f3 has no good jump away. Now, however, after the transfer of the \textit{\text{d}f3} to c6, the black knight cannot hold his ground on f4 and Black’s position in the centre falls apart.

18...\textit{\text{d}xf4}

Botvinnik: Or 18...\textit{\text{g}xf4} 19.0-0! $\textit{\text{g}}6$

20.\textit{\text{c}6} $\textit{\text{h}4}$ 21.\textit{\text{xh4}} $\textit{\text{c}6}$ 22.\textit{\text{c}5}, winning a pawn (22...a6? 23.bxa6 $\textit{\text{x}a6}$ 24.a4).

19.\textit{\text{c}6} $\textit{\text{d}5}$

20.\textit{\text{c}3}!

White’s last three knight moves surely represent the strongest continuation. To play for the win of the exchange by 20.\textit{\text{f}3} $\textit{\text{x}b5}$ 21.\textit{\text{e}7+} $\textit{\text{x}e}7$ 22.\textit{\text{x}a8} would be a mistake since Black would obtain the advantage by 22...$\textit{\text{xe}5}$+; also 21.\textit{\text{c}3} $\textit{\text{c}5}$ 22.b4 $\textit{\text{b}6}$ 23.\textit{\text{e}7}+ was unfavourable for White (Tarrasch).

20...$\textit{\text{c}5}$

After this, the queen will be driven right back and Black’s position will be virtually hopeless. Black should simply take the g-pawn with the queen and then, after 20...$\textit{\text{xg}2}$ 21.\textit{\text{f}3} $\textit{\text{xg}3}$+ 22.\textit{hxg3} $\textit{\text{d}5}$ 23.\textit{\text{x}d5} $\textit{\text{xe}5}$+ 24.\textit{\text{d}5} $\textit{\text{b}7}$, would have won the game by the simple but surprising move 24...$\textit{\text{b}7}$; also after 23.\textit{\text{x}d5}! $\textit{\text{exd}5}$ 24.\textit{\text{x}d5}+ $\textit{\text{e}6}$, he would have maintained a good game because of the weakness of the e5-pawn (Tarrasch).

21.b4! $\textit{\text{f}8}$

22.0-0!

Botvinnik: And so White does not castle until the 22\textsuperscript{nd} move! But this move wins the d3-pawn at once, since the knight on f4 must move away.

22...\textit{\text{e}2+} 23.\textit{\text{x}e}2 $\textit{\text{xe}2}$ 24.\textit{\text{xe}2} $\textit{\text{d}7}$ 25.\textit{\text{c}3}

Botvinnik: Defending the b4-pawn and the d4-square. The sharp struggle has ended in White’s favour, since he already has an extra pawn. Now
begins the technical phase to realise the advantage he has obtained.

25...\textit{bxc6} 26.bxc6 \textit{h8} 27.d4 \textit{ed8} 28.a4 \textit{f7} 29.ad1 \textit{e7} 30.b5 \textit{d5} 31.f3 \textit{e7}

Botvinnik: It turns out that it is not quite so easy for White to realise his extra pawn, since the position is of a reserved nature and Black has the important strong point on d5.

32.a3 \textit{b6}

Botvinnik: As White, the whole time, has refrained from exchanging the minor pieces, then Black himself forces the exchange, because on 33.a2, he would reply 33...a6!, introducing into play the rook on a8.

33.\textit{b3} \textit{xc4}

Chigorin: On 33...\textit{d5} 34.\textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 35.\textit{xf5} \textit{xd4} 36.\textit{xd4} exf5 37.\textit{wd5} h6 38.e6 White wins without difficulty.**

34.\textit{xc4}

34...g6

Botvinnik: Reinforcing the f5-pawn. Bad would be 34...\textit{xa3} 35.\textit{xe6} \textit{d3+} 36.\textit{h1} \textit{xd4} 37.\textit{xd4} \textit{xf5} 38.\textit{xf5} and White ought to win easily. But how does White win after 34...g6? Of course by means of an offensive on the queen's flank: for example, 35.a4 \textit{d5} 36.\textit{d3} \textit{g7} 37.\textit{b1} \textit{f7} 38.a5 \textit{b8} 39.\textit{b4} \textit{g7} 40.\textit{d4} \textit{f7} 41.\textit{d1} and there is no defence against the advance b5-b6. It is not clear how Black can prevent the execution of this plan. However, Chigorin makes a surprising decision: with his next move he gives up a pawn and obtains a slightly better ending.

35.d5

Chigorin: The Deutsche Schachzeitung calls this a gross mistake, as a consequence of which the game should be drawn with correct play. In the opinion of this magazine, White ought to break

** However, it is by no means as clear-cut after 38...\textit{xa3}, since after 39.\textit{xf5} \textit{a1+} wins a rook and on 39.\textit{d3} \textit{c1+} 40.\textit{d1} \textit{e3+} 41.\textit{h1} comes 41...\textit{f4}. 173
through on the queen’s flank with the move 35.a4! and then the win of the game would be assured. I calculated a more favourable position for White, namely 35.\textit{\texttt{w}}c5 \textit{\texttt{w}}f7! 36.a4 \textit{\texttt{b}}d5 37.\textit{\texttt{w}}c4, with no less doubt of securing the win of the game.

\textit{\texttt{35...\texttt{e}}d5 36.\textit{\texttt{a}}xd5 \textit{\texttt{e}}xd5 37.\textit{\texttt{w}}xd5 \textit{\texttt{a}}d8!}

Botvinnik: With this move, Black wins an important pawn.

\textit{\texttt{38.\texttt{w}}a2! \textit{\texttt{w}}xe5 39.\texttt{a}1 \textit{\texttt{w}}xa1}

Chigorin: This exchange of queens is forced. If 39...\textit{\texttt{a}}d4, then 40.\textit{\texttt{b}}e1 \textit{\texttt{w}}f6 41.\textit{\texttt{e}}e6 \textit{\texttt{a}}d1+ 42.\textit{\texttt{w}}xd1 \textit{\texttt{w}}xe6 43.\textit{\texttt{d}}d8+ and 44.\textit{\texttt{w}}xc7+ etc.

\textit{\texttt{40.\texttt{a}}xa1 \textit{\texttt{g}}7}

Botvinnik: And so a rook ending is reached, in which White has a definite advantage. This advantage lies in the distant advanced pawns on the queen’s flank, where White can create for himself a dangerous passed pawn. Besides this, Black has weak pawns on a7 and c7. With his last move, Black prevents the manoeuvre \textit{\texttt{e}}c1-e7.

\textit{\texttt{41.\texttt{f}}12 \textit{\texttt{f}}6 42.a4 \textit{\texttt{a}}d5}

Botvinnik: Black holds his ground passively. Very interesting here is the attempt to exchange the weak a7-pawn by 42...a6, in order to simplify the position, for example: 42...a6 43.\textit{\texttt{b}}b1 axb5 44.\textit{\texttt{b}}xb5 \textit{\texttt{d}}d6 45.\textit{\texttt{c}}c5 \textit{\texttt{d}}4 46.a5 \textit{\texttt{e}}e6 47.\textit{\texttt{e}}3 \textit{\texttt{a}}4 and ...\textit{\texttt{d}}d6; or 43.\textit{\texttt{e}}3 \textit{\texttt{e}}6 44.h4 \textit{\texttt{d}}5 45.\textit{\texttt{b}}b1 axb5 46.axb5 \textit{\texttt{d}}d6 and White is tied to the defence of the b5-pawn.

\textit{\texttt{43.\texttt{e}}3 \textit{\texttt{e}}5 44.\textit{\texttt{c}}c1}

Botvinnik: After this, 44...a6 is already impossible because of 45.b6. Now the difference between the position in the game and in the preceding variations is clear: the b5-pawn is defended by the a4-pawn, and the white rook is free to manoeuvre.

\begin{center}

\textbf{44...g5}

\end{center}

Chigorin: 'This pawn offensive – says the Deutsche Schachzeitung – does not achieve its aim, since the f5-pawn is shown to be weak. Black ought to have made a waiting move and then he would probably have obtained a draw.' However, what waiting move is there for Black? Let us suppose he moves the king; then \textit{\texttt{c}}c4, g2-g3, \textit{\texttt{h}}h4 and, after ...h7-h5, \textit{\texttt{b}}b4, Black is forced to advance the pawn to g5, after which White, by playing h2-h4, would still win the game simply. Precisely for this reason, Dr. Tarrasch prevents White from occupying the h4-square with the pawn.

\textit{\texttt{45.g3 h5}}

Botvinnik: But this is useless. Simpler and stronger would be 45...h6.

\textit{\texttt{46.\texttt{c}}c4}
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46...g4
Botvinnik: A new weakening. It seems that, after 46...d1, White would not be able to strengthen his position. Here are some sample variations:
1) 47.h4 gxh4 48.gxh4 e1+ 49.d2 a1;
2) 47.c5+ e6 48.a5 b1 49.d3 f6 (also 49.h4) 50.c2 b4 51.c3 b1 52.d5 e6 53.d7 xxb5 54.xc7 xxa5 etc.

47.b4 e6
Botvinnik: In his notes to this game, Chigorin wrote that, on 47...d6, White replies 48.d4 c5 49.xd5+ xxd5 50.xf4 c5 51.xf5 b4 52.xe6 xxa4 53.d7 and White wins. However, Black could play more strongly, and namely: 48...xd4! 49.xd4 e6 50.a5 (not 50.c5 f4) 50...d6 51.a6 e6 52.e3 d6! 53.d4 and a draw is unavoidable. Therefore Black could still play 47...d6.

48.a5!
Botvinnik: The last chance. If 48.d4, then of course not 48...xd4 49.xd4 d6 50.a5 e6 51.c5! and Black must resign, but 48.e5+ 49.d3 e1 50.d2 h1 with good counter-chances.

48...f6
Black is uncertain in his play and, with each move, worsens his position. 48...e5 loses quickly because of the line pointed out by Botvinnik: 49.b6 axb6 50.axb6 cxb6 51.c7 c5 52.b5!; some initiative remains with White also on 48...d6 49.b2! (49.d4 c5) followed by 50.f4. It seems that the black king is in its most favourable position on e6, where it is near to the queenside pawns and, at the same time, defends the f5-pawn. If Black had played 48...c5!, restricting the mobility of the white pawns, he would easily prevent the attempt to break through with the white king, e.g. 49.f4 f6, or 49.d4 d6.

49.b6 axb6 50.axb6 cxb6 51.c7!
Botvinnik: In order to force Black to stop the pawn with the rook and not the king.

51...c5 52.axb6+

52...g5
Black is faced with a painful alternative, to use the king for the protection of his pawns – then the c7-pawn decides; if
he holds the c7-pawn in check with the king, then, after 52...\(f7\) 53.\(h6\) followed by \(f4\), Black loses his pawns on the king's side, as indicated by Tarrasch.

Botvinnik: A decisive mistake. Tarrasch tries to utilise his extra pawn on the king's flank, but this proves to be a mistaken plan. If Black had transferred his king to the queen's flank, then he would still retain chances of a draw, and namely 52...\(f7\)! 53.\(b7\) \(e6\) 54.\(d4\) \(d7\) 55.\(c8\) \(c8\) 56.\(h7\) \(c2\) 57.\(xh5\) \(f2+\) 58.\(e5\) \(d7\) 59.\(xf5\) \(xh2\) 60.\(f4\) \(e6\) 61.\(xg4\) \(h8\) and a draw.

53.\(b7\) \(h4\) 54.\(d4\) \(c1\) 55.\(e5\) \(hxg3\) 56.\(hxg3\)

56...\(c3\)

Chigorin: Dr. Tarrasch remarked that, after 56...\(f4\), he would achieve a draw. This was also given in the Deutsche Schachzeitung. As far as I can remember, Dr. Tarrasch tried to give this move at the end of the game and was easily convinced that Black could no longer be saved. The following variation graphically confirms this: 56...\(f4\) 57.\(xh4\) 58.\(d6\) \(d1+\) (58...\(g3\) 59.\(b8\) \(g2\) 60.\(c8\) \(xc8\) 61.\(xc8\) \(g1\) \(g5\) 62.\(h8\) and White wins) 59.\(f7\) \(c1\) 60.\(d4\) \(d1+\) 61.\(c8\) \(g3\) 62.\(b8\) \(c1\) 63.\(c8\) \(xc8\) 64.\(xc8\) \(g4\) 65.\(c7\) \(c3\) 66.\(f5\) \(g2\) 67.\(g7\) and wins. This is by no means the only way to win. There are others.

57.\(e6\) \(e3+\) 58.\(e7\) \(e3+\) 59.\(d6\) \(d3+\) 60.\(e5\) \(e3\) 61.\(a7\)!

Chigorin: In order to hide from the checks with the king on a8.

61...\(f4\) 62.\(d4!\) 1-0

'The whole of the extremely difficult and interesting endgame was handled by Chigorin with the greatest mastery', said Tarrasch.

Chigorin: If 62...\(c6\), then 63.\(a5+\) and 64.\(c5\).

23 Spanish Game

Siegbert Tarrasch

Mikhail Chigorin

Match, St.Petersburg 1893 (19)

1.e4 \(e5\) 2.\(c3\) \(c6\) 3.\(b5\) a6 4.\(a4\) \(c6\) 5.\(c3\) d6 6.d4 \(d7\)

The position after 6...\(d7\) was the object of a creative argument in the Chigorin-Tarrasch match. In the beginning, Tarrasch tried direct play against the weakness of the black pawns after 7.\(xc6\) bxc6 8.dxe5 dxe5, but convinced himself that the two bishops and open b-file allow Black to develop piece pressure, compensating for the pawn weaknesses. Then he hit upon the idea of creating a defended pawn centre. In the present game, Chigorin demonstrates the effectiveness of Black's opening system also in this case.
7. \( \text{Ec}2 \text{ b5} \)

Chigorin said: 'In the 15th game, 7... \( \text{Ec}7 \) was played, and in the 17th game, 7...f6. I found that, even after these moves, Black could conduct the defence just as successfully; each of these defences has its own character: in the present game, the move 7...b5 gives Black a counterattack.'

8. \( \text{Bb3} \text{ a5!} \text{ 9.dxe5} \)

Chigorin indicated that he would have preferred 9.c3 \( \text{Cxb3} \text{ 10.\text{Wxb3}} \). This line conforms to White's opening idea, but does not promise him any advantage. Both 10...\( \text{Ec7} \) and 10...\( \text{Bb7} \) 11.\( \text{Gg5} \) d5! allow Black to comfortably develop his forces.

9...\( \text{Cxb3} \text{ 10.axb3} \text{ Cxe5} \)

The careless 10...dxe5 would lose a pawn to 11.\( \text{Wd5} \).

11.\( \text{Fd4} \)

It would be unfavourable for White to exchange 11.\( \text{Cxe5} \) dxe5 12.\( \text{Wxd8} + \text{Xxd8} \), since Black has the two bishops and good chances in an ending with many pieces on the board. Therefore Tarrasch, in anticipation of 11...\( \text{Gg4} \), moves the knight away to the centre.

11...\( \text{Bb7} \text{ 12.\text{Gg3} g6!} \)

The initial cause of all the subsequent trouble. Such a pawn move is justified only if it is linked to a plan of later advancing it and also thoroughly supporting it with pieces. With an incomplete development, the e4-pawn becomes a convenient target. Bogoljubow recommended limiting the mobility of Black's bishops by 13.0-0 \( \text{Gg7} \text{ 14.b4} 0-0 \text{ 15.c3} \text{ \text{Ee8} 16.f3} \), but this would be playing only for equalisation.

13...\( \text{Dd7} \text{ 14.b4} \)

It is doubtful that White wants to transfer the knight on d4 via b3 to a5, in order to drive away the bishop on b7 from the long diagonal and weaken the pressure on the e4-pawn. Obviously it would be enough for Black to play ...\( \text{Eab8} \), and the bishop on b7 obtains the comfortable a8-square. Apparently, Tarrasch wants to limit the mobility of the black knight by taking away from it the c5-square, which is necessary for the pressure on the e4-pawn.

14...\( \text{Gg7} \text{ 15.\text{Cb3} 0-0} \text{ 16.0-0} \)

There is no time for 16.\( \text{Cxa5} \), because of 16...\( \text{Xxe4} \text{ 17.\text{Xxe4} \text{ Ee8} etc.} \)

16...\( \text{Ee8} \text{ 17.\text{Ee1} Df6} \)

Black not only places his bishop actively, but also takes away the f5-square from the white knight.

13.f4

A critical moment in the game. It becomes clear that the handsome pawns on e4 and f4 are, in general, only convenient objects of attack. Thus,
on 18.e5 would follow 18...\(\text{\textcopyright d5}\) 19.\(\text{\textcopyright a5}\) 
(19.exd6 \(\text{\textcopyright xd6}\) 20.\(\text{\textcopyright xe8}\) 21.\(\text{\textcopyright c5}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright c8}\)! 22.c3 \(\text{\textcopyright xc3}\) 23.\(\text{\textcopyright xd6}\) cxd6; 
21.c3 \(\text{\textcopyright c6}\) 22.\(\text{\textcopyright a5}\) \(\text{\textcopyright b6}\) + 23.\(\text{\textcopyright f1}\) 
(23.\(\text{\textcopyright h1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright f2}\) 24.\(\text{\textcopyright d2}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xh4}\)) 23...\(\text{\textcopyright a8}\) 
and White has a very bad position which one can regard as lost) 19...\(\text{\textcopyright b8}\) 
20.\(\text{\textcopyright xb7}\) (on 20.exd6, Tarrasch gives the beautiful but rather 'cooperative' 
variation 20...\(\text{\textcopyright a7}\) + 21.\(\text{\textcopyright h1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright f2}\) 
22.\(\text{\textcopyright f1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xg2}\)+! 23.\(\text{\textcopyright xg2}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xh3}\) + and 
24...\(\text{\textcopyright h8}\) mate) 20...\(\text{\textcopyright xb7}\) 21.exd6 
\(\text{\textcopyright b6}\)+ 22.\(\text{\textcopyright f1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xe1}\) + 23.\(\text{\textcopyright xel}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xd6}\) 
24.\(\text{\textcopyright e4}\) \(\text{\textcopyright d8}\) and White loses material 
because 25.c3 cannot be played due to the 
forcing attack 25...\(\text{\textcopyright xc3}\) 26.bxc3 
\(\text{\textcopyright d1}\)+ 27.\(\text{\textcopyright f2}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xc3}\) 28.\(\text{\textcopyright b1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright d4}\)+ 
29.\(\text{\textcopyright e3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xe3}\)+ 30.\(\text{\textcopyright xe3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright d2}\)+ 31.\(\text{\textcopyright f3}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright d3}\)+ 32.\(\text{\textcopyright g4}\) \(\text{\textcopyright e3}\)! 33.\(\text{\textcopyright a8}\)+ \(\text{\textcopyright g7}\) 
34.\(\text{\textcopyright c6}\) h5+ 35.\(\text{\textcopyright xh5}\) + (35.\(\text{\textcopyright g5}\) \(\text{\textcopyright e5}\) + or 
35.\(\text{\textcopyright f3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xd3}\)) 35...\(\text{\textcopyright xh5}\)+ 36.\(\text{\textcopyright xh5}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright e6}\) 37.\(\text{\textcopyright f3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright c2}\)! etc. The only defence 
of the e4-pawn appears to be by 18.\(\text{\textcopyright d3}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright e7}\) (18...\(\text{\textcopyright xxe4}\) ? 19.\(\text{\textcopyright d2}\), but then 
White is ruined by the lack of 
cooperation between the rooks: 19... 
d5 20.e5 \(\text{\textcopyright xb4}\)! 21.exf6 \(\text{\textcopyright xe1}\)+ 22.\(\text{\textcopyright f2}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright xc1}\) etc. There remains the defence 
chosen by Tarrasch, but in this the \(\text{\textcopyright a1}\) 
and \(\text{\textcopyright c1}\) are cut off from the game and 
Black obtains an enormous advantage in 
the battle for the centre.

\(\text{18.\textcopyright d2}\) \(\text{\textcopyright d7}\) 19.\(\text{\textcopyright h3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright e7}\) 20.\(\text{\textcopyright e2}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright ae8}\) 

Here we see complete triumph for 
Chigorin's strategy. White is in a 
zugzwang position. The defence of 
the e4-pawn completely ties down the 
white pieces.

\(\text{21.\textcopyright f1}\) 
No better is 21.\(\text{\textcopyright e1}\). Though Black 
cannot avoid e4-e5, he has at his 
disposal the possibility of winning 
the ill-fated e4-pawn, by exploiting 
the weakness of the g2-square: 21.\(\text{\textcopyright e1}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright c6}\) 22.\(\text{\textcopyright c3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xe4}\) and on any capture 
of the knight would follow 23...f5.

Tarrasch defends the g2-square, but 
the game is decided by Black's last reserves.

\(\text{21...h5! 22.h4}\) 
Chigorin mentioned that Black 
threatens ...h5-h4; if White defends 
the e4-pawn by 22.\(\text{\textcopyright e1}\), then would follow 
22...\(\text{\textcopyright c6}\) 23.c3 h4 24.\(\text{\textcopyright g1}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xe4}\), and 
if 25.\(\text{\textcopyright xh4}\), then 25...\(\text{\textcopyright xc3}\)!

\(\text{22...\text{\textcopyright g4} 23.\text{\textcopyright f2} \text{\textcopyright xh4}}\) 
Black wins a pawn and retains an 
overwhelming positional advantage.

\(\text{24.\text{\textcopyright f3} \text{\textcopyright g4} 25.e5 \text{\textcopyright d5} 26.\text{\textcopyright h2}}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright d7}\) 27.\(\text{\textcopyright xd6}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xd6}\) 28.\(\text{\textcopyright xe7}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xe7}\) 
29.\(\text{\textcopyright c3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xb4}\)! 30.\(\text{\textcopyright e3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright d3}\) 31.\(\text{\textcopyright w2}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright xb2}\) 

The rest of the game is of no interest.

\(\text{32.\text{\textcopyright c1} \text{\textcopyright c4} 33.\text{\textcopyright f2} \text{\textcopyright h4} 34.\text{\textcopyright g1}}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright e2}\) 35.\(\text{\textcopyright f3}\) \(\text{h3}\) 36.\(\text{\textcopyright g3}\) \(\text{\textcopyright xf3}\) 
37.\(\text{\textcopyright xf3}\) \(\text{h2}\)+ 38.\(\text{\textcopyright g2}\) \(\text{\textcopyright e3}\)+ 39.\(\text{\textcopyright h1}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright c6}\) 

Chigorin noted that Black could play 
the more energetic 39...\(\text{\textcopyright xf4}\), forcing 
White to sacrifice his queen.

\(\text{40.\text{\textcopyright e4} \text{\textcopyright g4} 41.\text{\textcopyright g2} \text{\textcopyright xf2} 42.\text{\textcopyright xf2}}\) 
\(\text{\textcopyright w5}\) 

White resigned.

This game is a classic example of the 
immobilisation of the f4- and e4-pawns 
with a subsequent piece attack on the 
e4-pawn.
24 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Siegbert Tarrasch

Match, St.Petersburg 1893 (22)
1.e4 e6 2.\textit{We}2 \textit{\&e}7 3.b3 d5 4.\textit{gb}2

The exchange 4.exd5 looks tempting, for example: 4...\textit{gf}6 5.\textit{gc}3! \textit{xc}3
\textit{dx}3 \textit{Wxd}5 7.\textit{gf}4!. However, after 4.exd5! 5.\textit{gb}2, Black could play
with 5...f6 and 5...\textit{gf}6! 6.\textit{xf}6 \textit{gxf}, for example, 7.\textit{df}3 \textit{xc}6 8.d4 \textit{g}4
\textit{e}3 \textit{Wd}7, completely equalising the

4...\textit{gf}6 5.\textit{xf}6

A debatable decision. Though the exchange of the dark-squared bishops
might prove favourable for White, who is ready to set up the pawn wedge d4,
e5, f4, he must watch the danger of falling behind in development.

5...\textit{df}6

5...\textit{xf}6 6.e5 \textit{Wg}6 7.d4 \textit{e}7 is also quite possible, but Tarrasch chooses the
most purposeful continuation.

6.e5 \textit{fd}7

The advance of the pawn to e5 could bring great danger also to White. Immediate events will show whether this pawn is an outpost or a target for attack, and for this plan the transfer of
the knight to d7 is very much to the point.

7.\textit{Wg}4

It is clear that Black, after castling, will begin to undermine the centre, in order thereby to exploit his advantage in development.

Therefore White must act quickly and in the first place solve the problem of the development of his bishop. He cannot fianchetto it: 7.\textit{f}4 0-0 8.g3 \textit{f}6 9.\textit{f}3 \textit{xe}5
10.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 11.\textit{xe}5 \textit{c}6 12.\textit{g}2 \textit{Wg}4!, so he has to lose time in order to provide a way out for the bishop along the f1-a6 diagonal.

7...0-0 8.f4 \textit{c}6

The natural move is 8..c5. Tarrasch prefers to play for an advantage in development.

9.c3

The remoteness of the white queen on the king's flank begins to tell – White begins to have trouble with the defence of the c2-pawn. On the natural 9.\textit{df}3, the thrust 9...\textit{b}4 practically forces 10.\textit{d}1, since equally bad are both 10.\textit{a}3, because of 10...f5 11.\textit{g}3 c5
12.c3 \textit{a}5 13.\textit{xb}4 \textit{xa}3, and 10.\textit{d}4, because of 10...c5 11.a3 \textit{a}5 12.c3 \textit{xd}4
13.\textit{xb}4 \textit{c}7. He has to spend another tempo to defend the d4 and b4-squares from invasion by the black knight. In giving this variation, Chigorin remarked that he did not want to forfeit castling in this game.

9...d4! 10.\textit{f}3
The first critical position. Black’s fine play has not only increased his advantage in development, but has also created tension in the centre. The success of his opening strategy now depends on whether he can remove the e5-pawn and break up the centre. There are several ways to achieve this. Firstly, 10... f6! – the most logical; now dangerous for White are both 11.\textit{Wxe6+} \textit{\textsf{h}8} and 11.\textit{exf6} \textit{Wxf6}, but also after the relatively better 11.\textit{cxd4} \textit{c5}, Black’s advantage is obvious. Also good is another way, 10...\textit{f5} 11.\textit{Wxh3} \textit{dxc3} 12.\textit{xc3+} \textit{xc5} 13.\textit{d4} \textit{c4+}. The complications after 14.\textit{xe4} \textit{f6} 15.\textit{g5} \textit{h6} 16.\textit{xe6} \textit{xd4} 17.\textit{c4} \textit{xe6} or ...\textit{c2+} are clearly in Black’s favour. Tarrasch proceeds along this path, but makes a transposition of moves, and this enables White to hold his position by a heroic effort.

10...\textit{dxc3} 11.\textit{xc3} \textit{c5} 12.\textit{d4} \textit{f5}

Black side-steps the trap – 12...\textit{xd4} 13.\textit{0-0-0!}, and now waits for the move 13.\textit{Wh3}, so he can then entrenched his knight in the centre by 13...\textit{c4}.

13.\textit{exf6}!

At first sight this seems suicide: to the weakness of the d4-pawn is added also the weakness of the f4-pawn, which gives rise to the possibility of ...\textit{e6-e5}. However, it is only this move which preserves the tension in the game. A concrete calculation of the peculiarities of this position shows that the \textit{c5} is now deprived of support in the centre and the threat to take it paralyses the black queen, Black’s main attacking weapon.

13...\textit{Wxf6}

14.\textit{Ed1}!

Chigorin conducts a difficult defence with remarkable composure. By defending the d4-pawn, he also indirectly defends the f4-pawn. It seems this aim is also served by castling – 14.\textit{0-0-0}. Tarrasch considered that, in this case, Black would obtain the advantage by means of 14...\textit{e5} 15.\textit{xc4+} \textit{h8} 16.\textit{fxe5} \textit{Wxh6+} 17.\textit{g5} \textit{xf3} 18.\textit{Wxh6} \textit{xc3+} 19.\textit{b2} \textit{gxb6}; however, if one continues the variation – 20.\textit{xc3} \textit{c4+} 21.\textit{b2} \textit{f2} 22.\textit{Ed1} \textit{h1} 23.\textit{h8+}, then it becomes clear that Black gets mated. Nevertheless, the pawn weaknesses on the queen’s flank make the position of the white king on c1 precarious, and Black retains the initiative after both 14...\textit{a5} and also 14...\textit{d7} 15.\textit{g3} \textit{c5} 16.\textit{d5} \textit{d6}.

14...\textit{Ed7}

This retreat is a small victory for White. However, Black has no useful move to
-strenthen his position or even prevent
his opponent from playing 15.\textit{\textbf{c}e2} and
then castling. 14...\textit{\textbf{d}d8} seems strong, but
there is a sufficient defence in 15.\textit{\textbf{w}g5!}
(with a threat on c5) 15...\textit{\textbf{w}xg5} 16.\textit{\textbf{f}xg5},
and Black's initiative evaporates. Also
14...e5 does not work because of
15.\textit{\textbf{c}c4+} \textit{\textbf{h}h8} 16.\textit{\textbf{f}xe5} \textit{\textbf{x}g4} 17.\textit{\textbf{e}xf6}.

15.\textit{\textbf{d}d3}!

It would be unfavourable for Black to
take White's d4 or f4-pawns: 15...\textit{\textbf{w}xf4}
16.\textit{\textbf{w}xf4} (16.\textit{\textbf{w}xe6+} would be bad since it
frees Black's game; after 16...\textit{\textbf{h}h8}
17.\textit{\textbf{c}d5} \textit{\textbf{c}c5} Black stands well) 16...\textit{\textbf{w}xf4}
17.\textit{\textbf{d}d5} \textit{\textbf{b}b6} 18.\textit{\textbf{c}c7} \textit{\textbf{b}b8} 19.0-0
\textit{\textbf{d}d7} 20.\textit{\textbf{g}g5}. Despite all the apparent
dangers of the move 15.\textit{\textbf{d}d3}, this is the only,
but nevertheless adequate, means of
neutralising Black's initiative. 15.g3
would hold no promise of a quiet life,
in view of 15...e5! 16.\textit{\textbf{c}c4+} \textit{\textbf{h}h8}.

15...\textit{\textbf{w}h6}

As the frontal attack on the d4- and
f4-pawns is not succeeding, Tarrasch
includes also the rook on f8, and frees
the f6-square for the knight on d7. Besides
this, Black does not abandon the idea
of playing ...e6-e5 and for this he must
defend the h7-pawn, since an immediate
15...e5 fails to 16.\textit{\textbf{w}h5} g6 17.\textit{\textbf{f}xe5}.

16.0-0!

Chigorin completes his development,
with an awareness of the finest nuances
of defence. Again Black cannot take
the f4-pawn: 16...\textit{\textbf{w}xf4} 17.\textit{\textbf{c}c7} \textit{\textbf{h}h8}
18.\textit{\textbf{w}g3} \textit{\textbf{h}f3} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}xh7+} \textit{\textbf{h}h8} 20.\textit{\textbf{w}xc7},
and the cluster of black pieces cannot be
developed without loss.

For the last time, Black could try to
exploit the vis-à-vis of the bishop on
c8 and the white queen, by playing
16...e5, but again without advantage:
17.\textit{\textbf{g}g5} \textit{\textbf{f}6} 18.\textit{\textbf{w}g3} \textit{\textbf{h}h5} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}h4} \textit{\textbf{f}xf4}
20.\textit{\textbf{c}c4+} with a very strong attack.

One is struck by the timely, simple-
looking but deeply conceived moves of
Chigorin. In a very sharp situation, he
does not fear ghosts, but, at the same
time, he also does not get carried away
by mirages. Thus now 16.\textit{\textbf{g}g5} looks
tempting, but after 16...\textit{\textbf{f}6} 17.\textit{\textbf{w}g3}
\textit{\textbf{h}h5!} 18.\textit{\textbf{h}h7+} \textit{\textbf{g}g8} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}h4}! \textit{\textbf{f}xf4}
White's position once again becomes
critical.

16...\textit{\textbf{f}6}

17.\textit{\textbf{w}g3}?

One must explain this move by purely
sporting considerations, since, in this
last game of the match, Chigorin was
required to play for a win. 17.\textit{\textbf{w}g5}
\textit{\textbf{w}xg5} 18.\textit{\textbf{f}xg5} \textit{\textbf{c}c5} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}c1} would
have led to a quiet position with some
advantage for White.

17...\textit{\textbf{h}h5} 18.\textit{\textbf{w}h4} \textit{\textbf{f}xf4}

Now White intensifies the game, and, for
this purpose, has voluntarily given up
the long-suffering f4-pawn. However, there is little risk involved, since his pieces are actively placed, while, on the other hand, Black's rook and bishop are still not developed and the knight and queen are suddenly shown to be idle on the edge of the board. The most tense situation would be created by the move 19...e1, after which White would have many ways to further strengthen his position: 20...b5, 20...e4, 20...c4, or even 20.d5. Chigorin's choice is quite unexpected.

19.g4!? 20.xh6

White's plan consists of a rapid exchange of the active black pieces, so as to try to break through to the enemy camp with a small force, before Black introduces the a8 and c8 into play. In this position, many were puzzled by Tarrasch's refusal to capture the g-pawn, and that even with check. However, he breaks a lance for nothing; the g4-pawn is of no value. But what could prove important is the fact that the rook, by moving away from f4 to g4, has left the f6 undefended and the jump of the white knight on f3 is now very strong. Giving concrete variations, Chigorin shows that, by taking the second pawn - 20...xg4+ 21.xh1 gxh6 - Black would probably be exposed to greater danger.

(1) 22..b5 d7 23..e5 xxe5 24.xf6 x6+ 25.xc6 xc6 26.xe6 xd+ 27.e7 and White's chances are not worse;

(2) 22..c4! e7 23.b4! f8 24.a+ xb4 25.e5 g7 26.xd7 xd7 27.xe6+ h8 28.d5! with an active position.

Chigorin concluded that 'if Black, in conducting the defence, tries to hold on to the two pawns he has won, then he will be subjected to a varied and dangerous attack'. After long thought and agonising deliberation, Tarrasch rejects the move 20...xg4+.

20...gxh6 21.e5 xf1+ 22.xf1 xxe5 23.dxe5

Chigorin strove for this type of position, when making his surprising thrust 19.g4. If the rook breaks through to d8, it ties down Black's forces. However, the vulnerability of White's g4- and e5-pawns enables Black easily to bring the game to a drawn position, for example: 23.xg4 24.h3 xxe5 25.d8+ f7 26.b5 x6 27.h8 g7 28.e8 b8 29.xc7 d7. But Tarrasch, having an extra pawn, does not want to allow the white rook into his camp...

23...d5 24.e4 b6
Black must limit the mobility of the knight on e4, since, after 24...d7,
unpleasant is not the combination indicated by Chigorin. 25.\(\text{\textit{xd5 exd5}}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{xf6+ g7}}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{xd7 b6}}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{c6 c6}}\) followed by \(\text{\textit{e6, but simply 25.\textit{c5.}}}

25.\(\text{\textit{g2 b7 26.\textit{f6+ g7}}\)

Black is quite right in rejecting the rook ending with an extra pawn, but without any chances of victory: 26...\(\text{\textit{xf6}}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{xb7 b8}}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{xf6 \textit{xb7}}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{d7.}}\)

However, it is pointless worrying about the \(\text{h7-pawn. He should play 26...\textit{f7}}\) followed by \(\text{\textit{e7.}}\)

27.\(\text{\textit{h5+ g8 28.\textit{xd5 exd5}}\)

Black could hold the position after 28...\(\text{\textit{xd5}}, \text{for example, 29.\textit{f1!}}\)
(29.\(\text{\textit{xf6+ f7}}\) 29...\(\text{\textit{f8 30.\textit{f6+ h8}}\)
31.\(\text{\textit{f4}}\) 32.\(\text{\textit{d4 c8}}\). Black's last move surprisingly allows the e5-pawn to gallop forward, and the tide begins to turn in White's favour.

33...\(\text{\textit{d8 34.\textit{f5 d6}}\)

It is to Black's advantage to force the e6-pawn to advance to e7. For this purpose, 34...\(\text{\textit{g6 35.\textit{e5 e8 36.\textit{f4 f7}}\)

\(\text{\textit{f7 deserves attention.}}\)

35.\(\text{\textit{e5}}\)

Having achieved a clear advantage, White now prolongs the struggle. The win of a piece by 35...\(\text{\textit{c7 c6 36.c7}}\) decides the game, for example, 36...\(\text{\textit{g6}}\)
37.\(\text{\textit{c8+ xg6}}\) 38.\(\text{\textit{cxe8 d1+ 39.\textit{g2}}\)
37...\(\text{\textit{xh2 39.e8 w (it is possible to win also by means of the suggestion of Chigorin's contemporary, Klements: 39.\textit{xe6+ w g6 40.\textit{f4+ g7 41.h5+}}\)
39...\(\text{\textit{xex8 40.\textit{e8+ g6 41.\textit{f2 xf2}}\)
32.\(\text{\textit{xd5 c5 33.f1!}}\)

29.e6!

White threatens \(\text{\textit{f1, f7, f6+}}. \text{On 29...\textit{c8 would follow 30.\textit{e1.}}}

29...\(\text{\textit{c6?}}\)

Tarrasch probably had not seen 29.e6, and the move of the bishop to c6 serves as proof of his confusion. He should have brought up his king: 29...\(\text{\textit{xf8}}\)
30.\(\text{\textit{f1+ e7}}\).

30.\(\text{\textit{e1 e8 31.f6+ g7 32.xd5 c5 33.f1!}}\)

White cuts off the enemy king from the e6-pawn.
As a result, White has won a pawn, but the win is still far off since the e7-pawn is an obvious weakness.

42...\texttt{b7}

The bishop must retreat along the a8-h1 diagonal, in order to avert the invasion of the knight on d5, but Tarrasch twice rejects the move ...\texttt{a8}. And it is precisely in this case that the manoeuvre \texttt{f4-e6-d8} loses strength and the e7-pawn is lost.

43.\texttt{e3 c6}

'On 43...\texttt{e8} would follow 44.\texttt{e6} and Black cannot take the pawn' -- Tarrasch.

44.g5 \texttt{e8}

Now, in reply to 44...\texttt{a8}, Black could create threats to the h7-pawn, after 45.\texttt{h5 e8} 46.\texttt{f6}, and obtain a winning position, for example: 46...\texttt{xe7} 47.\texttt{xe7+} \texttt{xe7} 48.\texttt{hxh7 e4} 49.\texttt{f6 b1} 50.\texttt{d5+} and 51.\texttt{c3}.

45.\texttt{e6! c8} 46.\texttt{f8 g7} 47.\texttt{e6 f7} 48.\texttt{e5 g7} 49.\texttt{f4 e8} 50.\texttt{f5}

With the activation of the white king, Black’s chances of salvation vanish. Though the outcome of the struggle is clear, the tail-piece of the game is elegant and not lacking interest.
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50...\texttt{b5} 51.\texttt{d5 f7} 52.\texttt{hxh7 c4} 53.\texttt{f6 c3} 54.\texttt{e5 g7}

On 54...\texttt{c2} would have followed 55.\texttt{g6+ g7} 56.\texttt{xe8+ h6} 57.\texttt{e1 c1} 58.\texttt{xc1 xc1} 59.\texttt{d6} and White wins.

55.\texttt{xe8+ xe8} 56.\texttt{e6 e8} 57.\texttt{d7 c2} 58.\texttt{e1} 1-0

A titanic battle. Black gave a brilliant lesson in building up his game in the opening. In reply White gave a virtuoso display of accurate, active defence; with amazing skill, he abruptly changed the character of the struggle and showed fine technique in the endgame. His victory was fully deserved.
Chapter 15

Hastings 1895

The Hastings international tournament of 1895 opened a new era in the history of chess, an era somehow far closer to us than the previous years, and which also somehow seems legendary.

The tournament was the first meeting of the leading lights with the young chess players, who were destined to be the dominating figures of chess life at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

The organisers of the tournament hoped that the result of it would introduce clarity into an indefinite position created in the chess world by 1895. Lasker had won surprisingly easily against Steinitz (+10 -5 =4, in 1894), without receiving recognition. There was agreement on the fact that Lasker's play was free from blunders, that he defended tenaciously and displayed great care and solidity, but the completely renounced brilliant combinations, rich ideas, sharp and profound plans. It was considered that Lasker not so much won, as Steinitz lost. It was written that Steinitz played more deeply than Lasker, and emphasised that 'in many games, Steinitz at first completely outplayed his young opponent, obtaining winning positions, but then suddenly let things slip, and the game would end in a draw or even sometimes a loss.' Tarrasch wrote: 'Steinitz suffered defeat not because of his play, but because of his age.' He even suggested the proclamation of a chess republic and considered that there was no need to be in a hurry 'to transfer the chess crown from the grey head of Steinitz to Lasker,' since he had not yet won any important international tournament. In addition to this, Lasker had not yet met either Chigorin or Tarrasch and had not proved his superiority over them.
The tournament attained quite exceptional strength. In the whole of chess history, just a few tournaments could compare with it. Only Winawer, who was nearing 60, declined to participate (for a curious reason – the tournament committee would not allow him to play under a pseudonym). Arriving in Hastings were the participants of the World Championship match – Lasker and Steinitz, and also the pretenders to the chess crown – Chigorin and Tarrasch. Chigorin knew Steinitz and Tarrasch well, but it would be his first encounter with Lasker. Of the other participants in the tournament, Chigorin had played before against Blackburne, Burn, Gunsberg, Mason, Bird, Pollock, and, of course, Schiessers, with whom, a few months before the beginning of the Hastings tournament, he had played a training match, winning it with a score of +7 -3 =3. Readers will find one of the games of this match in this book. It is interesting that, in Hastings, Schiessers managed to inflict a painful defeat upon Chigorin.

Chigorin had not once encountered any of the remaining participants. Almost all of them were strong players, dangerous for any opponent.

Teichmann, Schlechter, Janowski were destined to be famous grandmasters, and though, for the present, they were taking their first steps in their chess careers, their play was already striking and strong. Teichmann and Schlechter had a quiet and subtle positional style, combined with a peaceful disposition, while Janowski, a bold and enterprising style with a great deal of risk and excitement.

There was little that could be said about the 22 year old American, Harry Nelson Pillsbury. His successes were modest and his right to take part, far from being without dispute. He had, admittedly, won a tournament of American masters, but, the year after, he came only 5th - 6th in another such tournament. However, Chigorin, who always closely followed the debuts of young chess players, already in 1894 noted that ‘much can be expected of the young Boston chess player... who probably has an outstanding chess future in prospect’ (Chess 1894, No.4, page 50).

Every move of the tournament proved to be like a keen and impetuous obstacle race, with defeats of the favourites and unexpected results. To general amazement, the habitual winner of international tournaments, the self-confident Tarrasch, was not amongst the leaders at any stage of the proceedings. Beginning the tournament with two defeats, Tarrasch explained his bad start by the effects of the sea air, to which he was unaccustomed and which made him drowsy. In the second round, he nodded off to sleep during his game against Teichmann, then, after being woken up by his opponent, fell into a losing position and in the end lost on time.

Steinitz made an excellent start to the tournament – 4¼ out of 5, then lost a series of four games and dropped out of the number of contenders for first prize. In the first four rounds, Lasker suffered two defeats – in the 2nd round against Chigorin and in the 4th round against Von Bardeleben, who, surprisingly, made an excellent start, scoring 7¾ out of 9.

In the first round, Chigorin’s opponent was Pillsbury. There were few who were surprised at the fact that, in this game, Chigorin succeeded in gaining a victory over the little-known debutant. But this win was achieved by excellent play, after a
tenacious resistance by the young American. In the second round, Chigorin won a famous game against Lasker.

In the third round, Chigorin won against Mason, but then, after an early blunder in an opening which he knew very well – the Two Knights Defence – he lost to Schiissers, who played excellently in Hastings and won 6th prize there. In a correspondence between two outstanding composers – N.A.Rimsky-Korsakov and S.K.Lyadov, who, as it happened, were passionate chess enthusiasts, was reflected with joy on the occasion of Chigorin’s brilliant start, and grief at his reverse against Schiissers.

'... Chigorin, for the present, is winning' – wrote Rimsky-Korsakov to Lyadov, on 28 July 1895, 'Chigorin has already lost to his countryman. This is a terrible misfortune for him', replied Lyadov on 1 August.

After his loss to Schiissers, Chigorin gained a series of five victories – over Tarrasch, Stechmann, Burn, Blackburne and Gunsberg – and, with 8 points out of 9, was ahead of everyone. It should be mentioned that after his reverses in the Queen’s Pawn Opening in his matches with Steinitz, Gunsberg and Tarrasch, Chigorin had at last taken the necessary measures and was now prepared for 1.d4. In Hastings, as Black against this opening, he scored four points out of four, with the help of his system involving the move ...Ng4 (in games against Lasker and Von Bardeleben) and ...c7-e6, ...c7-c6, ...d6 and ...e6xd7 (against Burn). Also Tarrasch, likewise beginning his game against Chigorin with a move of the queen’s pawn, achieved nothing in the opening and quickly fell into the worse position.

Chigorin fought stubbornly for the lead with Lasker, who, after a mediocre start, won game after game, and, with the young Pillsbury, displayed splendid form and overcame the first-class masters, one after the other. After losing, in the 10th round, a famous game against Steinitz – one of the most beautiful games of chess history, Von Bardeleben was unsettled, demoralised, and dropped out of the struggle for first prize. In the 17th round, he did not even turn up for play, and his opponent, Pillsbury, received a gift point.

After the 19th round, Chigorin had emerged in first place with 15 points. But in the next round, against Janowski, he played undoubtedly the worst game of his career, losing it, as White, in sixteen moves, seven of which he gave question marks, when he published the game in New Times. 'Chigorin played this game like a chess player to whom you can give rook odds', wrote a German chess magazine. This loss to Janowski cost Chigorin first prize; such a tragic outcome to an important competition can only be equalled by the 23rd game of his second match with Steinitz. Again, unsteadiness of sporting form let down the Russian champion. In the tournament in which he played superbly, like never before, nor since, he also played his worst game...

In the last round, Chigorin won a stubborn 78-move game against Schlechter, but Pillsbury also won his game, with the result that he took first place with 16½ points; Chigorin had 16, Lasker 15½.

And so ended the famous Hastings tournament, which, if not bringing Chigorin 1st prize, still evoked admiration for his splendid play from all his contemporaries.
Tarrasch, who was not inclined to overestimate somebody else's achievements, admitted: 'In my opinion, the famous Russian master, Chigorin, played strongest of all in this tournament.' He also wrote: 'There was nobody who was favoured with so little luck as Chigorin, but also nobody who needed so little luck in the tournament as Chigorin.'

Chess Journal likewise wrote: 'Chigorin, as witnessed by all the participants of the tournament, and also by the chess players who have seen and read about his games, played best of all in this tournament... In our view, he, more than anybody, deserved first prize for his masterly play.'

Actually, Hastings was the high point of the development of Chigorin's talent. His play there was distinguished by exceptional versatility and power. He defeated Pillsbury, Tarrasch, Gunsberg with beautiful attacks, whilst, at the same time, he set brilliant examples of positional play in his games against Lasker, Teichmann, Blackburne, Von Bardeleben, defence - against Pollock, and virtuoso endgame technique against Schlechter.

The winner of the tournament, Pillsbury, displayed enterprise, initiative and energy in his play. He enriched the Queen's Gambit, which, in the 1880s and 1890s had been treated sluggishly, with new methods that enabled sharp attacks to be launched in this opening on the king's flank. 'The 23 year old Pillsbury's victory', wrote S.Tartakower, 'was due not only to his genius, but also, to a considerable extent, to his creation of an era of 'invention': the famous attacking manoeuvre, named after him,  \( \text{cxe5, f4, } \text{wxf3, with a subsequent } \text{wh3, } \text{h3 etc., with which he, with unerring confidence, reduced his opponents to mate.' Tarrasch added: 'In every Queen's Gambit, Pillsbury placed his king's knight on } \text{e5, and there, having a pawn to the right and left, it stood in splendour, as a symbol of future victory.'}

Pillsbury was a great master of the breakthrough, opening the game and usually accompanying it with a brilliant sacrifice of a pawn or piece. Chigorin was immediately drawn to Pillsbury's play. 'He rated Pillsbury very highly (despite the fact that Pillsbury played almost exclusively the Queen's Gambit)', recalled one author in his memoirs. 'The ingenious combinations of Pillsbury', wrote Chigorin, 'even if based on sacrifices which are not quite correct, nor leading to their target, indicate a great chess talent. There is general sympathy with Pillsbury's play; in every game, he goes in for lively and interesting combinations and this cannot but please all of us. There is the feeling that in the young American's play, Chigorin sensed something close to his own. Chigorin could not but be drawn to the American's attitude to chess, which was very similar to his, and alien to the mercenary spirit, so prevalent in the native land of the winner of the Hastings tournament.'

'Chess is more than just a game', said Pillsbury at the banquet in honour of his victory in Hastings, 'it is a measure of strength of intellect, which goes beyond the limits of a simple pastime.'

Chigorin's subsequent encounters with Pillsbury (there were 21 in all) were sharp struggles, with an overall score of 8 wins to Chigorin, 7 to Pillsbury and 6 drawn.
25 Sicilian Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Emanuel Schillers
5th Match, St.Petersburg 1895 (10)
1.e4 c5 2.d3 c3 c6 3.d3 e6 4.e2
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{By a transposition of moves is reached one of the basic positions of the Chigorin system \(2.\text{d}e2\) in the French Defence, which at the time gave broad scope for creativity. Black can choose play according to his taste – either a pawn offensive on the queen’s flank with \(...b5-b4\), or maintaining the tension in the centre with \(8...c8\), or, what is very logical, to seize space in the centre.}
\end{array}\]
8...d4 9.d1 e5

With colours reversed, a well analysed (today!) position of the King’s Indian Defence is reached: 1.d4 d6 2.c4 g6 3.d3 c3 d.g7 4.e4 d6 5.d3 c6 0-0 6.d.e2 e5 7.0-0 d.c6 8.d5 d.e7 9.d.d2 d.e8 10.d.c1 f5 11.wb3 b6. Even if here, after 12.exf5 gxf5, the good continuation 13.e5! d.f6 14.f4 had occurred to Taimanov, with the help of which he seizes the initiative, then Chigorin’s deployment of pieces \(\text{d}e2, \text{d}d1\) (instead of \(...\text{d}d8, \text{d}c7\), as Fischer’s) is more favourable, since it practically eliminates the unpleasant invasion of the knight on c3. All the same, Schillers ought to have played 14...dxf4 and, on 15.gxf4, continued 15...d.e8! 16.d.f3 f5!, retaining equal chances.

14...d.h8 15.f5 w.d8

The advance of the f2-pawn to f5 is White’s first achievement, since it facilitates the advance of another
pawn – the one on g3. Black hurriedly organises a defence.

16.g4 \( \text{g}8 \) 17.\( \text{gf}3 \)

The exchange of the dark-squared bishops on the g5-square must be prevented. Now 18.h4 \( \text{xh}4 \) 19.g5! is threatened.

17...g5

Also this method of defence is worthy of study and is considered quite reliable, the more so since 17...f6 seems too passive: 17...f6 18.h4 b5 19.\( \text{gb}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 21.\( \text{h}3 \) c4 22.g5!

18.\( \text{e}2 \) f6 19.h4 h6 20.\( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \)

Black has managed to bring to a halt the attack of the white h- and g-pawns, by constructing in its way a strong pawn rampart, in which the g5-pawn is fortified by the f6- and h6-pawns, which in their turn are firmly defended by the knight on g8. Now Black could reorganise his forces – ...\( \text{f}8-f7 \), ...\( \text{g}7-f8 \), ...\( \text{f}7-g7 \), ...\( \text{d}7-e8-f7 \), and only then carry out the break ...b7-b5 and ...c5-c4.

21...b5 22.\( \text{g}3 \) a5

Up to here, one can perhaps argue about the quality of Black’s individual moves, but now it was already necessary for him to play 22...c4, in order, after 23.\( \text{d}2 \), to drive the bishop back to c1 with the move 23...c3. In this case, White would not be able to bring the rook on a1 over to the attack, and its effectiveness is sharply reduced.

23.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 24.\( \text{h}2 \)

24...\( \text{f}7 ? \)

Black misses the last opportunity moment for evacuating his king from the danger zone (24...\( \text{f}7 \) followed by ...\( \text{f}8 \), ...\( \text{g}7 \) and ...\( \text{f}7 \)) and instead of this locks it up in a cage with his own pieces. White’s task becomes extremely clear – a sacrifice of a piece on g5.

25.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{b}4 \)

Alas, freeing the way for the king here by 25...\( \text{e}8 \) is probably too late, since after 26.hxg5 fxg5 27.\( \text{xg}5 \) \( \text{xg}5 \) 28.\( \text{xg}5 \) hxg5 29.\( \text{d}2 \), White has a most dangerous attack for the piece.

26.\( \text{h}3 \)

46 But here Black has 28...\( \text{wx}g5 \) instead and if 29.\( \text{h}3 \), then 29...\( \text{e}3+ \) swaps queens, reduces the strength of the attack and should win.
Korchnoi plays inaccurately. After 26.hxg5 hxg5 27.h3, he could have placed his opponent in a hopeless situation, for example 27...\textit{Q}xa2 28.hxg5 \textit{Q}xg5 29.Qxg5 h4 30.Qh7+ Qf6 31.Qxg5+! Qxg5 32.Qh6+! Qxh6 33.Qd2+ Qf6 = 34.Qh6+ Qe7 35.Qe6 mate.

26...gxh4+

The only chance of holding back the onslaught of the white pieces. Both of White's knights now stand in the way of his rooks, and while he is clearing the way, Black can create counterplay.

27.Qxh4 c4?

Black at once misses his lucky chance. Only after 27...Qxc2 followed by ...Qe3 would he manage to take White's dark-squared bishop out of play and retain hopes of holding the position. In the variation 28.Qxh6+ Qxh6 29.Qxc2 Qh8 30.Qf3 c4! Black not only holds the defence but also preserves his prospects on the queen's flank.

28.Qf2

28...c3

Now one can try to understand Black's previous move. It seems he underestimated the sacrifice of the bishop and reckoned on refuting the attack with the quite comfortable 29.Qc1 Qxa2 and ...Qxc1. Likewise it is clear that Black will be given not two moves (the retreat of the knights on h4 and h3) to reinforce his position, but only one, since on 28...Qxc2 would follow 29.Qxh6+ Qxh6 30.Qg6 cxd3 31.Qxd6, and White's attack becomes decisive, for example: 31...Qg8 32.Qxd3 Qe3 33.Qxe5! Qf7 (33...fxe5 34.Qg6+ Qf7 35.Qxe5+ Qe8 36.Qxb5+) 34.Qg6+ Qf8 35.Qxg8+ Qxg8 36.Qh8+! Qxh8 37.Qxf7+ and 38.Qxd8. The same manoeuvre is also decisive in the event of 28...cxd3 29.Qxd3 Qc2 30.Qd1 Qxa2 31.Qxh6+ Qh6 32.Qg6! Qxg6 33.Qh6 Qc8 34.Qg6+ Qf7 35.g5 (35.Qh7+? Qe8 36.Qg7 Qd6 gives Black good counter-chances) 35...Qc2 (White threatened 36.Qh5) 36.Qxc2 Qxc2 37.Qh7+ Qe8 38.Qg7 Qd6 39.Qa7 etc.

29.Qxh6+! Qxh6 30.Qg6

White risks little by the sacrifice of the bishop. Black has no counterplay and must for the present just defend. However, his defence is not simple, since he can prevent the invasion of the white rooks on the h-file only by giving back the material with interest. Thus, after 30...Qxg6 (30...Qg8 31.Qh7#) would follow the forcing mating attack 31.Qxh6 Qg8 (31...Qf7 32.Qh7+) 32.Qxg6+ Qf8 33.g5 fxg5 34.Qh5 Qf6 35.Qh6+ etc. Therefore he decides to give up the queen.

30.Qh8 31.Qxh8 Qxh8 32.Qb5 fxg5 33.Qxh6

At first sight, even stronger was 33.Qg4; however, the surprising queen sacrifice
33...\text{\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{g}4! (33...\textit{\texttt{c}}6? 34.f6+) 34.\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{h}8 \textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{h}8 35.\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{h}8 \textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{h}8 36.\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{g}4 \textit{\texttt{f}}6! allows Black to put up resistance. 33...\textit{\texttt{w}}\textsubscript{h}6 34.\textit{\texttt{w}}\textsubscript{h}6 \textit{\texttt{w}}\textsubscript{h}6}

Thus White has won the queen, but the pawn chain’s mobility is frozen, and if Black manages to place his bishop on f6, he would save the game. Chigorin sacrifices the f5-pawn, in order to revitalise the bishop and break through with his queen via the f5-square into Black’s position. However, it would be better to do this at once, not fearing the threat to the c2-pawn. Chigorin decides to parry the threat to the c2-pawn and drive back the knight, but from the c6-square, the knight defends the e5-pawn.

35.a3 \textit{\texttt{c}}6 36.f6 \textit{\texttt{x}}f6 37.\textit{\texttt{g}}4+ \textit{\texttt{g}}7 38.\textit{\texttt{x}}f6 \textit{\texttt{x}}f6 39.\textit{\texttt{h}}3 \textit{\texttt{c}}7 40.\textit{\texttt{f}}3+ \textit{\texttt{e}}7 41.\textit{\texttt{f}}5

Though the white queen is very active, the win is still far off, since, besides the doomed g5-pawn, Black has no weaknesses. If Black now plays 41...b4, then, after 42.a4! \textit{\texttt{d}}6 43.\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{g}5 \textit{\texttt{c}}5 followed by ...\textit{\texttt{b}}6, his position would become a real fortress. White has to reckon with the threat to sacrifice the bishop on b3, and, after an exchange of bishops, Black, by placing the rook on d8, to not allow the white king further than the e6-square, will also achieve a draw. Schiffer makes a last mistake, as a result of which the queen obtains a new object for attack, and White finally manages to crush the opponent’s resistance.

41...\textit{\texttt{d}}6? 42.b4

If 42.\textit{\texttt{x}}\textsubscript{g}5, then 42...b4! with chances of a successful defence.

42...\textit{\texttt{a}}xb4 43.\textit{\texttt{a}}xb4 \textit{\texttt{e}}7

The pawn cannot be taken, since after 43...\textit{\texttt{c}}xb4 44.\textit{\texttt{f}}6+! \textit{\texttt{c}}5 45.\textit{\texttt{w}}xe5+, he would lose the whole of his pawn chain.

44.\textit{\texttt{w}}c8 \textit{\texttt{b}}3

Though Black has let the queen into his position, he still retains the capacity to defend the game. He should not allow the queen to a6: 44...\textit{\texttt{a}}7 45.\textit{\texttt{f}}8+ \textit{\texttt{e}}7 46.\textit{\texttt{w}}a8 \textit{\texttt{a}}7 etc. By keeping in force the threat of ...\textit{\texttt{b}}3, he could put up a more stubborn resistance.

45.\textit{\texttt{w}}a6

Of course not 45.cxb3 c2 and Black wins at once.

45...g4 46.\textit{\texttt{x}}g4 \textit{\texttt{g}}7
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more complicated task would be set
White by the logical continuation
of the bishop manœuvre – 46...\(\underline{\text{a}}\)4,
which Black keeps the \(b5\)-pawn
intended and also waits for a suitable
moment to capture the \(c2\)-pawn.
However, White would have a win even
then after 47.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)b6! \(\underline{\text{e}}\)8, he
transfers the king to \(f6\) and the bishop via \(e6\) to
\(g5\) (after \(\underline{\text{w}}\)c5+). But Schiffer's allows a
tactical blow and Black perishes at once.
47.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)xb5! \(\underline{\text{e}}\)6 48.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)c5+ \(\underline{\text{c}}\)7
Quite bad is 48...\(\underline{\text{d}}\)d7 49.\(\underline{\text{d}}\)d5+.
49.b5 \(\underline{\text{w}}\)xg4+ 50.\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f2 \(\underline{\text{f}}\)f4+ 51.\(\underline{\text{e}}\)e1
\(\underline{\text{h}}\)h3 52.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)xc6+ \(\underline{\text{d}}\)d8 53.\(\underline{\text{b}}\)b6
1-0
An interesting game, characterised by the
difficulty in conducting both attack and
defence in Chigorin’s favourite set-up.

26 King's Gambit Declined
Mikhail Chigorin
Harry Nelson Pillsbury
Hastings 1895 (1)

1.e4 e5 2.f4 \(\underline{\text{c}}\)c5 3.\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f3 d6 4.\(\underline{\text{c}}\)c4
\(\underline{\text{c}}\)c6 5.\(\underline{\text{c}}\)c6 \(\underline{\text{f}}\)f6 6.d3 \(\underline{\text{g}}\)g4 7.h3
\(\underline{\text{xf}}\)f3 8.\(\underline{\text{xf}}\)f3 \(\underline{\text{d}}\)d4 9.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)g3

Chigorin enters a principal argument,
since Pillsbury considered the sacrifice
of the rook on \(a1\) not quite correct.
This combination was well-known
to the players from a game between
Blackburne and Anderssen in 1873.
9...\(\underline{\text{x}}\)xc2+

Contemporary theory maintains that
Black can only retain equal chances
by the exchange 9...\(\underline{\text{x}}\)f4, for example,
10.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)xg7 \(\underline{\text{f}}\)f8 11.\(\underline{\text{d}}\)d1 \(\underline{\text{w}}\)e7 12.\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f1 \(\underline{\text{g}}\)g8
(12...0-0-0? 13.\(\underline{\text{x}}\)f4 \(\underline{\text{h}}\)h5 14.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)g4+)
13.\(\underline{\text{h}}\)h6 \(\underline{\text{x}}\)xg2 14.\(\underline{\text{x}}\)xg4.
10.\(\underline{\text{d}}\)d1 \(\underline{\text{x}}\)x1 11.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)xg7 \(\underline{\text{d}}\)d7
It was precisely with this move that
Pillsbury reckoned to refute Chigorin's
attack, by moving his king over to
the queen's flank. The natural way,
defending the f7-square by 11...\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f8,
does not succeed, since after 12.\(\text{fxe}5\)
\(\text{dxe}5\) 13.\(\underline{\text{g}}\)g5 \(\underline{\text{e}}\)e7 14.\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f1 \(\underline{\text{h}}\)h5
15.\(\underline{\text{xf}}\)f7+ \(\underline{\text{d}}\)d7 16.\(\underline{\text{w}}\)xe5, Black cannot
hold out for long.
12.\(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 13.\(\underline{\text{f}}\)f1 \(\underline{\text{e}}\)e7

Harry Nelson Pillsbury
It is difficult to understand why Chigorin did not play 14...e5. The threat of 15...xf6 could be parried in two ways – 14...g8 and 14...h5. However, 14...g8 is refuted easily: 15...xf7 exf5 16...e6+ e8 17...xf6 g7 18...xe5 c6 19...f3! and the g7 cannot move away because of 20...f8+!.

Chigorin considered that Black could defend by 14...h5 15...xf7 e8 16...xe7 xe7 17...xh5 af8, but after 18...f5! Black’s position remains difficult. However, after 14...g5 h5 15...xf7 e8, Black’s defence could be demolished more simply by 16...f5+ d8 17...xe5, threatening 18...xe7+; also 17...f8 cannot be played because of 18...xe7+! White has a strong attack also after 16...e6+ d8 17...b5! c6 18...d6+ c8 19...xe7 cxb5 20...xe5.

Probably Chigorin wanted to prove that White’s attack is strong even if Pillsbury does carry out the intended flight of the king to the queen’s flank.

14...c8 15...g5 f8 16...e6+ b8

17...h6

Though, as before, White has the initiative, his attack has subsided and the struggle drags on. Now he is forced to move away the bishop, since on 17...xe5 would follow 17...g8 or even 17...g4."

17...e8 18...xe5 d7

Another defensive possibility was 18...g8, but Black wants to bring the knight over to b6, in order to weaken the defence of the d3-pawn.

19...h5 b6 20...d5 a6

Only a little better was the other defence: 20...xd5 21...xd5...xd5 22...xd5 a5, since Black does not succeed in bringing out the rook via a6 – 23...d4 a4 24...e5! c5 25...e6 d6 26...xd6 cxd6 27...e7 a7 28...f7, and his position (despite the extra rook in the ending!) remains difficult.

21...d2...xd5 22...xd5 g8 23...g4

Since the loss of the black knight is inevitable, material equilibrium can be considered as re-established. However, the initiative and positional advantage lie clearly on White’s side. His pieces occupy dominating positions, while, for the present, Black’s heavy pieces, especially the rook on a8, do not take part in the game.

Black must now decide where to look for counter-chances – in the endgame or in complications. Let us examine the

47 This latter move enables White to play 18...xf8 xf8 19...xe7 e3+ 20...d2 with advantage.
first way: 23...\textit{g}5+ 24.\textit{x}g5 \textit{x}g5+ 25 \textit{x}g5 \textit{h}xg5 26.\textit{h}xa1, or 23...c6 24.\textit{e}e7 (24.\textit{c}c3 \textit{g}5+ 25.\textit{x}g5 \textit{h}xg5 26.\textit{w}xh7? \textit{w}b6!) 24...\textit{xe}7 25.\textit{f}4+ \textit{c}8 26.\textit{w}f5+ \textit{d}7 27.\textit{w}xal \textit{xf}5 28.\textit{ex}f5 \textit{d}7 29.\textit{e}1 \textit{e}8 30.\textit{e}4+ in this ending White has great chances of success, thanks to his passed pawns. Also, in the event of 23...\textit{c}5 24.\textit{xa}1 \textit{c}6 25.\textit{f}4+ \textit{a}7 26.\textit{c}7 \textit{d}4 27.\textit{w}xc5+ \textit{xc}5 28.\textit{a}e3 \textit{w}e3+ 29.\textit{w}xe3 \textit{h}f8, Chigorin assessed the ending after 30.\textit{e}6 \textit{a}6 31.\textit{d}4 \textit{e}5 32.\textit{e}1 \textit{a}5, followed by \textit{a}f5, as winning for White. In the last variation, Black, admittedly, could maintain a sharp struggle by playing 26...\textit{h}b4+ (instead of 26...\textit{w}d4), and only after 27.\textit{w}e2 move away the rook – 27...\textit{c}8. However, both 28.a3 and also 28.\textit{w}e5 would leave White with the advantage. Pillsbury chooses perhaps the relatively best continuation, increasing the activity of his queen and rook.

23...\textit{b}4+ 24.\textit{xb}4 \textit{w}d4!

25.\textit{c}2!

It seems that Black’s idea would be most simply refuted by the effective 25.\textit{f}8!, for example: 25...\textit{wb}2+ 26.\textit{e}3 \textit{c}2+ 27.\textit{xc}2 \textit{xc}2 28.\textit{w}xh7 \textit{xa}2 29.\textit{g}5 30.\textit{xc}7 \textit{b}5 31.\textit{d}6! \textit{a}7 32.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}8 33.\textit{w}d7, however after 25...\textit{xf}8! 26.\textit{xf}8+ \textit{a}7 27.\textit{xa}8+ \textit{xa}8 28.\textit{we}8+ \textit{a}7 29.\textit{we}7 \textit{xb}2+ there is a long struggle in prospect.

Leading surprisingly to a difficult position for White is 25.\textit{xa}1 \textit{xb}4+ 26.\textit{xc}2 \textit{g}6! 27.\textit{f}1 \textit{c}6+ 28.\textit{b}1 \textit{d}4! or 27.\textit{d}1 \textit{a}4+ 28.\textit{c}1 \textit{c}6+ or 27.\textit{d}2 \textit{a}4+ 28.\textit{b}3 \textit{c}6+.

By rejecting the win of the doomed knight, Chigorin endeavours to maintain the activity of his pieces.

25...\textit{xc}2 26.\textit{xc}2 \textit{g}6

Risky but quite possible was the continuation 26...\textit{a}7 27.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5! since, after 28.\textit{xe}3 \textit{w}a4+ 29.\textit{c}1 \textit{ac}8, all of Black’s pieces enter the game.

27.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}6 28.\textit{f}3 \textit{w}a4+ 29.\textit{c}1 \textit{xa}2 30.\textit{c}3

Black has managed to win back one pawn and obtain some counter-chances; however, his position is more difficult since Chigorin has built a strong defence around his king and his pieces occupy quite active positions.

Black’s only real chances of saving the game depend on whether he can quickly bring into play the ill-fated rook on a8. Now White is threatening to win by 31.\textit{f}8+ \textit{a}7 32.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}6 33.\textit{d}4! and so there is no time to defend the h7-pawn. He must choose between 30...\textit{a}7 and 30...b5. Though 30...\textit{a}7 could be played – 31.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}6 32.\textit{d}4 \textit{d}8! 33.\textit{w}c3 \textit{a}1+ 34.\textit{d}2
\textbf{xd4!} – White would nevertheless face his most difficult task after 30...b5, enabling the black king to move to b7 and forcing White to watch out for the further advance of the b-pawn. Chigorin considered that, in reply to 30...b5, White could calmly take the h7-pawn – 31.\textbf{xf8+} \textbf{xb7} 32.\textbf{xa8} \textbf{xa8} 33.\textbf{wh7}, but this is not so. On the 32\textsuperscript{nd} move, Black, with the intermediate move 32...\textbf{xd3!}, would guarantee himself at least a draw; and, indeed, if we continue with Chigorin’s variation – 33...b4! or 33...\textbf{xd3}, then it becomes clear that White must fight for the draw. It seems that, after 30...b5, White would have to go in for a very sharp endgame: 31.e5! \textbf{xc6} 32.\textbf{xf6} \textbf{xc3+!} (32...\textbf{b7} 33.\textbf{xc6} \textbf{xc6} 34.\textbf{wh7} b4 35.\textbf{e4}+ and wins) 33.bxc3 \textbf{a1+} 34.\textbf{d2} \textbf{b2+} 35.\textbf{e3} \textbf{xc3} followed by ...\textbf{b7}, in which he would retain the somewhat better chances. Pillsbury was in time-trouble, and his last move before the control is understandable: not having time to calculate the variations, he takes away the c5-square from the white queen.

30...\textbf{xc6} 31.\textbf{wh7} b5 32.\textbf{we7}

With the fall of the h7-pawn, the sacrifice ...\textbf{xc3+} is not dangerous for White, but there is no other counterplay for Black. The move 32...a5 offered some chances of salvation, but Pillsbury makes a decisive mistake.

32...\textbf{wb5} 33.\textbf{d2} a5 34.\textbf{f5!} Pillsbury admitted afterwards that, in playing 33...a5, he had overlooked this reply. Now 34...a4 35.\textbf{b5+} \textbf{a7} is refuted by the reply 36.\textbf{d4+} \textbf{a6} 37.\textbf{c5}. Black cannot strengthen his position further, and his initiative abruptly subsides.\footnote{Stronger still, instead of 36.\textbf{d4+}, is the pretty 36.\textbf{xc7} 37.\textbf{d4+} \textbf{a6} 38.\textbf{b6+} \textbf{a7} 39.\textbf{xb4+} \textbf{a6} 40.\textbf{xb3} with four pawns for the exchange and an easily won endgame.}

34...\textbf{b7} 35.\textbf{c5} \textbf{a6} 36.g5 \textbf{xc5} 37.\textbf{xc5} \textbf{e6} 38.\textbf{wd5!}

The outcome of the game becomes clear. Black cannot prevent the advance of the g-pawn.

38...\textbf{a4} 39.g6 b4 40.g7 \textbf{bxc3+} 41.\textbf{bxc3} \textbf{a3} 42.g8\textbf{w}

The well-known master and chess journalist, G.Marco, in one of his reports on the tournament, relates an amusing incident: 'Chigorin, in promoting his pawn, instead of a queen placed an upside-down rook, and then proceeded to a neighbouring room in order to obtain a white queen. En route he ran into Lasker, who, quickly meeting him half-way and taking into account that White had yet another two irresistible
passed pawns on the board, handed him three queens with the words 'I trust, Mr. Chigorin, that these will be enough for you!'  
42...\textit{Wxc3}+ 43.\textit{Ge2} \textit{Wc2}+ 44.\textit{Wh3} \textit{Wd1}+ 45.\textit{Gg3} \textit{Wg1}+ 46.\textit{Oh4} \textit{Wt2}+ 47.\textit{Oh5} \textit{Wf3}+ 48.\textit{Wg4} \textit{Wf6} 49.\textit{Wgf5} \textit{Wh6}+ 50.\textit{Gg4} \textit{Wg7}+ 51.\textit{Wg5} 1-0

A very interesting game. After 'misfiring' the first phase of the attack, Chigorin continually forced his opponent to solve the most difficult problems.

27 Queen's Gambit: Chigorin Defence
Mikhail Chigorin

\textbf{Emanuel Lasker}
Hastings 1895 (2)

1.d4 d5 2.e3 Gg4 3.c4 \textit{Wxf3} 4.\textit{Gxf3} Cc6 5.c3 e6 6.e3 \textit{Wb4} 7.cxd5 \textit{Wxd5} 8.\textit{Cd2}

The game arrives at one of the principal positions. Black gives his opponent both the advantage of the two bishops and a superiority of pawns in the centre, but in return he obtains counterplay, particularly against the blockaded centre.

8...\textit{Wxc3}

It is possible to wait for this exchange, by playing 8...\textit{Wd7} or 8...\textit{Wh5}, and exchanging only in reply to a2-a3.

But it must be taken into account that this was the first meeting of the best representatives of two opposing schools of creative thought. That is why, without delay, Chigorin exchanges his bishop for Lasker's knight; one can assume that he did this consciously, endeavouring to very quickly obtain a position which could serve as a basis for a principal creative argument. The new school, the basic principles of which were proclaimed by Steinitz, considered the advantage of the two bishops, the pawn centre and the possession of open lines, very important factors in the evaluation of a position. And all these, already on the 9th(!) move, Chigorin has voluntarily given Lasker...

9.bxc3 Gg7 10.\textit{Gg1}

Lasker hurries to occupy the open file, though the threat to the g7-pawn is illusory. Deserving attention is the strengthening of the position in the centre: 10.c4, and after 10...\textit{Wd7} (or 10...\textit{Wh5}) - 11.f4. Later the bishops will move to c3 and g2 and obtain good prospects.

10...\textit{Wh5}

Black wants to immediately emphasise the weakness of the h2-pawn, but allows a strong retort by his opponent. Castling is stronger, and only then the transfer of the queen to h5 (with the aim of
playing \ldots e6-e5), for example: 10...0-0
11.c4 (on 11.\textit{\textbf{W}}b3, quite possible is
11...\textit{\textbf{W}}xf3 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g2 \textit{\textbf{W}}h5 13.\textit{\textbf{W}}xb7 \textit{\textbf{W}}xh2
14.0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{R}}ab8!) 11...\textit{\textbf{W}}h5 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g6
13.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g3 e5 14.d5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}ce7.
11.\textit{\textbf{W}}b3!
A strong move, after which 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xg7
\textit{\textbf{Q}}g6 13.\textit{\textbf{W}}xb7 is threatened. There are
three possible ways to defend against
this threat: 11...\textit{\textbf{Q}}b8, 11...\textit{\textbf{Q}}d8, and
11...0-0, but probably only the last,
the most natural move, gives Black a
fully acceptable defence. After 11...0-0
12.\textit{\textbf{W}}xb7 \textit{\textbf{W}}xh2 13.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}fc8, followed by \ldots\textit{\textbf{Q}}a8-b8-b6 and \ldots\textit{\textbf{Q}}f5, the position
rather favours Black; but even on the
stronger continuation, 12.\textit{\textbf{Q}}g3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d8
13.e4! \textit{\textbf{Q}}g6 14.\textit{\textbf{Q}}h3 \textit{\textbf{W}}a5 15.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d3 e5!,
there arises a position which, though
better for White, all the same gives
Black definite counterplay.
11...\textit{\textbf{Q}}d8
Now White succeeds in exchanging
queens, after which the threats to the
h2- and f3-pawns come to an end and
he is left with a positional advantage.
12.\textit{\textbf{W}}b5+ \textit{\textbf{W}}xb5 13.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xb5+ c6
14.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d3

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram1.png}
\end{center}

White has excellent prospects in the
forthcoming struggle. There is no
possibility of taking on his pawn centre
as then the bishops would become
very menacing. Black's pieces, for the
present, are passively placed, while his
 cramped position prevents him from
quickly putting right their coordination.
However, the absence of weaknesses
gives Black a position quite capable of
being defended. If he succeeds in giving
the game a closed character, by limiting
the mobility of the white centre with
pawns on f5 and c5 (and even better,
...c5-c4), then White's advantage will
disappear.

Later, Chigorin played the black pieces
very skilfully in similar positions. The
present game was his first attempt to
work out a method of restricting the
mobility of the opponent's bishops.
14...\textit{\textbf{Q}}g6 15.f4 0-0 16.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram2.png}
\end{center}

16...\textit{\textbf{Q}}c8?
An inaccuracy in the execution of a
correct strategical plan, which might
have had serious consequences for
Black. With the move 16.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2, White
has not only established communication
between the rooks, but also anticipates
the thrust \ldots\textit{\textbf{Q}}h4. Therefore Black is
obliged to play 16...f5, preventing
the opening of the position, and only
then carry out the advance \ldots c5-c4.
Admittedly, in this case, after 17.a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c8
18.\textit{\textbf{Q}}cl \textit{\textbf{Q}}f7 19.\textit{\textbf{Q}}a3, White would have
a significant positional advantage, but
now it could be even greater if he were
to play 17.f5. After 17...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xf5 18.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xf5
c7 19.e4, Black’s position suddenly deteriorates.
It is hard to believe that Lasker did not see the move 17.f5. Apparently he decided not to give the black knight on e8 an outlet on e6 and overestimated the strength of White’s threats on the g-file. Only with this is it possible to explain his rejection of the move f4-f5 (for two moves running).

17.c3 e5 18.b4 c5 19.b2 f5!
20.c1 f7!

What a sudden change in the character of the position over the last four moves! Black has succeeded in blockading the centre, while his last move eliminates threats to the g7-square.
The activity of both the bishops is sharply, and for a long time, reduced, while the knights will obtain splendid outposts in the centre. The outcome of the struggle now largely depends on whether White is able to transfer his rooks quickly to the b-file and loosen the queen’s flank.

21.a3 c6 22.c5 d6!
Any movement of the a7- and b7-pawns would create an extra object of attack for the white pieces. In his turn, Black favourably provokes the move a2-a4, since this will limit the sphere of activity of the c2.

23.a4

Black has continued to consistently improve the position of his pieces, and it only remains for him to free his rook on a5 from imprisonment, after which the success of his strategy would become obvious. Over the next few moves, Chigorin proceeds to further strengthen his position.

Romanovsky noted: ‘Now there springs up the threat of ...xf4 followed by ...xc5. The point of Black’s move clearly lies not in this threat, but simply in the transfer of the rook to a better position.’

28.b6 b6 29.a3 g6 30.b5 d6
31.c1 d8 32.b4 e7 33.a5 d6
This complicated knight manoeuvre has only one aim — to provoke the move f2-f3. But in his apparently quite pointless regrouping, White has been preparing this very same move! The fact of the matter is that he only needs to play ³a3 and ³e2 and he will be ready for the break e3-e4. Lasker carries out this preparation not quite accurately (it is necessary to include the move h2-h4), and if Chigorin were now to play not ³d6, but ³g5, then White would be faced with an unpleasant choice: to give up the f4-pawn or allow the invasion of the knight on e4, after ³fxg5 ³xg5.

34.³f7 35.³a3! g5

On the 33rd move, the fortuitous possibility 33...³g5 would have given Black real chances of success. But now the attempt by Chigorin to put right his negligence provokes keen activity by the white pieces. Chigorin continues to look for an active plan, though it was probably wiser to return with the knight to d6, and, by placing the rook on f7, to construct a fortress.

36.³e2!

Precisely this. The c3-pawn is now defended by the rook, while the king, in leaving d2, opens the way for the bishop on c1. The threat is 37.fxg5 ³xg5 38.e4 and Black’s reply is forced.

36...³xf4 37.e4!
The f3-pawn now proves useful. Black loses his strong point in the centre.

37...³f6 38.³xf4!
Romanovsky pointed out that if 38.exf5, then 38...³xf5 39.³xf5 ³e7+ 40.³f2 ³d6 followed by ...³d5 gives Black an excellent position.

38...³h5

Once again the position changes out of all recognition. White has formed an ideal centre, the black knights have been driven away from the centre, and the bishops are just about to show their strength. It seems that it is necessary for White to retreat his bishop to d2, for example: 39.³d2 fxe4 40.fxe4 e5 41.³g1+ ³f8 42.³a1! exd4 43.cxd4 ³xd4? 44.³b4+ ³e8 45.³e3! or 39...e5 40.exf5 exd4 41.cxd4, in both cases developing an attack. Lasker again displays excessive caution.

39.³e3? f4!

Chigorin at once gets to work to again set up a blockade of the position.

40.³f2 ³a5

Again the rook vainly crawls out to a5 (we recall the 27th move). Black might have at once erected a second rampart in his blockade — 40...e5 41.³g1+ ³f8, since the obvious 42.dxe5 ³xe5 43.³g5 is refuted by the simple 43...³d2+.

41.³g1+ ³f8
The exchange of rooks, by 41...\texttt{g5}, would be to White's advantage after 42.\texttt{xg5+ \texttt{xg5} 43.a5.

\textbf{42.\texttt{a1?!}}

The immense effort expended in the principal battle gives rise to a mistake. In this game, Lasker either generally underestimated the significance of the blockade, or continued to consider his position as won, otherwise he would have played 42.e5 and, on 42...b5, replied 43.\texttt{a1}, after which White's advantage could become overwhelming.

\textbf{42...e5!}

Chigorin does not let slip the moment to close the game again.

\textbf{43.\texttt{ab1 \texttt{g7} 44.\texttt{b4 \texttt{c7} 45.\texttt{b1 \texttt{e6} 46.\texttt{d1}}}}}

White wrongly refrains from the opening of the b-file by means of 46.\texttt{a2} b5 47.\texttt{xb5}, after which both of his rooks would occupy threatening positions.

\textbf{46...\texttt{ed8!}}

By heroic efforts, Black has succeeded, if not in equalising the position (after his mistake on the 35th move), then, at least, in avoiding a quick death. Now White has to make a responsible decision, which will largely determine the character of the future struggle. He could try to limit the mobility of the knight, by advancing the d-pawn, and, after 47.d5 \texttt{d6} 48.\texttt{c2}, to bring the rook again over to the g-file. In this case, Black would exchange one pair of rooks on g7 and transfer the knight on d8 via b7 and c5, setting up a defensible position.

The greatest difficulties lying in store for Black to overcome would arise if White were to strive for the opening of the game by means of 47.dxe5!, for example, 47...\texttt{c6} 48.e6! (but not 48.\texttt{b5} \texttt{xb5} 49.axb5 \texttt{exe5} 50.\texttt{d5 \texttt{e7}}!) 48...\texttt{f5} 49.\texttt{c2} \texttt{d3} 50.\texttt{b5}. Lasker does not want to spoil his centre and waits for Black himself to exchange on d4. In this, he notices that 48.\texttt{xc4 \texttt{d4}+ is parried by the move 49.\texttt{dxd4}; also, not wanting to release the rook on a5 from imprisonment after 47.\texttt{a2} b5, he decides to prepare the transfer of the bishop to a2.

\textbf{47.\texttt{d2 \texttt{c6}}! 48.\texttt{b5}}

It becomes clear that, on 48.\texttt{xc4}, would follow 48...\texttt{d6}! and White's rook is caught in a trap, while the attempt to catch the black rook in a net, by 48.\texttt{c2}, fails to 48...\texttt{exd4}! 49.\texttt{xd4 \texttt{xb4} 50.\texttt{xb4 \texttt{h5}}.}

\textbf{48...\texttt{xa4}}

Black's rook comes into play, taking an important pawn on the way.

\textbf{49.\texttt{dxe5 \texttt{xe5}}}

This game is striking by its kaleidoscopically changing events.
55...\texttt{e}ag1! 56.\texttt{f}f5+ \texttt{e}e8
The f4-pawn is immune from capture:
57.\texttt{x}xf4 \texttt{g}g6g2+ 58.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{e}e1#. White's last hope is dashed to the ground.

57.\texttt{g}g5 \texttt{a}6xg5 0-1
An exceptionally tense battle of principle, in which each of the opponents followed, to the end of the game, a strategy chosen beforehand. Though this game shows the strength of the pawn centre and the power of the two bishops, Chigorin nevertheless won the creative argument. Twice in the game, Lasker had everything to which he aspired, and each time Chigorin demonstrated an effective method of play against both the pawn centre and the two bishops – the method of blockade.

28 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Richard Teichmann
Hastings 1895 (6)
1.e4 e6 2.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{c}c6 3.\texttt{f}f3 e5
Quite feasible, since the extra move made by White – 2.\texttt{e}e2, only shuts in the bishop on f1.
4.c3 \texttt{f}f6 5.d3 \texttt{e}e7 6.g3 d5 7.\texttt{g}g2

Each partner chooses a plan of developing forces in accordance with his chess

---

49 In fact it is a much better defence!
...e4. Black occupies the centre with two pawns, but White, after securing possession of the e4-square, prepares, after castling, to carry out a pawn storm in the king’s flank.

Now Black, not fearing the threat to the e5-pawn, could proceed with his development by ...e6, ...d7 and then 0-0-0. By exchanging the d-pawn, Tschischwitz liquidates the tension in the centre and also determines the sphere of activity of the g2, but he gives White the possibility of occupying the d-file and also prospects of invading d5 with his knight.

7...dxe4 8.dxe4

Efmanovsky: Black obtains a good, if not better game. White has a passive king’s bishop, he lags behind in development. However, there are also weaknesses in Black’s position. They are imperceptible, but with deep insight, Chigorin soon begins to sound them out.

8...f5 9...f2 0-0 10.c4 e

Efmanovsky: Black’s position clearly has the greater prospects. He has at his disposal many tempting plans: 12...h4, 12...d1, or 12.b4.

Black must endeavour to put right the coordination of his pieces, for example, ...f7-e and ...ad8. Instead of this he makes several planless moves and finds himself in a positional bind.

11...e8

Efmanovsky: Intending to stabilise the position in the centre with the move e7-f6, and, in the event of 12...xd6, take knight with knight. However, the retreat of the knight restricts Black’s pieces. A more purposeful plan would be ...f7 and then ...f.d8.

12.b4 a6 13.d1 f7 14.a4 f6 15.a3

Efmanovsky: White consistently carries out a strategic offensive. The knight on d5 cannot be taken: 21...x d5 22.exd5 followed by a5 and f1.

21.d5

Efmanovsky: White strives to exploit the weakness of the c5-square.
22...c6 23.\textit{\=e}3 \textit{\=w}b7

More chances of a successful defence were offered by 23...\textit{\=w}c8 (maintaining control over the f5-square) followed by the regrouping ...\textit{\=f}7 and ...\textit{\=f}8.

24.\textit{\=e}a1 \textit{\=c}7

\textbf{25.\textit{\=f}5!}

An unpleasant move. White does not give the knight the chance to move from e8 to d6. Taking the knight is again impossible, since after 25...\textit{\=x}f5 26.exf5, the bishop on g2 enters the game with decisive effect.

\textit{Romanovsky:} Not a single piece on the board has been exchanged, while the positional manoeuvring has already led to the white pieces taking up dominating positions.

\textbf{25...\textit{\=b}6 26.\textit{\=e}3 \textit{\=x}e3}

Black resigns himself to defeat, though also after the relatively better 26...g6 27.\textit{\=d}6 \textit{\=c}7 28.\textit{\=x}e8 \textit{\=x}e8 29.\textit{\=f}3 \textit{\=f}8 30.\textit{\=d}3 \textit{\=b}7 31.\textit{\=a}6 it would only be possible to prolong his resistance.\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{27.\textit{\=x}e3}

\textit{Romanovsky:} The exchange of bishops has led to an even further weakened c5-square, which the knight now heads for.

\textbf{27...\textit{\=f}7 28.\textit{\=d}3}

The threat to invade on c5 with the knight decides the game. Black’s oversight – necessary was 28...\textit{\=a}8 – only shortens his agony.

\textit{Romanovsky:} White threatens the combination 29.\textit{\=c}5 and \textit{\=x}xd8.

\textbf{28...\textit{\=c}8?}

\textit{Romanovsky:} Overlooking another little combination, but Black already could hardly put up a satisfactory defence. For example, 28...\textit{\=a}8 29.\textit{\=c}5 \textit{\=x}a1 30.\textit{\=x}a1 \textit{\=c}8 31.\textit{\=d}2 \textit{\=b}7 32.\textit{\=x}e6 \textit{\=w}xe6 33.\textit{\=h}3 etc.

\textbf{29.\textit{\=x}e5 \textit{\=x}e5 30.\textit{\=x}xd8 \textit{\=e}6}

\textbf{31.\textit{\=d}6}

1-0

Of course, Black’s defence was not exemplary; nevertheless, the intricate work of Chigorin, in accumulating small advantages and consistently maintaining a bind on Black’s position, is very impressive.

\textit{Romanovsky:} ‘The whole game is an excellent example of play in the spirit of the modern school’ – remarked Tarrasch. We would say that this game is characteristic of Chigorin’s realistic style of play. The brightest reflection of this style is to be found in the games

\textsuperscript{50} In fact after 31...\textit{\=x}e3 32.\textit{\=w}xe3 \textit{\=a}8 33.\textit{\=d}1 \textit{\=x}a6 34.\textit{\=x}a6 \textit{\=d}8, Black is not worse.
his match with Tarrasch and in international tournaments of the years 1895-1900.

29 Evans Gambit
William Pollock
Mikhail Chigorin
Hastings 1895 (19)
1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3.\(\text{c4} \text{c4}\) 4.b4
\(\text{bxc4} \text{cxb4}\) 5.c3 \(\text{a5} \text{e4}\) 6.d4 exd4 7.0-0 d6
8.cxd4 \(\text{b6}\) 9.\(\text{c3} \text{a5}\) 10.\(\text{g5} \text{f6}\)
11.\(\text{h4} \text{e7}\)

Chigorin considered that the retreat to \(\text{h6}\) is not the best and that the strongest reply to it is 11...\(\text{cxc4}\) 12.\(\text{wxa4} \text{wxd7}\)
13.\(\text{wxxc4} \text{wff7}\) 14.\(\text{d5} \text{e6}\) – see the game between Chigorin and \(\text{Takubovich, correspondence 1879.}\)

12.\(\text{g3}\)!

The sharpest and most logical continuation. White plays for the opening of lines in the centre, not fearing the exchange of queens. After the careful 12.h3, Black manages to consolidate his position in the centre:
12...\(\text{cxc4}\) 13.\(\text{wa4} + \text{c6}\) 14.\(\text{wxc4} \text{d5}\).

12...\(\text{g4}\)

13.e5!

An interesting and, in our opinion, correct decision in the position. White allows an exchange of queens and totally 'disintegrates' his pawn chain. The lack of pawns does not bother him. The centralised position of the rooks on the open e- and d-files, the power gained by the \(\text{h4}\) and the black king on e8 – all this gives him sufficient grounds for opening up the game.

Levenfish commented: 'An interesting and deeply calculated combination which shows Pollock’s talent in a very favourable light. Incidentally, at the Hastings tournament, Pollock defeated both Steinitz and Tarrasch.'

13...dxe5 14.dxe5 \(\text{wx}d1\) 15.\(\text{exd1} \text{cxc4}\)

Not 15...f5, because of 16.\(\text{e6}\).

16.\(\text{exf6} \text{gx}f6\) 17.\(\text{xf6}\)

A no less strong continuation seems to be 17.\(\text{d5}\). However, Levenfish pointed out that the attack is repulsed by castling queen’s side, for example: 17...0-0-0 18.\(\text{exe7} + \text{b8}\) 19.\(\text{xf6} \text{wxd1}\) 20.\(\text{wxd1} \text{xf8}\) 21.\(\text{d3} \text{xf3}\) 22.\(\text{xf3} \text{ed2}\) 23.\(\text{f5} \text{wxe4}\) 24.\(\text{h4} \text{xf5}\) 25.\(\text{xf5} \text{c5}\)!

Despite the exchange of queens, the heat of the battle is intense. Chigorin
finds the best retort to the opponent’s inevitable invasion on the seventh rank and sets a cunning trap. Worse would be 19...\textit{He8} 20.\textit{Hd7} \textit{g8} 21.\textit{d5}! or 19...\textit{Hg8}+ 20.\textit{f1} \textit{g7} 21.\textit{d7} \textit{g8} 22.\textit{d5}.

\textit{20.\textit{Ed7}?!}

Pollock probably did not see Chigorin’s splendid reply. White still has equality: 20.\textit{He4}! (after 20.\textit{d3} \textit{he8} White loses) 20...\textit{xc3} 21.\textit{xc4} \textit{e5} 22.\textit{f4}! and 22...\textit{Hg8}+ 23.\textit{xf1} \textit{g4} is no good because of 24.\textit{g5}! and 25.\textit{h3}. The invasion of the rook seems to be decisive, since, on 20...\textit{xc3}, strong is 21.\textit{b4+}, and 20...\textit{we8} is parried by means of 21.\textit{d3}! \textit{f7} 22.\textit{e4} \textit{xc3} 23.\textit{dxc3}.

\textit{20...\textit{b6}!}

If 20...\textit{we8}, then 21.\textit{d3}.

\textit{21.\textit{xc7} \textit{xc8}!}

In this lies Chigorin’s defensive idea. Black still wins a piece.

\textit{22.\textit{xb7} \textit{xc3}}

Despite the extra piece, Black is faced with a difficult task. White, however, cannot hope for victory but the limited number of pawns gives him grounds for reckoning on a draw. In Bogoljubow’s opinion, White retains equality after 23.\textit{h4+} (on the other hand Levenfish says ‘there is no hope in 23.\textit{h4+} \textit{g6} 24.\textit{e6+} (24.\textit{ee7} h6) 24...\textit{f5} 25.\textit{h6}}
28...\textit{\textbf{d}5}!

The bishop has no comfortable square of retreat. The a7-pawn cannot be taken: 29.\textit{\textbf{x}a}7 \textit{\textbf{d}6}! 30.\textit{\textbf{f}d}7 \textit{\textbf{g}5}+ etc. On 29.\textit{\textbf{e}3}, decisive is 29...\textit{\textbf{c}xe}3+ 30.\textit{\textbf{x}e}3 \textit{\textbf{h}6}+ 31.\textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{d}1}+ 32.\textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{d}2}+ 33.\textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{g}g}2 34.\textit{\textbf{x}h}7+ \textit{\textbf{g}6} and there is no defence against the threat of 35.\textit{\textbf{d}f}2 mate.

Pollock wants to move the king away to h3 and therefore prevents ...\textit{\textbf{h}6}+. But now the white rook is tied to the defence of the bishop.

29.\textit{\textbf{f}8} \textit{\textbf{d}2} 30.\textit{\textbf{a}3} \textit{\textbf{f}5}! 31.\textit{\textbf{c}7}

White’s initiative has evaporated. He could not take the pawn: 31.\textit{\textbf{x}h}7 \textit{\textbf{g}5}+ 32.\textit{\textbf{h}3} \textit{\textbf{g}7}! 33.\textit{\textbf{h}4} (33.\textit{\textbf{f}4} \textit{\textbf{d}5}!) 33...\textit{\textbf{x}f}3 34.\textit{\textbf{g}4} \textit{\textbf{g}1}+ 35.\textit{\textbf{g}3} \textit{\textbf{e}2}+ 36.\textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{f}8}+ and wins.

31...\textit{\textbf{g}5}+ 32.\textit{\textbf{h}3} \textit{\textbf{f}6} 33.\textit{\textbf{f}4} \textit{\textbf{h}5}+ 34.\textit{\textbf{g}2} \textit{\textbf{f}5}+ 35.\textit{\textbf{h}1}

35...\textit{\textbf{f}3}

That’s it. The cage is slammed shut. The rest is agony.

36.\textit{\textbf{b}5}+ \textit{\textbf{e}6} 37.\textit{\textbf{f}5}+ \textit{\textbf{x}f}5 38.\textit{\textbf{c}6}+ \textit{\textbf{d}7} 39.\textit{\textbf{d}6}+ \textit{\textbf{c}7} 40.\textit{\textbf{b}1} \textit{\textbf{h}5} 0-1

After 41.\textit{\textbf{c}1}+ \textit{\textbf{b}8}! White loses a rook or is mated.

‘A most fascinating game, in which Chigorin displayed great skill in counterattack’, said Levenfish.
Chapter 16

St.Petersburg 1895/96

It was only three months after the ending of the Hastings tournament, in which Chigorin had displayed such excellent form, that, in his homeland, in St.Petersburg, he suffered a most serious setback that was quite exceptional in his chess career. This failure was deeply rooted in the specific conditions of the chess life of pre-revolutionary Russia.

The question as to who was the strongest chess player in the world was not settled at the Hastings tournament. The World Champion, Lasker, came only third, while in the face of Pillsbury appeared a new pretender to the World Championship.

The St.Petersburg Chess Society decided to organise a match-tournament, with the five winners of the Hastings tournament, Pillsbury, Chigorin, Lasker, Tarrasch and Steinitz, who were due to play three or four games against each other. But Tarrasch replied that he could not leave his medical practice for a prolonged period and declined to participate. So... it was decided that the remaining competitors play six games against each other.

The start of the tournament was accompanied by curious circumstances.

The publisher of New Times, A.S.Suvorin, who estimated correctly the growth in popularity of chess in Russia, left everyone behind and hurried to make a formal agreement with the tournament committee; by paying the Chess Society 500 roubles, he acquired the exclusive right to publish the games of the tournament in Russian periodicals.
As a result, in the programme of the match-tournament was included the amazing clause: 'All the games are the property of the tournament committee and are earmarked for future publication in a separate collection. The committee reserves the right, however, to publish these in both Russian and foreign periodicals by formal agreement.'

Six St.Petersburg newspapers lodged their protest against one newspaper being given such exclusive rights. There began a stubborn fight amongst the rivals. After selling the games of the tournament to Suworin, the Chess Society fervently set about upholding the monopoly of New Times. They took precautionary measures, which were unprecedented in the history of chess. At first, the Chess Society imposed a ban on all those present at the tournament, from giving the tournament games to the newspapers. But, nevertheless, the games appeared in News and other rival newspapers. So then they had to resort to extraordinary measures – newspaper employees and several visitors, who were suspected of transmitting the games, were removed from the hall. When even this did not help, visitors were forbidden to write down the games and take photographs. Since the games still appeared, the Chess Society announced their intention to take the newspapers to court – for infringement of the ‘monopoly’. But this unprecedented judicial process, unique of its kind, fortunately for the reputation of the St.Petersburg Chess Society, did not take place.

In 1895, one could not talk of age as being a factor in the decline of Chigorin’s chess powers. He had just played splendidly in Hastings, while in 1896, he was to win 1st prize in Budapest. The causes of Chigorin’s failure in St.Petersburg were different, and there were several of them.

In St.Petersburg, Chigorin found himself in worse conditions than the remaining participants. These could devote themselves wholly to the game, but Chigorin, as director/manager of the St.Petersburg Chess Society (the president was one of the aristocratic chess amateurs – Prince Kantakuzen), bore all the administrative responsibilities of the tournament. Even right in the middle of play, he would often be taken aside to deal with various trifles. In addition to this, Chigorin was depressed over serious material worries and disorder, as ill luck would have it for him just at this time. Of course, also the highly unhealthy atmosphere in St.Petersburg, which surrounded Chigorin during the tournament, the baiting of him in the pages of the St.Petersburg press, greatly agitated him.

The St.Petersburg Gazette was particularly aggressive. On the opening day of the tournament, it was written that if Chigorin ‘will this time be attentive to his game, then, without doubt, one can predict that he will receive the palm of the championship in his forthcoming struggle with the most famous foreign chess players.’ (St.Petersburg Gazette 1895, No.330). But when Chigorin lost a few games, it decidedly changed its tone, and carried malicious remarks in its pages.

It is clear why Chigorin, when asked about the cause of his failure in the match-tournament, replied: ‘I am even amazed that I did not lose every game. Going into play, whilst worrying over the fact that they want to evict you from your apartment because of non-payment of rent, and your wife comes to you with a bill which has to be paid quickly, and then also all around there is intrigue, gossip, nastiness...’
As a result, the bad form of Chigorin took its toll. In the first half of the tournament, he scored only 1½ points and was in last place: he lost two games to Pillsbury through blunders, after achieving winning positions. In the St.Petersburg match-tournament, his favourite Evans Gambit was subjected to a difficult test. In the 3rd round, Lasker employed his own defence for the first time, and won quickly. From this moment began a theoretical argument, in which Chigorin, wanting to defend the honour of the opening with which he had scored so many remarkable victories, endeavoured to refute Black's novelty. This cost Chigorin several points, but did not give a final answer to the question. Chigorin stood by his opinion, but came to play the Evans Gambit far more rarely. He now preferred the Italian Game. Lasker's system was not a refutation of the Evans Gambit, but it was just about the main reason for the virtual disappearance of this opening from master practice. And this happened only as a consequence of the fact that Lasker did not set out for a 'refutation' but tried to radically change the character of play.

In the second half of the match-tournament, Chigorin played far better — scoring 5½ points out of 9 and winning two excellent games against Pillsbury. One of these had historical significance, since in it Chigorin demonstrated a completely new means of attack, against what seemed to be an ideal pawn centre for White.

Chigorin conducted, with great brilliance, a fascinating, sharp, but also risky attack in the other game against Pillsbury.

Chigorin’s play in the second half of the match-tournament proved to be sufficient only for 4th place, with 7 points. With a brilliant start to the tournament, Pillsbury led after the first half with a score of 6½ points. Afterwards, Lasker overtook Pillsbury, winning against him a game which later on, in his declining years, he named as his most outstanding game. Lasker subsequently moved steadily on, but Pillsbury, who was taken ill during the tournament, began to lose game after game. As a result, Lasker took first place with 11½, behind him were — Steinitz 9½, Pillsbury 8, Chigorin 7.

Chigorin’s failure in the St.Petersburg match-tournament, practically speaking, represented the end of his fight for the World Championship. It is true that during Lasker’s stay in St.Petersburg in 1897, talks began regarding a match, but they led to nothing. After giving up thoughts of a match at the highest level, Chigorin took part continuously in international tournaments. If, from 1881 to 1894, he played in only four tournaments, an average of one tournament every 3½ years, then from 1895 to 1907 he took part in over 20 international contests (an average of less than 8 months interval between each one). Not one of the strong tournaments took place without Chigorin, apart from Munich 1900, and also the tournament at Monte Carlo 1903, where Chigorin did not get to sit down at a chess table for a particular reason, which was beyond his control.

Chess life had become much more lively than before. Now in Germany, now in Austro-Hungary, now in England, now in France, now in Belgium, now in the USA, now even in the tiny state of Monaco, were organised annual international tournaments. Chigorin was a welcome participant in these. The Russian chess player crossed the frontiers of various European countries, which were still looking
table, and went to Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, Ostende, Monte Carlo... and he
had occasion to sail across the Atlantic Ocean one more time — when in 1904
an international tournament was held in the North American resort of Cambridge
Springs. Out of the important nations, only Russia, after the St.Petersburg match-
tournament of 1895/96, had not organised an international tournament for a long
time. The next such tournament in Russia took place only in 1909 and was, by this
time, dedicated to the memory of Chigorin...

Chigorin came up against a new generation of masters, the majority of whom
were 20 and, later on, even 30 years younger than him. The strongest of these were
well armed for a technical positional struggle, played the openings excellently, were
dangerous opponents in the middlegame and in the ending. Admittedly, it was only
in a few of these that Chigorin saw a player close to himself in creative character
and attitude to chess. There was no shortage of careful professionals, who avoided
risky. They had a pragmatic approach, which was never enough for Chigorin, and
they skillfully exploited the Russian champion’s aversion to dull draws, which was
characteristic of him.

Side by side with the young players, also competing in the tournaments were
the famous names: Steinitz, Winawer, Mason, Englisch, Bird, Blackburne and Burn.
Several of these were soon to depart from the chess arena for ever, and even, in fact,
from life itself. Only Steinitz, Blackburne and Burn were still formidable opponents,
and not just in individual games, but in whole competitions.

For the rest, it became more and more difficult to compete with the young
rivals. The whole stamp of chess life was changing, both the line-up of participants
in competitions and their opening repertoires, as well as the very character of
the struggles. All the more and more rarely, chess players ventured to offer the
King’s Gambit, while also the Evans Gambit virtually disappeared. In return, all
the more frequently appeared solid openings: Spanish, French, Queen’s Gambit.
Instead of sacrifices in the opening, the striving to obtain a solid position with
developed pieces began to predominate. However, the principle of development,
to a considerable extent, contained within itself a significant point: avoid moving
twice, one and the same piece in the opening — this was considered a loss of tempo
— and the task of the opening was considered accomplished if all the pieces had
come out. It was recognised that knights should be developed earlier than bishops.
Crammed positions were to be avoided at all costs. In reply to 1.d4, the move
1...e5 was employed very rarely and reckoned to be an incorrect defence. Great
importance was attached to the two bishops. Chess players became confident of
exploiting such factors as open lines, weak squares, an advantage in development.
At the beginning of the 20th century, soon after Tarrasch brought into practice his
defence, 3...c5 in the Queen’s Gambit, a heated argument flared up on the strengths
and weaknesses of the isolated queen’s pawn. A dangerous counterattacking system
in the Four Knights Opening was worked out. Pillsbury and Marshall played the
Petroff Defence successfully as Black. New opening patterns were taking shape and
being formed. The strongest chess players of the age, and the best games, displayed
brilliant and interesting play.
In this changing chess world, with the years taking their toll, Chigorin, despite uneven sporting success, remained an unfailing original artist in each of his appearances.

30 Queen’s Gambit Declined
Wilhelm Steinitz
Mikhail Chigorin
St.Petersburg 1895/96 (1)
1.d4 d5 2.c4 f3 c6 3.c4 e6 4.d3 e7 5.d4
Romanovsky: Steinitz was successful with this move in many games.
5...c6
Contemporary theory recommends a more active plan with ...c7-c5. For example: 5...0-0 6.e3 c5 7.dxc5 c6 8.cxd5 exd5 9.e2 xc5 10.0-0 e6 11.e1 b6 12.a4 d4! with equal chances.
6.e3 bbd7 7.h3

A useful but not obligatory move. White could also allow the exchange of his bishop on the f4-square, after ...h5(d5). In this case, his position in the centre would be still further strengthened. A similar scheme was later skillfully employed by Kortchnoi, and it was also a formidable weapon in the hands of Alekhine.

7...0-0 8.d3
Black would have more difficulties after 8.c5. In this way, White could gain space on the queen’s flank, with firm control of the centre and a gradual preparation for an attack on the king’s flank.
Romanovsky: After 8.c5, the attack ...b6 does not give Black anything substantial after 9.b4 a5 10.a3, but the break ...e6-e5 could be more awkward.

8...dxc4
Romanovsky: The beginning of a sharp and complicated operation, characteristic of Chigorin’s style, which was full of initiative.
9.xc4 d5 10.h2
And now the variation 10.0-0 xf4 11.exf4 would not be unfavourable for White, but of course Steinitz played 7.h3 in order to preserve the bishop.

10...a5

11.e1
Steinitz is careful. It would be quite possible to castle: 11.0-0 xc3 12.xd2 b5 (if 12...b4, then 13.a3 d5 14.axb4 and 14.xb4 is not possible because of 15.xb4 followed by d6) 13.d3 b4 (and now on 13...b4 would follow 14.a3 d5 15.axb4 xb4 16.c2 with the threats of xc6 and xh7+) 14.bxc3 bxc3 15.xc2. However, Black would obtain a comfortable game by means of 15...g6! (15...f6 16.e5!) 16.e4 a6!
11...d7b6 12.b3 a4

In this game can be seen the outline of a defence which nine years later was tried in the tournament at Cambridge Springs and the author of which was Pillsbury. But do we not have here its original source?

13.c2

Steinitz is too cautious. With the sacrifice of a pawn - 13.a3 xc3+13...xc3 14.axb4! 14.bxc3 wxa3 15.c4 f6 16.c5 - he could obtain a menacing initiative.

13...xc3 14.bxc3 a3 15.d1 d5 16.3d3

The exchange 16.xd5 cxd5 would have gone against the theory of Steinitz. Black would have a very good game after ...d7-a4, ...c8 etc. A sharp game would have occurred if Steinitz had decided upon the pawn sacrifice: 16.0-0 xc3 17.wc4! e7.

16...e5!

It is just such an unexpected thrust, allowing Black to seize the initiative, which crowns the opening strategy of the Cambridge Springs Defence. It is also strong here. The threat is 17...f5.

17.e4

There is no choice – the continuation 17.xd5 cxd5 18.d2 (if 18.d1, then 18...d7 with the threat of ...a4 and ...c8) 18...e4 19.g1 (19.g5, e5

or h4 lead to the loss of the knight) 19...b6 20.e2 a6 21.0-0 c8 gives Black an overwhelming advantage.

17...xc3!

18.0-0!

Steinitz has several times rejected the promising sacrifice of a pawn. Now he is obliged to give it up, since 18.xc3 b4 19.d2 exd4 20.xd4 d8 would lead to a clear advantage for Black, who will be left at least the exchange and a pawn ahead. Black can now take either pawn. After 18...xe4 19.xe5 d6, the black knight remains in the centre and White’s initiative does not compensate for the material loss.

18...xd4 19.xd4 b5 20.a4 c6

21.g5

White does not obtain very much for the pawn. It is only the absence of black pieces on the king’s flank which allows
him the hope of creating threats before Black has had time to set up a defence. How should he begin? On 21.e5 would follow 21...\textit{e7} and the g4- and h4-squares are inaccessible to the rook on a4. On 21.\textit{e5}, good is 21...\textit{d6}, and the combination 22.\textit{xf7} does not come off: 22...\textit{h2}+ 23.\textit{xh2} \textit{xf7} 24.\textit{wc4} \textit{c7} etc. The plan chosen by Steinitz is the most dangerous for Black. Now he threatens both 22.\textit{xf7} \textit{xf7} 23.\textit{wc4} and also 22.e5 followed by \textit{h4}.

21...\textit{wc5} 22.\textit{wd2} \textit{h6} 23.\textit{xf3} \textit{we7}

White rejects the unclear piece sacrifice 23.\textit{xf7} \textit{xf7} 24.\textit{d1}, and Black wrongly does not play 23...\textit{e6}. Romanovsky: Black plays this move primarily to get his bishop, stuck on a3, back into the game.

24.e5

White achieves his objective - to provide for his rook the h4-square, from where it would threaten the sacrifice \textit{h6}. Chigorin now finds that he has to withstand a very strong attack, all because for four moves in a row (23-26th moves) he rejected the exchange of the light-squared bishops, which would have weakened White's attacking potential and brought into play the rook on a8.

Even now, after 24...\textit{e6} 25.\textit{h4} \textit{xb3} 26.axb3 \textit{we6}! followed by \textit{e7}, Black would have managed to solve the problem of his defence. Chigorin's commencement of operations on the queen's flank just gives White more time to concentrate his pieces on the king's flank.

24...\textit{a5} 25.\textit{h4} \textit{b4} 26.\textit{wc2} \textit{h8}?

Chigorin stubbornly refrains from the move 26...\textit{e6}. He parries the threat of 27.\textit{hx6} g\textit{xh6} 28.\textit{g6}+ \textit{h8} 29.\textit{hxh6}+ with an unfortunate move of his king, which leads to hard times for Black.

27.\textit{f4}

White brings his second bishop into the attack, with the clear intention of sacrificing it on h6, and, at the same time, he sets a cunning trap by tempting the opponent into making the spectacular move 27...\textit{d4}. In this case, 28.\textit{hxh6}+ \textit{xh6} 29.\textit{xd4} \textit{h4} (29...\textit{g7} 30.e6 \textit{xe6} 31.\textit{e5}+ 30.\textit{we4}! \textit{g8} 31.e6 \textit{f6} 32.\textit{c2} leads quickly to a rout of Black's position.

It should be noted that White also has at his disposal the move 27.\textit{wc1}, with the 'crude' threat of 28.\textit{h6}+. It is too late for the reply 27...\textit{e6}: 28.\textit{hxh6}+ \textit{gxh6} 29.\textit{hxh6}+ \textit{g8} 30.\textit{g5} \textit{f5} 31.\textit{g4}! \textit{d3} (31...\textit{d2} 32.\textit{h4}+) 32.\textit{d1} and wins.

\footnote{But how does White win after 32...\textit{d3}!}
Perhaps slightly stronger here is 28...\textit{g}8! or 27...\textit{f}5 28.\textit{x}h6+ \textit{g}8! but in these variations, Black's position is hanging by a thread.

27...\textit{f}5

28.\textit{exf}6

But this is inaccurate as it allows the \textit{f}8 to take part in the defence of the h6-pawn.

Very strong would be 28.\textit{g}5 (the sacrifice of the bishop by 28.\textit{xh}6 would hardly turn out to be successful after 28...\textit{gxh}6 29.\textit{wc}1 \textit{f}4) 28...\textit{we}8 (Romanovsky gives 28...\textit{wc}5 to meet 29.\textit{xh}6 \textit{gxh}6 30.\textit{xc}h6+ with ...\textit{g}7, refuting White's attack) 29.\textit{wc}1. The strength of White's attack is shown by the following variations:

A) 29...\textit{g}6 30.\textit{xe}6 31.\textit{d}2+ \textit{g}8 32.\textit{xb}4 \textit{axb}4 33.\textit{g}5! \textit{f}7 34.\textit{h}8+!! \textit{xh}8 35.\textit{h}4+ \textit{g}8 36.\textit{g}5;

B) 29...\textit{e}7 30.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 31.\textit{xc}h6+ \textit{gxh}6 32.\textit{xc}h6+ \textit{h}7 33.\textit{xf}8+;

C) 29...\textit{f}4 30.\textit{xf}4 \textit{c}7 31.\textit{xc}h6 \textit{xc}h4 32.\textit{xc}h4 \textit{h}5 33.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}4 34.\textit{c}d1 \textit{e}2+ 35.\textit{xe}2 \textit{xe}2 36.f4 or 36.\textit{c}6+.

28...\textit{Exf}6

28...\textit{xf}6 is not possible because of 29.\textit{xc}h6+ \textit{gxh}6 30.\textit{e}5.\footnote{Even stronger was 29.\textit{c}5!}

29.\textit{g}5?

Now White's attack peters out, whereas after 29.\textit{e}5 Black would have difficult problems. White's basic threats are seen in the following variations: 29.a4 30.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}5 31.\textit{xf}5! \textit{xf}5 32.\textit{xc}h6#, or 29...\textit{ed}6 30.\textit{wc}1 \textit{d}2 31.\textit{xd}2 \textit{xd}2 32.\textit{xc}h6#.

The only defence would be 29...\textit{ed}6!, keeping the f5-square under control; in this case, after 30.a3! \textit{xa}3 31.\textit{xc}1 \textit{f}5, Black could hope for a successful defence.

29...\textit{f}5! 30.\textit{wc}1

Romanovsky: After 30.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 (it would be a mistake to play 30...\textit{xc}2? 31.\textit{xc}h6+ \textit{h}7 32.\textit{xe}7, when 32...\textit{gxh}6 is not possible because of 33.\textit{xf}6#), Black has more than sufficient compensation for the exchange in view of his extra pawn, two harmonious active bishops and significant pawn majority on the queen's flank.

30...\textit{af}8 31.a4

Recognising the failure of his attack, White begins to make 'casual' moves. Now the knight enters the battle very strongly. After 31.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 32.\textit{we}3, he would find himself switching over to defence. Black would play 32...\textit{c}3 followed by ...\textit{b}7-\textit{b}5, preserving all his winning chances.
31...\textit{c3} 32.\textit{h1}
Romanovsky: Now, after 32.\textit{we3}, Black simply exchanges queens.
32...\textit{d3} 33.\textit{e1} \textit{e2} 34.\textit{wd1} \textit{exe1}

The situation has changed abruptly over the last six moves. With a swift counterattack, Chigorin has disorganised White's attacking formation and completely seized the initiative. Black has three pieces under attack, but it is equally bad to take any one of them. If 35.\textit{xf6} \textit{exf6}, there is the irresistible threat of 36...\textit{xf3}, and so Steinitz decides to leave the pinned black rook for the time being and capture a minor piece; however he chooses an unfortunate continuation.

He could have put up the most stubborn resistance by 35.\textit{xe1} (bad is 35.\textit{xe1} because of 35...\textit{g3+} 35...\textit{h2} (36.\textit{g1} \textit{xel+} 37.\textit{xe1} \textit{a6!} 38.\textit{xf6} \textit{xel} 39.\textit{fxg3} \textit{xf1+} 36...\textit{e4}
37.\textit{xf6} \textit{xel} 38.\textit{xa5} \textit{xel} 39.\textit{xf3} \textit{xh4} 40.\textit{a8+} \textit{h17} 41.\textit{g8+} \textit{g6}
42.\textit{f7+} \textit{g5!} 43.\textit{e7+} \textit{f6} 44.\textit{xg7+} \textit{f4}, but even then Black has a decisive advantage.

35.\textit{xd3}
Now Black finds a way of breaking the pin on the \textit{f6}, thereby also breaking White's further hopes of a successful defence.

35...\textit{xf3}! 36.\textit{gx3}
Other moves also lose quickly: 36.\textit{xf3} \textit{xf3} 37.\textit{xe7} \textit{xb3} or 36.\textit{xe7} \textit{xd3} 37.\textit{c4} (37.\textit{xf8} \textit{xb3} 38.\textit{f6} \textit{b1}
39.\textit{xe2} \textit{b4+} and 40...\textit{xf8}) 37...\textit{xf2!}
38.\textit{xd3} \textit{f1+} and 39...\textit{g3} mate.

36.\textit{xd5} 37.\textit{g4}
In this position, Black has several ways to win, but Chigorin's choice is the most elegant.

37...\textit{c1}! 38.\textit{we4} \textit{f5!} 0-1
A tense struggle. Chigorin demonstrated exceptionally subtle opening strategy and created a model lightning counter-attack.

31 Queen's Gambit:
Chigorin Defence
Harry Nelson Pillsbury
Mikhail Chigorin
St.Petersburg 1895/96 (11)
1.d4 d5 2.c4 \textit{c6} 3.g3 \textit{h4} 4.cxd5
The only drawback of this move as compared to the 'theoretical' 4...\textit{a}4 lies in the directness of its plan. White does not conceal his intention of creating a strong pawn centre.

4...\textit{xf}3

Tarrasch considered 4...\textit{xd}5 5...\textit{c}3 \textit{a}5 followed by ...0-0-0 to be stronger. Tarrasch's recommendation was played in a game Tolush-Aronson, 1957, which however did not last long: 6.d5! 0-0 0-0 7...\textit{d}2 \textit{xf}3 8.exf3 \textit{b}4? 9.a3 \textit{xd}5 10...\textit{a}4! and Black resigned. Of course, 8...\textit{b}4 is a fatal mistake, but Black's position is suspect.

5...\textit{xc}6

White creates a strong pawn centre, but Black, with the help of his two bishops, attacks it and obtains clear counterplay. Lovers of complicated positions, in which the accumulation of positional advantages comes by slow and painstaking work, would prefer the more substantial 5.gxf3 \textit{xd}5 6.e3 e6 (it is possible to play also the sharper 6...e5) 7...\textit{xc}6 \textit{d}7 (7...\textit{b}4 8.a3 \textit{xc}3 9.bxc3 favours White). It is not difficult to see that positions arise strongly characteristic of Chigorin's favourite set-up, and the kind which he time and again played successfully as Black. The correct method of playing such positions for White was shown in the game Taimanov-Spassky, 1960: 8...\textit{g}2 \textit{b}4 9.0-0 \textit{ge}7 10.f4 \textit{d}8 11.a3 \textit{xe}3 12.bxc3 \textit{a}5, and, after 13...\textit{c}2, White can play c3-c4, obtaining the advantage.

5...\textit{xe}6 6...\textit{c}3 e6 7.e4

Timid moves, such as 7...\textit{f}4 or 7.e3, would contradict the point of playing 5...\textit{xe}6. After 7.e3 \textit{wd}7, White begins to experience difficulties in developing his king's flank, because of the strong position of the bishop on c6.

7...\textit{b}4 8.f3 f5

In Chigorin's time, the teaching of Steinitz on the strength of the pawn centre was considered absolute. Chigorin was by no means in opposition to this, but he was undoubtedly the first to pay attention both to the weaknesses of the pawn centre and the working out of a method of struggle against it. In the present game we have the first practical trial of Chigorin's method of loosening the centre. The strategical plan, applied by Chigorin, made a strong impression on his contemporaries and proved to be a great influence on the development of the creative ideas of the new generation of chess players. The Grünfeld Defence, the Alekhine Defence — the basic idea of these topical present-day opening systems is Black's struggle against a mobile pawn centre.

9.e5?
A serious positional mistake. With one move, White deprives his beautiful centre of mobility, in that he weakens irreparably his d4-pawn and leaves the d5-square totally in the opponent's hands. This game is an example not only of great strategical skill but also of the fine exploitation of a single mistake. Not much better than 9.e5 is the exchange of pawns, 9.exf5 exf5 (if at first 9...\(\text{Nf4}\) then after 10.g3 \(\text{Nh5}\) 11.fxe6! 0-0-0 the e6-pawn proves to be very full of life) 10.\(\text{Nc4}\) \(\text{Nh4}\)!! 11.g3 \(\text{Ne7}\) 12.\(\text{Nf2}\) (12.\(\text{Nf2}!\) \(\text{Nxf3}\) 0-0-0 13.\(\text{Kh1}\) \(\text{Nf6}\), as the weakness of the white pawns in the centre and on the king's flank gives Black a clear advantage. In order to assess the strength of the move 8...f5, it is necessary to estimate the position after 9.\(\text{Nc4}\) \(\text{Nh4}!\) 10.g3 \(\text{Ne7}\) 11.0-0.

9...\(\text{Nf7}\)

Playing such a position is easy and pleasant. The strategical plan is clear and the moves come forward all by themselves.

10.a3

Since the exchange would remove White's worry over the defence of the d4-pawn, he drives back the bishop in case he should need to break the pin by b2-b4.

10...\(\text{Nc5}\) 11.\(\text{Nc4}\) \(\text{Nd5}\)

\(\text{ wb4}+\)

The weakness of the d4-pawn is shown by the variation 12.\(\text{Nxd5}\) \(\text{Nxd5}\) 13.\(\text{Nf2}\) \(\text{Nh4}!\). Perhaps the crisis would have come later if White had played 12.\(\text{Nc3}\).

However, after 12...\(\text{Nxc4}\) 13.\(\text{Nxc4}\) \(\text{d7}\) 14.\(\text{Nxa5}\) \(\text{b5}\) 15.\(\text{Nxd3}\) \(\text{Nc3+}\) 16.\(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{Nxd5}\), Black's advantage is indisputable.

12...c6 13.\(\text{Nd3}\)

He must not play 13.\(\text{Nxd5}\) \(\text{Nxd5}\) 14.\(\text{Nc2}\), because of 14...\(\text{b5}\)! 15.\(\text{Nc3}\) \(\text{Nh4}\)!! and 16...\(\text{Nxd4}\).

13...\(\text{Nc6}\)

The white queen suddenly finds itself in danger. 14...\(\text{Nc6}\) is threatened, and on 14.b4 or a retreat of the queen, possible is 14...\(\text{Nxe4}\).

14.\(\text{Nc2}\)

\(\text{ wa6}\!\)

Again the queen finds itself threatened, this time by the move 15...\(\text{b5}\), while the text move, incidentally, also prevents castling. Even now, White cannot play 15.b4 because of the loss of the d4-pawn: 15...\(\text{Nc4}\)!! 16.\(\text{Nc2}\) \(\text{Nc6}\) etc.

15.\(\text{Nc1}\) \(\text{Nc4}\!\)

White's tragedy is that the weakness of the d4-pawn and the light squares

53 In fact White can defend the pawn in two ways, directly with 17.\(\text{Nc2}\) or tactically with 17.\(\text{Nc1}\) \(\text{d4}\) 18.\(\text{Nf4}\) \(\text{Nxb2}\) 19.\(\text{Nc3}\) \(\text{Nc4}\) 20.\(\text{Nf2}\) \(\text{Nxa4}\) 21.\(\text{Nc3}\) \(\text{Nc3}\) 22.\(\text{Nf2}\) etc.
19...\text{b}x\text{d}4

Black’s positional advantage yields its first fruit.

20.\text{c}c1

Losing a piece as well, but 20.\text{f}f2 \text{d}3 21.\text{c}c1 \text{c}c4 does not put off the rout for long.

20...\text{d}3 21.\text{b}b3 \text{c}c4

It turns out that the bishop on \text{d}2 is not to be saved, since 22...\text{x}x\text{d}2 23.\text{x}x\text{d}2 \text{c}c4+ is threatened.

22.\text{f}2 \text{x}x\text{d}2 23.\text{x}e6+ \text{b}8 24.\text{f}3 \text{b}6 25.\text{g}3 \text{xf}3

Prolonging the struggle is pointless, but Pillsbury does not resign until the 39th move.

26.\text{g}x\text{f}3 \text{c}c4 27.\text{w}x\text{f}5 \text{x}c3
28.\text{x}x\text{c}3 \text{d}d2 29.\text{w}h3 \text{g}6 30.\text{h}h4 \text{h}6 31.\text{w}g4 \text{f}f2+ 32.\text{g}3 \text{g}5+
33.\text{g}4 \text{f}5 34.\text{f}f5 \text{d}3+ 35.\text{e}e6 \text{b}6 36.\text{w}x\text{g}5 \text{c}5+ 37.\text{f}f7 \text{c}4+
38.\text{g}7 \text{g}8+ 0-1

32 Spanish Game

Mikhail Chigorin
Harry Nelson Pillsbury
St.Petersburg 1895/96 (13)
1.e4 \text{e}5 2.\text{f}3 \text{c}c6 3.\text{b}b5 \text{g}6 4.\text{c}c3

Chigorin rejects the usual continuation, 4.d4, and chooses a quiet scheme of development.

4...\text{g}7

A very strong move now is 4...\text{d}4!, after which White cannot continue either 5.\text{x}e5? \text{g}5! or 5.\text{x}d4 \text{x}d4 6.\text{e}2 \text{g}5! 7.\text{d}4 \text{g}7, while after 5.\text{a}4 would follow 5...\text{x}f3+ 6.\text{xf}3 \text{c}6 (Keres’ variation) and Black has a good game.

5.\text{d}3 \text{g}e7 6.\text{g}5 \text{f}6

After 6...\text{h}6, the bishop could move away to \text{h}4, and the threat of \text{d}5 would force Black to submit to a new weakening.

7.\text{e}3 \text{a}6 8.\text{a}4 \text{b}5 9.\text{b}3 \text{a}5
10.\text{d}2 \text{xb}3 11.axb3 \text{b}7 12.\text{h}6 0-0
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13.h4
White goes in for a risky intensification of the struggle. 13.0-0 would lead to a quiet game in which Black would have no difficulties. He could either play at once 13...d5, or else prepare ...f6-f5. Not bad now would be 13...f5, and, after 14...xg7, to reply 14...xg7 in order to meet 15.h5 with either 15...g5 or 15...d5 16.hxg6 hxg6. It would not be easy for White to create real threats on the h-file. Pillsbury considers the defence of his king to be quite solid and proposes to open the a-file, not worrying about the concentration of White's forces on the king's flank.

13...d6
On 13...d5, White would continue the attack by playing 14.h5, and on 14...g5 he could successfully sacrifice his knight for three pawns: 15...xg7 xg7 16...xg5 fxg5 17...xg5+ f7 18...xg5 etc.

14.0-0-0 c5 15.g4 b4 16.d1 a5 17.d1 a4 18.bxa4 xxa4 19.e3

Chigorin liked positions in which there was the possibility of a pawn storm on the enemy king position. Here he treats a quiet variation of the Spanish Game just like his favourite opening 1.e4 e6 2...e2. After constructing a long pawn chain, he throws forward his g- and h-pawns. Admittedly, opposite sides castling gives Black rich possibilities for counterattack. The position must be regarded as double-edged, as Black threatens to outstrip his opponent in attack. White's last move is necessary, since on an immediate 19.g5 would follow 19...f5.

19...c6
Black could set up a defence in the following way: 19...f7 20...xg7 xg7 21.g5 f5 22.h5 e8 23.hxg6 hxg6. Pillsbury chooses another, no less solid plan, in which, however, Chigorin manages to open the black king position by combinative means.

20...xg7 xg7 21.g5 d4
Apparently Pillsbury has decided to play ...f6-f5 in reply to 22.d2. In this case, after 22...f5 23.f3, a complicated struggle ensues. However, there follows an unexpected combinative explosion...

22.h5!

22...xf3
Now 22...f5 is too late: 23.hxg6! hxg6 (23...f4 24.xd4!) 24.h6! f4 (or 24...
Black ought to win (29...\textit{f7} 30.\textit{xe}3 \textit{h}8 31.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xb}1+ 32.\textit{g}3+ etc.\footnote{55}) Chigorin refutes Pollock’s analysis by the variation 29.b3! \textit{a}8! (29...\textit{e}2 30.\textit{g}8 30.\textit{g}8 \textit{xe}6 31.\textit{h}8 \textit{w} and ‘White at least secures for himself a draw.’
With due respect for the rich imagination of Chigorin in conducting an attack, it should be noted that, in the diagrammed position, Black could repulse the attack in two ways, found by the former World Champion, Spassky: 25...\textit{f7} 26.\textit{xe}5! \textit{h}4! and 25...\textit{g}7! 26.\textit{w}h6+ \textit{h}8!\footnote{56}

26.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}7 27.\textit{w}h3+ \textit{c}6 28.\textit{w}e6 \textit{a}8 29.\textit{g}7 \textit{xb}6

\footnote{54 Or if Black returns some material with 29...\textit{d}5, to give his king a possible safe haven on \textit{d}6, then 30.\textit{xb}7 \textit{dxe}4 31.\textit{dxe}4 \textit{w}d6 32.\textit{w}e2 \textit{a}5 33.\textit{w}c4 \textit{xc}6 34.\textit{g}7! (threatening 35.\textit{g}8 to queen the h-pawn) 34...\textit{a}8 35.c3! to meet 35...\textit{bxc}3 with 36.b4! \textit{wd}4 37.\textit{we}6+ \textit{wd}6 38.b5+, winning the queen.}

Here we have the result of the combination. At the cost of two pieces, the black king’s pawn cover has been completely destroyed.

25...\textit{e}6
To avoid the hostilities, Pillsbury chooses a promising plan of defence—moving his king over to the queen’s flanks, where there is the possibility of hiding behind his own pawns.
A commentator of this game, Pollock, points out, citing the opinion of Pillsbury and Steinitz, that in the variation 25...\textit{f7} 26.\textit{xe}5 \textit{w}f6? 27.\textit{w}h3 \textit{xc}8 28.\textit{w}h5+ \textit{e}7 29.\textit{g}8(?)

\footnote{55 But 33.f3 saves White! Some variations: 
A) 33...\textit{h}5 34.\textit{xf}4 \textit{h}1 will end up in a level ending after 35.\textit{f}8 \textit{xf}3+ etc.;
B) 33...\textit{xf}3+ 34.\textit{xf}3 \textit{h}2+ 35.\textit{f}2 \textit{h}5+ 36.\textit{w}f3 etc., and repetition as 36...\textit{w}h7 allows a queen and rook roll beginning with 37.\textit{w}f6+ and ending with 41.\textit{w}b6 mate;
C) 33...\textit{e}1+ 34.\textit{x}1 \textit{g}3+ leads to perpetual check.}

56 Actually, after 25...\textit{g}7 26.\textit{xe}5+! \textit{w}f7 (other moves allow mate in a few moves, e.g. 26...\textit{h}8 27.\textit{f}3+ 26.\textit{f}6 (after 27...\textit{e}6, the simplest of three ways to win is 28.\textit{w}h8 \textit{xe}8 (on 28...\textit{xf}3 follows 29.\textit{w}xd8) 29.\textit{xf}5+ \textit{e}7 30.\textit{g}7+ \textit{e}8 31.\textit{xf}7 mate) 28.\textit{w}xe6+ \textit{xe}6 29.\textit{g}8 wins.}
Thus Black has succeeded in sheltering his king behind the pawn chain and safely prevented the promotion of the h7-pawn into a queen. It only remains to make the move 30...\( \text{g}c6 \) and it will be possible to go over to the counter-attack by means of ...\( \text{Wh}h4 \). With regard to this, 30...\( \text{Ed}d7 \) cannot be played because of 30...\( \text{Wg}5+ \). Chigorin finds a surprising possibility to introduce into play his last reserve – the knight on b1 – and the attack breaks out with new strength.

\[ 30.\text{Ca3!} \]

\[ 30...\text{Ca6} \]

In a very sharp position, Pillsbury makes a move spontaneously, to repulse the threat of 31...\( \text{Cc}4+ \). Admittedly, it gives up the queen, but with firm compensation and, most of all, it sharply reduces White’s attacking potential.

It seems that Pillsbury could not take the knight, since, after 30...\( \text{bxa3} \)
31...\( \text{Wb}3+ \)
\( \text{Ca6} \)
32...\( \text{Wxb7}+ \)
\( \text{Ca5} \)
33...\( \text{b4+} \)
\( \text{Cxb4} \)
34...\( \text{Wd5+} \)
\( \text{Ca6} \)
35...\( \text{Cxb7} \)
\( \text{b6} \)
36...\( \text{Cxb6+} \)
\( \text{Cxb6} \)
37...\( \text{Wd6+} \)
\( \text{Cb7} \)
38...\( \text{Cb1}! \), the h7-pawn limits the activity of the black rook to the eighth rank, and the game is decided by the advance of the white pawn mass in the centre.

All the same, the extra rook would give Black the chance of defending in another way: 30...\( \text{Cf6} \)
31...\( \text{Wg8} \)
\( \text{Ch6!} \)

\[ 32...\text{Wf7} \]
\[ 33...\text{Cc6} \]
\[ 34...\text{Cc4+} \]
\[ 35...\text{Ca6} \]
\[ 36...\text{Gg8} \]
\[ 37...\text{Xh7} \]
\[ 38...\text{Xh7} \]
\[ 39...\text{Xg8} \]

though after 36...\( \text{Cc7} \) he must force a draw by perpetual check.

\[ 31...\text{Ed7} \]
\[ 32...\text{Xd7} \]
\[ 33...\text{Xg7} \]
\[ 34...\text{bxa3} \]
\[ 34...\text{bxa3} \]

Black has managed to rebuff the attack. His two rooks and bishop, struggling against queen and three pawns, would have more chances of success if it were not for the h7-pawn, riveting both Black’s rooks to the defence of the h8-square. However, if Pillsbury were to play 34...\( \text{Cb5} \), the game in all probability would end peacefully. However, he decides to lengthen the diagonal of the bishop and falls into a trap.

\[ 34...\text{Cc4?} \]
\[ 35...\text{Cc4}! \]

\[ 34...\text{Exf2} \]

Chigorin points out the win both on 35...c3 – then 36...\( \text{dxe5} \)
37...\( \text{Xf2} \)
38...\( \text{Xf2} \), and 35...\( \text{b7} \) – met by 36...\( \text{dxe5} \)
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36.e4 37.e6!. Apparently, Pillsbury noticed some of these variations after having the move 34...c4. However, even 35...xf2 is only a desperate attempt to postpone the so unjustly cruel end, in view of the preceding events. The game is already over.

36.h8 37.hxh8 c8 38.b2 exd4 39.xd4+ c7 40.a4 f7 41.a5 c8 42.xd6 a7+ 43.c3 b5 44.a6 c7 45.a7

And Black resigned.

A mighty battle: the royal art of attack of Chigorin set against the young American’s calm and steadfast defence, which is broken down only at the very end. Chigorin’s rich imagination is very impressive.
Chapter 17

Chigorin – the man

What sort of relationship did this man, who was a personification of all that was most brilliant and significant in Russian chess over the past ten years, have with his colleagues? What kind of human being is preserved for us in the recollections of people who met the great Russian chess player? What was Chigorin like as a man?

Different, very different were the people who had recollections of Chigorin. Russians and foreigners, strong and weak chess players, writers, academics, quite unknown chess amateurs. And with all this dissimilarity, it is astonishing how, as an integral whole, the character of Chigorin, which we are reconstructing with this narrative, is revealed.

A man of enormous magnetism, with an attractive personality which inspired not only respect, but also love, and which left glowing memories of himself by nearly everyone who came into contact with him.

Modesty and simplicity, not a shade of attitude, conceit or self-satisfaction. Nobody, not even novice chess players, would be refused if they made a request to him to look at a game or give a simultaneous display. Unselfish. But, you know, one cannot forget that, for a long time, Chigorin’s life was not easy, and what little material security he had was achieved over forty years. Yes, and this material security was apparently very relative: when, in 1899, a friend of Chigorin expressed interest as to whether Chigorin would be taking part in the forthcoming London tournament, he replied: ‘I would definitely play. It is just the money...’ – and he clutched his head.

Humane and sympathetic, Chigorin was considerate towards the needs of his colleagues. In 1907, the by now mortally sick Chigorin played in the tournament at Carlsbad. Competing there was also the young Duz-Khotimirsky, at that time not yet a master. He arrived at the tournament without any money and, on the first day, was literally starving. He had no means of obtaining food. This told on his results, he lost game after game. Chigorin noticed how famished Duz looked, and asked him whether he had any money. When the fact was established that he was living in poverty, Chigorin roundly condemned the organisers of the tournament and there and then discussed what was necessary to ease the serious situation of the young chess player. As a result of Chigorin’s intervention, Duz was given money to buy food. He immediately began to look better and scored half the possible points in the tournament, which qualified him for the rank of master.

Later on, Duz-Khotimirsky was to recall this event many times, with deep gratitude.

It is true, with his worsening illness, Chigorin’s character displayed nervousness and short temper. Failing health sapped his strength. It became difficult for him to play.

His main source of vitality, the centre around which focuses all the spiritual strength of this remarkable man, was a love for chess. To live in the way that Chigorin
it, was possible only as long as he kept this in mind. Neither social upheaval, no matter how considerable that might be, nor domestic troubles, nor material disorder, could overshadow his love of the game for a moment. It was only chess which wholly absorbed him, only to it did he completely devote himself, only for it did he live. The fact that it intruded upon his private life added to Chigorin’s misfortunes. Obviously, the reason was an all-absorbing passion for chess, for the sake of which he could forget everything and disregard all his worries about domestic comforts. Chess also became his private life.

But love of chess was not, for Chigorin, the sort of self-satisfaction and self-indulgence of a lone artist. His attitude to chess, which he regarded as a true, full-blowned art, could not be separated from his passionate desire that everywhere in the whole country it should become the favourite game.

People gather together in societies, sometimes in order to pass on to one another, and thereby combine, their strength and knowledge, in order to be helpful to one another, in order to achieve by joint effort those sorts of results which leave nobody under-strength. And in this collective work, which increases tenfold the strength of individual people, is something wonderfully attractive’, wrote Chigorin as long ago as 1885.

This thirst for working for the general good never, to his very grave, ever deserted him. It gave strength to Chigorin. He displayed an enormous capacity for work, gave up a mass of time for organisation, literature, propaganda activity, and united the uncoordinated chess amateurs, who, by increasing their chess mastery, he wanted to pass on, as it were, a part of their own chess strength.

It was not easy to achieve all this. Mikhail Ivanovich had to spend time on organisational work, which took away from him rest and leisure. Here is an extract from the writing of Chigorin, which illustrates his enormous excess of work on chess or chess-related business.

‘Everything lies with me; the responsibility of being secretary, treasurer, and even librarian, and all the work of the Society, meetings, with reports, accounts, etc., etc., and finally the organisation of two tournaments, and a dinner on the occasion of a house-warming, which has still not been celebrated.’

Thus it was in 1893. Several years later, this is the picture: ‘I tell you, how I have to live now, in Piter, in the only house with a chess society (in a yard entered by another gate).

Here is what happened yesterday. I corrected the column for New Times. At 10.30 in the evening, someone came to me from the Society. At first one person, then another. I had to meet a man (P.A.Saburov). I had to go. I arrived. I sat down to look at his game. Afterwards I went to the dining room.

I whiled away the time until 3.30 a.m. when I set off for home, since I was terribly tired, leaving the public in the Society. I just had time to drop off to sleep, when a messenger came to me, informing me that a friend of mine, with an acquaintance, would soon arrive and wanted to see me. I did not go back to bed. The friend arrived within half an hour, and we talked to 7-8 in the early morning, as I now realise. Meetings can often take place even later...’
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The constant creative and also routine work required great energy and a strong will. And without doubt Chigorin possessed these. One reminiscing contemporary compared his life with the flight of a missile – he displayed such a clearness of purpose.

Chigorin was a proud man. He came from the people, remained deeply democratic, and always maintained his human dignity to a high degree. In his dealings with wealthy or influential chess amateurs, he never associated himself closely with them if this approximated to moral compromise and servility. The heavy demands Chigorin placed upon himself, his incorruptibility and fierce independence, would not allow him to come into conflict with his own peace of mind.

The only compromise which this strong-willed man made to his weak side was his predilection for alcohol. Mikhail Ivanovich acquired this as long ago as his Dominican years, and it remained his companion all through life...
Chapter 18

Nuremberg and Budapest tournaments 1896

In 1896, in connection with the Bavarian fair in Nuremberg, was organised a great international tournament. It had succeeded in attracting nearly all the strongest chess players of the time. In addition to the masters who competed in the tournament at Hastings, there were two young Hungarian chess players taking part in Nuremberg – Geza Maroczy and Rudolf Charousek. Maroczy had come out winner of the reserve tournament in Hastings; before this he had graduated from the Zurich Polytechnic, and the traits of the high-class ‘chess engineer’ – planning, manoeuvring, well prepared and thought out victories – were already being noticed at that time, with the quiet master’s play displaying both steadfast defence and virtuoso endgame technique (particularly with queens). He maintained his chess strength for a very long time, and, in the 20s and 30s of the 20th century, still gained outstanding victories and proved a dangerous opponent for the strongest players of the age. The Nuremburg tournament was his first international meeting and Maroczy at once made himself famous by taking 2nd prize. He lost only one game and allowed only one rival to come ahead of him – Lasker. It became immediately clear to the chess world how remarkable was this modest and consistent young engineer.

Despite the dissimilarity of their chess styles, Maroczy had a deep admiration for Chigorin. Not long after his death, he wrote: 'M.I. Chigorin was a brilliant chess player at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century... He was respected for his chess creativity, of which we were well aware and appreciated highly. Chigorin was on particularly good terms with me, possibly because he saw that I not only loved, but also deeply respected chess.'

A chess player of quite another type was the 23-year-old compatriot of Maroczy, Rudolf Charousek, whose very brilliant, but alas, short-term upward flight made
a very strong impression on his contemporaries, amongst whom were numbered Lasker and Chigorin. Lasker reckoned with the possibility that Charousek one day would play a match against him for the World Championship, and said this publicly, while Chigorin considered him to be the most gifted of all the young masters. On 27 December 1896, he wrote in one letter: 'The trend in the game, which contemporary players follow, is, so to speak, that of a craftsman (Steinitz is not joined with them), but not of a creative artist... A new Morphy has sprung up and thrashed everybody. Is that not what Charousek is? Highly possible. He is young, energetic, has physical endurance etc... these are essential qualities for success.' But, particularly on the last point, Chigorin was mistaken. It was hard to believe that the very healthy young man would be sent to his grave at the age of 26, with tuberculosis.

About Charousek, it was said that, when he was studying at high school, and not having the means to buy the important 'Handbook' — the most authoritative opening manual — he copied it out by hand. It is terrible to think of the amount of effort he must have spent on going through this enormous book! But (if this is history — not fiction) Charousek's play after this feat of hard work did not acquire any shade of bookishness at all and also did not lose its material freshness. The distinctive play of Charousek particularly attracted Chigorin's sympathies, which lay in the fact that out of all the young chess players rising from the ranks in the 1890s, he was the most alien to the influence of the Steinitz school and tried to be influenced most of all by the creativity of Chigorin. 'My best teacher' — said Charousek about Chigorin. He employed the Evans Gambit, the King's Gambit, the Scotch Gambit, and boldly came out with such openings against the strongest opponents, and beat them.

But this was not all. Just like Pillsbury, he was able to fill the Queen's Gambit with new combinational interest and also gained brilliant victories in it. The ability of both these young masters was very instructive for Chigorin! In particular, Charousek set excellent examples for a triumphant conclusion to a bold attack in the Queen's Gambit, in two excellent wins in his games against Chigorin (3rd game of the match, Budapest 1896, and Berlin 1897).

Charousek was allowed entry into the Nuremberg tournament at the last moment, instead of Burn, who suddenly withdrew. He occupied a low position in the tournament but his play attracted universal attention, while, in the last round, he brilliantly crushed Lasker himself. It was precisely at that time that Lasker made the comment that Charousek was a possible future opponent for him in a match for the World Championship.

Chigorin began the Nuremberg tournament very well and, after the first seven rounds, had 5 points out of 6. In the 8th round took place his meeting with Lasker. As Black, in the Queen's Gambit Declined, Chigorin, by very fine play, exploited a slight mistake by Lasker, but Lasker demonstrated his amazing ability to defend bad positions, which only he possessed, and even won the game.

In the tournament in Nuremberg, Lasker had further lost positions against Schiffers, Albin, Showalter and Schallopp, and also won all these games. In the tournament book, which he compiled, Tarrasch added a 'table of luck' in which
Lasker was placed first (in this table, Chigorin was in last place: not even one half point was due to luck).

As far as Tarrasch was concerned, this win of Lasker was undeserved and based on sheerish luck. But in our day his play was estimated at its true worth by D. Bronstein:

A great number of positions, which earlier were considered lost, can be defended successfully and even actively, but for this is required, firstly, effective counterplay, and secondly, the ability at a critical moment to leave weak points to the mercy of fate, and to transfer the struggle to another sector. Only now does it become clear that it was just such a manner of struggle which characterised the style of Emanuel Lasker, and that in this lay one of his basic advantages, which was not understood by any of his contemporaries.

But Chigorin was probably the only contemporary of Lasker who understood this advantage of his. '... Who, besides Lasker, would have planned a dangerous attack on my king's flank with the little means he had at his disposal?' – asked Chigorin, and, in these words is contained a high regard and a recognition of Lasker's manner of play. Chigorin himself was a first rate master of defence – possibly not without Lasker's influence – and was still further perfecting his art of resistance in hopelessly lost positions.

After losing to Lasker, Chigorin began to play far weaker and, in the remaining eleven games, scored only 4½ points. Together with Schiffer, he shared 9th-10th place with 9¼ points out of 18. Above them were: Lasker 13½, Maroczy 12½, Pillsbury and Tarrasch 12; Janowski 11½; Steinitz 11, Walbrodt and Schlechter 10½.

In the Nuremberg tournament took place a very rare event in the practice of Chigorin – he opened his game against Albin with the move 1.d4. Up to now, he had only played this twice, in the London tournament 1883 – against Mackenzie and Bird. The game with Albin was the third and last time. This aversion to 1.d4 was eloquent testimony to the somewhat one-sided nature of the great Russian chess player. I.Z. Romanov quite rightly wrote on this occasion: 'It is clear that, by opening 1.d4, Chigorin associated himself with the, so antagonistic to him, Steinitz school, which endeavoured to avoid lively piece play, in essence rejecting the combinational method of struggle... But, you know, Chigorin himself had no respect at all for the Queen's Gambit and the Queen's Pawn Opening in general! The creative content of these openings was however sufficiently broad and versatile to provide room for Chigorin's rich methods of strategy and tactics... By not taking up arms in closed openings, Chigorin undoubtedly limited his creative possibilities.'

By employing the move 1.d4 against Albin, Chigorin, unfortunately did not have any intentions at all of broadening his opening repertoire. His aim was narrow – he had a low opinion of the Albin Counter Gambit and was expecting that the inventor of this system could not resist the temptation of trying it against him. Thus it happened, and Chigorin quickly obtained a winning position. After gaining victory, he once more returned to the open games.

Out of Chigorin's other games in Nuremberg, it is worth mentioning his win against Charousek and his victory over Janowski, against whom he employed this variation of the Queen's Gambit Declined: Janowski-Chigorin: 1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6
3. \( \text{\textord Salisbury f6} \) 4. \( \text{\textord Salisbury f3} \) c6 5. e3 \( \text{\textord Salisbury d6} \) 6. \( \text{\textord Salisbury d3} \) 0-0 7. 0-0 \( \text{\textord Salisbury bd7} \) 8. e4 dxe4 9. \( \text{\textord Salisbury xe4} \) \( \text{\textord Salisbury xe4} \) 10. \( \text{\textord Salisbury xe4} \) Wc7. This game shows one of the stages of development, pertaining to Chigorin’s system with ...c7-c6, ...\( \text{\textord Salisbury bd7} \) and ...\( \text{\textord Salisbury d6} \) in the Queen’s Gambit. Even in the London tournament of 1883, he played this way against Mackenzie, while in the first match against Steinitz – without success – he made use of this system in the 8th game. In the 1890s, and also later, Chigorin time and again, in both domestic and international tournaments, defended with this system which he himself had worked out. He played it even against the strongest opponents – Burn (Hastings 1895), Maroczy (London 1899), Janowski (Nuremberg 1896 and Budapest 1896) –, who were not able to find a good reply against it. In all these games, Chigorin, with the black pieces, obtained the advantage and converted it to victory. In the 1890s, the variation with the development of the bishop on d6 had still not been worked out in standard chess theory, and, one after the other, first-class masters fell victim to it.

Only two months after the Nuremberg contest, was held a strong international tournament in Budapest to celebrate the thousand years of existence of Hungary. Lasker and Steinitz were not competing, as they were preparing for their return match in Moscow, but otherwise nearly all the strongest players of the day were taking part.

The tournament was opened with great pomp at the palace of the municipality of Budapest. At the opening ceremony, the orator, dressed in colourful national costume, delivered a speech, glorifying chess: 'Other games arouse passions which, in their awakening, take hold of the players, whereas chess takes dominance over passion; it is necessary for the mind of a chess player to be calm, so that self-control will assist him on the eve of victory.' Chigorin probably listened, with particular feeling, to these words of wisdom, as they emphasised the need for self-control – which had betrayed even himself at decisive moments! But it was precisely in Budapest that he conducted the whole contest excellently from beginning to end, and gained a brilliant victory.

The favourites – Pillsbury and Tarrasch – began the tournament surprisingly badly: in the first round, Pillsbury lost to Albin, Tarrasch – to Winawer. After six rounds, Tarrasch had only 1½ points and, by the end of the tournament, he had, with difficulty, scored half of the total possible points – a quite extraordinary result for a habitual winner of international tournaments. Maroczy played even worse throughout the tournament, making only 5 points out of 12. On the other hand, the veteran, the 58-year-old Winawer, had an excellent start with 6 out of 7.

Chigorin also started the tournament well. In the 10th round he won his game against Tarrasch in a famous rook ending.

As a result, Chigorin and Charousek shared victory with 8½ points out of 12. A match of four games between them was arranged to decide the first-prize winner. Chigorin emerged as the victor, winning the 1st, 2nd and 4th games, and losing the 3rd.

Chigorin displayed very strong and versatile play in Budapest. He had protracted manoeuvring games with Von Popiel and Marco, and excellent attacks against Janowski and Walbrodt, a stubborn, tense defence with Maroczy, and the remarkable
endgame against Tarrasch. Though, in the future, he still managed to achieve excellent results — his victories in the gambit tournament at Vienna 1903 and in the first three all-Russia tournaments —, he never again had such an outstanding success.

Chigorin’s victory in Budapest met with general recognition. Deutsches Wochenschach wrote: ‘Chigorin is a man, not of words, but of actions: when he suffered so many painful defeats in Nuremberg, he did not try to make excuses and give an explanation of his failure, but availed himself of the first opportunity to make amends for it. This he did with his fully deserved present victory. The Russian master’s uplift will be appreciated twice as much and greeted with twice the joy everywhere there are lovers of chess art.’

It was pleasant for Chigorin to receive also the congratulations of Steinitz, who was in Moscow playing his return match with Lasker.

10 November 1896, Moscow.

My dear friend and highly esteemed colleague! Please accept my warmest congratulations on the occasion of your honourable victory in Budapest. Connoisseurs of our noble art will be truly glad of the fact that the winner was the representative of Russia, who in recent times has made such a great contribution to the development of chess, which is the result of your genius and authority.

Let me assure you, that out of all the chess masters known to me, I wish you, in the future, the greatest success.

With friendly greetings
Yours, W. Steinitz.

Despite the contrast of their principal standpoints and style of play, Steinitz and Chigorin valued highly their friendship with each other and could not but feel joy and satisfaction when the play of a great rival was crowned with success.

At this time, a young chess player, Alexey Alexeyevich Troitsky, was studying in the St. Petersburg Forestry Institute. He took part in the handicap tournament of the St. Petersburg Chess Society, receiving knight odds from Chigorin. In 1896, the future great endgame study composer dedicated to Chigorin and Charousek — the winners of the Budapest tournament — two new studies, in which White’s minor pieces worked wonders in overcoming the strength of the black queen.

Chigorin himself, with rightful satisfaction, wrote of his result in Budapest: ‘I
Grekov: After 32...\textit{bx}b3 the win is achieved no quicker than upon the game continuation.

\textbf{33.exf5 h3}
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49 Evans Gambit

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

\textbf{Wilhelm Steinitz}

World Championship Match, Havana 1889 (7)

\textbf{NOTES by: Chigorin, Steinitz, Grekov, Romanovsky and Bogoljubow}

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{\&a}5 6.0-0 \textit{\&f}6

Grekov: Steinitz's variation, the idea of which, in accordance with the general principles of its inventor, is to conduct the defence with only pieces, keeping, as far as possible, the pawns on their original squares; later, in accordance with the teachings of the 'new school', these will represent a serious advantage for the defending side. Steinitz's defence was the object of a long running and principled analytical debate between Chigorin and its inventor and seen many times in games of the Russian master and the World Champion. Both in analytical debates and in practical encounters Chigorin was proved right: after the Russian's many victories over the board in games played with this defence, particularly convincingly in the telegraph match, Steinitz himself: refrained from the defence he himself had proposed, and in games with Chigorin in 1892-1896 he defended in another way.

Romanovsky: Steinitz's own invention, with which he intended to inflict a shattering blow upon Chigorin. However, the weapon rebounded against its author.

\textbf{7.d4 \textit{\&ge}7}

Grekov: In the telegraph match game Steinitz played 7...\textit{\&h}6.

\textbf{8.\textit{\&g}5}

Romanovsky: In the 15\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} games, Chigorin stuck to a different move-order: 8.d5 \textit{\&xd}8 9.\textit{\&a}4 \textit{\&b}6 (in the 11\textsuperscript{th} game, 9...b6 was tried, but this proved unsatisfactory) 10.\textit{\&g}5, which is probably the most convincing refutation of Steinitz's defence.

\textbf{8...\textit{\&d}6 9.d5!}

Bogoljubow: The strongest!

\textbf{9...\textit{\&d}8 10.\textit{\&a}4 \textit{\&b}6}

Romanovsky: In the 13\textsuperscript{th} game, Steinitz replied 10...f6 and obtained a quite satisfactory position. That is why Chigorin came to play 9.d5 and 10.\textit{\&a}4 with the black queen on f6.

Bogoljubow: Also unsatisfactory is 10...b6, as was seen from future games.

\textbf{11.\textit{\&a}3}
personally was satisfied not only with the fact that I gained a victory in Budapest, but also because I succeeded in being consistent in nearly every game, whether defending or attacking. I took these games with a fight; nobody gave me any "gifts". It was precisely this which pleased me.'

After the Budapest tournament, Chigorin, returning to his native land, played his last match with his old rival E. Schiffer. He won by a wide margin: +7 -1 =6. In total they played six matches, in which Chigorin won 21 games, while losing only 9, with 9 draws.

33 Italian Game
Mikhail Chigorin
Rudolf Charousek
Nuremberg 1896 (7)

1.e4 e5 2.Ąf3 Ąc6 3.Ąc4 Ąf6 4.d3
Ąc5 5.c3 d6 6.Ąbd2 0-0 7.Ąf1 d5
8.exd5 Ąxd5 9.Ąe3 Ąxe3 10.Ąxe3

In the St. Petersburg tournament, 1895/96, Chigorin, against Lasker, took back with the pawn here, whereupon Lasker made the fine pawn sacrifice 10...e4.

10...Ąd6 11.Ąe2 Ąe6 12.Ąg5

Probably Charousek considered his game quite acceptable, since White's position in the centre seems quite unstable in view of the threat 15...f5. For example, on the natural move 15.0-0 could follow 15...b5 16.Ąe3 f5 with an excellent game for Black.

15.g4!

A splendid positional move, which at once clarifies the situation. White secures his knight on e4 from attack and prepares the occupation of the f5-square. It is interesting that Chigorin applied a similar method of consolidating a minor piece in the centre in a game against Pillsbury (Game 44).

What can Black do? Probably deserving a try is the transfer of the knight via
t5-e6 to f4, and after this to begin to put pressure on the d3-square, for example, 15...f6 16.Qe3 Wf7 17.Qf5 Qd8! 18.h4 Qe6 with a complicated game. Also deserving attention is the transfer of the bishop: 15...Qg5 16.h4 Qf4!.

Tarrasch: To prevent 15...f5, after which the e-pawn would be isolated and the g-file opened for a rook attack. Chigorin now prepares the attack in the finest way and conducts it with wonderfulerve.

15...Qf8 16.Qe3 b5?

Tarrasch: Black should rather double rooks on the d-file or make some defensive move.

17.Qf5 Qf8 18.h4 Wf6 19.Wf3 Qe7 20.h5

A positional game was not to Charousek’s taste. Hereabouts, while Chigorin carries out a splendid regrouping of forces and goes from defence to attack, Charousek plays without a clear plan. Here, even now, instead of preventing the further weakening of his position by 20...h6 (though after 21.Qg1 White has an indisputable advantage), he sets a simple trap.

20...Qd7?

Obviously counting on 21.Qc5 (Qg5) Qd5! or 21.Qf6+ Wxf6 22.Qxe7+ Wxe7 23.Wxa8 Qxd3 with some hopes of defence. However, Chigorin at once provokes a weakening of the f6-square, after which there arises a variety of forks by the knight on e4.

21.h6 g6

22.Qg7

Tarrasch: This is even stronger than 22.Qxe7+ Qxe7 23.Qf6+ Wxf6 24.Wxa8+.

22...Qxg7 23.hxg7

The game is over. Black cannot simultaneously defend against the two terrible threats of 24.Qf6+ and 24.Qxh7.

23...Qd5 24.Qxh7 Qxh7 25.Qg5+ Qxg7 26.Qxe6+ fxe6 27.0-0-0 Qb6 28.g5 Qf8 29.Wh3 Qxf2 30.Wh6+ Qf7 31.Wh7+ Qe8 32.Qxg6+ Qd8 33.Qg8+ Qe7 34.g6 Qg2 35.Qf1

Black resigned.

Tarrasch: This game is amongst the finest of the tournament.

34 Queen’s Gambit:
Semi-Slav Defence

Dawid Janowski
Mikhail Chigorin

Budapest 1896 (4)

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.Qc3 c6 4.e3

The principal alternatives are 4.e4 dxe4 5.Qxe4 Qb4+ 6.Qd2, and 4.Qf3 dxe4 5.e3 b5. Janowski is not for the present thinking about the fate of the bishop on c1 and defends the c4-pawn.

4...Qf6 5.Qd3 Qbd7 6.Qf3 Qd6
played in 1953: 7.a3 \( \text{a}5 \) 8.\( \text{W}c2 \) (better is an immediate 8.0-0) 8...0-0 9.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 10.0-0 \( \text{dxc4} \) 11.\( \text{a}x\text{c4} \) e5, and now, instead of 12.\( \text{a}e1 \) \text{exd4} 13.\text{exd4} \( \text{b}6! \), White must play 12.\( \text{c}xe5 \) \( \text{c}xe5 \) 13.\text{dxe5} \( \text{a}xe5 \) 14.f4, striving to advance his pawn centre.

Theory, instead of 6...\( \text{d}6 \), recommends the so-called Meran Variation: 6...\( \text{dxc4} \) 7.\( \text{dxc4} \) b5 8.\( \text{d}3 \) a6, or even 8...\( \text{b}4 \).

7.0-0 0-0

8.\( \text{e}4 \)

Now Black carries out his idea in the most favourable light and obtains counterplay in the centre. Contemporary opening strategy, in similar positions, considers as more expedient the plan involving the fianchetto of the bishop on \( \text{c1} \) – \( \text{b3} \) and then \( \text{d}2 \). In this case, White firstly completes his development – \( \text{W}e2 \), \( \text{a}c1 \), \( \text{f}1 \), and then carries out the advance \( \text{e}3-\text{e}4 \).

8...\( \text{dxc4} \) 9.\( \text{c}xc4 \) e5! 10.\( \text{g}5 \)

Later, World Champion Alekhine, upon whom, as he himself said, Chigorin exerted immense influence, somewhat modernised the plan with the advance ...e6-e5. He proposed, instead of 6...\( \text{d}6 \), the move 6...\( \text{b}4 \), in order to hamper the advance e3-e4 and prepare ...e6-e5. One of the most serious practical trials of this idea took place in the game Botvinnik-Taimanov.
10...\textbf{We7!}

A critical position in the opening system. Black reinforces the e5-square inferior would be 10...h6 11.\textbf{Ah4} exd4 12.\textbf{Wxd4} Ac5 13.\textbf{Ad3} Ab6, because of 14.e5! \textbf{Wxd3} 15.\textbf{Dxd3} Dfd5 16.De4) and wants, after ...Dfd8, to create some threats in the centre.

But, all the same, White is fully capable of maintaining the tension in the centre, by playing 11.Ae1. The position which is created after the standard 11.h6 12.Ah4 Ab6 13.Ab3 Ad8, can be estimated as complicated and approximately equal.

Janowski liquidates the tension in the centre and thereby simplifies Black's problems.


White's pressure is becoming unpleasant, but it is hard to believe that this is the result of the move 11.d5. Probably Chigorin committed an error in playing 12.Ag4. It was necessary to play 12...h6 13.Ah4 g5!? so as after 14.Ag3 to pin the knight by 14...Ag4.

16.Dh8

Objectively the best move, though it does not eliminate his difficulties. By taking the king off the a2-g8 diagonal, Black prepares the move ...h7-h6, and, on 17.Dxg6+, prepares to take back with the f-pawn, in order, after ...h7-h6 and ...g7-g5, to obtain the f4-square and play on the f-file. Black cannot linger by 16...Ac7 17.Wf3 Ad8, since after 18.De2 there is an unavoidable invasion of the knight on f5.

17.De5 Axh5

Janowski finds an interesting plan of attack on the king's flank.

15.g4! Ag6 16.Ah4 18.gxf5?
Janowski clearly overestimates his chances on the g-file. The next move already shows that White has neither the strength nor the time to organise an attack on the king. From this moment on, Chigorin conducts the struggle with exceptional skill and energy and creates decisive threats... on the g-file.

After 18.exf5! Black would have to go over to defence, since the white knight swoops upon the freed e4-square. The attempt to seize the initiative at the cost of a pawn: 18...e4 (with the threat of 19...We5) does not work because of 19.Qxe4 or 19.Qxf6 gxf6 20.Qxe4. After 18...Rd8 would have followed 19.Qe4 Qc7 20.Wc2 with a bind. He could only resign himself to the inevitable, and build a fortress, for example: 18...Qc5 19.Qe4 Qd4 20.Wc1 Qac8 21.Qxf6 gxf6 22.Wh6 Qd7.

18...h6 19.Qh4

It is useless for White to move his bishop away from the centre, since he does not succeed in exploiting the pin on the Qf6. Necessary was 19.Qe3, tempting the opponent into the effective 19.g5 20.fxg6 Qg8. In this case, 21.Qh1 Qxg6 22.Wf3, followed by Qg1, gives White equal chances. Instead of 19...g5, more substantial looks 19...Qc5, followed by an occupation of the d4-square.

19...Rad8 20.We2 g5! 21.Qg3 Qg8 22.Qg2 Qg7 23.Rad1

White does not have any serious counterplay and decides to place his pieces simply in 'good positions'. The sortie on the queen’s flank, 23.a4 a5 24.Wa6, is doomed to failure: 24...Qc5! 25.Wxa5? Qa8.

23...h5!

Of course, Black risks nothing by beginning an attack on the king, and White is obliged to go over to passive defence.

24.Qh1 h4 25.Qh2 Qdg8 26.Qf1 Qc5

27.Qb1

This move is not good, if only because after a few moves the knight returns to c3, with the result that White loses two tempi. But also hardly better would be 27.Wf3, because of the simple 27...Qd4 followed by ...Qxd7-c5, and in the event of 28.Qe2, strong is 28...c5! 29.Qxd4 cxd4. Little is changed also by 27.Qa4 Qxa4 (27...Qd4? 28.Qxb6 axb6 29.Qxd4! exd4 30.e5) 28.Qxa4 g4 and Black would continue the attack as in the game.

27...g4 28.hxg4 Qxg4 29.Qg1 Qg5

Black is threatening 30.Qh2+! 31.Qe1 Qg2.

30.Wf3 Qd4 31.Qc3 c5 32.Qe2 c4 33.Qc2 Wh6!
Black completes his preparations for a decisive invasion on the g-file and the only way to prevent this is by the move $34.Wh3$ (so as, after $34...Cxf2$, to play $35.Wxh4$!). However, after $34...Kh7$, Black’s attack would all the same develop without hindrance, for example: $35.Cb5$ ($35.f3 Cg3$!) $35...Cxf2 36.Cxf2 Cxf2 37.Cxf2 Cg3!$ $38.Cd8+ Cg7 39.f6+ Wxf6+ 40.Wf5 Wxd8 and wins.

34.Cb5 Cxf2! 35.Cxf2 Cxf2

The bishop is immune from capture – $36.Cxf2 Cg3!$ or $36.Wxf2 Cg2$. The agony begins.

36.Cd6 Cc5 37.f6 Cg2+ 38.Cf1 Cxd6 39.Cxd6 Cc2 40.Cd1 Cg2

5...We7

A chivalrous gesture – Black accepts the challenge. The shortcomings of the move $5.We2$, related to the retarded development of his king’s flank, would be highlighted upon the continuation $6.d4 exd3 7.Cxd3 We7$ followed by $...0-0$ with a good game.


A typical positional piece sacrifice for two pawns and a powerful pawn centre.
Though Chigorin considered that White ought to obtain an attack just as strong as in the Muzio or Allgaier Gambits, the problem here is considerably more difficult, since White does not for the present have an advantage in development. But in order to place under doubt the correctness of Chigorin’s sacrifice, Black must play energetically, not clinging to his material advantage, and he will not be able to do this.

It is interesting that a similar sacrifice of a piece, but in a Two Knights Defence, was successfully carried out by grandmaster Bronstein: 1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qd5 Qf6 4.Qg5 d5 5.exd5 Qa5 6.d3 h6 7.Qf3 e4 8.dxe4 Qxc4 9.Wd4 (Bronstein-Rojahn, Moscow 1956).

8...c6

Walbrodt wants to provide the c7-square for his bishop and, at the same time, cover the b7-pawn, freeing the bishop on c8 from the responsibility of defending it. But, all the same, this move does not help his development and gives White time to organise an attack.

Black ought to play for an advantage in development by 8...Qf6 (on the move 8...Qd7, White obtains a good game with the reply 9.Qd3, but possible also is the attack with 9.Qb5; if 9...c6 then 10.Qxc6 Qxc6 11.Qxc6 Qb8 12.Qxd6 etc.). Also Chigorin considered this move equally strong, rightly believing that the attempt to immediately regain the sacrificed material by 9.We2 could lead to a dangerous attack on the white king after 9...0-0-0! However, the plan suggested by him, 9.Wh4 Qxd5 10.Qg5 We6 11.Qc4 etc., is not forced. Black could seize the initiative by the counter-sacrifice of a piece, 9...Qxe5! 10.dxe5 We5+, for example: 11.Qe2 Qg4 12.Qc3 0-0 and White can play neither 13.Qg5, because of 13...Qxe2 14.Qxe2 Wxb2, nor 13.0-0, Qxe2 14.Qe1, because of 14...Qc5+.

9.Qc4 Qc7 10.0-0 Qe6

At first sight it seems that Black has found a successful deployment of his forces and if he succeeds in playing ...Qd7 and ...0-0-0, everything would be in order. But White has an advantage in development and, exploiting this, he begins an attack on the king.

11.Qg5! Wxg5

It is difficult to say which is the lesser evil for Black. Of course, the exchange of bishops favours White, since he obtains the possibility of invading both on f7 and also on c8, and on h7 (after Qxg8). However, in the event of 11...Qd7, the

57 But Black then has 12.Wh4+ in conjunction with a subsequent ...Wc4+, ...Qb6 and ...Qa6+, exploiting White’s lack of development.
Black king is stuck in the centre for a long time, and White strengthens his attack with each move, for example: 12.\text{d}2  \text{e}7 13.\text{c}3  \text{a}6 14.\text{w}h4  \text{g}6 15.\text{w}h5  \text{d}8 16.\text{e}4! etc.

12.\text{x}e6

12...\text{h}6?

Black has played the opening somewhat incorrectly, but this move finally ruins his game. Probably this is the result of an oversight, since, in repulsing the threat of invasion on the f7-square, Black does not notice the threat to the b7-pawn.

Chigorin, analysing this position, calculated only two variations: 12...\text{e}7 13.\text{h}4  \text{w}h6 14.\text{g}4, and 12...\text{w}7 13.\text{c}8! (not 13.\text{x}g8??  \text{x}g8 14.\text{x}h7  \text{w}e6) 13...\text{b}6 14.\text{d}2  \text{a}6 15.\text{c}4! allowing White to develop a very strong attack, for example: (1) 15...\text{f}6 16.\text{w}h4  \text{d}5 17.\text{d}6+  \text{d}8 18.\text{f}7  \text{w}h4 19.\text{d}7#; (2) 15...\text{xc}8 16.\text{d}6+  \text{d}8 17.\text{f}7  \text{w}e6 18.\text{f}8+  \text{d}7 (if 18...\text{e}7 then 19.\text{xc}8) 19.\text{xc}8  \text{f}6 20.\text{xb}6+  \text{xb}6 21.\text{d}5! \text{cx}d5 22.\text{a}4+ and 23.\text{xc}8.

However, Black’s position could be defended with the move 12...\text{d}7.

58 In fact much stronger is 16.\text{d}3 with the threat of 17.\text{x}g6+ e.g. 16...\text{g}8 17.\text{c}e4  \text{c}7 18.\text{d}6+  \text{x}d6 19.\text{x}g6+ wins, e.g. 19...\text{x}g6 20.\text{x}g6+  \text{f}7 21.\text{ex}d6  \text{x}g6 22.\text{ae}1+.

preparing 0-0-0. White would have several tempting attacking plans, but in none of them can be seen a quick outcome to the struggle, for example: 13.\text{f}7  \text{c}1+ (or ...\text{e}7); 13.\text{h}4  \text{w}e7 14.\text{f}7+  \text{d}8 15.\text{c}3  \text{h}6 16.\text{b}3 \text{g}6 followed by ...\text{f}5; 15.\text{c}3 0-0-0 14.\text{f}7  \text{h}6! 15.\text{h}4  \text{w}g6 16.\text{x}g6 hxg6 17.\text{x}g7  \text{f}5!.

After 12...\text{d}7, the best prospects seem to lie in 13.\text{f}7+  \text{d}8 14.\text{c}3  \text{h}6 15.\text{ad}1 followed by \text{d}4-\text{d}5, but also here it is not simple to prove an advantage for White.

13.\text{c}8!

13...\text{d}7 14.\text{xb}7  \text{e}7 15.\text{xc}6!

White secures the d5-square for his knight. This invasion must decide the game far quicker than the prosaic 15.\text{xa}8.

15.\text{af}8 16.\text{c}3  \text{xf}1+ 17.\text{xf}1  \text{af}8 18.\text{d}5+  \text{d}8 19.\text{f}4  \text{e}8 20.\text{w}d5  \text{w}e7

21.\text{b}5!
Chigorin conducts the attack beautifully. The bishop clears the way for the queen to a8.

21...g5 22.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}}a8+ \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}b8} 23.\texttt{\textbullet}d5 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}e6} 24.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}7 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}7 25.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}b}7+ 1-0

Since if 25...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}c}7 26.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}x}c7#.

36 Spanish Game
Mikhail Chigorin
Siegbert Tarrasch
Budapest 1896 (10)
Notes by: \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\textbullet}Levenfish}}

1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}f}3 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}c}6 3.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d}5 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}f}6 4.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e}2 d6

Tarrasch does not play ‘according to Tarrasch’. He might have calmly continued 4...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}c}5. If then 5.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}6 dxc6 6.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xe}5, then not 6...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d}4 7.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}3 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}b}6 8.f3 0-0 9.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}f}2 with advantage to White, but simply 6...0-0 with an attack for the pawn.

5.d4 exd4
Simpler is 5...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d}7, but Tarrasch has a highly piquant retort in mind.

6.e5

6...d3!
The only move, since after 6...dxe5 7.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xe}5 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}b}4+ 8.c3, Black loses a piece.

By diverting the c2-pawn, Black gains time for a saving check on b4.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{59} Black can limit his material loss to just the exchange after 7...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e}7 8.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}6 bxc6 9.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xc}6+ \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}7 9...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xa}8.

7.cxd3 dxe5 8.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xe}5 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}b}4+ 9.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}2 0-0

The threat of ...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}e}8, exploiting his backward development, requires White to play very accurately. Chigorin repulses all Black’s attempts to obtain the attack in exemplary fashion.

10.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xc}6! \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}6+ 11.\texttt{\textbullet}d2 bxc6 12.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}6 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d}6 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e}7+ \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}h}8 14.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}8 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xc}8 15.0-0

White completes his development. He will of course lose the d3-pawn, but he endeavours to sell its life as dearly as possible.

15...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}8 16.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e}4! \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xd}3 17.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xd}3 \texttt{\textbullet}d3 18.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xf}6 gxf6

And so we have reached the ending. Black’s pawns are all isolated and weak, and his only counter-chance consists of invading with his rooks on the seventh rank. In rook endings, such an invasion can compensate even for the loss of a pawn. White’s position is complicated still further in that he must lose time to create a flight square for his king. Nevertheless Chigorin finds the only way to give himself winning chances – by invading on the seventh rank.

19.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}f}d1! \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d}8 20.\texttt{\textbullet}d3 \texttt{\textbullet}d3 21.g3 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}d}2 22.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}c}1! \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xb}2 23.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbullet}xc}7 \texttt{\textbullet}a2

As is shown by the game continuation, occupying the seventh rank, with
the black king on the eighth, proves decisive, and, objectively speaking, Tarrasch should have continued 24...g7 24...a7 g6. Since the black rook occupies a position behind the a-pawn, such an ending would give Black greater chances of a draw. I realise that such advice is easy to give after the end of a game, but which master, in a similar position, would willingly allow the opponent an extra passed pawn?

24...xh7 Ea6

White has achieved his optimum position. That the extent of White’s advantage is not great can be seen by the fact that, even in the event of the loss of Black’s a7-pawn, the ending of rook and three pawns against rook and two pawns is still far from won.

25.g2 g8 26.hb7 Ma2 27.h4 a6

Black’s last two moves reveal that he does not suspect any danger for himself; he intends to stick to his waiting tactics. In particular, he does not advance the pawn further so as not to limit the mobility of his rook on the a-file. I consider that this tactic is right: the variation 26...Ma1 (instead of the move in the game, 26...Ma2) 27.h4 a5 28.h5 h6 29.hf3 a4 30.ee4 a3 31.hf5 hf1 (or 31...a2 32.Ma7) 32.g6 h8 33.Ma7 xf2 34.Ma3 shows the danger to which Black exposes himself by speeding up the advance of the a-pawn.

28.hf3

28...h5

The preceding move, 27...a6, prepared the advance of the pawn to h5, since it prevented the reply 29.gh5. An analysis of the position shows that Tarrasch chose the best defence. A simple continuation of the waiting tactics does not help, for the reason that the black king finds itself in zugzwang (on ...h8, would follow hf7) and Black, if he does not want to advance the a-pawn, can move the rook only along the a-file. White sets up a pawn formation, f3, g4, h5, which, in view of the threat h5-h6, evokes the reply ...h7-h6. But then the white king invades via f5 to g6; for example: 28...Ma4 29.h5 h6 30.Ma7 Ma2 31.g4 a5 32.g3 a4 33.f3 f5 (otherwise 34.xf4 etc.) 34.gxf5 Ma1 35.xf4 h1 36.xe5 xh5 37.xe6 h1 38.Ma8+ h7 39.g6 g1+ 40.hf5, and the f-pawn advances to queen.

29.Ac7 Ma5

The threat was 30.Sc5. In this position, Tarrasch proposed a draw, not seeing the winning plan for White. Chigorin declines the draw and brilliantly demonstrates the way of realising White’s tiny advantage.

30.xf4 hf8
At first sight it is incomprehensible why Black frees the way for the white king. But Tarrasch rightly calculates that he cannot continue with passive play for much longer; for example: 34...\texttt{g8} 35.h5 \texttt{f8} 36.h6 \texttt{g8} 37.\texttt{g7+ f8} 38.\texttt{g6 f7} 39.h7! \texttt{a4+ 40.f3 a3+ 41.h4 a1 42.h8 f8 43.xf6+ g7 44.g5! xh8 (44.a5 45.f5 xf5+ 46.gxf5 xh8 47.f6) 45.g6 g8 46.b6, and White wins by the same method as in the game.}\(^{60}\)

But Black can still save himself if, by giving up the a6-pawn and maintaining his rook on the fifth rank, he does not allow the advance of the king, for example: 34...\texttt{g8} 35.h5 \texttt{b5} 36.a6 \texttt{g7} 37.a7+ \texttt{g8}! 38.g3 c5 39.h4 b5 40.h6 c5 41.g7 f8 42.g6 f7 43.h7 c8! and the variation might end in the following way: 44.h5 c1+ 45.h8 f8 46.f6+ g7 f7 47.f7+ xh8 48.g6 c8 with a drawn position.

35.f5 f1+ 36.g6 f4!

Tarrasch is defending in masterful fashion.

32.a7 f8 33.g4! hxg4 34.fxg4

34.a1

37.g5 f5

If 37...\texttt{xh4}, then not 38.gxf6? but 38.a8+! \texttt{g7} 39.gxf6+ etc.

\(^{60}\) However the Nalimov Endgame Tablebase calculates that it’s only a draw after 46.f8.
38. hxg5

Though White is left with only one pawn, his position, from being somewhat better, is transformed into a theoretical win thanks to the active position of his pieces and the position of the pawn on the g-file.

38... a4

Black cannot achieve a draw by means of 38... g8, since there would follow 39. a8+ (after 39. xa6? f8 draws) 39... f8 40. xf8+ xf8 41. h7, and the g-pawn advances to queen.

39. a8+ e7 40. h6

40... a5

Also hopeless is 40... d6 41. g6 e5 42. g7 g4 43. xa6. After 40... a1 41. g6 h1+ 42. g7, there is also reached a well-known theoretical position, winning for White.

41. g6 a1 42. g7 h1+ 43. g6 g1+ 44. h7 h1+ 45. g8 a1 46. a7+ e8

47. a6!

White intends to promote the g7-pawn after 48. a6 and h8.

47... h1 48. a5

Now White threatens 49. e5+ d7 50. f7 f1+ 51. g6 g1+ 52. g5.

48... e1 49. h5 g1 50. e5+ d7 51. h7

An important rook ending, requiring from Chigorin quite exceptional mastery – the more so that Tarrasch also defended excellently. The importance of controlling the seventh rank came out very clearly in the present game. Botvinnik bestows great praise on this ending and, in his Selected Games, writes 'Whenever I play a rook ending, I always remember this game.'
Chapter 19

Ever creative and competitive

After the Budapest tournament, there was a drop in the curve of Chigorin’s results in international tournaments. The quality of the odd game, the depth and brilliance of his combinations and strategic planning remained at its former height, one could even say that the development of his talent did not cease and gave rise to new interesting ideas. Chigorin remained a fearsome opponent for the strongest chess players, but surprising, disappointing failures became more frequent and spoiled his results. He lost his confidence and composure. By now he did not have sufficient strength to play equally well throughout a whole competition; sometimes, at the beginning, sometimes at the end of a tournament, would occur a period of failure. Thus, in Berlin 1897 and Vienna 1898, he conducted the finish very weakly, while, on the other hand, in Hannover 1902, he had 4 points out of the first 11 games and 5 out of the remaining 6; in Barmen 1905 – 2 points out of the first 9 and again 5 out of the remaining 6; in Nuremberg 1906, 4 points out of the first 10 and then he won all 6 remaining games.

As before, he strived to win each game, which at times was exploited by the weakest competitors, who knew Chigorin very well and were aware of his indomitable fighting spirit. ‘An interesting situation arises’, said Chigorin, ‘where it is possible to create something out of the ordinary, but the opponent avoids making any effort, so as to deprive the position of its individuality. Then you become angry, get agitated, sharpen the play still further, and he cuts you down in cold blood.’

And yet, ‘however frequent were the failures of Chigorin, both in individual games and in whole competitions, they always featured surprises; however brilliant
his victories, they always seemed natural,’ wrote the strong German chess\nmaster Walbrodt.

After his victory in Budapest, everyone was anticipating a victory for Chigorin\nin Berlin 1897. Tarrasch confidently forecast that 1st prize in the Berlin tournament\nwould be taken by Chigorin. But the tournament finished in a triumph for\nCharousek. This was the finest achievement of Charousek, who remained alive for\nanother two and a half years. He will remain forever in the history of chess as\none of the brightest and most quickly fleeting stars.

Chigorin played well in Berlin for the first fifteen rounds, scoring 10 1/2 points\nand winning a series of real ‘Chigorin’ games. But, surprisingly, he lost the last four\ncounters and only came 10th.

In 1898, in Vienna, in honour of the fifty-year reign of Franz Joseph, was held\na grand double-round tournament, lasting almost two months, in which nineteen\nparticipants played two games against each other. Tarrasch and Pillsbury, after\nundistancing their rivals by two points, played a match of four games between\nthemselves for first prize (Tarrasch won with the score +2 -1 =1).

In this tournament, Chigorin shared 6th-7th prize with Burn. His game from the\n20th round against Burn (White) was very significant for opening theory. Its first\nmoves were altogether unusual for chess of the 19th century: 1.d4 &f6 2.c4 c5 3.d5\n3.exd5 cxd5 4.e4 e6 5.e4 &e7 6.f4 0-0. Before us is the so-called King’s Indian Defence.

Not only in 1898, but also much later, both sides — White and Black — aimed\nto occupy the centre as soon as possible in the opening. Such was the prevalent\nattitude to the openings of the epoch. Chigorin’s idea was quite different: to allow\nWhite the centre and pounce on it with blows from the pieces and pawns. His\nremarkable victory over Pillsbury in the Queen’s Gambit, which we have already\nmentioned, was a model of the same strategy.

In the game between Burn and Chigorin, the tenacious Englishman achieved\nvictory, which was the reward for his steadfastness, but the game remains one of\nthe most remarkable monuments to Chigorin’s creativity in the openings. Later on,\nfrom 1903-1907, he systematically chose this opening.

The Vienna tournament finished on 30 July 1898, and, on 1 August, the next\ninternational tournament of the German Chess Federation already began in\nCologne. Out of 16 participants there were only seven who completed the final 36th\ngame in Vienna. They spent all day, on 31 July, travelling from Vienna to Cologne,\nand, on the following day, they began play in the new tournament. Amongst these\ndefeatfiable seven were both Chigorin and the fifty-year-old Englishman, Amos\nBurn.

Burn was an original figure, a chess player of exceptional composure, persistence,\nsteadfastness, a true embodiment of the notorious British imperturbability.\Nimzowitsch numbered him amongst the greatest masters of defence of all\ntime. It was practically impossible to unsettle him and deprive him of his\nmental equilibrium. In 1886, he played a match against Mackenzie. Burn made a\ncatastrophic start — he lost the first four games. But the match ended in a draw! In\none tournament, a bottle of water fell to the ground with a crash. Nearly everyone
present was startled, only Burn continued calmly looking at the board. Later on, he said that he had not heard anything.

The Cologne tournament proved to be the finest achievement of Burn's entire chess career. In Cologne, he played, against Steinitz, a game which could be numbered amongst the best of Steinitz's achievements, if the World Champion had not been on the victim's side...

In Cologne, Chigorin shared 2nd-4th prizes with Charousek and V.Cohn. In the 11th round, against Schiffer, he again produced a ‘prophetic' game, the opening moves of which nobody would be surprised to see made in a game, played not in 1898, but thirty years later: Schiffer-Chigorin: 1.d4 †f6 2.†f3 b6 3.c4 †b7 4.e3 g6 5.†c3 †g7 6.†d3 d6 7.0-0 0-0 8.e4 †bd7. The double fianchetto, for chess players of the 19th century, even for one as strong as Schiffer, was equivalent to the suggestion of starting a conversation with a foreigner in an unfamiliar language.

In the final years of the 19th century, Chigorin was producing creative ideas with exceptional intensity. It seems that never before had his talent flourished so splendidly, and so many systems were being introduced ahead of their time, far outliving their creator, and thriving even today with full-blooded vitality.

In 1899, at the international tournament in London, Chigorin first employed one of his most important theoretical novelties – the famous defence in the Spanish Game which bears his name.

Three basic defences against the Spanish game were known in the 1890s: the Open Variation, the Steinitz Defence with ...d7-d6 and ...f6, and the system with 3...e6 and...xe4. Steinitz and Lasker considered that the move 3...a6 contradicted a basic principle of chess theory (‘Do not move any pawns in the opening, other than the king’s or queen’s’ – this is how Lasker formulated the principle). Lasker declared that the move 3...f6, in accordance with this doctrine, was stronger than 3...a6.
Chigorin, at one time or another, had employed all these defences. He even played
the Steinitz Defence in 1880, when Steinitz himself considered it weaker than
the others, but none of them satisfied him. In his match against Tarrasch, he
introduced a defence, which he had invented himself, with ...\( \mathcal{Q} \)fd7, but was not
happy with it, and worked out a system connected with an advance of pawns on
the queen’s flank.

In his game against Lasker at the London tournament of 1899, he employed a
setup which can be considered the prototype of the present Chigorin Variation. The
first moves of this game were: 1.e4 c5 2.e3 d6 3...\( \mathcal{Q} \)c6 3...\( \mathcal{Q} \)b5 a6 4...\( \mathcal{Q} \)a4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)f6 5.0-0 \( \mathcal{Q} \)e7
6...\( \mathcal{Q} \)c3 b5 7...\( \mathcal{Q} \)b3 0-0 8.d3 d6 9...\( \mathcal{Q} \)e3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)a5 10...\( \mathcal{Q} \)e2 c5 11.c3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xb3 12.axb3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)c7.

The final scheme of this variation, which has now become classical, was applied
by Chigorin in his game against Duras, Nuremberg 1906. Nowadays, Chigorin’s
system in the Spanish Game is one of the most interesting chapters in modern
opening theory.

The London tournament ended in a new triumph for Lasker, who scored 23\( \frac{1}{2} \)
points out of 28 and outdistanced Maroczy, Pillsbury and Janowski, who followed
4\( \frac{1}{2} \) points behind. This colossal margin remained a record until Alekhine, in the
Bled tournament of 1931, left behind the second prize-winner by 5\( \frac{1}{2} \) points.
Chigorin finished in 7\( ^{th} \) place with 16 points.

In the 16\( ^{th} \) round of the London tournament took place the last, 59\( ^{th} \) in number,
meeting of Chigorin with Steinitz. In the most recent of their games, Chigorin had
gained the upper hand. The overall score of the encounters between the two great
rivals was +27 -24 =8 in favour of Steinitz. The seriously ill ex-World Champion,
in the London tournament – the last of his life – shared 10\( ^{th} \)-11\( ^{th} \) place, without
scoring a single draw. Only one year of life remained for him.

The departure of Steinitz from the chess arena and also from life itself ended
a colourful, dramatic and significant stage in chess history. And the beginning of
another. Chess players of the following generation often did not even begin to
suspect how much they owed to this contradictory, stubborn, selfless man who
was devoted to chess. Sadly and painfully, Chigorin probably would have realised
that inevitably he would soon be parting company for ever with Steinitz. He was
destined never again to meet this small, bearded old man, supported by a crutch – a
great chess player…

37 Sicilian Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Emanuel Schiffsers
Match, St.Petersburg 1897 (14)
Notes by: Tarrasch
1.e4 c5 2...\( \mathcal{Q} \)c3 ...\( \mathcal{Q} \)c6 3...g3 d6 4...\( \mathcal{Q} \)g2 e5
In the 1860s this move was
recommended by Anderssen: it is
an attempt to limit the activity of
White’s king’s bishop. However, Black’s
d6-pawn is left backward and the
d5-square is weak. In my opinion,
it would be better not to advance the
e-pawn, but to develop with the moves
...g7-g6 and ...\( \mathcal{Q} \)g7.
5...\( \mathcal{Q} \)ge2 f5
Schiffsers played the same opening also
in his game with Von Bardeleben at the
Hastings tournament in 1895.
6.d3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)f6 7.f4
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7...fxe4
This same mistake — in my opinion already decisive — was also made in the above-mentioned game, though Schiffer's opponent did not exploit it. However, Chigorin in the present game plays absolutely faultlessly and finds the strongest move every time — and this is rarely seen, even in games between the strongest masters. In similar positions, where two pairs of pawns stand opposite each other, in the majority of cases the inferior game is obtained by the player who exchanges pawns first — apart from the case when such an exchange gives an immediate advantage.

8.dxe4 Kg4
Whether Black makes this move or not — there is no longer any chance of him equalising the game.

9.f5! Ke7 10.h3 Kxe2 11.Kxe2 0-0 12.0-0

On a deeper study of this position, which on the surface might seem quite equal, the significance of Black’s mistaken idea becomes clear. Black, by exchanging his f-pawn for the white d-pawn (but not for the e-pawn), cleared the f5-square and gave the opportunity for the white pawn to advance to this square. This outpost creates the danger of a quick attack, which actually proves irresistible. But, on the other hand, the black d-pawn shows itself as a material, but by no means a positional equivalent for the white f5-pawn. Thus Black loses because these two pawns of different value, he evaluates as being of equal worth, and exchanges them.

12...Cc8
Other moves, for example 12...Cd4, would not be better.

13.Cc3 Cc8
Black was threatened with the loss of a pawn after 14.Cb3+.

14.g4 Ce8

15.Ch2!
As will be seen later, this is the beginning of a fine manœuvre which has the aim of carrying out a pawn storm on the opponent’s king position.

15...Cc7
Nowadays, in the defence of similar positions, the exchange of bishops by means of 15...Cg5 would be considered absolutely essential.

16.Cg1 Cg7 17.Cc4 Cc7 18.Cf3 d5
Black advances his backward pawn and, with its further advance, it might even become passed. However this pawn does not have any kind of influence on the further course of the game as does the white f-pawn (and the other white pawns on the king's flank).

19.h4!

Of course, Black cannot take this pawn, since after 20.g5 he would lose a piece.

19...dxe4

This frees the e4-square for White. Possibly more chances were offered by 19...d4.

20.\textit{Wxe4} \textit{Qxe8}

White cannot now play 21.g5, because of 21...\textit{Qd6}.

21.\textit{Qg5} \textit{Qxg5}

If Black does not exchange, then this knight invades on e6.\textsuperscript{61}

22.\textit{hxg5} \textit{Qd6} 23.\textit{We3} \textit{Wb6}

\textbf{24.g6!} \textit{Qe8}

\textsuperscript{61} 22.f6 was also threatened.

On 24...hxg6 would have followed \textit{Wh3+}, \textit{Qd5+} and \textit{fxg6}.

25.\textit{Wh3} \textit{h6} 26.\textit{Axh6!} \textit{Qf6}

On 26...gxh6 would have followed 27.\textit{Wh6+} and then \textit{Qd5+}.

27.\textit{Qg5+} \textit{Qg8} 28.\textit{Axf6} \textit{Qxf6}

29.\textit{Wh7+} \textit{Qf8} 30.\textit{Wh8+} 1-0

In giving the game with Tarrasch's notes it is necessary to state that here and there they are too dogmatic, and therefore questionable; however, they clearly reflect the character of the struggle and most importantly its fine points.

38 Queen's Gambit: Chigorin Defence

Amos Burn
Mikhail Chigorin
Berlin 1897 (13)

1.d4 d5 2.c4 \textit{Cc6} 3.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qg4} 4.e3 \textit{e6} 5.\textit{Cc3} \textit{Qb4} 6.\textit{Wb3}

Panov: The text move introduces a broadly thought out, but apparently incorrect strategical plan: White prepares queen's side castling, which, in conjunction with the open g-file and the presence of the two bishops, should give him attacking chances.

6...\textit{Axf3}

Panov: Otherwise 7.\textit{Qxe5} \textit{Qxe5} 8.\textit{Whx4}, winning a pawn.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{62} In fact Black can avoid the loss of a pawn by playing 7...\textit{Qc3}+ first.
7.\textit{gxf3} \textit{\textit{d7}} 8.\textit{\textit{d2}} 0-0 9.\textit{a3}

White immediately puts the question to the bishop on b4; however, the move 9.f4, or even 9.0-0-0, would contribute more to his development.

9...\textit{\textit{xc3}}

The retreat of the bishop, 9...\textit{\textit{xc4}} 10.\textit{\textit{xc4}} \textit{\textit{d6}}, is less attractive, since after 11.\textit{\textit{e4}} \textit{\textit{b8}} 12.a4 Black does not succeed in playing either ...\textit{\textit{b7-b5}} or ...\textit{\textit{e6-e5}}.

10.\textit{\textit{xc3}} \textit{\textit{b8}}

As will be seen later, the defence of the b7-pawn is by no means the main purpose of this move.

11.\textit{\textit{g1}}

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

11...\textit{\textit{g6}}

More accurate would be another order of moves – 11...\textit{\textit{d6}}, for the present not determining the position of the knight on e7, and also attacking the h2-pawn. In this case, White would have no better move than 12.f4, after which Chigorin could carry out his tried and tested scheme of blockading the centre: 12...\textit{\textit{xc4}} 13.\textit{\textit{xc4}} \textit{\textit{xd5}}! and then ...f7-f5.

12.0-0-0

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

\begin{center}
14.b5!
\end{center}

The basic aim of the move 10...\textit{\textit{b8}} becomes clear.

15.\textit{c5!} b4 16.axb4 \textit{\textit{xb4}} 17.\textit{\textit{c4}}
White introduces the bishop into play (restalling 17...\( \mathcal{Q}a2+ \)) and waits for a suitable moment to simplify. Now 17...\( \mathcal{W}xd6 \) exd6 18.\( \mathcal{Q}xb4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xb4 \) 19.\( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) would be rather in favour of Black, who develops pressure on the b2-pawn.

17...\( \mathcal{W}b6 \) 18.\( \mathcal{R}dg1 \)

An unnecessary move, since White cannot create threats on the g-file. Either now or on the following move, White should have exchanged queens, and then, after \( \mathcal{W}d2 \), occupied the a-file with the rook. The \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) reliably defends the b2-pawn, and the pressure on the a7-pawn could gradually equalise the chances.

18...\( \mathcal{Q}fb8 \) 19.\( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\( \mathcal{W} \)}
\text{\( \mathcal{Q} \)}
\text{\( \mathcal{R} \)}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

19...\( \mathcal{W}d7! \)

Until now the black queen could not move away from d6 because it defended the knight on b4. Now that the knight is defended by the rooks, Chigorin immediately moves the queen away from exchange and the tension increases sharply. At once there arise concrete threats to the white king, for example, 20...\( \mathcal{W}a4 \) and 21...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \).

20.\( \mathcal{Q}a1 \)

White not only parries the threat 20...\( \mathcal{W}a4 \), but also attempts to divert the black pieces by an attack on the a7-pawn. The other way of defending against 20...\( \mathcal{W}a4 \) was by 20.b3; after this Black is under some threat from the march h4-h5. Nevertheless, Black's initiative would be sufficiently strong, for example: 20.b3 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) 21.h4 \( \mathcal{Q}xb3 \) 22.\( \mathcal{Q}xb3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xb3 \) 23.\( \mathcal{Q}c1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xh4 \) 24.\( \mathcal{W}xa7 \) h6.

20...\( a6! \)

Black not only defends the pawn but creates the threat of \( \mathcal{W}c6 \) or ...e6-e5.

Panov: If at once 20...\( \mathcal{W}c6 \), then 21.\( \mathcal{Q}b5 \), and if 20...e5, then 21.\( \mathcal{Q}xa7 \) exd4 22.exd4 (but not 22.\( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \) because of 22...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 22...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) (if 22...\( \mathcal{W}c6 \) then 23.\( \mathcal{Q}b5 \)) 23.\( \mathcal{W}a2 \) and White retains the extra pawn.

21.\( \mathcal{Q}e2? \)

An oversight, immediately losing the game in a position where White still had great defensive resources. Also bad
was 21.b3 because of 21...d5 22.a5 (if 22.b2 then 22...c6 23.a5 xc4 or 23.wa3 e5) 22.c6 23.wa3 e5 with advantage to Black. Above all it was necessary for him to eliminate the b4 - 21.xb4, so as, after 21...xb4, to reply 22.b3, and then set about the a6-pawn. However, it is not so simple to find a clear way to equalise after 21.xb4 c6. A sharp variation is 22.c3 xc5 23.xc5 a8 24.b4 c8 25.f4, or 22.b5 xb5 23.wxb5 c2+ 24.xc2 xb5 25.c3 e2 26.f4 xf2 27.xa6 h6 28.a1 xh2 29.g1, favouring Black. However, there is another possibility - 22.wa5 xc4 23.c3 c6 24.e2. Black's positional advantage is beyond doubt, but he has still to demonstrate that White is not able to create sufficient counterplay against the weak a6- and c7-pawns.

21...c6 22.a7

Probably White did not see the opponent's reply. The consequences of the variation 22.b5 xb5 23.wxb5 axb5 24.a8+ f8 25.xb4 d6 26.e4 c6 are obviously unfavourable for him.

22...c8!!

A terribly strong surprise move. It turns out that White has no time to defend the bishop on c4 since the queen is in a trap.

23.xb4

There is no hope in 23.b3 d5! (but not 23...a8 24.xa8 xa8 25.xb4).

23...xc4

Now the bishop on b4 is under threat, while the queen awaits its execution by the move ...a8.

24.c5 a8 25.xa8 xa8

26.d3

Panov: White's last hope – to catch the rook – is fated to be not feasible.

26...e5+ 27.e2 d7! 0-1

White resigned because on 28.d3 there is an elegant mating finish by 28...xc5+ 29.xc4 d5+ 30.b4 b3+ 31.xc5 b5#. A splendid example of the carrying out of a positional attack in a complicated middlegame.

39 French Defence

Mikhail Chigorin

Jackson Showalter

Vienna 1898 (26)

1.e4 e6 2.wc6 c6

Of the many good replies to 2.wc6, the most expedient seems to be 2...c5 and only then 3.d3.

3.d3

In the final years of his chess career, Chigorin played here the more logical 3.f4.

3...e7 4.g3 d5 5.d3 f6 6.g2 0-0 7.d3 d4 8.d1 e5 9.0-0
Chapter 19 - Ever creative and competitive

Though Chigorin voluntarily went in for this position, Black’s prospects here are by no means worse. He has seized more space in the centre, and it is also easy for him to manoeuvre. If now Black chooses the plan of 9...\textit{Q}d7 10.\textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}c5 11.f4 exf4 12.gxf4 f5! followed by ...\textit{Q}e6, \textit{W}d7 and ...\textit{W}ae8, then he would not have any difficulties. Nowadays, a similar position (with colours reversed) quite often arises from the Ufimtsev Defence: 1.e4 d6 2.d4 g6 3.\textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}g7 4.f3 \textit{Q}f6 5.\textit{Q}e2 0-0 6.0-0 e5 7.d5; the knight is better placed on b8 than on d8, while 7...\textit{W}e7 is by no means a move everyone would choose to make. Practice shows that the continuation 8.\textit{Q}d2 (analogous to 9.\textit{Q}d7) etc. favours White. But all this is known only now, and in the overwhelming majority of games Chigorin succeeded in developing a pawn offensive – beginning with f4-f5 and then also g4-g5. The move chosen by Showalter cannot be called inaccurate, it is simply that the e8-square is not very good for the knight.

9...\textit{Q}e8 10.\textit{Q}e1 f5 11.f4

A programmed move. Of course it would be unjustified greed to win a pawn by 11.exf5 \textit{W}xf5 12.\textit{Q}xc6 bxc6 13.\textit{W}xe5. Black would quite quickly bring into play all his pieces and obtain a menacing initiative, for example, 13...\textit{W}d7 14.\textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}f6 15.\textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}d6 followed by ...\textit{W}ae8.

11...\textit{fxe}4

But this already is an inaccuracy. White obtains the possibility of transferring the knight from e1 to d3 without partitioning off the f-file. He should exchange the other pair of pawns – 11...exf4! Then, on 12.\textit{Q}x e4, the capture 12...\textit{fxe}4 would be fully justified, since White is forced to choose between voluntarily isolating his pawn, after 13.dxe4, and losing the initiative, after 13.\textit{Q}xe4 \textit{Q}f6 14.\textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}d5! 15.\textit{Q}d2 \textit{W}xf1+ 16.\textit{W}xf1 \textit{Q}e6 17.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{W}d7. In the event of 12.gxf4, Black could reinforce the f5-pawn with the move 12...\textit{g}6 and then regroup his forces: ...\textit{Q}g7, ...\textit{Q}e6, ...\textit{W}d7 and ...\textit{W}ae8.

12.dxe4 \textit{Q}e6 13.\textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}d6 14.f5 \textit{Q}f7

Black should move the bishop to c4 and, after ...\textit{Q}b4, exchange on d3, in order to limit the mobility of the bishop on g2.

15.\textit{Q}f2 \textit{Q}f6

If Black wants to set up a blockade, then it would be better to begin with the move 15...\textit{Q}e7.

16.g4 h6

Now White changes his plan of attack just in time:
17.g5!
On 17.h4, Black has time to dig himself in, by retreating the knight to h7 and then the bishop to e7.

17...hxg5 18.xg5 h5 19.xf3
xf3 20.wxf3 f7
The exchange of the light-squared bishops is objectively in White’s favour, but, by undertaking this, Showalter intends the tempting plan of evacuating the king and occupying the h-file.

21.qg4 h8 22.ed2 wg8

23.xf6
White would have a good position also in the event of 23.hg2 xg4 24.xg4, but Chigorin works out an interesting plan: with the help of his rook and two knights he constructs an impregnable defence for his king, while his queen, supported by the other rook, penetrates the enemy camp on the a2-g8 diagonal.

23...gxf6 24.hg2 wh7 25.de2

With the building of a fortress, Black’s battery on the h-file will be ineffective—and meanwhile 26.wb3+ is threatened.

25...da5

26.wd3!
All White’s further operations have one aim—to put the queen on e6.

26...a6
On 26...c5, Black apparently feared the reply 27.wb5 b6 28.wd7+.

27.c3
Not so clear was the tempting 27.b4, because of 27...xb4 28.xf6 xf6 29.qg4+ e7 30.qe5 c3.

27...c5 28.b4 cb4
With the counter-sacrifice 28...c4 29.wf1 b5 30.bxa5 c5 31.cxd4 xd4, Black could only stir up trouble, but not save the game: 32.ad1 ad8 33.sh1 etc.

29.cb4 xb4 30.hb1
At this point, the combination 30.xf6 xf6 31.qg4+ e7 32.qe5 does not promise much.

30...e7
31. \textit{W}c2!

White breaks through to d7, either d3 or c7.

31...\textit{B}b5

31...\textit{A}ac8 32. \textit{W}a4 b6! 33. \textit{W}d7 \textit{A}c6, 34. \textit{Q}d3 is decisive, since there is defence against 35. \textit{Q}(any)xe5+.

32. \textit{W}c7 \textit{Q}c4 33. \textit{W}d7!

\textit{Q}c4's attack becomes irresistible. \textit{W}c5 has to defend against numerous threats – 34. \textit{Q}xf6, 34. \textit{W}d5+, 34. \textit{W}e6+.

33...\textit{W}f8 34. \textit{W}c6! \textit{Ab}8 35. \textit{Q}xf6

first breach in Black's defence.

35...\textit{W}h4 36. \textit{Q}g4 \textit{Q}e3

Chigorin exploited the possibilities of his favourite opening scheme splendidly. A highly instructive creation of an impregnable fortress, to shelter the king, and a fine queen manoeuvre.

40 Queen's Pawn Opening

Francis Lee

Mikhail Chigorin

London 1899 (6)

Notes by: Smyslov

1.d4 d5 2.e3 \textit{Q}f6 3.\textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}c6

A characteristic deployment of this knight for Chigorin in the Queen's Pawn Opening. Black threatens 4...\textit{e}5, obtaining a free game.

4.f4 \textit{e}6

In a game against Tarrasch in Hastings 1895, Chigorin continued 4...\textit{Q}b4 5.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Qxd}3+ 6.cxd3 \textit{e}6 and achieved an excellent position. Obviously, in the present game, Chigorin wanted to try a new move, avoiding simplification.

5.a3 \textit{Q}d6 6.\textit{Q}f3 0-0 7.\textit{Q}c3

White interprets the position superficially. Deserving attention was the development of the knight on d2 and the fianchetto of the bishop on b2. This plan is more in accordance with the spirit of the system chosen by White.

7...\textit{b}6 8.\textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}b7 9.\textit{W}f3 \textit{Q}d7

10.\textit{W}h3 \textit{f}5

This is debatable as Black could use his extra tempo to shelter his king with 40...\textit{Q}e7 and 41.\textit{W}f5+ \textit{Q}g7 it's not clear how White avoids progress.

After this, White's attacking pieces come up against a 'Stonewall'. Now, on
the only attacking continuation, 11.g4, Chigorin probably had in mind the interesting combinative blow 11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xe5 12.fx e5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xe5} 13.dxe5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xe5} with very great complications, for example, 14.gxf5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xd3+} 15.cxd3 d4 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}e4} exf5 or 14.0-0 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xe4} 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}d2} d4! with an irresistible attack for Black. And on other replies, by obtaining for the piece three pawns and a strong pawn centre, Black can begin a dangerous offensive. It is a characteristic of Chigorin’s creative work that he was able to penetrate deeply into the hidden secrets of a position and had amazing skill in conducting an active defence.

11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xd7}

White senses the dangerous intentions of his formidable opponent, but does not choose the best continuation. It was stronger to take the other knight. After 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xc6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xc6} 12.g4, Black cannot do without the move 12...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}g6, weakening his position, as after 12...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}f6, White would have at his disposal the knight manoeuvre \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xe2-g3. After forcing 12...g6, White advances his pawn to g5 and prepares to attack with his h-pawn. In this case, a sharp struggle could arise, with chances for both sides. After the move in the game, White’s attack loses its power and the initiative passes to Black.

11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xd7} 12.g4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}e7} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}e2}

\textbf{13...a5!}

Chigorin conducts the positional struggle beautifully. With the text move he prepares the exchange of the light-squared bishops. It is interesting to note that nowadays an analogous manoeuvre is considered the best recipe against the ‘Stone-wall’ in the Dutch Defence. If it is frequently said — and rightly so — that in the field of opening theory Chigorin left a richer legacy than anybody, then one should mention that of no less importance were Chigorin’s innovations in the middlegame, where he also introduced many ideas which were new for his time. For anyone striving for improvement in chess, a serious study of the creative work of Chigorin would be particularly beneficial!

14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}g3}

He should avoid the exchange of bishops by means of 14.c3, though admittedly, after 14.c3 b5 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}d2} b4! 16.axb4 axb4, Black opens lines for attack on the queen’s flank.

14...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}a6} 15.gxf5 exf5 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xa6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttrademark}xa6}

Now we can make an assessment. White is left with the ‘bad’ bishop and an immobile backward pawn on e3. Without doubt an advantage for Black is now taking shape. It is interesting to observe how systematically Chigorin exploits the advantage of his position.
The only chance for White is to develop an initiative on the g-file, but Black carries out the necessary counter-action without difficulty by a similar plan of regrouping his pieces.

20...\textit{\texttt{gg8}}

Only here is it possible to notice that Chigorin does not play in the strongest way. He should at first play 20...\textit{\texttt{hh6}} intending \textit{\texttt{ff6}} \textit{\texttt{ee6}}. The g8-square ought to be left free for the itinerary of the \textit{\texttt{ee7}} via g8-f6 to e4.

21.\textit{\texttt{gg1}} \textit{\texttt{hh6}} 22.\textit{\texttt{ff1}} \textit{\texttt{ee6}} 23.\textit{\texttt{dd3}} \textit{\texttt{ff8}} 24.\textit{\texttt{ff2}} \textit{\texttt{hh3}} 25.\textit{\texttt{ee2}} \textit{\texttt{hh6}}!

Black increases the activity of his heavy pieces. Now it only remains for him to transfer the knight to e4 or g4, in order to increase the positional pressure.

White finds the best defence, freeing the g1-square for the knight.

26.\textit{\texttt{ff1}} \textit{\texttt{gg8}} 27.\textit{\texttt{gg1}} \textit{\texttt{hh5}} 28.\textit{\texttt{ff3}} \textit{\texttt{ff6}} 29.\textit{\texttt{ee5}}

This eases Black’s task; White’s plan allows the exchange of the bishop for the opponent’s knight, after which Black’s knight takes up an unassailable position in the centre.

A more complicated game arises after 29.\textit{\texttt{gg5}} \textit{\texttt{gg4}} 30.\textit{\texttt{ee2}} \textit{\texttt{gg6}}, though also in this case Black would in the end realise his advantage.

\textit{34...\texttt{wc6}}!

Remarkable – a true Chigorin move! At the heart of it lies a beautiful strategical idea: the queen transfers to a diagonal which is dangerous for White – and on which stands his king. Chigorin not only prepares the beautiful combination 35...d4 36.cxd4 \textit{\texttt{exh2+!!}} but also sets a fine, disguised trap. White’s best defence was 35.\textit{\texttt{ff1}}, although the variation 35.\textit{\texttt{dd8}} 36.\textit{\texttt{ff3}} \textit{\texttt{xf3}} 37.\textit{\texttt{wxf3}} d4 38.exd4 \textit{\texttt{cd4}} 39.\textit{\texttt{dd2}} d3! does not give him much hope. In looking for a way out, White himself decides to make a combination, but by doing so he falls into Chigorin’s carefully prepared trap.

35.\textit{\texttt{xf7}}

White counts on winning back the rook by his 37th move, but he does not foresee Black’s reply.

35...\textit{\texttt{xg7}} 36.\textit{\texttt{xg7}} \textit{\texttt{gg7}} 37.\textit{\texttt{gg2+}}
37...\textbf{Q}g3+!!
A spectacular move which refutes White’s combination! Now Black remains the exchange ahead and the game is decided.

38.\textbf{N}xg3 \textbf{Nh}6 39.\textbf{N}h4+ \textbf{Ng}6
40.\textbf{Nf}6+ \textbf{Kh}7 41.\textbf{W}f3 \textbf{We}6 42.\textbf{c}c4
\textbf{b}5! 43.\textbf{b}3 \textbf{bxc}4! 44.\textbf{bxc}4 \textbf{W}b7
45.\textbf{h}4 \textbf{W}b1+ 0-1

With the exception of the inaccuracy on the 20\textsuperscript{th} move, Chigorin handled the strategical game very delicately.

41 Queen’s Gambit:
Semi-Slav Defence
\textbf{Geza Maroczy}
\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}
London 1899 (13)
1.\textbf{c}c4 \textbf{c}6 2.\textbf{d}d4 \textbf{e}6 3.\textbf{c}c3 \textbf{d}5 4.\textbf{f}f3
\textbf{c}6 5.e3 \textbf{bd}7 6.\textbf{d}d3 \textbf{d}6 7.0-0 0-0
8.\textbf{e}4 \textbf{dxc}4 9.\textbf{xc}c4 \textbf{e}5

This opening was discussed in the notes to the game Janowski-Chigorin, Budapest 1896. We would remind you that modern theory considers the best continuation to be 11.\textbf{e}e1, though also possible are both 11.h3 and even 11.d5, as Janowski played. Maroczy, wishing to remove the tension in the centre, makes a perhaps too crafty prophylactic move.

10.\textbf{g}g5 \textbf{W}e7 11.\textbf{h}h1!? \textbf{Ad}8

Chigorin creates threats on the d-file, although another no less effective plan would be to increase the pressure on the e4-pawn, beginning with 11...\textbf{W}e8.

12.\textbf{W}c2

Now the point of the move 11.\textbf{h}h1 becomes clear. After the natural exchange 12...\textbf{exd}4 13.\textbf{exd}4, White threatens f2-f4, since there is no pin from the c5-square. It is not possible to win a pawn by 13...\textbf{exh}2?! 14.\textbf{gf}5! or 13...\textbf{b}6 14.\textbf{d}d3 \textbf{exh}2 15.\textbf{f}f3! \textbf{e}e5
(15...\textbf{c}c7 16.e5! \textbf{xe}5 17.\textbf{e}e1 \textbf{bd}7
18.\textbf{xe}5 \textbf{xe}5 19.f4 \textbf{xd}3 20.\textbf{fxd}3+) 16.\textbf{xe}5 \textbf{we}5 17.f4 \textbf{wd}4 18.\textbf{e}e2 with dangerous threats.

12...\textbf{h}6!

A move which is useful in all respects. Black not only makes a flight square for his king, but also creates threats to the h2-pawn. The point is that, after 13.\textbf{h}h4 \textbf{exd}4 14.\textbf{exd}4 \textbf{b}6 15.\textbf{d}d3
(or 15.\textbf{b}b3) 15...\textbf{exh}2 16.\textbf{f}f3 \textbf{e}e5
17.\textbf{xe}5 \textbf{we}5, 18.f4 allows the strong reply 18...\textbf{h}h5!, and 18.\textbf{we}2 is parried by the simple 18...\textbf{e}e8. If White, on the 15\textsuperscript{th} move, retreats his bishop to e2, then the covering over of the e-file also makes possible the variation 15...\textbf{exh}2
16.\textbf{f}f3 \textbf{c}c7 17.e5 \textbf{xe}5.

There is no comfortable retreat of the \textbf{g}g5 along the h6-c1 diagonal (13.\textbf{e}e3

64. 20.\textbf{fxe}5! is even better.
14. dxe5

Once again, a natural move conceals a cunning idea. But is it the best in the present position? Apparently yes. Actually, closing the centre by 14.d5 .bd6 15.bd3 is unfavourable because of 15...g4 followed by ...ac8, while retaining the tension by 14.ad1 is risky for White after the exchange of the bishop on g5 since, with the move d4...e8, Black firmly reinforces the e5-square and threatens to seize the initiative with the manoeuvre ...b6 and ...g4.

14...axe5!

Splendid. Maroczy probably hoped for the natural 14...exe5 15.dxe5 exe5, which would allow him to sharpen the conflict by a pawn sacrifice: 16.f4 xf4 17.g3 ad2 18.wxd2! (18wb3 axh2+!) 18...xd2 19.axf6 gxf6 20.ad1 xc3 21.ad8+ or 16..xc3 17.e5!. Chigorin finds a stronger plan and takes the initiative.

15.ad1

Capturing on e5 is dangerous since, after 15.axe5 axe5, Black is the first to create threats: 16.b3 f3! 17.ad1 h3!! or 16.e2 w4 17.g3 w6! 18.f4 g4.

15...e8

Chigorin calmly moves away the rook, thereby eliminating the threats connected with the d-file. On 15...c7, White 'comes to life' after 16.b3, with the unexpected threat of 17.ed5.

Geza Maroczy
16. \textit{axe2?} \\
White begins to think about defence too soon, and once and for all cedes the initiative. As before, it is dangerous to take the bishop – 16. \textit{cxe5} \textit{cxe5} 17. \textit{axe2} \textit{w4} 18.\textit{h3} (18.g3 \textit{w6}) 18...\textit{wh4!} – when the white king finds itself under attack. But it was necessary to retreat to b3 – 16. \textit{b3} – since dangerous is 16...\textit{c7} 17.\textit{d5! cxd5} 18.\textit{xc7} dxe4, because of 19.\textit{d6} \textit{e7} 20.\textit{e1}, and it is difficult for Black to unravel his pieces. However, by means of 16...\textit{xc3}! 17.bxc3 \textit{c5} 18.e5 \textit{wh5!}, Black would still retain the better chances in view of the weakness of the c3- and e5-pawns and the strong position of the knight on c5.

16...\textit{c7!} \\
With the bishop placed on e2, the blow 17.\textit{d5} does not have its former strength – 17.\textit{d5 cxd5} 18.\textit{xc7} dxe4 19.\textit{d6} \textit{exf3!} 20.\textit{xf6} \textit{fxe2} 21.\textit{e1} \textit{xf6}, and Black’s advantage is sufficient for victory.

17.\textit{e1} \textit{e5} 18.f4 \textit{g4} 19.\textit{xe4} \\
A necessary exchange. On 19.e5 would follow 19...\textit{e7} and the threats of 20...\textit{c3} and ...\textit{xe2} force the exchange 20.\textit{xe4} with an inferior position for White due to his weak light squares and ossified pawns.

19.\textit{xe4} \\
And so at the cost of the advantage of the two bishops, White obtains, as it were, some sort of play in the centre. By the same token, his position has not improved at all.
The e4- and f4-pawns may look beautiful, but any move – e4-e5 or f4-f5 – will paralyse them. Forcing these pawns to move – it is precisely this which is Black’s basic problem, and Chigorin easily solves it.

20.\textit{g4} \textit{d8} \\
For the present, the rook on d3 is the most active white piece and its exchange increases Black’s attacking potential.

21.\textit{f2} \textit{e3} 22.\textit{cxd3} \textit{d8} \\
Black seizes the d-file. The \textit{c3} has no comfortable square for retreat – on 23.\textit{c5}, strong is 23...\textit{c8}.

23.\textit{g3} \\

23...\textit{g6}! \\
Now material loss for White is inevitable in view of the terrible threat of ...\textit{e6-c4}. On 24.\textit{c5}, decisive is 24...\textit{c4} 25.\textit{f3} \textit{xc3!}. In desperation White tries to exchange even if it is only one bishop, but at too high a price.

24.e5 \textit{f1} 25.\textit{c5} \\
White would also not have suffered for very long after 25.\textit{f2} \textit{d4!} 26.\textit{e2} \textit{d2}.

25.\textit{xe5} 26.\textit{xe6} \textit{fxe6}
The game is over. Black’s extra pawn and overwhelming positional advantage make resistance useless.

27.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}e3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Ax}}}}}c3 28.bxc3
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}xc3, then 28...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}xf4!.

28...b6 29.h3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}d3 30.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}e2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Ax}}}}}c3
31.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}a6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}d5! 32.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}g1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}c2 33.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}f3
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}d1+

0-1

In this game, Chigorin showed himself as an exceptionally fine strategist and his play with the two bishops, which with only five moves completely tore White’s position to pieces, is a classic model.

7...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}d7

Apparently the best square for the queen. On 7...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}d6 could follow 8.0-0 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}f6 9.d3 exd3 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}d4! and White would win an important tempo for his development (10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{W}}}}}xf4 is not possible because of 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}xf4+). 8.0-0 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}f6 9.d3! exd3 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}d1

It is too early to determine the position of the rook. More accurate would be at once 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}xd3, in order after 10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}d6 to have the choice between 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}d1 and 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{G}}}}}e1+.

10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}d6 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{K}}}}}xd3 0-0 12.h3

A useful move, taking away the g4-square from the black knight. White has obtained a positional advantage from the opening. Black has weak c-pawns, his queen is badly placed, and, in addition, the transfer of the white queen to h4 and the bishop to g5 could give White a dangerous attack.
12...\textit{We6!}
A clever defensive resource. Black not only indirectly continues to defend the \textit{c6}-pawn, but also wants to outstrip his opponent in attack by transferring the queen to \textit{e5}.

13.\textit{Af4}
The other build-up also deserves attention: 13.\textit{Cd2} \textit{Ab7} 14.\textit{Cc4} \textit{c5} 15.\textit{Wc2}.

13...\textit{Bb8} 14.\textit{Xxd6 cxd6} 15.\textit{Cd2!} \textit{Cd5} 16.\textit{Wh4}

16...\textit{f5}
Black's idea is clear – to remove the threat to the \textit{h7}-pawn and provide an outpost for the knight on \textit{e4}; however, its great drawback is perfectly obvious – the weakening of the a2-g8 diagonal. Meanwhile Steinitz could have built up a strong defensive position with the simple manoeuvre 16...\textit{h6!} 17.\textit{Cb3} \textit{Wd5} 18.\textit{Be1} \textit{Wf4!} or 17.\textit{Be1} \textit{Wf6} 18.\textit{Wxf6} \textit{Qxf6} 19.\textit{Bb3} \textit{Be6}.

17.\textit{Gb3!}
The first consequence of the ill-advised 16...\textit{f5} – the black knight loses its foothold in the centre. 18.\textit{Cd4} followed by \textit{Exc6} is threatened, and on 17...\textit{c5} would follow 18.\textit{Cc4} \textit{Ab7} 19.\textit{Be1} \textit{Wf7} 20.\textit{Cc7} etc. Also no better is 17.\textit{Wh8}, for example: 18.\textit{Cd4} \textit{Wf6} (18...\textit{d7} 19.\textit{Xxf5}) 19.\textit{Wxf6} \textit{Exf6} 20.\textit{Exc6} \textit{Exb2} 21.\textit{Eb1} \textit{Exb1}+ 22.\textit{Exb1} and then \textit{Bb8} with a winning endgame. The knight has to retreat.

17...\textit{Bf6} 18.\textit{Cd4} \textit{Wf7} 19.\textit{b3} \textit{d5}
Seeing that material loss is unavoidable, Steinitz in desperation tries to consolidate his knight on the \textit{e4}-square.

20.\textit{Exc6} \textit{Bb6}

21.\textit{Cd4}
The outcome of the struggle is clear and the plan chosen by Chigorin to realise a huge positional advantage, is far from being the only way of playing. White could also occupy the centre by means of 21.\textit{Be5} \textit{Wc7} 22.\textit{Wd4} \textit{Be8} 23.\textit{f4}. Chigorin, however, wants to leave the \textit{e-file} for his rook.

21...\textit{Be4} 22.\textit{f3} \textit{Bh6} 23.\textit{Wf4}
Black has too many weaknesses and realising that 23...\textit{g6} 24.\textit{Wf5!} \textit{Exc3} 25.\textit{Xdc1!} is bad for him, Steinitz endeavours to open the king position and complicate the game.

23...\textit{g5} 24.\textit{Wc1} \textit{Wg7} 25.\textit{fxe4}
The most useful move for the struggle in the centre, and also primarily for control over the d5-square.

4...\(\text{c6}\)

A natural move, but not the best, after which Black gets into difficulties. Most contemporary chess players, having learned from the experience of the previous generation, would play here 4...c6 and then 5...d5; for example 5.e5 d5! 6.exf6 dxc4 7.fxg7 \(\text{xg7}\), or 5.We2 d5! 6.exd5+ \(\text{xe}7\) 7.dxc6 \(\text{xc6}\).

5.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{b4}\) 6.0-0

An immediate 6.\(\text{d5}\) is considered a better plan of attack, with the idea, after 6...0-0 7.0-0, to offer a sacrifice of the e4-pawn. However, after 6...\(\text{a}5\) 7.0-0 \(\text{d6}\), it would only lead to a simple transposition of moves.

6...0-0 7.e5

An active but at the same time committal move, allowing the opponent to create tension in the centre. Theory recommends 7.\(\text{xd5}\).

7...\(\text{g4}\)!

Black could still reply with the counter-attack 7...d5, but he prefers to set up an attack on the e5-pawn.

8.d4

In similar positions of the King’s Gambit, White usually goes for the exchange of the bishop on c1 after 8...\(\text{xe}3\), hoping to exploit the opening of the f-file.

8...d6!
9.h3
With a well-timed blow in the centre, Black has managed to obtain counterplay, and White must play accurately. Thus, on 9...xf4, would follow 9...dxe5 10...xe5 (10.dxe5? c5+ and 11...f2+) 10...cxe5 11...xe5 e3 12...xf7 xf7 13...xf7+ with equality, and, on 9...d5, Black has the pleasant choice between 9...dxe5 and 9...c6. Finally, after 9.exd6 cxd6, Black is left with an extra pawn and, in addition, a harmonious development. Chigorin spends time getting rid of the unpleasant knight on g4. Though the worry over the centre diminishes, the f-file gives White some attacking chances on the f7-square.

9...e3 10...xe3 fxe3 11...d5

11...e5?
Black could have advantageously pinned the active knight on d5 with the move 11...e6!, which Schlechter in fact played four years later in a game against Maroczy: 12...xe3 dxe5! 13.d5 c5! etc. Instead of this, Black loses an important tempo and also shuts his king’s bishop out of the game. White not only eliminates all his difficulties, but also seizes the initiative.

12.exd6!
Black cannot hold on to the e3-pawn since 12...e8 would catastrophically weaken the f7-square, and 12...xd6 would lead to a clear positional advantage for White after 13...xe3.

12...xd6 13...g5!
White is in no hurry to win back the pawn and at once creates serious threats – 14.d3, 14...e4.

13...g6
On 13...xd4, decisive is 14...d3.65

65 This is not so. After 14...f5 (14...f5 is possible, too) 15.xf5 xf5 16.xf5 g6, Black will have a rook and two pawns for two knights, and if now 17...f6+ then Black calmly plays 17...h8 and after 18...xg5 xf6 19...f1 d4 the game goes on. However, what would be decisive is the direct 14...h5 h6 15.xf7 and if Black wishes to retain his queen with 15...g3 there follows 16...e7+ h7 17...d3+ f5 18.xf5 with a forced mate in a few moves.
defending the b1-h7 diagonal and the f7-square an extra time, Black seems to have warded off the first onslaught.

**14.\textit{xf7}?!**

Though the f7-pawn is defended three times, it is in reality unprotected, since it is defended by pieces of too high a calibre, and it is in this circumstance that lies the basis of Chigorin's combination. However, the execution of his brilliant idea is not quite right. Winning at once would be 14.\textit{xf7}, when Black would be powerless to do anything against the discovered attack of the bishop on c4 + \textit{e7}.

**14...\textit{xf7}**

Now Chigorin's inaccuracy passes without leaving a trace and Black perishess instantly, whereas the move 14...\textit{xe6} would have given him chances of a successful defence; indeed, in some variations, there is a queen sacrifice, for example: 15.\textit{xf4} \textit{xc4}! 16.\textit{xd4} \textit{dxc6} 17.\textit{xc4} or 15.\textit{e5}! \textit{g5}! 16.\textit{f3} \textit{h5} 17.\textit{xc5} \textit{xc4} etc.

**\textbf{4.\textit{e3}}**

It was not until after Chigorin's death that the move 4.\textit{a4}, which theory considers best, was introduced into tournament practice. But though 4.\textit{a4} poses Black complicated problems, it does not refute the Chigorin Defence. Critical for the evaluation of the opening is the position reached after 4.\textit{a4} \textit{xf3} 5.\textit{xf3} e6 6.\textit{xc3} \textit{e7} exd5 exd5 8.\textit{b5} a6 9.\textit{xc6}+ \textit{xc6} 10.0-0, when a rather unclear continuation is 10...\textit{w7} 11.\textit{e1}+ \textit{e7} 12.\textit{b3} 0-0-0.

By making the move 4.\textit{e3} – of good quality, reinforcing the d4-pawn, but at the same time limiting the mobility of the bishop on c1 – White makes it understood that he does not lay claim to 16...\textit{e2} wins at once!

- Actually, 16.\textit{d8}+ would collect more than just the queen.
to an opening advantage and wants to quietly finish his development and switch the whole weight of the struggle to the middlegame.

4...e6 5.\(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Cb4}\) 6.\(\text{Wb3}\)

A committal move which in large measure determines the character of the further struggle. White considers that the exchange on f3 is favourable to him, since it strengthens his centre and opens the g-file. A quieter development of events arises from 6.\(\text{Cd2}\) followed by \(\text{Cc2}\). Then White would avoid the doubled pawns.

6...\(\text{xf3}\) 7.\(\text{gxf3}\) \(\text{Ge7}\) 8.\(\text{d2}\) 0-0

\(\text{W}a4!\) 30.\(\text{b7+}\) \(\text{e6}\) 31.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{a1}\) 32.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{g1}\) 33.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{xc2+}\) 34.\(\text{xc2}\) \(\text{g2}\) 35.\(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{h2}\) 36.\(\text{b7}\) \(\text{xf2+}\) with a draw on the 62nd move.

In our opinion, White should not castle queen’s side but rather complete his development in this manner: f3-f4, \(\text{Cc2}\), 0-0, \(\text{h1}\), \(\text{g1}\), \(\text{ac1}\) — and then play on the queen’s flank.

9...\(\text{b8}\) 10.\(\text{cxd5}\)

It is easy to see that this capture changes nothing in comparison with the variation 10.0-0-0 \(\text{dxc4}\) 11.\(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 12.\(\text{xc3}\) b5 13.\(\text{c5}\) b4.

\(\text{W}a4!\) 30.\(\text{b7+}\) \(\text{e6}\) 31.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{a1}\) 32.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{g1}\) 33.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{xc2+}\) 34.\(\text{xc2}\) \(\text{g2}\) 35.\(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{h2}\) 36.\(\text{b7}\) \(\text{xf2+}\) with a draw on the 62nd move.

In our opinion, White should not castle queen’s side but rather complete his development in this manner: f3-f4, \(\text{Cc2}\), 0-0, \(\text{h1}\), \(\text{g1}\), \(\text{ac1}\) — and then play on the queen’s flank.

9...\(\text{b8}\) 10.\(\text{cxd5}\)

It is easy to see that this capture changes nothing in comparison with the variation 10.0-0-0 \(\text{dxc4}\) 11.\(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 12.\(\text{xc3}\) b5 13.\(\text{c5}\) b4.

10...\(\text{d5!}\)

Black introduces the knight into play, and the pawn on e6 could prove useful for the break ...e6-e5.

11.0-0-0

It is already too late for castling king’s side — 11.0-0 \(\text{b4!}\).

11...\(\text{xc3}\) 12.\(\text{xc3}\) b5!
...Nenfish wrote: 'A timely counterattack. White threatened a dangerous thrust in the centre (e3-e4 followed by d4-d5). Now on 13.e4 would follow 13...b4! 14.a3 Bxd4 15.Wc4 Bb6 16.Wxb4 with advantage to Black. Chigorin's knights are not inferior to the white bishops!'

13.£d2 Eb6

A critical moment. Black's plan is clear to open lines on the queen's flank to get at the king. A very complicated problem for White. His pawn mass in the centre is not mobile (in a few moves Chigorin even paralyses it) and Pillsbury begins to prepare directly to double rooks on the g-file. The decision, arising naturally from the character of the position, has disastrous consequences for White. Neither the queen nor the bishops can support the attack by the white rooks and they will be choked. Meanwhile the march of the b-pawn weakens the c5-square, and White could have organised counter-play on the queen's flank by means of 13.Bb1 a5 14.Ecl a4 15.Wd1 and then £d2 and Ec5.

14.Edg1 a5 15.£f4

Necessary, otherwise ...e6-e5 would follow.

This move has so much merit that it fully deserves two exclamations. The white pawn mass in the centre is immobilised and becomes a barrier, blocking his bishops. The position of the £d5 becomes unassailable and the lengthy re-grouping by White on the g-file can be countered by just one move of the rook to f7.

16.£g3 a4 17.Wd1 £cb4!

Revealing a deep understanding of the position. It would seem there is no sense in exchanging the bishop on d2, rather he should aim to eliminate the bishop on d3...

18.£xb4

There is no choice. On 18..£b1, decisive is 18...Ec6+.

18...£xb4 19.£hgl £f7 20.£b1

Without his dark-squared bishop, White would dangerously weaken the position of his king with 21.b3 (after this would follow 21...£d6 and then ...£c7-c5) and he has to go in for the opening of lines. The significance of Black's 17th move becomes clear.

21.bxa3 £d5 22.Wb3 b4

White is absolutely helpless. In the event of 23.a4, the weakness of the c3-square ruins him - 23...Ec6+ 24.Ed2 £c3! 25.Wb2 c5.

23.axb4 £xb4 24.Wd3 c5 25.dxc5
25...\textit{Wa5!}

Now the white king cannot take flight to the king's flank. 26...\textit{Wxc5+ 27.Wd1}

\textit{Wxb1+} is threatened: White is forced to give up the a2-pawn. The rest is clear without commentary.

26.\textit{Cc2 Wa2} 27.f3 \textit{Cc4} 28.\textit{Hg2 Ad7} 29.c6 \textit{Hxc6} 30.\textit{Wd4 Wa3+ 31.Wd2 Hxc2+!}

The simplest.

32.\textit{Wxc2 Oxe3+ 33.Wb1 Hxd4 34.Hxg7+ Wf8 35.Hg8+ We7}

White resigned.

Chigorin's logical execution of the strategical idea of the opening and his method of opening lines on the queen's side, were very impressive.
Chapter 20

All-Russia championships

After visiting Moscow at the beginning of 1899 for an exhibition tour, Lasker called Moscow a Chess Eldorado. This was how the love of chess reigning in the city, and the enthusiasm of the Moscow amateurs, struck him.

In March 1899, in Moscow, Chigorin undertook an exhibition tour. He decided to take advantage of the lively chess scene in Moscow, to realise the long-standing dream of Russian chess players – the organisation of an All-Russia tournament.

Chigorin talked to the Muscovites about organising the first All-Russia contest of chess players, including himself. This suggestion had a positive and enthusiastic response. On 29 March, Chigorin wrote in his column: 'In Moscow circles at the present time there is great gusto. Rumours are rife that in the autumn of this year a national chess tournament will be held. We think that the energy of organisers and friends, assisted by Russian chess players sympathetic to this idea, will easily manage to implement it. It's high time!'

Chigorin's help with the tournament was not only moral, but also material. He donated the takings from his exhibitions to the proceeds of the tournament. A major role in the organisation of the tournament was played by the outstanding chess activist Paul Pavlovich Bobrov (1862-1911), publisher of the remarkable magazine Chess Review and former secretary of the Moscow Chess Club.

The means, necessary for the execution of the tournament, were collected by subscription, and on 2 September 1899, in the great hall of the Moscow Doctors' Assembly, on Great Dmitrov (Pushkin Street), the tournament began.

Amongst the 28 participants of the 1st All-Russia championship and supporting tournaments, we see the surnames 'Alekseev', 'Fedorov', 'Andreev' and 'Borisov' - chess players not known by anybody. Under these pseudonyms were concealed chess players who were afraid that participation in the tournament could reflect badly on their 'reputation'. This feature of the era nowadays seems astonishing, but we recall that Winawer wanted to play in the Hastings tournament under a pseudonym, and that Tarrasch was rather afraid of the fact that his chess reputation could damage his medical practice.

Though not all the strongest players of Russia at that time were encouraged to take part in the first All-Russia tournament, this proved to be an important event in Russian chess life. It began the traditional regular meetings of the best chess players in the land and induced a considerable enlivening of chess activity. It is true that the organisation of an All-Russia Chess Union, as before, had to remain only a dream, but in Warsaw, Kiev, Odessa, and other towns, clubs sprang up and competitions were held. Chigorin wrote at the end of the tournament: 'The main thing is that the tournament took place. For a long time, everyone has understood that a national tournament was an urgent need for Russian chess life; nobody doubted the plentiful resources to organise this tournament, but for some reason it has been put off. And here, the Moscow Chess Club, with characteristic energy, has
organised and successfully carried out this competition, which could have a great influence on the growth of chess in Russia. A good start has been made; honour and glory to the white-stone city!

The tournament ended in a victory for Chigorin, who won 10 games out of 11. Second was Schiffs, who scored 7½. Chigorin confirmed that he was undoubtedly the strongest chess player in the land, considerably superior to the rest, while Schiffs proved that he was inferior only to Chigorin.

In January 1900, a tournament of the strongest players in St.Petersburg was held. Ten participants played amongst themselves on equal terms. Up to this point, annual handicap tournaments were held in St.Petersburg, but, later on, the level of the play increased and the need for odds passed. The long years of tireless work by Chigorin had resulted in the upgrading of chess culture in the country. The young and promising chess player Alexander Mitrofanovich Levin even shared 1st and 2nd place with Chigorin. Both scored 14½ points out of 18. In 3rd place, with 12 points, was S.F.Lebedev, who was lucky enough to win both games against Chigorin, and indeed, before this, in the first All-Russia tournament, also gained a victory over him.

Lebedev was a member of a chess circle existing in St.Petersburg, which included an unscrupulous clique, hostile to Chigorin. They feared like death the blameless moral authority, Chigorin, merciless to any sort of dirty trick. But here, thanks to his wins against Chigorin, Lebedev took the opportunity to swell his chess reputation and endeavoured to wage a sordid, slanderous campaign against Chigorin in the press.

In his chess column in the newspaper Russia, Lebedev published his game with Chigorin and, in the annotations, compared his own play with that of Tarrasch, Burn and Pillsbury. Following on from this, he attacked Chigorin’s play in the St.Petersburg tournament, and declared that Levin’s performance there was ‘undoubtedly superior to that of his unexpected rival(!), who jumped up to first place only because of the phenomenal negligence of the other participants.’ However, when this provoked indignation, with a joint protest of a group of St.Petersburg chess players, denouncing the boaster Lebedev, then he met them with verbal abuse.

To the credit of St.Petersburg chess players, Lebedev and his followers formed an insignificant minority, but, unfortunately, their slanderous efforts yielded their fruit – for the extent of many years they poisoned the great Russian master’s life, which was already difficult enough without this. We note, incidentally, that Lebedev’s first wins against Chigorin were also the last; Chigorin later several times convincingly smashed his garish rival.

In 1900, in Paris, an international tournament was held in conjunction with the World Fair. The line-up proved to be very mixed: eleven first-class chess players joining battle with six outsiders, who scored, against the first eleven participants, in all half a point out of 66!

The victor – Lasker – finished the tournament with 14½ points out of 16; he lost to Marshall and, in the last round, made a draw with Chigorin. He won all the other games!
But it was not this striking numerical result, but the new creative approach of Lasker, a serious change in the character of his play, manifesting itself at the end of the 1890s, which influenced Chigorin's attitude towards Lasker, the chess player. While Lasker, who proclaimed himself, in *Common Sense in Chess*, to be a loyal follower of Steinitz, came out with clear, precise, rational and rather dry play, Chigorin, though acknowledging his strength, obviously was not sympathetic to what was, as he saw it, an improved, perfected style of the 'new school'. 'Lasker, without doubt, plays strongly', he wrote to D.N.Pavlov on 12 April 1894. 'He plays very attentively, carefully, deliberately. But I – speaking for myself – do not see depth, that depth in planning when plotting an attack, defence, such as that which we come across with Anderssen, Morphy, and also Steinitz himself.'

But Chigorin's attitude to Lasker became quite different from that time when Lasker displayed so much that was really new and fresh, so much boldness, sharpness, complexity, originality, in his play. Chigorin understood perfectly well how far distant Lasker was, despite all his outstanding skill in positional play, from the routine and stereotyped 'new school'. 'We asked readers, with their chess friends', he wrote in one of his chess columns, 'to which school, the “new” or the “old”, they attach Lasker. The majority, by replying “to the new”, were mistaken (New Times – 4 November 1902). It goes without saying that this does not mean that Chigorin attached Lasker to the archaic ‘old’ school. He very accurately and correctly defined the basic feature in Lasker's approach to chess: 'It is not luck, nor hypnosis, which explains Lasker's strength. He has a fighting temperament and enormous talent. Steinitz wanted to make a science out of chess, I – an art. Lasker – a struggle, or, if you like, a sport.' Chigorin considered Lasker to have the sharpest style out of all the contemporary masters – this meant a great deal to Chigorin.

Chigorin took 6th place in the Paris tournament, with 10½ points out of 16. His game against Mortimer received the brilliancy prize, but this prize was won against a distant outsider and does not belong to the finest pearls of the creative treasure house of Chigorin.

In December of the same year, a native of Russia, residing permanently in Paris – Janowski, was touring his native land. He visited Kiev, Odessa and St.Petersburg. In St.Petersburg, two games were arranged for him with Chigorin. Chigorin won both games.

At the end of December, in Moscow, began the 2nd All-Russia tournament. Taking advantage of the presence of Janowski in Russia, the organisers secured his participation. They expected that the tournament would become a contest between Chigorin and Janowski, but
Janowski, after losing in the first round to Sharov, and later again to B. Grigoriev, only came third. Ahead of him was Schiffer, who took 2nd place and outdistanced Janowski by half a point. First place, however, was taken by Chigorin, who conceded only one draw and won all the remaining 16 games! As in the first All-Russia tournament, the distance between Chigorin and the second prize-winner – Schiffer – was 2½ points. Thus the tournament ended in a complete triumph for Chigorin, who smashed his opponents, one after the other.

However, Janowski, after rather a modest performance in Russia, a month later took first prize in the international tournament at Monte Carlo 1901. 14 participants came together for this tournament, in which Janowski scored 10½ points. The ¼ point, to which we are unaccustomed, is explained by the fact that the organiser of the tournament, Arnous de Rivière, who lost a match to Chigorin in 1884, was dissatisfied with the generally accepted reward of half a point for a draw, and, in the tournaments at Monte Carlo, which he directed (1901 and 1902), he introduced a complicated system: for the first draw, each of the partners received a quarter of a point; the win of a replayed game received a further half a point (in all three quarters), while, upon a loss, the quarter point remained. If, however, the second game also finished in a draw, then both opponents received another quarter of a point, that is, in all, half a point for the two games. This involved system was a belated echo of the custom, which existed in several old tournaments, of replaying or not counting draws at all. But after the application of the system of Arnous de Rivière in two tournaments, it was abandoned for ever and laid to rest in the storehouse of chess curiosities: it placed at a disadvantage the participants, who were forced to replay games, and who got more tired than if they had received an immediate 1 or a 0. In the first tournament at Monte Carlo, for example, Janowski and Scheve played 15 games, Chigorin and Schlechter 17, and Alapin – even 21! Chigorin protested against this absurd and unfair system, but Arnous de Rivière was convinced of its unsuitability only after conducting two tournaments with replays and hearing out a mass of protests.

Chigorin’s result in Monte Carlo, tying for 3rd-4th prize with Scheve, might have been higher, if it had not been for several missed opportunities.

The opening stages of two Chigorin games in Monte Carlo, which did not at that time attract particular attention and passed unnoticed, were, as is clear today, magnificent: one – a prevalent opening system of our day, the other – an even more prevalent opening idea. In the first game, a variation of the French Defence, well-known to us, was reached after a transposition of moves. Marshall-Chigorin: 1.d4 d5 2...c3 e6 3.e4 d.b4 4...d2 dxe4 5.g4 gxd4 6.0-0 f5 7.g5 gxf2. While, in the second game, against Schlechter, Chigorin brought about in the English Opening, a setup characteristic of the modern King’s Indian Defence, with the knight on c5, a position which is reinforced by a pawn on a5. Schlechter-Chigorin: 1.c4 e5 2.e3 g6 3.e3 d7 4.gf3 c6 5.d4 d6 6.d3 g4 7.d5 g8 8.e4 gbd7 9.g3 c5 10.c2 a5. This setup has been applied a countless number of times in many situations by chess players of different countries, without suspecting that the original source was an innovatory experiment of the Russian master, tested by him as far back as the very beginning of our century.
Monte Carlo, Chigorin met Winawer at the board for the last time. The veteran was 63 years old, and this was his last tournament. The previously famous chess player, who was one of the first to value highly the talent of the young Chigorin, had now had enough of chess and for the last 18 years of his life – after the tournament in Monte Carlo – did not appear in competitions. His play was by this time a shadow of the past; in Monte Carlo he scored only four points, and he lost his game against Chigorin without a struggle in twenty moves, over which Chigorin spent, in all, half an hour.

On the other hand, an exceptionally stubborn game proved to be that between Chigorin and another veteran – Mason. This game, which was the longest in the whole of Chigorin’s chess career, lasted 17 ½ hours. Only after 144 moves, in a rare endgame – bishop, knight and rook’s pawn against rook –, did Mason resign.

In 1902, an international tournament was again held in Monte Carlo, this time with a much stronger line-up, and 20 participants. As a result of the 40 day struggle, Maroczy emerged the winner, which he fully deserved by his interesting, deep and highly technical play. Admittedly, the second prize-winner – Pillsbury – was only a quarter of a point behind (Maroczy had 14 ½; Pillsbury had 14 ½) – the system of Arnous de Rivière was used once again. On a usual calculation of points, Maroczy and Pillsbury would have had 14 ½ points each, but the stubbornness of the organisers tipped the scales to Maroczy’s side, which, in the present case, decided the fate of first prize by ¼ point (and therefore, 2000 francs, which constituted the difference between first and second prizes).

Chigorin, who occupied 8th place in this tournament, won several excellent games. He defeated Tarrasch, Schlechter and Pillsbury – all in the Italian Game. Chigorin began to play this opening frequently in the second half of the 1890s. He played the Italian, with the move d2-d3, systematically – by correspondence and over the board, in Russia and abroad, and against both weak and strong opponents.

Against a background of these and a few more beautiful victories, his defeat against Marshall had a downright depressing effect: 1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6x3 c3 dxc4 4.d5 Qa5 5.f4 f4 d7 e4 e6 e6 dxe6 fxe6?? 8.Wh5+ g6 9.Wxa5.

In February 1903, Chigorin, after receiving an invitation to participate in the third international tournament, crossed practically the whole of Europe and arrived in Monte Carlo to start play. But now occurred an unprecedented event. The organiser of the tournament, the same Arnous de Rivière, declared that the invitation was annulled and Chigorin would not be allowed to play.

The reason for this unparalleled incident was that the honorary president of the tournament, the arrogant Prince Dadian of Mingrelia, had issued an ultimatum: either he or Chigorin. Either Chigorin was refused entry or he, the Prince, would divest himself of the title of honorary president of the tournament and immediately leave Monte Carlo. If not over the board, then, if you like, he endeavoured to gain a ‘victory’ over Chigorin like this.

The threat was serious. Probably, the administration of the casino, which financed the tournament (just as it did, generally speaking, the activities of the State of Monaco), did not want to fall out with the ‘Shining’ President. Only after
threatening legal action and spending nearly two weeks there, did Chigorin succeed in obtaining compensatory expenses, and then he left for home.

In St.Petersburg, the chess players, feeling deep sympathy for Chigorin, held a celebratory dinner in his honour on 23 March 1903 in the chess club. After the dinner, a telegram from a great Russian scientist was read out.

The outstanding microbiologist, V.L. Omelyansky, together with his two brothers, who were also strong chess players, sent this telegram:

Though we are unable to be present today to celebrate the honour of Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin, we raise our glasses to the Russian master. Brilliant chess genius and an outstanding gift for analysis has already secured Mikhail Ivanovich a foremost place amongst the ranks of chess fighters of the whole world. Confident that the inspiration of our master will continue to give a great deal of the highest pleasure to true admirers of Caisa, we allow ourselves to express the wish that the future career of Mikhail Ivanovich, the universally recognised representative of Russian chess players, will never again be done a deed such as that which serves as the reason for the present celebration in his honour.

The Omelyansky brothers.

The academic Markov, who formerly had played training games with Chigorin by correspondence, also could not remain indifferent:

Dear Mikhail Ivanovich,

Please accept my assurance that I am filled with deep indignation by the action of the President of the tournament in Monte Carlo against the best chess player in Russia, whose beautiful games will always arouse pleasure and wonder in admirers of the noble game.

My cordial wishes to you for new successes.
Alexander Markov.

The finest people in Russia, the foremost representatives of Russian science, understood very well the social significance of the chess activities of Chigorin, admired his creativity and bowed before his genius.

45 King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Ivan Zhibin
Correspondence game 1899
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{d}d6 4.\textit{c}c3 \textit{c}c6 5.\textit{f}f3 \textit{b}b4 6.0-0
This opening variation was discussed in the notes to Chigorin-Schlechter, London 1899.
6...d6 7.\textit{d}d5
Chapter 20 - All-Russia championships

Chigorin suggests a debate with his opponent, since the opening Handbuch, famous at this time, recommended, on the basis of the game Paulsen-Dubois, 7...exd5 8.exd5 Qe5 9.Qxe5 dxe5 10.d4 Qe7 11.c3 as a reliable method of defence. Chigorin intended to play instead 11.Qb5+ - a recommendation which he had made long before to strengthen the white attack.

7...Qg4 8.c3 Qa5 9.Qb3 Qxd5
10.Qxd5 Qb6+ 11.d4

The opening has turned out in White’s favour as he has been able to set up a strong pawn centre. However, if Black had castled now, then there is a stubborn resistance in prospect, although after 12.a4! White keeps the advantage. To his misfortune, Black embarks upon a combination, hoping to win a bishop.

11...Qa5 12.Qxf7+ Qf8 13.Qd5 Qf6

Apparently Black noticed too late that on 13...c6 would follow 14.Qg5!, after which the f-file is opened unexpectedly quickly and with disastrous effect: for example, 14...Qxg5 15.Qxg5 h6 16.Qxf4 hxg5 17.Qxd6#, or 14...Qxf3 15.Qxf4! Qf6 16.Qxf3.

14.b4!

Of course, the combination 14.Qxf4 Qxf7 15.Qxd6+ Qg8 16.Qxf7+ Qxf7 17.Qxc7 Qxc7 18.Qe5+ and 19.Qxg4 would be too light a punishment for Black for his premature activity in the opening. White wants to drive away the knight to c6, thereby eliminating the threat ...c7-c6.

14...Qc6

After 14...Qxf7 15.Qg5! there is suddenly a threat to win two pieces - b4xa5xb6.

15.Qh5

15...Qxf3

Black could win the rook on a1: 15...Qh5 16.Qxh5 Qxd4 17.cxd4 Qxd4+ 18.Qxd4 Qxd4+ 19.Qh1 Qxa1, but after 20.Qf4+ his king cannot be saved from mate.68

16.Qxf3 g5

Again, after 16...Qxd4 17.cxd4 Qxd4+ 18.Qf1 Qxa1 19.Qf7, Black gets mated;}

68 It can, but at the cost of giving up his queen when White will have a queen and bishop against two rooks.
therefore he tries to barricade the f-file by holding on to the f-pawn, but this is in vain.

17.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}xf4! 1-0

After 17...gxf4 18.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{x}}}xf4 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}xf4 19.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}xf5+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g8 22.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}g5+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f8, there are two possible forcing continuations: 23.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}f6+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g8 24.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d1 h6 25.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{b}}}b3+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{h}}}h7 26.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c7+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g6 27.e5! dxe5 28.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c2+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{h}}}h5 29.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}g7, mating, and also that pointed out by Chigorin, 23.e5 h6 24.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f6+ \textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g8 25.e6 etc. A textbook example of a lightning defeat in a position with the king stuck in the centre.

46 Spanish Game

\textbf{\textit{\texttt{Miklos Brody}}}

Mikhail Chigorin

Paris 1900 (7)

1.e4 e5 2.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c6 3.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{b}}}b5 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f6 4.0-0\n
\textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d6 5.d4 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d7 6.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e7

Chigorin introduced this system into practice in his match with Tarrasch in 1893 and stubbornly defended its right to exist. The basis of the system lies in the sound positional idea of maintaining a pawn outpost at e5. A few defects appear in the formation of doubled and isolated pawns on the c-file. However, Chigorin considered that this circumstance 'in the present case does not cause a deterioration of Black's position'. Possible proof of this is his game with Zhibin, played in the same year 1900: 7.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{x}}}xc6 bxc6 8.dxe5 dxe5 9.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c2 0-0 10.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d6 11.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g5 f6 12.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{b}}}b6 13.b3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}e7 14.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{h}}}h4 g6 15.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}d2 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{a}}}a6 16.c4 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{b}}}b4 17.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}c2 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{a}}}a3! 18.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f1 c5 19.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{b}}}b7 20.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{h}}}h6 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e8 21.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c8 22.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d2 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d6 23.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f7 24.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{d}}}d8 25.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e1 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e6!. Later, Smyslov played a similar system with great skill.

7.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e2 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{xd}}}d4

Usually Chigorin played 7...0-0 8.c3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f6, but here he shows the flexibility of his opening set-up. In the present situation, this decision to exchange on d4 is probably the most appropriate. The exchange \textbf{\textit{\texttt{xc}}}c6 and a later e4-e5 is not threatened and the knight, having left c3, does not get to d5.

8.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{xd}}}d4 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{exd}}}d4 9.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{xd}}}d4 0-0

Black intends a comfortable and single-minded deployment of his forces: ...\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f6, ...\textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c5, ...\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e8. White should complete his development, for example with the moves 10.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f4 and then \textbf{\textit{\texttt{w}}}d2 and c2-c3. However, he makes a rash move.

10.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f5? \textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f6 11.c3 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{c}}}c5!

White begins to have his first trouble with the e4-pawn. The threat is not only 12...\textbf{\textit{\texttt{exe}}}c4, but also 12...d5.

12.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{g}}}g3 a6 13.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e2 \textbf{\textit{\texttt{e}}}e8 14.\textbf{\textit{\texttt{f}}}f3
Thanks to the pressure on the e4-pawn, Black has taken the initiative and his further progress depends on how successful he is in introducing into play the pieces on the queen's flank.

14...We7!

A cunning move. Does Black allow the exchange of the bishop on f6? Yes, but only after 14.\textit{We}h5 \textit{We}e5! (threatening 15...g6) 15.f4 \textit{We}f6. But in this case the e4-pawn is lost.

15.\textit{We}e3 \textit{Wh}4! 16.\textit{W}xc5 dxc5

The tempting exchange has led not only to a doubled black pawn, but also to a weakening of the dark squares in White's camp and it is particularly this which is exploited by Chigorin.

17.\textit{Wh}d3

White goes over to passive defence too early. He should play 17.\textit{W}c4 \textit{W}g5! 18.f4 \textit{W}g6 19.f5!, after which complications arise, but the position is still somewhat better for Black.

17...\textit{W}d6 18.f4 \textit{W}d8! 19.\textit{W}c2 \textit{W}b6!

20.\textit{W}c1 c4+

Black clearly shows up the defects of the move 17.\textit{W}d3. With a forcing manoeuvre, he has seized the d-file and ensured the other bishop entry to g4.

21.\textit{W}e2

21.\textit{W}h1 would lose at once to 21...\textit{W}xg3 22.hxg3 \textit{W}d6.

21...\textit{W}g4

22.\textit{W}f5?

White does not suspect any danger and makes a pseudo-active move — cutting off the retreat of the bishop on g4 and preparing \textit{W}f4. It was necessary to immediately unpin the rook on f2 by playing 22.\textit{W}f1. Admittedly, after 22...\textit{W}d7 23.b3 \textit{W}c5! or 23.e5 \textit{W}ad8, Black has an obvious advantage, but a struggle is still in prospect.

22...\textit{W}e7!

White finds himself unable to defend against the threat of 23...\textit{W}c5, since, on 23.\textit{W}f1, would follow 23...\textit{W}c5 24.\textit{W}d2 \textit{W}e3 25.\textit{W}xd8+ \textit{W}xd8 26.\textit{W}e1 \textit{W}h6, threatening 27...\textit{W}f4+ as well as a rook invasion on d2 with a mating attack. The continuation chosen by White saves him only from mate.

23.h3 \textit{W}c5 24.\textit{W}f4 \textit{X}xf2+ 0-1

White resigned in view of the heavy material loss. A splendid example of the exploitation of the strength of the two bishops.
Theoreticians do not now pay very much attention to this move; indeed also in practice it is met far more rarely than 3...c3. But for the present Black must at once solve the problem of the d5-square and determine his strategy in the struggle for the centre. Obviously, only 3...e6 substantially reinforces Black’s position in the centre, but at the cost of temporarily limiting the mobility of the bishop on c8. Logic would dictate a plan for White of 4.e4 dxe4 5.d5, however, after 5...b4 White achieves nothing. There remains the restrained scheme of development: 4.f3 b4 5.e3 f6 6.d3 0-0 7.0-0, which the Soviet players, Ragozin and Lipnitsky, spent a great deal of energy analysing. They, in particular, showed that Chigorin’s manoeuvre 7...dxc4 8.xc4 d6, followed by ...e6-e5, also here gives Black good counter-chances. And if he does not hold on to the d5-pawn? The cunning move 3...f6 would tempt White to take a wrong road: 4.cxd5 xd5 5.e4 xc3 6.bxc3, since then, after 6...e5 7.d5 b8!, Black completely blockades the pawn chain in the centre. However, if on the cunning White also replies with cunning – 4.xg5 xe4 5.cxd5! (but not 5.xe2 dxe4 6.d5? e6!! 7.dxc6 xg5 8.a3 b8 9.cxb7+? d7 etc.) 5...xc3 6.bxc5 xd5 7.f3 g4 8.b3! – then Black has in prospect a struggle for equality.

One can play in the style of the Albin Counter Gambit, 3...e5, but in the variation 4.cxd5 xd4 5.e3 f5 6.e2 d6 7.f3, Black must worry about both the e5 and c7-pawns.

3...dxc4 4.d5

4...a5!?

It was precisely this continuation, in conjunction with the sacrifice of a piece, which Chigorin considered the basic objection to 3...c3. Deserving attention is 4...e6, which was played in the game Gligoric-Smyslov, Amsterdam 1971.

5.a4+

It seems that the moving away of the knight to the edge of the board allows White to seize the initiative in the centre in various ways, and in particular with the move 5.f4. However, after 5...e6 6.e4 f6, Black has a completely satisfactory position, since the c4-pawn hampers the development of the bishop on f1, while there is no threat of b5 for the present because of ...b4+.

5.c6 6.b4
In 6.dxc6, Chigorin pointed out the following way to equality: 6...\(\text{Qxc6}\) 7.e3 d7 8.\(\text{Qxc4}\) e6 9.\(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\) 10.0-0 \(\text{Qc8}\).

6...\(\text{Qxb3}\) ?

Later on, the erroneousness of this prepared sacrifice was demonstrated. It seems the estimation of the move 4.d5 depends on an assessment of the position arising from the variation 6...b5! (instead of 6...\(\text{Qxb3}\)). 7.\(\text{Wxa5}\) \(\text{Wxa5}\) 8.bxa5 b4. Theory considers that 9.\(\text{Qd1}\) \(\text{cx}d5\) 10.e4 e6! gives Black sufficient compensation for the piece, since the pawn avalanche paralyses the activity of the white pieces.

7.axb3 e6

8.\(\text{Qb2}\) ?

Of course, it is impossible to take the knight on a5, either now or after 8.dxe6 \(\text{Qxe6}\) (9.\(\text{Wxa5}\) \(\text{Wxa5}\) 10.\(\text{Qxa5}\) \(\text{Qb4}\)). 8.b4 would also lead to an unclear game: 8...\(\text{Wf6}\)! (possible also is 8...b5) 9.\(\text{Wxa3}\) \(\text{Qc4}\)! 10.dxc6 b5!, but nevertheless the invulnerability of the knight seems temporary and rather accidental. White need only defend the \(\text{Qc3}\) with the bishop, that is from d2. In this case, the combination 8.\(\text{Wb6}\) 9.\(\text{Wxa5}\) \(\text{Wxb3}\) is unfavourable for Black because of 10.\(\text{Qb1}\), and in the variation 8.\(\text{Qxb3}\) 9.\(\text{Wxb3}\) exd5 10.e4! d4 11.\(\text{Qc4}\)! \(\text{Wc7}\) 12.\(\text{Qxe2}\), the extra white piece (though also for three pawns) as well as a big advantage in development and the open character of the position, have decisive significance. Probably, after 8.\(\text{Qd2}\), Black would have to reply 8...\(\text{b6}\) 9.dxc6 \(\text{Qe7}\).

8...\(\text{Wb6}\)! 9.\(\text{Wxa5}\) \(\text{Wxb3}\)

This is where the drawback of the move 8.\(\text{Qb2}\) tells. The bishop finds itself under attack and White is forced to lose an important tempo on its defence. In so far as the continuation 10.\(\text{Wxa2}\) \(\text{Wxa2}\) 11.\(\text{Qxa2}\) reduces sharply White’s attacking potential, there is the possibility of 11...\(\text{exd5}\). The tactical trap 10.dxc6 (so as after 10...\(\text{bxc6}\) to reply 11.\(\text{Wxa2}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 12.\(\text{Wxb3}\) \(\text{Qxb3}\) 13.\(\text{Qa4}\)) is beautifully refuted by 10...\(\text{Qb4}\)! 11.cxb7 \(\text{Wxb7}\) 12.\(\text{Wb5+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\)! White has to switch over to defence.\(^{69}\)

\(^{69}\) 12...\(\text{Qc7}\) is stronger still as it pins after 13.\(\text{Wxb4}\!+\) \(\text{Wxb4}\) 14.\(\text{bxa8}\) and if instead 13.\(\text{bxc8}\) \(\text{Qr}\) then 13...\(\text{Wf8}\)!
10.\textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}b}1 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}b}4 11.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}a}1 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}e}6!}}}}

By taking the pawn (11...\textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}x}d5}), Black would risk losing the initiative: 12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}f3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}2 (12...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}f}5? 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}d2! \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}2 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}c}c1 and wins) 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}d4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g}6 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}a}a}3.}}}}}

12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}c6 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}e}4 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}c1}}

![Diagram]

14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}f3!}

The plausible 14.f3 would in fact be a waste of time, since it is not the knight on e4 but the a-pawn which is dangerous for White. Chigorin gives the following convincing variation: 14.f3 a4! 15.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}x}e4 a3! 16.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}f}f2 axb2 17.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}x}a}8 bxc1\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}}} 18.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}c8+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}e}7 19.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}c}c7+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}f}6}}

This is how Black's game is in jeopardy after 17.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}xb}7 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}x}b}7 18.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}d}5+! \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}f}8 19.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}c}a}3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}c}5 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}xb}4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}x}b}4 21.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}c}c}c6}.}

![Diagram]

17.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}a}x3!}

At this moment, when it seems that White's resistance is broken -- 17.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}b}5 0-0! 18.0-0 axb2 19.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}x}a}8 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}x}c}3 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}b}1 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}x}d}4, or 17.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}xb}7 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}x}b}7 18.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}b}5+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}f}8}}

13...a5!
Chapter 20 - All-Russia championships

...ex2 axb2 20...xb2 a3 — he finds a tactical chance, endeavouring to divert the bishop on b4 from the a5-e1 diagonal, after which the black queen finds itself under attack.

17...xc3!
The best reply. The pin of the knight on a3 can no longer be exploited: 17...xa3 18...xa3; 17...a5 18.cxb7 xb7 19.b5+, or 17...0-0 18...xb4 xa1 19.xa1! xc3 20.xc3 (20.xf8 e5 21.a8 exd4 22.xc8 wxf5) 20...xb6 21.e2 e5 22.xf3 with advantage to White.

18...xb4 xa1 19.xa1 a2!
Black not only moves the knight away from attack, but also prevents the invasion of the rook.

20.b5! d8 21.a5+ e7 22.0-0

A very sharp and original position. Black has a small material advantage, but for the present only his queen takes an active part in the game. White's pieces are actively placed but his formation has a defect which is not immediately obvious - the precarious position of the bishop on b5. This circumstance is immediately exploited by Chigorin.

22.e5! 23.e4!
The only way of maintaining the tension. On 23...f3, Black would win a pawn - 23...bxc6 24.xf1 (24.xc6 xa5) 24...xb5 25.xxa2 e6.

23...wxd4 24.xa2 bxc6 25.xc6 xe6 26.a4 wd3 27.b4+ ef6

Up to now, White has defended ingeniously, and if he now succeeds in exchanging rook and bishop, then the pawn formation, all on one flank and with an absence of weaknesses, foreshadows a drawn result. The exchange of rooks is probably not difficult: 28.a7 b8 29.e7+ g6 30.a3 b3 31.xb3 xxb3, but the queen and bishop, assisted by the pawns, might still create threats to the white king, though there is also a long struggle in prospect. Instead of this, White falls into a cunning trap and loses at once.

28.f4? c8 29.xe5+ g6 30.d5

30...c1!
White resigns, since large-scale material loss - 31.xc1 e3+ 32.f1 xc1+ 33.e1 (33.f2 c2+) 33...f4+ 34.f2 xd5 - is unavoidable.
A tense struggle! White displayed great tenacity in defence in a difficult position, but the greater impression is made by the energy and fine precision of Chigorin in conducting the attack and in the realisation of his material advantage.

48. Petroff Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Sergey Lebedev
All-Russia Championship, Moscow 1901 (10)
1.e4 e5 2.d4 d5 3.dxe5 dxe4
4.dxe5 c5 5.d3 d6 6.0-0 0-0
7.c4 c6 8.d3 c3 dxc3 9.bxc3

For the present, White is winning the opening battle. He has a pawn superiority in the centre and a strong knight on e5. The direct attempt to drive it away with 9...f6 is refuted at once by 10.Wh5, after which there is nothing left for Black except 10...fxe6 (10...h6 11.Qh6 fxe6 12.Qg5 Wf8 13.Bh7+ and mate in two moves). Nevertheless Black must not leave the Qe5 in peace, and must at the same time develop his pieces. For this purpose, 9...Qd7 is the indicated move, for example: 10.Wh5 Qf6 11.Wh4 Qe4 or 10.Qf4 Wf6
11.Qxd7 Qxd7 12.Qxd6 Wxd6 and the game should be gradually equalised. However, Black gives his opponent the advantage of the two bishops in an open position.

9...Qxe5 10.dxe5

10...Qxc4
Possibly also inaccurate. Black diverts the bishop away from the h7-square, but the weakness of the f7-point now begins to tell. Black's position may rightfully be considered difficult, but, after examining his defensive resources, Chigorin points out only the move 10...Qe6, which though solid does not create a threat to the e5-pawn. But it is precisely this fact which allows White to embark upon a direct attack — 11.Wh5 g6 12.Wh6! Now, on 12...Qd7, would follow the forced destruction 13.Qg5 f6 14.Qxg6 hxg6 15.Wxg6+ Wh8 16.Qf6 Qxf6 (if 16...Qxf6 then 17.Qae1 Wf7 18.Qe3 and White wins) 17.Qh5+ Qh7 18.Qa1 Wf7 19.Qxf6+ Qxf6 20.Wg5+ Qf7 21.Qe3 and White wins. Black could put up a more tenacious defence after 10...Qd7, so as, after 11.cxd5, to continue 11...Qxe5! 12.Qhx7+ Qhx7 13.Wh5+ Wh8 14.Wxe5 Qxd5, and on 11.f4 to reply 11...Qc5 12.Qa3 Qxd3!

11.Qxc4 Wf7
The exchange of queens leaves White with an enormous positional advantage: the open d-file, two strong bishops and a strong pawn on e5.
12. a4!

Ridiculous, though also not obviously decisive. White prepares the transfer of the bishop to a3 without spending time on the defence of the e5-pawn.

12... d8

With such a backward development, it would be extremely dangerous to take the pawn. Chigorin’s variation:

12... xe5 13. e1 c7 14. a3 d8 15. xf7! xf7 16. h5+ is sufficiently convincing.

13. h5 e8

It is difficult to give good advice to Black. On 13... g6, a very unpleasant reply would be 14. g5!, and equally bad are also 14... xe5 because of 15. xf7+ and 14... xh5 in view of 15. xe7 e8 16. d6.

14. a3! d7 15. aad1 f5 16. h4

There is of course no sense in White exchanging queens. He now threatens 17. d3 and, on 16... g4, both 17. d8 and 17. d7 win.

16... xe5 17. f6

Beginning a forced winning manoeuvre.

17... f6

The black queen cannot desert the e7-square, for example: 17... e3+ 18. h1 xc3 19. e7.

14... c5 is better when after 15. f3 White hardly has any advantage.

18. xf6!

The most effective continuation of the attack. Added to all Black’s misfortunes, now threats on the g-file come down upon his king.

18... gxf6 19. ef3 e6

White threatened 20. g3+ and 21. xf7.

20. g3+ h8

White, of course, has a winning position, but the decisive blow is not immediately obvious.

21. e7! h5

Desperation, but 21... d7 would lose a piece: 22. xe6! xe7 23. xd7 d8 24. g3 etc.

22. xf6+

And without waiting for the announcement of mate in three moves, Black resigned.

A refined, lucid game. Chigorin very skillfully created and carried out an attack on the king by exploiting, in essence, the only mistake by Black in the opening – on the 9th move.

49 Caro-Kann Defence

Mikhail Chigorin

Ignatz von Popiel

Hanover 1902 (14)

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.c3 dxe4 4.dxe4

f5 5.g3 g6 6.h4

The variation is subject to the whims of fashion, though practice has never
placed under doubt its reliability. 25 years ago White went in rather for the system $2.\text{dxc3 d5 3.\text{dxf3}}$, allowing the pin $3...\text{g4}$ (but in return preventing the development of the bishop to $f5 - 3...\text{dxe4 4.\text{cxe4 f5 5.g3 g6?}}$

$6.h4 h6 7.g5$). The system with the development of the bishop to $f5$ was adopted in the match for the World Championship, Botvinnik-Petrosian, and only Spassky, in his match with Petrosian in 1966, succeeded in finding a sufficiently effective plan for White.

$6...\text{h6 7.\text{c3 d7}}$

This order of moves, through which Black prevents the white knight easily occupying the $e5$-square, is considered the best. But, nowadays, White, before exchanging the light-squared bishops, advances the pawn to $h5 - 8.h5 h7$;

he thereby not only gives himself a space advantage and a bind on the king's flank for the middlegame, but also good chances in the ending, where he is usually left with knight against dark-squared bishop. The standard of play for White is as in the 13th game of the Spassky-Petrosian match, 1966, in which, after $8.h5 h7 9.d3 d3 10.xd3 c7 11.c2 e6 12.e2 g6$

$13.0-0-0 0-0-0 14.e5 c5 15.dxe5 d7 16.f4 c7 17.e4 c5 18.c3$, White obtained the advantage.

\begin{align*}
8.d3 & \text{xd3 9.wxd3 e6 10.d2 g6} \\
& \text{gf6 11.0-0 c7 12.e4 0-0-0 13.g3}
\end{align*}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{White} & \text{Black} \\
\hline
\text{K} & \text{K} \\
\text{Q} & \text{Q} \\
\text{R} & \text{R} \\
\text{B} & \text{B} \\
\text{N} & \text{N} \\
\text{P} & \text{P} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The plan with the exchange of the bad- placed $g3$ and a subsequent struggle for the $f4$- and $e5$-squares is thought by many of our contemporaries as having been worked out by Ukrainian chess players. However, the source of it, we see, is deeper.

\begin{align*}
13...\text{xe4}
\end{align*}

Usually, in similar positions, as frequently occur in the Caro-Kann and French Defences, an exchange of the knight on $e4$ followed by a transfer of the other knight with tempo to $f6$, is considered a minor success for

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Ignatz_von_Popiel.png}
\end{center}
... Here, however, the matter is more complicated, since the \( \text{c6x} \) does not take part in the struggle for key point e5 and, in this respect, placed even worse here than on d7.

Spassky suggested the exchange \( \text{c5xc5} \) 14.\( \text{cxc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 17.\( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 18.\( \text{f4} \)
\( \text{xd6} \) 19.\( \text{xd6} \) and also 16...\( \text{d7} \) 17.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xc3} \).

14.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 15.\( \text{he1} \) \( \text{he8} \)

16.\( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f6} \)

17.\( \text{we2}! \)

Spassky time and again has stressed that the greatest role in his chess development was played by a careful study of the creative work of Chigorin. This is apparent for example in how skillfully he plays the King's Gambit, his love of the Chigorin treatment of the Closed Variation of the Sicilian Defence, and finally his handling of the Caro-Kann Defence – in particular the manoeuvre \( \text{e4-e2} \) with which Spassky began to soften up Black's tough position in this opening.

17...\( \text{wb6} \)

Black makes his aim the carrying out of the freeing advance ...c6-c5, but, played at once, this would give White a clear advantage: 17...c5 18.\( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 19.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 20.\( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 21.\( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 22.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 23.h5 followed by \( \text{h1-h4-c4} \).

18.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 19.\( \text{xc1} \)

19...\( \text{b8} \)

The advance of the pawn to c5 does not rid Black of his opening difficulties, since the natural freeing manoeuvre, the exchange 19...\( \text{xd4} \), is for the present not possible because of 20.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 21.\( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 25.\( \text{xe5} \) etc.

This combination later on will paralyse Black's activity, as will be underlined by the unfortunate triangular arrangement of the queen, bishop and c5-pawn.

20.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7} \)

By retreating the queen to c7, Black would risk coming under attack on the h2-b8 diagonal: 20...\( \text{c7} \) 21.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 22.c5, or 21.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 22.\( \text{b4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 23.c5! \( \text{f8} \) 24.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 25.\( \text{xe5} \) etc.

21.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a8} \) 22.\( \text{a1} \)

Moving the king into the corner represents a little chess enigma, since, on the reply 21...\( \text{a8} \), White could at once and with great effect play 22.\( \text{b4} \) ! Instead of this, Chigorin likewise moves his king off the b-file. However, it is difficult for Black to take advantage of this short pause. After the relatively best 22...\( \text{c6} \)

71 In fact 23...\( \text{d8} \) 24.\( \text{h1} \) \( \text{d4} \) would prevent this time-consuming manoeuvre.
23.dxc5 アク5 24.アクxc5 アxc5, he has in prospect a long and agonizing struggle for equality.

22...\(\text{\textit{W}}c7\)

23.b4!
Beginning to ‘crack’ the c5-square. Defending it with the move 23..b6 would be risky because of the opening of the b-file, which, in conjunction with the threats on the h1-a8 diagonal would give White a strong attack. There remains a tactical possibility which has a surprising effect.

23...\(\text{\textit{W}}d7\)! 24.\(\text{\textit{Ed}}d1\)
White takes a wrong path; here the simple 24.アクxc5 would guarantee him a big advantage (24...アクxc5 25.dxc5! \(\text{\textit{W}}xd2\) 26.\(\text{\textit{Ed}}d1\)).

24...\(\text{\textit{X}}\text{cx}d4\) 25.f4

25...\(\text{\textit{H}}h5\)?
Now Black once again finds himself under attack. It was possible to hold the position by immediately seizing the a8-h1 diagonal with the queen: 25...\(\text{\textit{W}}c6!\) 26.\(\text{\textit{Ec}}1\) (he has to lose time to defend against 26...\(\text{\textit{W}}e4\)!) 26...h5 27.\(\text{\textit{B}}b7\) 28.\(\text{\textit{B}}b4\) \(\text{\textit{Xb}}b4\) 29.\(\text{\textit{W}}xh5\) \(\text{\textit{Xd}}d3\) 30.\(\text{\textit{Xd}}d3\) \(\text{\textit{Xd}}d3\) 31.\(\text{\textit{Dc}}d1\) \(\text{\textit{W}}e4\) with equality.

26.b5 b6 27.\(\text{\textit{B}}b4\) \(\text{\textit{Gg}}4\)
It is difficult to suggest a more tenacious defence – the threats of 28.\(\text{\textit{W}}f3+\) and 28.c5 are very strong. Thus, on 27...\(\text{\textit{W}}b7\) would follow 28.\(\text{\textit{Dx}}d6\) \(\text{\textit{Xd}}d6\) 29.c5, and after 27...\(\text{\textit{Cc}}8\), unpleasant is 28.\(\text{\textit{W}}f3+\) \(\text{\textit{Xb}}5\) 29.c5 or even 29.\(\text{\textit{Cc}}5\).

28.\(\text{\textit{Dx}}d6\) \(\text{\textit{Xd}}d6\) 29.c5! \(\text{\textit{Bx}}c5\)
30.\(\text{\textit{Cc}}5\) \(\text{\textit{Cc}}7\) 31.\(\text{\textit{Xc}}d1\) \(\text{\textit{Cc}}5\)
32.\(\text{\textit{Cc}}x5\) \(\text{\textit{Gf}}6\)?
He could have put up a more stubborn resistance by playing 32...\(\text{\textit{Cf}}6\) 33.\(\text{\textit{Wf}}3–\) \(\text{\textit{Dd}}5\), though after 34.\(\text{\textit{W}}xh5\) White has a great advantage.

33.\(\text{\textit{Wf}}3+\) \(\text{\textit{Gb}}8\)

34.\(\text{\textit{Dg}}4\)!
The rook on c5 is immune from capture and there is no defence against 35.\(\text{\textit{Dd}}a6+\).

34...a5 35.\(\text{\textit{Aa}}6+\) \(\text{\textit{Fa}}7\) 36.\(\text{\textit{Ec}}7+\)
\(\text{\textit{Wxc}}7\) 37.\(\text{\textit{Xc}}7\) 1-0
After 37...\(\text{\textit{Dd}}3\) 38.\(\text{\textit{Cc}}6\) \(\text{\textit{Dd}}2\) 39.\(\text{\textit{Bb}}6+\) he is mated. A very good illustration of the theme, ‘The role of Chigorin in the development of modern opening systems’.

286
King’s Gambit Accepted

Mikhail Chigorin

van Zhibin

Petersburg 1902

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5 4.Qc4 d5

This refrains from the sharp but common 4.g4 and prefers to complete his development.

5.0-0 d6 6.d4 h6 7.c3

The King’s Gambit, the c3-square generally best left for the knight. Chigorin apparently decides to test the length of the attack with Wb3.

7...Qc6

A natural reaction to 7.c3, though it recommends 7..Qc6 or even O-O.

8.e5

The attack 8.Wb3 0-0 9.e5 is refuted by the counter-blow 9...d5!

8...dxe5

9.Qxe5

But here White could play 9.Wb3. Chigorin considered that in reply to this it is possible to defend in a rather original way. 9...Qf6? 10.Qxf7+ Kf8 11.Qh5 Wh7 and after 12.dxe5 Oxe5 13.Oxe5 Qxe5 14.g3 to reply 14...Qg7, preserving the extra pawn and a solid position. Though on the 12th move White could strengthen the attack with a knight sacrifice – 12.Qh4!! gxh4

13.dxe5 Oxe5 14.Qxf4, Black again would hold the defence by 14...Qg7; admittedly he would still have to ward off some dangerous threats, for example: 15.Qd2 Qxf4 16.Qxf4 Qc5+ 17.Qh1 Wh5 18.Qe6!

9...Qd5

In good time Black covers the a2-g8 diagonal. Other moves seem to be less reliable. Thus 9...Qe6 10.Qxe6 fxe6 leads to a formation in Black’s camp with numerous weaknesses, and on 9...0-0, the reply 10.Wb3 practically forces Black to sacrifice the exchange by 10...Qe8 11.Qg6 Qc6 12.Qxf8. Certainly, in this case, the position remains very tense and unclear but White hardly has an advantage since Black’s pawn chain on the king’s flank is very strong.

Chigorin: Black has, in comparison with the ‘theoretical’ variations, a very desirable game. White only with difficulty will profit from the insignificant advantage in material (rook against bishop and pawn) as he cannot smash the black pawns on the king’s flank; if h4, then ...Qh5 and the knight obtains a strong position on g3.

10.Wb3

Chigorin is consistent in the carrying out of his opening idea, but his opponent fathoms out his intentions
and takes necessary measures. On the other hand, the transfer of the knight to d5, as pointed out by Boris Spassky, gives White the opportunity to conduct a sharp combinative attack: 10.Qxf7! (possible also is 10.Wh5 0-0 11.Qxf4!) 10...Wxf7 11.Qxf4 gxf4 12.Wh5+ etc.

10...c6 11.Qd2
The attack with Wb3 has been shown to be harmless. While the regrouping Qd2-f3, Qc1-d2 and Aa1 is taking place, Black can also develop his pieces on the queen's flank.

Thus, now deserving attention is 11...Qd7 12.Qxd7 Wxd7 13.Qe1+ Qf8 or 11...0-0 12.Qd5 Qd7; however, Black unexpectedly rids himself of the knight on e5, giving up the bishop which plays an important role in the defence of the king.

11...Qxe5 12.Qe1!

12...0-0
Confusion. It was possible to organise a defence only by exchanging queens - 12...Qe3! 13.Qxf7+ Qf8 14.dxe5 Wb6!.

13.Qxe5 Qe3 14.Qf3 Qxc4
Black cannot exploit the rook's exposed position on e5; 14...Qd7 15.Qxe3 Qxe5 16.Qxe5 fxe3 17.Qxf7! Wb6+ 18.Wc2

Better is 17...Qc7, defending on the kingside.

17...g4
Black avoids serious material loss only in the event of 17...gxh4 18.Qh5 Wg6! (18...Qg4 19.Qxf3 Qxf3 20.Qxf4 and White has undoubtedly the better position) 19.Qxg6+ fxg6 20.Qh6 Qg7 21.Qh4, escaping with the loss

72 He should unpin by 18...Qd7, although White is still on top after 19.Wc4 Wc7 20.Qf1.

74 Interesting is 17...Qc5 18.Qg6+ Qh7 19.Qf5 fxg6 20.Qxc5 when Black is left with a rook and pawn for two pieces. Nevertheless the potential knight outpost on e5 gives White the edge.
a pawn, as 17...d7 loses far more: 
exg5! wg7 19.xf4 xe5 20.xe5 exf6 etc. The move chosen by 
White is also bad.
18.g5! wg7 19.xf4 d7
20.xe6 fxe6 21.xe6 f6

summing up, White has an extra pawn 
and a strong attack. With the following
six-move manoeuvre, Chigorin obtains a decisive material advantage.

22.ae1 af8 23.d6 xe6
24.xe6 f6 25.e8+ f8 26.wc4+

Chigorin: If 26...h8, then 27.e5.

27.e7

The rest is of no interest.

27...xd6 28.xg7+ xg7 29.wc5

e6 30.wxa7 e7 31.wc5 g6

32.g3

Chigorin: Better than 32.h5 g3 33.wf1
h7+ 34.wel g4.

32..e2 33.wf5 e6 34.wg4

f6 35.h5 d8 36.wf4+ h7

37.wf5+ h6 38.wf6 e2

Chigorin: If 38...g8 39.g4 d7, then
40.g5 dxg5 41.g6+ and White wins easily.

39.wf5+ 1-0
Chapter 21
Gambit contests in Vienna and Brighton

In May 1903, the Vienna Chess Club held a double-round international tournament with an obligatory opening—the King's Gambit Accepted. Gambits, and in particular the King’s Gambit, by this time were already met infrequently. For example, in Hastings 1895, out of 230 games, there were, in all, eight played with the King's Gambit Accepted and Declined (whereas the Queen’s Pawn Opening was played 65 times and the Spanish – 44). The majority of chess players were definitely in favour of solid, reliable openings.

The initiative of the Vienna Chess Club aroused lively controversy in the pages of the chess press. The St. Petersburg and Moscow Chess Clubs greeted the organisation of the tournament with telegrams. Sympathy was also conveyed by Chess Review: 'One cannot but welcome the fortunate idea of the Vienna Club. The "modern style" has produced such boring games in recent years that the whole chess world, for a long time now, has longed to see lively gambit play' – was written in this magazine. Tarrasch, who did not approve of the King’s Gambit, assessed the tournament completely differently: 'It is possible that the organisers of the tournament', he wrote, 'expect to see far more interesting games than in previous tournaments — a hope which will probably prove to be false. The King’s Gambit is not the slightest bit more interesting than, for example, the Spanish Game, and it is easier to conduct, because always "anything goes". Gambit play in chess approximates to the poster-style of painting and ball or military music in pure art. It is like a flashy painting, with bright colours, without a palatable tone, without secret charms. As soon as a talented player becomes acquainted with the chess openings, he almost exclusively plays gambits, since the fine points of this type of play are most readily understood. Many years pass before he goes on to the secrets of the closed games, where, as Anderssen aptly remarked: "The spirit is soothed under a fine cover".'

No way could Chigorin, who maintained his love of the King’s Gambit all through life, go along with these words of Tarrasch. As far back as his 'Course on the Openings' in Chess Shop, he wrote about the King’s Gambit:

'Generally speaking, all gambit play leads to the most beautiful attacks in chess, and the main representative of this play is the King’s Gambit, which makes up one of the most interesting chapters in the theory of the chess openings.'

In the Vienna tournament, Chigorin displayed a great superiority over the other participants, even though there were first-class masters playing here: Marshall, Pillsbury, Maroczy, Teichmann, Schlechter and others. One contemporary wrote: 'Looking closely at the games of the Vienna tournament, one cannot but be convinced that the majority of the participants were apparently "not quite themselves", feeling that they were being transported somewhere else, into territory alien to them, with unfamiliar, strange and unexpected wonders. Having grown out of the habit of 'sharp' positions, having trained themselves to play 'from the start' (Queen’s Pawn and Spanish), with slow development and careful
...evading, they not infrequently became flustered with the constant danger of unexpected complications’ and gave up their position without a fight... or even threw themselves headlong into impossible head-spinning attacks for which there were insufficient grounds.

Chigorin, who was the oldest competitor of the tournament, displayed very fine, very fresh play. In contrast to all his rivals, he was in his element with novelties, and played equally confidently both with white and black, attacking or defending.

Maroczy, Schlechter and Teichmann were first-class chess players, who possessed exceptionally fine understanding of a position and contributed much that was valuable and new to the development of chess, mainly on the strategical side. Their games are an interesting and lasting chapter in the history of chess. But, coming in an integral part of their attitude to chess, was an increased anxiety over personal gain. Not without reason, the creative credo of one of these – Teichmann – was simply expressed: ‘Attack, but also have a draw in your pocket.’ It is not surprising then in the Vienna tournament, he proved to be no rival at all for Chigorin and occupied a low place.

A new wave of popularity for the King’s Gambit, for which, perhaps, the organisers had hoped, was not aroused. The reason lay not in the arithmetical plus score made by Black, who won 36 games and lost 33, but in the chess taste of the era. Mighty progress in the understanding of chess was needed so that the concept of the inevitability of risk would cease to be a bugbear, but the sacrifice of a pawn for the initiative was propagating this method of struggle. On top of all this, the gambit idea went far beyond the bounds of the King’s Gambit and began to be applied in the opening, without limitations.

What does the King’s Gambit represent now, in our day? It is played infrequently, yet in the hands of Keres, Bronstein, Spassky, it represented a dangerous weapon. As well as this, in spite of Tarrasch’s opinion, ‘bright colours’ and ‘palatable tone’ are displayed in the King’s Gambit. This is the result of the living tradition of Chigorin. It is possible that the King’s Gambit can expect an even longer and more glorious life, and, in the future, will once again take its place in the ranks of the widely used, viable openings.

It only remains to say a few words about the Vienna tournament. There was no contest at all for first place. Chigorin won game after game and, five rounds before the end, had broken away from his nearest rival by three points.

The final results were: 1st Chigorin 13 out of 18; 2nd Marshall 11½; 3rd Marco 11.

Two months after the end of the Vienna tournament, Chigorin was waiting for the champion, Emanuel Lasker, in the English sea-side resort of Brighton. Mikhail Ivanovich was about to play a match of six games with him, under unusual conditions. Lasker would be conducting every game with the white pieces, and all these games were to begin with a position, stipulated beforehand, arising from the Rice Gambit.
The Rice Gambit presented itself as just one of the variations of the Kieseritzky Gambit. Why then did Lasker and Chigorin decide to investigate this non-topical opening? The reason was rather curious and interesting.

The inventor of the gambit, the American Isaac Rice, had a rare combination of qualities: he was a chess millionaire. But if Kolisch, about whom we have spoken, became a millionaire by moving away from chess, then Rice, on the other hand, after making his fortune, worth millions, gave up his business! He was happy to finance all arrangements which helped to investigate and popularise his invention.

Out of New York began to flow a river of gold, and a new source of income appeared in the budget of the masters. Under Rice's sponsorship were organised, one after the other, tournaments devoted to the Rice Gambit, over the board and by correspondence, consultation games and analytical matches. Arenas for these events were New York, St.Petersburg, Berlin, Monte Carlo, and even the transatlantic steamship Pretoria, on which, in 1904, the European chess players were sailing to America, for a tournament. Chess magazines published analyses, and controversial articles, special pamphlets and monographs appeared on the Rice Gambit. Masters, and also simply amateurs, stimulated the generous subsidies of Rice by looking for better continuations, both for White and Black. And here the indefatigable Rice had succeeded in engaging the World Champion and the greatest expert on gambits in the world, to analyse his variation.

Chigorin had a low opinion of the Rice Gambit and stated this in print. The result of the Brighton match confirmed the correctness of this view. Lasker won one game, Chigorin – two, three ended in a draw. The games of the match took a sharp and intricate course, with wild complications.

Of course, it would have been of far greater value for chess, if the joint analyses of the two great chess players had been devoted to some topical opening variation. But what can you do if the inspiration of the patron dictates otherwise? After the match was over, Chigorin had still not finished with the Rice Gambit. In 1904, he took part in several consultation games, which were played by the competitors of the international tournament in Cambridge Springs, in order to explore the gambit, while, in 1905, he took first prize in a special tournament in St.Petersburg, in which the Rice Gambit was also played.

The semi-comic epic of the Rice Gambit ended after Rice's death in 1916. Today, in the most complete manuals, only a few lines are spared for the Rice Gambit. But this forgotten opening variation formed an integral part of the biography of Lasker and Chigorin, who displayed a great deal of wit and ingenuity in their investigation of this continuation.
Chapter 21 - Gambit contests in Vienna and Brighton

5. King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Geza Maroczy
Anna 1903 (12)
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\&c4 d5 4.\&xd5 \&h4+ 5.\&f1 g5

6.g3!
Chigorin gladly played this astute move, which allows White various possibilities - from a favourable early exchange of queens (in the event of 6...\&g3) to a characteristically sharp King's Gambit position after 6...\&h6.

Chigorin: I do not remember against whom and when I first played this attack. Up to now I have no grounds to suppose that it is unfavourable for White.

6...fxg3 7.\&f3!
The move 7.\&g2 is more romantic than strong. The simple 7...\&d6 sets White difficult problems since it threatens 8...\&xh2, and the attack 8.e5 \&xe5 9.\&e2 \&d4+ 10.\&xf7+ \&xf7 11.\&f3 is refuted the effective 11...\&h3+!. Chigorin also defends the rook on h1 and wants to play 8.hxg3, but more importantly he creates mating threats and obliges Black to occupy himself with organising a defence.

7...g2+
Black does not want to allow the open h-file.

8.\&xg2 \&h6

9.\&g3!
A rather surprising (for the King's Gambit), but also quite correct decision in the position. The exchange of queens is favourable for White.

9...\&d6
Black cannot avoid the exchange (9...\&h5 10.\&e5+) and wants to immediately determine the character of the position. In addition, at the cost of doubled pawns, he reckons on obtaining play on the g-file. After 9...\&c5 could follow 10.d4! \&xd4 11.\&f3 \&xg3+ 12.hxg3 \&g7 13.\&xg5 with the better game for White.75

10.\&xh4! gxh4 11.d4 \&g8+ 12.\&f1 \&g6

75 In fact 11.\&f3 would be a huge blunder as 11...\&h3+ 12.\&xh3 \&f2 is mate!
13.e5
Black has indeed obtained counterplay based on the rook on the g-file and White has to solve several problems related to the development of his pieces. Chigorin takes away the f6-square from the rook and, in addition, defends the g2-square with the bishop, making possible the development of the king’s knight. However, in return for this he has to concede the f5-square.

13... dịp 14. öğ
Chigorin does not want to exchange the light-squared bishop – 14. öğ zug 15. öğ f5, though, in our opinion, after 16. xh6! lệ 17. xe4 xh6 18. f3, White’s position possibly deserves the preference.

14... f5
Chigorin: On 14... f5, White could reply 15. f3.

15. c3 c5 16. ge2 c6 17. f3

A critical moment. Black, by retreating the rook, gives White the chance to reinforce the d4-pawn and gradually take over the initiative. Deserving serious attention is the exchange sacrifice 17. fxd4 18. xg4 xg4 19. xd4 xg4, and if 20. xg1, then 20... f3! (but not 20... h3+ 21. f2 0-0-0 22. xg5, or 20... h5 21. d5).

17... f8 18. b5! d8 19. c3 a6
Black seems to have lost the thread.

Nevertheless the knight will travel on to a3, even if Black does not drive it away but makes a useful developing move (19... d7).

20. a3 f6
Chigorin: It is difficult to indicate a move which would improve Black’s position.

21. h5+ e7 22. exf6+ xf6

23. f4!
Black’s position has deteriorated. The king is ridiculously placed, blocking the way of the bishop on d8, which in turn means that the rook on a8 remains out of play.

Chigorin: A strong move, finally placing Black in a ‘vice’.

23... fe7 24. d2 f5 25. e1 c6

Though Black’s last three moves appear to be the most expedient, his position remains very difficult. Chigorin does not hurry and first of all improves the coordination of his rooks.
26. $\text{Ef2}$

Chigorin finds a fine move, which 
takes our admiration,' wrote 
Schlechter.

26...h3 27. $\text{Eh1!}$

Now White seizes the g-file and the 
threat of 28...$\text{Exf4}$ and 29...$\text{Eg2}$+ is 
neutralised.

27...$\text{Ef7}$

6. $\text{Ec4}$

Contemporary theory considers the 
strongest move to be 6.d4, after which 
there begins a complicated and sharp 
struggle with chances for both sides. The 
continuation chosen by Pillsbury limits 
White's possibilities and allows Black to 
strike a counterblow in the centre and 
obtain completely equal chances.

6...d5! 7.exd5 $\text{Ed6}$

The other reliable continuation is 
considered to be 7...$\text{Eg7}$.

8.d4

8.$\text{Eh5}$+ seems rather adventurous in 
view of 8...c6! 9.$\text{xc6}$ 0-0 10.$\text{Ec7}$ $\text{Exc7}$.

8...0-0

52. King's Gambit Accepted

Harry Nelson Pillsbury

Mikhail Chigorin

Vienna 1903 (13)

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.$\text{Ef3}$ g5 4.h4 g4

5.$\text{Ed5}$ $\text{Ef6}$

9.$\text{Exf4}$

A slight inaccuracy which Chigorin, 
with his fine feeling for all the nuances 
of the King's Gambit, exploits in the 
very best way. White ought to have 
castled, 9.0-0, when Black, to avoid 
the loss of the h4-pawn, would have to
reply 9...\(\text{\textit{g}}\text{h}5\), and after 10.\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{g}4! \text{\textit{w}}\text{xh}4\) (10...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{g}3 11.\text{\textit{f}}\text{xf}4\) 11.\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{h}2 \text{\textit{e}}\text{e}8 12.\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3 \text{\textit{w}}\text{f}6 13.\text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3 \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}4 14.\text{\textit{f}}\text{e}2 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}7, there arise complications in which there are more prospects for White than he obtains in the game.

9...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{h}5\)

A critical moment in the game. Moving away the bishop, for example 10.\(\text{\textit{h}}\text{h}6\), leads to a clear advantage for Black after 10...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e}8\) 11.0-0 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xh}4\); on 10.0-0, strong would be simply 10...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xh}4\) with the 'crude' threat of 11...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{xe}5\) and ...\(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}4\)–\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3\).

10.\(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}3\)

The advance of the f-pawn is also unpleasant for White, but Chigorin prefers a piece attack.

14.\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3\)

A second and this time disastrous inaccuracy. White should not allow the queen into his position and, with this in mind, should play 14.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{e}2\). After the exchange of queens, 14...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xe}2+ 15.\text{\textit{f}}\text{xe}2 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}5\), and on the avoidance of it, 14...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{g}6\) 15.\(\text{\textit{h}}\text{h}5 \text{\textit{w}}\text{h}6\) 16.\(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}2 \text{\textit{a}}\text{d}6\) 17.\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}2! \text{\textit{w}}\text{xd}2+ 18.\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}2 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}5\) 19.\text{\textit{h}}\text{f}1 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}4\) 20.\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{e}4 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3+ 21.\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}2 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}7\), there arises a sharp position, also favourable for Black.

14...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{e}3!\) 15.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{e}2\)

Apparently Pillsbury intended 15.\(\text{\textit{b}}\text{b}5\), but just in time saw the stunning reply 15...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e}8!\) after which the threat to annihilate the \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}3\), the defender of \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{2}\), by 16...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}5\) is irresistible. The other way of defending the d4-pawn, by 15.\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e}2\), is also insufficient: 15...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3+ 16.\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}1 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}5\) 17.\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}1? \text{\textit{e}}\text{e}3+ 18.\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}2 \text{\textit{e}}\text{e}4\) etc.

15...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xd}4\) 16.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{e}4\)

Though he has lost a pawn, Pillsbury nevertheless offers an exchange of queens in order to save himself from an intensification of the attack; however, Chigorin refuses to exchange.

16...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{b}6!\) 17.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{g}2 \text{\textit{f}}\text{5}\) 18.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{e}7 \text{\textit{a}}\text{d}6\) 19.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{g}5+ \text{\textit{h}}\text{h}8 20.\text{\textit{h}}\text{f}1 \text{\textit{w}}\text{d}4 21.\text{\textit{c}}\text{f}1!\)

21...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{g}8!\)

21...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xc}4\) runs into 22.\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{g}6+! \text{\textit{h}}\text{xg}6\) 23.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{h}6+\) with a draw, but Black could
simply retreat by 21...\textit{wg7}. However, Chigorin conducts an accurately
-calculated plan of active defence, based on the unstable white pieces in the centre.
\textbf{22.\textit{Wh6 e7?!}}
Now 22...\textit{Wxc4} would even lose after 23.\textit{Wf6+ \textit{eg7} 24.\textit{h5}}, and on 22...\textit{f8}
would again follow 23.\textit{Qg6+!}. By defending the \textit{f6}-square, Chigorin
threatens to take the bishop.
\textbf{23.\textit{Qd3 f8! 24.\textit{Wh5 e6 25.\textit{Wf7 d7}}}

Now we see the hidden strength of the move 22...\textit{Qd7?!}. The white queen, not
long ago active, now finds itself in a trap and in order to save it White is forced to
exchange the \textit{Qf4}, thereby clearing the way for the black \textit{f}-pawn.
\textbf{26.\textit{Qh5!}}
On 26.\textit{Qe6} would follow 26...\textit{Qxe6
27.\textit{Wxe6 f4} and ...\textit{f3+}. Pillsbury tries to
prevent the advance of the \textit{f}-pawn, but goes out of the frying pan into the fire.
\textbf{26...\textit{Qxh5 27.\textit{Wxh5}}}

\textbf{27...\textit{We3!}}
Now the white king is subjected to threats from the entire black army.
\textbf{28.\textit{Exf5 Wh3+ 29.\textit{Qf2 Xxf5
30.\textit{Wxf5 e5+ 31.\textit{Qe1 Xe8+ 32.\textit{Qe2 Xgf8 0-1}}}}}
A splendid example of an actively conducted struggle in one of the sharpest
variations of the King’s Gambit. The game once again demonstrates how far
ahead of his contemporaries Chigorin was in his understanding of the King’s
Gambit.

53 King’s Gambit Accepted
\textbf{Emanuel Lasker
Mikhail Chigorin}
\textit{Rice Gambit match, Brighton 1903 (4)}
\textbf{1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5 4.h4 g4
5.Qe5 Qf6 6.Qc4 d5 7.exd5 Qd6
8.0-0 Qxe5 9.Qe1 Qe7 10.c3}

\textbf{10...f3}
The Rice Gambit was not destined to
live a long life, though the complicated and sharp positions arising in it
attracted many players. The fact of the matter is that Black is not obliged to
enter the main variation of the gambit. As was discovered later, he can
obtain good counterchances by playing 10.\textit{Qbd7 11.d4 Qh5}. This, by the way,
is how the games Malutin-Chigorin and Koyalovich-Chigorin continued in
the thematic tournament organised by Rice in St. Petersburg 1905. The further course of these games showed the idea of Black's counterattack: 12.\( \text{b5} \) (Chigorin effectively refuted the move 12.\( \text{wxg4} \) made by Koyalovich: 12...\( \text{qf6} \), and White has a miserable choice: 13.\( \text{we2} \) \( \text{qg4} \) 14.\( \text{wxg5} \) \( \text{qxe5} \) 15.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{wxe6} \) 16.\( \text{dxe6} \) \( f5 \) or 13.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xd4} \+ \) 14.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{xe1} ++ \) 15.\( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{h6} \)?) 12...\( \text{d8} \) 13.\( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{xd7} \) 14.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{axh4} \) 15.\( \text{xh5} \) \( \text{wxh5} \) 16.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{d8} \) (threatening 17...\( \text{f3} \)) 17.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{xh5} \) 18.\( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \) 19.\( \text{a3} \) \( \text{d3} \) 20.\( \text{b7} \) \( \text{a5} \) 21.\( \text{el} \) \( \text{g5} \) 22.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 23.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{h6} \) + .

11.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e4} \) 12.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{h2} \+ \) 13.\( \text{wh3} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 14.\( \text{g3} \)

The games in the Lasker-Chigorin match all began with this basic position of the Rice Gambit.

14...\( \text{0-0} \)

76 An alternative way of playing, instead of 12...\( \text{d6} \), would be 12...\( \text{xd4} \+ \) 13.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{g3} \) 14.\( \text{wxg3} \) \( \text{fxg3} \) 15.\( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 16.\( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{g6} \) when he is a clear exchange ahead. Also, 12...\( \text{d6} \) could be met by 13.\( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 14.\( \text{xe5} \) when White would also be the exchange down but would have sufficient compensation in his improved pawn structure and unopposed light-squared bishop.

For the sacrificed exchange, White has two bishops, strong pawns on the d-file and chances of attack linked to the possibility of penetrating with the queen to \( h6 \). Meanwhile, it is not easy to get near the white king, since the basic point of invasion — the e2-square — is defended by the bishop. It is not possible to give a simple assessment of this position and the stereotyped phrase 'the chances for both sides are approximately equal' is very appropriate here.

15.\( \text{f4} \)

Keres, in his opening handbook, indicates the best method of attack as being the variation 15.\( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 16.\( \text{d2} \) (16.c4 \( \text{h5} \) ?), after which the threat \( \text{wh6} \), in his opinion, completely equalises the chances. The move chosen by Lasker is logical. While creating a threat to the c7-pawn, he prepares to bring into play the pieces on the queen's flank.

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

Of all the possible replies, this is the most important and interesting. Black does not worry about the c7-pawn, but prepares an invasion on the e-file. The threat is 16...\( \text{el} \). Besides 15...\( \text{e8} \) there are some other continuations, which we give with Chigorin's assessments:

A) 15...\( \text{b5} \) 16.\( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{a6} \) 17.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 18.\( \text{c3} ! \) — 'and the pawn has been given up for nothing';
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15...\(\square f5\) 16.\(\triangle d2!\) \(\square c2\) (16...\(\square e7\) \(\triangle f1\) followed by \(\triangle g5\) etc.) 17.\(\square x c2\) \(\triangle x f1\) and 'in view of the threat \(\triangle e3\), Black must worry about the defence of the g4-pawn'.

15...c6 16.\(\triangle d2\) ('The best reply is \(\triangle x d3\), as was played in the 3rd game, resulting in a draw.') 16...\(\triangle g6\) 17.\(\triangle e1\) With the idea of occupying the e-file with the queen and rook, but White's plan is shown to be unsound. Having a bishop for rook, White must strive for play on the diagonal, and therefore ...\(\triangle b3\)' - Bogoljubow)

...\(\triangle f5\) 18.\(\triangle e7\) \(\triangle d7\) 19.\(\triangle e1\) \(\square x d5\) (it would be bad for Black to win the queen for two rooks: 19...\(\triangle x e 8\) 20.\(\square x e 8\) \(\triangle x e 8\) \(\triangle x e 8\) \(\triangle x g 7\) - or 21...\(\triangle f 8\) 22.d6 = 22.dxc6 bxc6 23.\(\triangle e 7\) 20.\(\triangle x d 5\) (if White plays 20.\(\triangle b 5\), then Black, now not fearing the attack, could win the queen for two rooks) 20...\(\triangle f 6\) 21.\(\triangle x b 7\) \(\triangle a e 8\) 22.\(\triangle x e 8\) (if 22.\(\triangle x e 5\) \(\square c 8\) 23.\(\triangle b 3\), then 23.\(\triangle d 3\) 24.\(\triangle f 1\) \(\triangle x d 5\) 25.\(\triangle x d 5\) \(\triangle x c 2\) + and mate in three moves) 22.\(\triangle x e 8\) 23.\(\triangle e 5\) \(\square c 8\) 24.\(\triangle x c 6\) \(\triangle c 2!\)

25.\(\triangle x f 7+\) \(\triangle x f 8!\) 0-1 (if 26.\(\square d 6+\) then 26...\(\triangle e 7!\) was how the 2nd game of the Lasker-Chigorin match ended.

16.\(\triangle d 2\) \(\triangle g 6\) 17.\(\triangle f 1\)

17...\(\triangle x c 7\) would lead to a transposition of moves.

17...\(\triangle f 5\) 18.\(\triangle c 4\) \(\triangle d 7\) 19.\(\triangle x c 7\)

With the win of the c7-pawn, White has not only restored material equality, but also obtains the d6-square for the knight, which, in conjunction with a subsequent c4, should promise him good prospects in the centre.

19...\(\triangle f 6!\)

It turns out that White's problems are far from simple. After 20.d6, the bishop is locked out of the game, and, on 20.d6 \(\triangle x d 6\) would follow 20...\(\triangle c 2\) 21.\(\triangle d 2\) \(\triangle e 7\) 22.\(\triangle b 5\) \(\triangle x d 5\) 23.\(\triangle x e 5\) f6 etc.

20.\(\triangle e 5\) \(\triangle x h 6\) 21.c4

After 21.\(\triangle c 4\), Black, as Chigorin points out, carries out a decisive invasion of his rook on e2: 21...b5! 22.\(\triangle x b 5\) \(\triangle x d 5\) 23.\(\triangle x e 8\) \(\triangle x e 8\) 24.\(\triangle a 5\) f6 (25.\(\triangle b 3\) \(\triangle d 2+\)).

21...\(\triangle e 3!\)

An unpleasant move. Since 22.\(\triangle e 1\) would lose the very important d4-pawn, Lasker allows the black queen into f2 and goes \(\triangle d 4\) en 

banque, counting on breaking through with the queen to the black king.

22.\(\triangle c 1\) \(\triangle f 2+\) 23.\(\triangle h 1\) \(\triangle e 4!\)

Yet more trouble. In order to defend himself against mate, White must take away the knight from e5 and open the e-file.

24.\(\triangle d 3\) \(\triangle x g 3+\)

A precisely calculated action. Black allows the queen to g5, since it has no available support.
25.\textit{\textit{\textbf{x}}}_g3 \textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_xg3 26.\textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_g5+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_6
27.\textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_5
White must cover the e-file again, since if 27.h5, immediately decisive is 27...\textit{\textit{\textbf{h}}}_2! However, there follows a conclusive combination.

27...\textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_2 28.\textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_2

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chigorin.png}
\caption{Position after 28.\textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_2}
\end{figure}

28...h6!
It is necessary to unpin the bishop, so that after 29.\textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_6 \textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_x5, there is not the reply 30.dxe5 (because of 30...\textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_4!).

29.\textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_xh6
There are no chances at all of saving the game after 29.\textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_6 \textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_x5 30.\textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_x5

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chigorin2.png}
\caption{Position after 29.\textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_xh6}
\end{figure}

30...\textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_x5
Chigorin consistently carries out his intended plan. The other way – 30...\textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_4!
31.\textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_5+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_8 32.\textit{\textit{\textbf{h}}}_6+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_8 33.\textit{\textit{\textbf{h}}}_8+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{d}}}_7 34.e6+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_7! 35.d6+ \textit{\textit{\textbf{e}}}_x6
36.\textit{\textit{\textbf{h}}}_6+ f6, he reckoned to be longer.

31.\textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_1 g3 32.\textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_5 \textit{\textit{\textbf{w}}}_xg5 33.\textit{\textit{\textbf{h}}}_xg5
\textit{\textit{\textbf{g}}}_7! 34.\textit{\textit{\textbf{f}}}_3 \textit{\textit{\textbf{d}}}_3 0-1

This game could serve as a textbook example of the playing of a sharp position.
Chapter 22

Feverish final years

After gaining victory in the Vienna tournament and winning a match, albeit only analytical, against Lasker, Chigorin made his way to Kiev, where in September 1903, the third All-Russia tournament was due to take place.

Moscow coped excellently with the organisation of the first two tournaments, but, at the same time, suffered considerable financial loss. The account of the tournament showed a big deficit. As a result, the Moscow enthusiasts were convinced that they were working 'not over a hot iron, but over one which had cooled down,' as Chess Review put it, and gave over the third All-Russia tournament to other hands.

The tournament was taken on by the Kiev Chess Society. In the tournament were 19 participants, amongst whom were Bernstein, Rubinstein, Salwe, Znosko-Borovsky, A.Rabinovich and Duz-Khotimirsky. Later on, each one of these became a famous chess player, each had an original and interesting individuality at the board, and several also outside chess. Bernstein and Rubinstein were particularly famous as chess players. In 1903, Bernstein was a law student, Rubinstein - a poor shop assistant. The student later became a successful lawyer and a strong grandmaster, who, however, more often preferred to take part in legal proceedings than in chess tournaments. He maintained his chess strength for a long time. Rubinstein became not only a grandmaster, but also a pretender to the chess crown. In 1903, Bernstein was a stronger player than Rubinstein and proved to be Chigorin's principal rival.

The tournament took place in a large hall, which, in winter, served as a bicycle track for members of the Kiev amateur cyclists society, in whose accommodation the chess club took shelter. The organiser of the tournament was the Kiev notary Count Plater, who was, at the same time, chairman of both the chess and bicycle societies. The enormous hall was comfortable to play in, but, at times, noise could be heard coming from a neighbouring room, where play was also allowed - at cards. Such gambling games were the main source of income for the cyclists society, which otherwise would not have kept its comfortable three-storey home on the main street of Kreshchatik.

In the first and second All-Russia tournaments, Chigorin had achieved victory without any difficulty, but, in Kiev, there was a bitter struggle. Already in the first round, Chigorin, as White, suffered a surprising defeat against V.N.Yurevich (1869-1907) - a talented, though also uneven, impulsive player, for whom chess was only one, and not the main passion of his life. Chigorin recognised his undoubted talent, but considered that 'Nothing will come of him - he does not love chess.'

At the beginning of the tournament, Bernstein and Salwe won game after game and scored 6½ points out of 7. In the 8th round, Bernstein, playing Black against Chigorin, tried to confuse Mikhail Ivanovich with the unusual continuation: 1.e4 e5 2.f4 d6 3.fxe5 dxe5 4.d3 f5. 'This move', said I.Lashin, a journalist, who was present at the tournament, 'somewhat puzzled Chigorin.' None the less, he refuted Bernstein's manoeuvre and quickly obtained an easily winning position.
But later on, as so often happened to Chigorin, particularly in the last years of his life, he began to make flagrant errors and lost the game.

This loss to Bernstein did not traumatise Chigorin, but, on the other hand, gave him new strength. Already, in the next round, he smashed Salwe, who had 5 points out of 8, in 18 moves with the black pieces, and then won all his remaining games, apart from a draw in the last round, which guaranteed him first prize, viz: 15 points out of 18.

Bernstein came second with 14 points, Yurevich took third place with 12 points.

The main creative result of the tournament gave rise to hope and probably made Chigorin happy: he witnessed the growth of a Russian chess array, the advancement of a whole galaxy of new talent. This was also one of the main objectives in his for the Russian chess genius.

In 1904, eight European masters crossed the Atlantic Ocean, on the steamer Pretoria, to compete in the international tournament at the North American resort of Cambridge Springs. Amongst them was Chigorin.

Before the start of the tournament, one American weather forecaster, well known for his accurate predictions, decided to come forward in the role of a chess prophet and published his version of the results. In first position, he confidently placed World Champion Emanuel Lasker. Lasker was also tipped to win in all the other American newspapers.

One can easily understand these forecasters. You know, it was only a few years before that Lasker gained his wonderful victories in London and Paris. His superiority was so great that it seemed pointless to think that somebody else could come ahead of him.

But this time all the prophets were wrong. Lasker shared second and third prizes with Janowski, and was left a whole two points behind the first prize-winner, Frank Marshall, from whom nobody expected such a feat.

Marshall's really outstanding result — 13 out of 15, without a single defeat — surprised everyone and proved to be the finest achievement in the whole of his chess career. However, this was not so unexpected — any grandmaster could be justly proud of such a victory.

Chigorin scored 7½ points out of 15, coming equal with Schlechter and remaining behind Marshall, Lasker, Janowski, Marco and Showalter. The game against Marco, with its splendidly conducted attack, was an excellent creative achievement by Chigorin. But... in the tournament table, the point for this is credited to Marco in an easily winning position, Chigorin exceeded the time limit, after forgetting about the control!

Though Chigorin had several good wins in the tournament — against Schlechter, Mieses, Napier and Delmar (admittedly not one of these games can be called outstanding), Cambridge Springs might be regarded as a great failure for him — in the sporting, and perhaps even in the creative sense, if he had not gained a truly historic victory against Teichmann, whom he met, by the will of fate, in the final round.
Many chess events of the past are today forgotten, and little is said about them even from the hearts of inveterate specialists in chess history. Could that, for example, be said about Burn's conclusive victory in Amsterdam 1899? Perhaps, except for the fact that it was precisely there that the immortal game, Lasker-Bauer, was played, with the famous sacrifice of the two bishops. One such event is enough to outweigh everything else in our minds — all the victories, defeats, joys and disappointments, connected with a very old tournament in a Dutch city.

The Cambridge Springs tournament, of course, is not to be compared to Amsterdam: its line-up was first class, the quality of the games was high. But even among these, the game Teichmann-Chigorin distinguishes itself as a strategical masterpiece far ahead of its time.

And so, Chigorin visited America for the last time.

In 1905, friends began to notice a change in his appearance. He had lost weight, the colour of his face was unhealthy, his nose became sharper and his eyes duller, always looking complacent, discreetly harbouring suffering.

These were dreadful symptoms. Having earlier possessed great physical strength and a healthy complexion, Chigorin was now seriously ill. In this also lies the basic reason for Chigorin's failures in 1905. In the Ostende tournament he played so badly, as never before in his life: he scored only 6½ points out of 26 and finished last but one in a field of 14 participants. At this tournament, a St.Petersburg friend of Chigorin, G.Ge, was present as a spectator. In his memoirs he depicts this scene:

'Our steps can be heard resoundingly on the sinking pavement. And here I will never forget the moment we turned into the, by now, gloomy alley; in the same turning, under the last beam of the moon which remained behind the projecting house, Chigorin suddenly said, in a quiet voice: "There is not a spark of play left in me..." I do not know why, I felt the truth in his words. The sorrow that was felt by this grown-up child was inexpressible, but I did not say anything... This was only a second of total frankness by Chigorin, on the most burning question of all for him, the recognition of his death.'

It was incredibly difficult to play in such an emotional state, yet, even in so bad a tournament for Chigorin, he managed to create several brilliant games. One of these (against Marco) received a brilliancy prize.

It was not even a month after the Ostende tournament, when the Barmen Chess Club marked its 40th anniversary by holding a congress with a whole range of tournaments. Chigorin played in master tournament 'A' and shared 7th-10th place with 7 points out of 15. Two chess antipodes — the embodiment of consistency, Maroczy, and recklessness incarnate, Janowski, peacefully shared 1st-2nd prize.

And the creative result? In two games played at the very end of the tournament — in the 12th and 14th rounds — Chigorin again succeeded in creating model games, as if 'appealing to the future' with a presentation of opening strategy which was far and away ahead of its time. One can only be astonished at the fact that the significance of these Chigorin brainwaves escaped the attention of his contemporaries and was realised only much later! These were the games with Mieses and Marshall.
In December 1905, in St. Petersburg, was held the 4th All-Russia chess tournament. Not long before this, the All-Russia political strike broke out, bringing work to a halt on the railway, and almost shutting down the telegraph system, which could not but have an effect on the organisation of the tournament.

Correspondence from the tournament committee to the future participants was irregular; many letters did not get through at all. The line-up of the tournament was not clearly known until the last moment. For all that, on 22 December 1905, in the premises of the Chernorechensky Club on Kamennnoostrovsky Prospekt assembled 17 participants (amongst whom numbered ten St. Petersburgers; there was not a single player from Moscow).

The tournament did not go smoothly, and there were a series of unpleasant conflicts between the participants. In the fifth round occurred an incident which served as the reason for the withdrawal of Chigorin from the tournament – the only such case in the whole of his long chess career.

During Chigorin’s game with Izbinsky, on the 38th move, Izbinsky placed his queen en prise and resigned at once. But a member of the tournament committee declared that Chigorin had exceeded the time limit, as far back as the 35th move, by one and a quarter minutes (the time control was taken as two hours for the first 36 moves and 18 moves in each subsequent hour). Now, however, was convened a meeting of the tournament committee, which made the decision: 'The game is considered lost for Chigorin.' But, in the meantime, it was found that the control clock was defective: in fact the duration of the game was five and a half minutes less than that shown on the clock. Obviously, Chigorin’s clock had continued to go also when his opponent was thinking over his move. Izbinsky himself also did not dream of declaring that Chigorin had overstepped the time limit, and the participants of the tournament appealed to the tournament committee to reconsider its decision. But this did not have any effect – the committee stood firm.

Deeply offended by the decision of the tournament committee, Chigorin announced his withdrawal from the tournament. Giving an account of the incident with this game, he wrote: ‘Anyone in my place would have refused to submit to the whims of the “committee” and there was nothing else left for me, but to withdraw...’

Thus, for a very dubious reason, the championship of Russia was deprived of a three-times champion. Chigorin’s withdrawal from the tournament served as the reason for a new attack on him in the pages of the hostile press.

The winner of the 4th All-Russia tournament was the Lodz chess player G. Salwe (1862-1920), a man with an original chess biography. Up to the age of forty, not once had he appeared in a tournament, although he played very strongly. In 1903, when the Lodz Chess Society came into existence, Salwe took part in local competitions, and, after this, was invited to the 3rd All-Russia tournament – where his play was well-liked. There, he won fourth prize and, within two years, had already become champion of Russia.

He played very solidly and soundly and was very tenacious in defence. When, in 1909, a Chigorin memorial tournament was held in St. Petersburg, Lasker, who
Salwe there, remarked 'Salwe is unusually strong in defence. In positions where other players would lose his head, because of the multitude of threats, he finds complex and surprising resources, thanks to which he saves himself from, at first losing positions.'

In March–April 1906, in Lodz, a match was held between Chigorin and Salwe, which was won by Chigorin with the score +7 −5 =3. Chigorin confirmed his authority, but also for the modest, good natured and obliging Lodz master, the result was honourable.

Right after the end of the match in Lodz was held a four player match-tournament. It played Chigorin, Salwe, Rubinstein and the strongest Warsaw player, Flamberg. The winner turned out to be the 23-year-old Rubinstein (6½ out of 9) about whom, as far back as Kiev 1903, Chigorin (who won easily against Rubinstein in Kiev tournament) made some very complimentary remarks. Obviously, already at that time, he had an insight into the enormous potential which Rubinstein's exceptional capacity for work promised, and, even in Chigorin's lifetime, this potential was being realised. His first prize in the Lodz match-tournament was quite an important achievement and, in the following years, Rubinstein managed again the first of his remarkable victories in international tournaments – Carlsbad 1907. This was the very last tournament with the participation of Chigorin.

Salwe, who was tired after the exhausting match, played quite badly and occupied last place. Chigorin was second with 5½ points, winning excellent games against each of his opponents. In all those three games he played the opening innovatively against Salwe – the Old Indian Defence with the development of the bishop on c5, against Flamberg – 'his own' Chigorin Defence in the Spanish Game, against Rubinstein – a variation of the French Defence; all these variations were, at that time, little-studied topical problems of opening theory) and, after obtaining the advantage, converted them to victory.

In the same year, Chigorin took part in the group tournament in Ostende, which had 36 entrants. The organiser of the tournament was Gunsberg, who had devised an incredibly complicated five-stage system, which, for confusion, has without doubt never been equalled in the whole history of chess competitions. Only 9 participants out of 36 were to find themselves in the final stage, where the winner was the player with the most endurance – Schlechter, who scored 21 points out of 30 (the results of all the stages were added up). In Ostende, Chigorin managed only to get as far as the second round. The only consolation (creative)
was a good win as Black against Marshall. (Again, as against Salwe in the master-tournament, an Old Indian with the development of the bishop on e7. It was not easy for even the strongest masters to contend with him in this Chigorin treatment.

The dashing Marshall, who had played very unevenly since his brilliant victories in Cambridge Springs, and at times also quite badly, achieved a new outstanding success in 1906. In the tournament at Nuremberg, he won first prize, as in Cambridge Springs, without losing a single game. He left behind him 16 other participants, amongst whom numbered Schlechter, who arrived in Nuremberg a month after his Ostende triumph, Tarrasch, who, a year previously, likewise in Nuremberg, had crushed Marshall with the score +8 -1 =8, and Janowski, who found himself in last place.

A peculiarity of the tournament was an item of the programme, according to which an overstepping of the time limit did not entail the loss of the game, but would be punished by a monetary fine. This item was introduced on the initiative of Tarrasch, who considered the system of expiry of time 'an infringement which gives more credit to a player than his performance' and the rule in which overstepping the time limit is considered a loss of the game 'illogical'. But the attempt to put into practice Tarrasch's suggestion would have resulted in the insolvency of the participants of the tournament, since the fine for overstepping the time limit amounted to a thousand marks, so this rule had to be abolished.

Out of the first ten games in Nuremberg, Chigorin only scored four points; it seemed that once again failure would befall him. Only six games remained to be played, yet here, with an unexpected surge of energy, Chigorin won all these six games in excellent style. As a result, he obtained 5th prize with 10 points out of 16. This was Chigorin's last success in an international tournament. After this he made two more appearances, and both times without success—in Ostende 1907 and in Carlsbad, the same year.

Chigorin played in a deathly sick condition in Carlsbad, he had only a few months left to live. But even when a whiff of the inevitability of death came upon him, all his thoughts were about chess. Unquestionably, amongst the participants of the Carlsbad tournament, though the names of many of them are glorified in the history of chess, there was not one who would give himself up to chess with such passion as Chigorin. This was a burning, feverish passion. It cannot but be recognised that he gave up his last days to his beloved art. This ardent feeling, which gave strength to the man who is preparing to be done with his last earthly cares, could not go unnoticed by the other participants of the tournament.

The young Spielmann, whose talent as also his attitude to chess, had much in common with Chigorin's, wrote: 'At this time, he was already breaking down; he was suffering from liver disease, death was close at hand and he knew it. And indeed, four months after the end of the Carlsbad tournament he passed away. Though he knew death was near, this in no way gave rise to dejection in him—he was full of an unquenchable thirst for activity. It is possible that never in the whole of his glorious chess career did he take to chess so fervently as in the last months of
his life; it was precisely then that the fanatical devotion to chess art and passionate love of it, burned in him with particular brilliance. When his time was almost up, he endeavoured to devote all his remaining hours, minutes, seconds to chess, and likewise right up to his last breath. Almost 24 hours, round the clock, he spent at the chessboard: when I, a young master, was already dead tired, when my brain was totally clouded by the numerous combinations, Chigorin still felt in his element: he was indeed, unquenchable, and, fascinated by him, I also untiringly continued our joint analysis, our search for truth. It was not the awareness of his close death, but the awareness of his inevitably soon parting with chess, which aroused in him that intense, anxious searching, which was passed on also to us, excited us, giving rise to both confusion and joy.'

How much mental strength and energy there still was in this hopelessly sick man! Chigorin played several beautiful games in Carlsbad. He crushed Johner in excellent style in ‘his own’ closed variation of the Sicilian; defeated Marshall in 84 moves in a Falkbeer Counter Gambit – the last time that the King’s Gambit showed its strength in the hands of Chigorin; won an unusually complicated and intricate game against Spielmann, and defeated Teichmann in an Old Indian Defence. This was the last flash of Chigorin’s genius.

On 4th (17th old style) September 1907 took place the last round of the Carlsbad tournament. Rubinstein made a draw with Wolf and secured clear first place for himself. Maroczy was second. In the last round, Chigorin played against Vidmar. A year before, in the Nuremberg tournament, Chigorin had encountered this young student at the Polytechnic Institute for the first time, and won a very complex game against him, in the King’s Gambit Declined. Now again, Chigorin was playing with the white pieces, and again the King’s Gambit Declined (2...c5) arrived on the board. How many times he had sacrificed the f-pawn on the second move and created an irresistible attack! The King’s Gambit was an instrument which Chigorin had, undoubtedly, mastered better than all his contemporaries. Also in this game – the last of his tournament games – Chigorin once again chose the opening, to which were attached so many of his memories. Alas, Chigorin lost his last tournament game.

Chigorin knew that he could no longer compete in tournaments, travel from town to town, meet good friends and hitherto unknown partners, be enthusiastic, invent, seek and find new ideas, win and lose – leading the difficult, troubled, and, for all that, only possible life for him of a chess player, with its setbacks, distress, alternating success and failure and being rewarded for everything by the joy of creativity. There was to be no more struggle, searching for truth, appreciation of beauty...
And time marched on quickly to the inevitable end. From Carlsbad, Chigorin returned to St.Petersburg. There he tried to carry on with his normal life, and turned out a few more chess columns, but the illness was taking hold of him more and more. He hardly left his room, where he remained without any care and attention. In November, he was persuaded to enter the clinic of Professor Afanasev, where he spent a month, but, after beginning to languish, he decided to discharge himself. The doctors admitted his condition was hopeless.

In the Polish town of Lublin, then part of the Russian empire, lived Chigorin’s wife and daughter. General Dubravin was also serving there; he was married to Chigorin’s sister-in-law. And to them came the dying Mikhail Ivanovich.

At first, in Lublin, he was still able to give an exhibition and play consultation games, but he quickly deteriorated and could no longer get up.

On 12th (25th old style) January 1908 Chigorin passed away.

His games, the work of a great artist, began their eternal life...

54 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Georg Marco
Cambridge Springs 1904 (10)
1.e4 e6 2.Øe2 c5 3.Øf3 Øe7 4.b3 d5
5.Øb2 Øf6 6.Øc3

By advancing the pawn to e5, White would gain space in the centre but limit the prospects of his dark-squared bishop. Instead of this, he tempts his opponent to advance the d5-pawn, after which the c4-square could prove handy as an outpost for the white pieces.

6...Øc6 7.Øf3 Ød4

With an incomplete development, such an operation will seldom be successful. Castling king’s side is safer.

8.Ød3 dxe4

Black should go back with the knight and then castle. This exchange in the centre not only does not ease his position, but, on the contrary, allows White to bring his light-squared bishop to a different position and take the initiative.

9.Øxe4 Øxe4 10.Øxe4 Øxf3+ 11.Øxf3 0-0

At first sight it seems, after the inevitable ...Øf6, the game might quickly end in a draw, since it is not clear how White can progress after those two moves which Black needs for getting out his queen’s bishop (...Øb8 and ...b7-b6). However, Chigorin finds a way to complicate Black’s task.

12.Ød3 Øf6

13.Øc3!

It seems, by agreeing to an exchange of his dark-squared bishop, White goes into the least favourable variation. However, he is endeavouring to obtain open lines in the centre.

This position is probably critical for the game. Black will hardly manage to equalise if his light-squared bishop does not have so active a participation in the
same as that of his opponent. Of course, transferring the bishop to the b1-h7 diagonal in the near future is hardly feasible, and the best he can do for the present is to bring it to the long a8-h1 diagonal. However, its presence on this diagonal will only be noticed if White castles king’s side and the g2-square trends defending. This last point is particularly important in the event of ...exd3; however, Black is not obliged to exchange first. His c5-pawn controls the d4-square and Black could reinforce it with 13...d4 and then, after ...b8, bring the light-squared bishop into play. This would give him the most practical chance of equalisation.

13...exd3 14.dxc3

14...Wh4+ 15.g3 Wh3

It seems that Black in this way wanted to defend the h7-square without weakening the pawn chain with the move ...g7-g6. However, it soon transpires that the advance of the g7-pawn is still necessary in order to save the queen, perched on the edge of the board.

16.0-0-0 Bb8 17.dhe1 b6 18.b5! g6

18...b7 was slightly more accurate, but the time that Black gains – 19.We2 g6 20.Wf2 bbd8 – does not facilitate his defence.

19.Wf2! Bbd8 20.b5 b7

Black not only loses control over the a4-square, but also will be forced to move his queen off the d-file. Since he can hardly move away without the move ...g7-g6, it is worth provoking White to castle king’s side by playing 14...Wa5, in order to safeguard himself against the march of the pawn, h4-h5, and then, by moving the queen to c7, concern himself with the transfer of the bishop to the a8-h1 diagonal. In this case, Black could still count on equalisation. But, instead of this, he drives his queen to the edge of the board in order to prevent his opponent castling king’s side!
For the present, White’s bishop abandons its post on d3 in order to prepare a pawn storm on the king’s flank. Black has no counterplay whatsoever and he is obliged to wait passively for the approaching denouement.

21...\textit{Wh6} 22.\textit{b2} \textit{d6} 23.\textit{g4} \textit{bd8} 24.\textit{d3}

The bishop has carried out its mission and returns to its attacking position. At the same time, it covers the a-file and the black rooks are once again left unemployed.

24...\textit{Ed5} 25.\textit{Ee2} \textit{Ec8} 26.\textit{f5}

After 30.c4 or 30.\textit{xa7}, White would quickly obtain a decisive material advantage. However, Chigorin overstepped the time limit, as he never made his 30\textsuperscript{th} move...

0-1

55 Queen’s Gambit: Chigorin Defence

\textbf{Richard Teichmann}
\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

Cambridge Springs 1904 (15)

\begin{align*}
1.\textit{d4} & \textit{d5} 2.\textit{c4} & \textit{c6} 3.\textit{f3} & \textit{g4} \\
4.\textit{cxd5} & \textit{xf3} & 5.\textit{dxc6} & \textit{xc6}
\end{align*}

Chigorin: With this, in my opinion, favourable opening for Black, I have had success in several games against Pillsbury and others.

6.\textit{Ec3} \textit{e6}

Chigorin: Pillsbury continued 7.e4 \textit{xb4} 8.f3. But after 8...\textit{e7} and then ...f7-f5, White’s centre pawns lose their importance.

7.\textit{f4}

7...\textit{f6} 8.\textit{e3}
White, preferring to have the principal struggle outside the centre, (for 7.e4 see Pillsbury-Chigorin, St.Petersburg 1895/96) chooses a modest scheme of development without pretence to obtaining an opening advantage.

8...\text{\textit{b4}} 9.\textit{\textit{b3 d5}} 10.\textit{\textit{g3}} 0-0

The opening has resulted in a slight advantage for Black. In fact, with careful calculation, his advantage in development is found to be equal to one tempo, and, in particular, this tempo also means that now Black can endeavour to force his opponent into a game suited more to his own style of play. Probably, after the cautious 11.\textit{\textit{e2}} (not good is 11.e4? \textit{\textit{xc3}} 12.bxc3 because of 12...\textit{\textit{a5}} (13.\textit{\textit{a3}} b6), with a subsequent transfer of the bishop to f3, White would not experience any difficulty, but to his misfortune he chooses a more active square for the bishop.

11.\textit{\textit{d3}?}

11...\textit{\textit{g5}!}

It is more desirable for White to castle king's side and Chigorin naturally strives to prevent this: 12.0-0 \textit{\textit{xc3}} 13.bxc3 \textit{\textit{xe3}!}. White ought to unpin his knight by playing 12.\textit{\textit{ff1}} with the threat of 13.\textit{\textit{xd5}}. The exchange 12...\textit{\textit{xc3}} 13.bxc3 would strengthen White's centre and make the position of the knight on d5 precarious. The sacrifice 12...\textit{\textit{xe3}+} 13.fxe3 \textit{\textit{xe3} appears to be incorrect because of 14.\textit{\textit{e2}} (with the threats of 15.\textit{\textit{f4}} and 15.\textit{\textit{xe7}+}). However, Teichmann does not sense the danger and does not notice the move 12...f5, after which he has to urgently castle on the queen's side.

12.\textit{\textit{c2}?!} f5 13.\textit{\textit{e5 f7}} 14.0-0-0

15.\textit{\textit{xc3}} 15.bxc3

15...\textit{\textit{b5}!}

Griew: On looking at the apparently so solid position of White, who himself is ready to attack on the king's flank, it is hard to believe that in only a dozen moves his king position, at present far removed from the influence of the black pieces, will be completely routed: the more so, since the player of the white pieces was a prominent master of defence. However his opponent was an incomparable master of attack...

Here we have the result of differing conceptions of a position. White has made moves which seem to be of a high quality, but his position soon changes
The move 17. \( \textit{b}2 \) would not prevent Black from continuing his direct attack on the king; for example: 17...\( \textit{b}8 \) 18.\( \textit{g}4 \) \( \textit{b}4 \) 19.\( \textit{c}4 \) \( \textit{c}3 \) 20.\( \textit{d}f1 \) \( \textit{a}4+ \) 21.\( \textit{a}1 \) (even worse is 21.\( \textit{c}1 \)) 21...\( \textit{b}3 \) 22.axb3 \( \textit{wa}3+ \) 23.\( \textit{wa}2 \) \( \textit{xb}3 \) and Black wins at least a bishop.

17...\( \textit{wa}3+ \) 18.\( \textit{d}d2 \) \( \textit{b}4! \) 19.\( \textit{c}4 \) \( \textit{a}4! \) 20.\( \textit{wb}1 \) \( \textit{c}3 \)

'Blow after blow! Chigorin, as always, conducts the attack with enormous energy', wrote Schlechter.

21.\( \textit{wa}1 \)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

21...\( \textit{d}d8 \)

A useful move, after which White's attempt to unlock the \( \textit{e}5 \) for defence of his king, by \( \textit{d}4-\textit{d}5 \), would lead to an immediate catastrophe because of the opened d-file. Probably White would have held out for an extra 5 or 6 moves with 22.\( \textit{f}3 \), but now follows a forcing and quick finish.

22.\( \textit{g}4 \) \( \textit{e}4+ \) 23.\( \textit{e}2 \)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

Chigorin: So that after 17...\( \textit{wa}3+ \) 18.\( \textit{d}d2 \) \( \textit{b}4 \) and ...\( \textit{a}4 \), the queen and rook are not both under attack by the bishop.
after 23.\( \text{Qxe4 fxe4} \), White, to defend against 24.\( \text{Wd3+} \), must play 24.\( \text{Wb1} \), but then 24...\( \text{Wc3+} \) 25.\( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) is decisive.

23...\( \text{Qc5!} \) 24.\( \text{Wb1} \)

Chigorin: After 24.\( \text{Qb1} \), Black would win the queen by 24...\( \text{Qb3} \).

24...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 25.\( \text{Wxd3} \) \( \text{Wxa2+} \) 26.\( \text{Qf3} \)

1-0

One of the masterpieces from the treasure house of chess. A true classic. Chigorin’s strategy in the first half of the game was highly profound yet crystalline, as was his accurate, powerful, and lightning attack on the king. One such game bestows upon the winner chess immortality.

56 Spanish Game

Jean Taubenhaus

Mikhail Chigorin

Ostende 1905 (13)

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{Qf3} \) 3.b5 a6 4.\( \text{Qa4} \) 5.e6 6.\( \text{Qe7} \) 7.\( \text{ab3} \) 0-0

Nowadays, this is the standard position of the Spanish Game.

9.d3 \( \text{Qg4} \)

Contemporary opening theory considers the pin of the \( \text{Qf3} \) premature with the pawn on d3, since White transfers his knight on b1 via d2, f1 and e3, with gain of tempo.

10.\( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 11.\( \text{Qf1} \)

11...\( \text{d5!?} \)

Apparently Chigorin considered that in a quiet game he would for a long time be confined to repairing the weakness of the d5- and f5-squares; he therefore prefers to sacrifice a pawn to sharpen the game.

12.\( \text{exd5} \)

A hasty decision. After 12.\( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \)

(12...\( \text{Qe6} \) 13.\( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 14.\( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 15.\( \text{Qxe5} \) 16.\( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 14.dxe4 \( \text{Qa5} \) 15.\( \text{Qc2} \) g6, White has possibilities of increasing the pressure and Black has no counterplay.

12...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 13.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 14.\( \text{g4} \)

A serious weakening of the king position. The e5-pawn could be captured under more favourable circumstances: 14.\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 15.\( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 16.\( \text{Qxe5} \). After 16...\( \text{c6} \) 17.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 18.\( \text{Qxe8+} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 19.\( \text{Qd2} \) or 19.a4, White would have a solid position.

14...\( \text{Qg6} \) 15.\( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 16.\( \text{Qxe5} \)

It is astonishing, but before us lies the prototype of the Marshall Attack, introduced into practice after the sensational encounter Capablanca-Marshall, played in 1918, thirteen years after this game. Marshall also played in Ostende and it is very likely that it was there in particular that he took note of Chigorin’s method of counterattack beginning with the move 11...\( \text{d5} \).
In comparison with the widely known initial position of the Marshall Attack, White has managed to transfer the knight from b1 to f1, but has seriously weakened his king position by the pawn advance to g4.

Now Chigorin could play 16...c6 and then ...\(\text{\textit{d}}6,\) but he intends another plan of attack — the same plan as Marshall later adopted!

16...\(\text{\textit{d}}6\) 17.d4 \(\text{\textit{d}}6\) 18.\(\text{\textit{f}}8+\) \(\text{\textit{x}}e8\)

This position is more favourable for Black than the variation of the Marshall Attack after 7...0-0 8.c3 d5 9.exd5 e4 10.dxc6 exf3 11.\(\text{\textit{xf}}3\) \(\text{\textit{g}}4\) 12.\(\text{\textit{f}}3\) \(\text{\textit{e}}8\) 13.d4 \(\text{\textit{d}}6\) 14.\(\text{\textit{xe}}8+\) \(\text{\textit{x}}e8\). Chigorin transfers the \(\text{\textit{g}}6\) to a longer diagonal and thereby creates some strong threats which force White to still further weaken the pawn cover of his king.

19.\(\text{\textit{f}}3\) \(\text{\textit{d}}4\) 20.f3 \(\text{\textit{b}}7\) 21.\(\text{\textit{c}}2\)

It is difficult for White to find an active plan. Closing the diagonal of the \(\text{\textit{b}}7\) with the move 21.d5 is not successful because of both 21...c6 and 21...\(\text{\textit{d}}8\).

21...\(\text{\textit{d}}5\) 22.\(\text{\textit{d}}3\) g6 23.\(\text{\textit{e}}1\) \(\text{\textit{c}}6\) 24.\(\text{\textit{d}}2\) \(\text{\textit{g}}7\)

White has completed a regrouping of his forces and prepares for defence. His further activity is designed to cover the pawn weaknesses on the king’s flank, while Black continues to strengthen his position. Black can increase the pressure in two ways: by transferring the rook to h8 and playing ...h7-h5, or, with help from the rook on f8, to advance ...f7-f5.

This last plan is the most unpleasant for White, since he will be deprived of his last support in the centre — the e4-square.

25.\(\text{\textit{e}}2\) \(\text{\textit{f}}8\) 26.\(\text{\textit{d}}4\)

The reply 26.\(\text{\textit{g}}2\) would prevent 26...f5, but then other possibilities emerge for Black — 26...\(\text{\textit{d}}6\) or 26...b4.

26...f5 27.gxf5 gxf5 28.\(\text{\textit{c}}2\) \(\text{\textit{e}}7\)

Over the last few moves, Black has noticeably strengthened his position. The f5-pawn deprives White of the e4-
square and with it the hope of reducing the pressure on the a8-h1 diagonal. And what is more, the opening of the g-file is unpleasant, not only because of the threat of invasion by the black rook, but also with the clearing of the g6-square Black’s knight threatens to jump to h4.

29.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{g}5}} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}6}}} 30.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{d}2}} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}3}}} 31.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{f}1}} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}6}}} 32.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{e}3}}}

Black's counterattack becomes clear. The knight is to be transferred to h4, to increase the pressure on the f3-pawn and also to defend the f5-pawn; then the rook is free for action on the g-file.

32...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{h}4}}}!

33.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}1}}}

On 33.d5, good is 33...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}g}6}! 34.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}4}} + \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{h}7}} and White has no time for 35.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}e}7}} + \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{f}7} 36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}e}8} in view of 36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}2}}} + .

33...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{h}7}}

White is defenceless against the oncoming threats. He can neither seize the g-file — 34.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}1}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{xf}3}} — nor utilise the moment to display some activity — 34.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}4}} — since, in the resulting combination, 34...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{f}xe}4}}! 35.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e}4} + \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}xe}4} 36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{f}xe}4}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{xf}1} + 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}xf}1} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe}4}} +

78 In fact 36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}e}8} is a blunder; 36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}e}6} instead prevents the mate. After 36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}e}8}, Black mates in two with 36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}1}} +} and not 36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}2}} +} because the white king escapes after 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}f}2}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{g}2} + 38.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{e}1}} or 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{w}g}3} + 38.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}2}}.

38.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}1}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{f}3} + 39.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{g}2}} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}2} + 40.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}g}3}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{xf}1} +}, he is left without any pieces.

34.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}d}3}} \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{g}6} 35.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}1}} \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}5}}}! 36.\textit{\textbf{d}5}

White closes the diagonal of the bishop. The fragility of this barrier is underlined if only by the variation 36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}8}} 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{b}3}} (37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}4}} + \textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{xd}5}}) 37...\textit{\textbf{c}6}, but Chigorin no longer needs this diagonal.

36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}8}} 37.\textit{\textbf{c}2}}

White tries to defend against the threat of 37...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{xf}3}} by tying down the knight to the defence of the f5-pawn; however, there follows a splendid reply and all becomes clear.

37...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}8}}!}

The bishop has done its work — the bishop can leave...

38.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}4}}}

A desperate attempt to divert Black from his intended plan of attack.

38...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{f}xe}4}} 39.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}xe}4}}

With the vain hope of 39...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{purple}{\textbf{f}3}} 40.\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}5}} + .

39...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}5}}!}
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Of course not the only, but undoubtedly the most elegant decision. The struggle is at an end.

40.\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Exf5 Exf5 41.exf5 \textbf{\textbf{Exh3+}}}}}}

White resigned.

A brilliant creative achievement by Chigorin. The game reveals the source of the Marshall Attack and once again shows how far ahead of his time was the chess genius Chigorin.

\textbf{57 English Opening}

\textbf{Jacques Mieses}

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

Barmen 1906 (12)

Notes by: Botvinnik

1.g3 e5 2.c4 \textit{\textit{\textbf{Dc6}}}

By a transposition of moves, the game has gone into the English Opening. Here it is simpler for Black to continue at first with 2...\textit{\textbf{Df6}}, after which he could free his game with ...d7-d5.

3.\textit{\textbf{Dc3 Df6 4.d3}}

Mieses, however, does not think about preventing Black's move, ...d7-d5, and without good reason: recent tournament practice has shown that, after 4.\textit{\textbf{Dg2}}, Black cannot advance his d-pawn two squares and is left with a cramped position for a long time.

4...\textit{\textbf{Dd5}} 5.cxd5 \textit{\textbf{Dxd5}} 6.\textit{\textbf{Dg2 Dg6}}

7.\textit{\textbf{Df3 De7 8.0-0}}

8...\textit{\textbf{Dd8}}

And now we have the 'Dragon Variation' of the Sicilian Defence, with reversed colours. The theory of this opening recommends playing 8...\textit{\textbf{Dc6}} to prevent the move d3-d4. Actually, now, after 9.d4 exd4 10.\textit{\textbf{Dxd4 Dxd4}} 11.\textit{\textbf{Dxd4 Dc5}} 12.\textit{\textbf{Dc5}}, the chances would be equal. But Mieses, playing White, of course is trying to win and avoids premature exchanges. And so he finds the only other plan — to utilise the half-open c-file.

9.\textit{\textbf{Dd2 Dd7}}

It is now taken for granted that there is no danger to Black in an immediate 10.\textit{\textbf{Dg5 Dg5}} 11.\textit{\textbf{Dxg5 Dd4}} and, though White has two bishops, Black's position is far better, as he dominates the centre.

10.a3 f6

Reinforcing the e5-pawn, as White threatened b4-b5.

11.\textbf{De4}

The knight heads for c5. For this purpose, 11.\textbf{Da4} was sufficient.
17...h4
Mieses still does not suspect that he will soon find himself almost completely stalemated. Otherwise he would have certainly played 17.b4! cxb4 18.axb4 a5 (18...\textit{ac}8 19.\textit{xc}8 20.\textit{wa}3!) 19.bxa5 bxa5 20.\textit{wa}3 a4 21.\textit{bi}, and White can successfully contend with the a-pawn. Obviously, Mieses is playing for 'traps'; he waits for the move 17...\textit{xc}6 in order to then play 18.b4.

17...\textit{ac}8
A contemporary chess player would play 17...a5, reliably preventing the move b2-b4. Admittedly, even now, after 18.b4 cxb4 19.axb4 \textit{wb}5, White would not easily be able to defend the b4-pawn. Nevertheless, this would be White’s best chance.

18.\textit{dc}3? \textit{ac}6 19.\textit{wh}2 \textit{ae}6

Before I was acquainted with this game, I thought that it was Rubinstein who was the first to show how one should play such positions for Black (see for example the famous game Zhubarev-Rubinstein, Moscow 1925). Now I see that I was sadly mistaken. It turns out that, even in 1905, Chigorin had found the correct plan for Black. This plan is very simple: by playing ...\textit{xd}4, Black forces the move \textit{xd}4 and takes the bishop on d4 with the e5-pawn, opening the e-file for attack by the
rook on the backward pawn on e2. And against this plan, White is absolutely helpless.

Mieses, for his part, aims for the move f2–f4, but this only plays into the hands of the opponent, since it leads to the exposure of the e3-square on the open e-file.

20.\(\text{Qg1}\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 21.\(\text{f4}\)

Now Black carries out his plan. Also hopeless was 21.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{Qd}4\) 22.\(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Qxd}4\) 23.\(\text{Qb}2\) \(\text{Bxc}2\) 24.\(\text{Kxc}2\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 25.\(\text{Kb}2\) \(\text{Kc}7\).

21...\(\text{Qd}4\)! 22.\(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{exd}4\) 23.\(\text{Qe}4\)

Preventing the manoeuvre ...\(\text{Qf}5\)-e3. If 23.\(\text{b}4\), then 23...\(\text{Qf}5\) 24.\(\text{Qxc}5\) \(\text{Qe}3\) 25.\(\text{Qc}6\) \(\text{Qe}7\) and White's position is hopeless, since he loses both the exchange and the passed pawn on \(\text{c}6\).

23...\(\text{Qd}5\)

Up to this point, Chigorin has played excellently, but here he gives White a respite. Rubinstein would certainly, without a moment's hesitation, have played 23...\(\text{Qb}3\) 24.\(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 25.\(\text{Qxf}5\) \(\text{Qxf}5\) followed by a doubling of rooks on the e-file, and White is completely stalemated. Chigorin obviously thought that White would exchange on \(d5\), after which the knight still gets to \(e3\). White, however, prefers to accept a weak pawn on \(e4\), in order to somewhat liberate his game.

24.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 25.\(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 26.\(\text{Qf}3\)

\(\text{Qxe}4\) 27.\(\text{dxe}4\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 28.\(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qd}8\)

Carelessness. With a simple transposition of moves (...\(\text{Qe}5\) and there...\(\text{Qc}d8\)), Black would not allow the move \(b2-b4\). But now the weakness of the \(c5\)-pawn is shown.

29.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 30.\(\text{bxc}5\) \(\text{bxc}5\) 31.\(\text{Qh}3\)

If at first 31.e3, then simply 31...\(\text{dxe}5\) (32.\(\text{Qxe}3\)? \(\text{Qg}4\)+).

31...\(\text{h}5\)

Threatening (if the opportunity presents itself) ...\(\text{Qe}5\)-g4-e3; but now a new weakness appears in Black's position – the \(h5\)-pawn.

32.e3

The only useful move. 32.\(\text{Qc}1\) would be bad because of 32...\(\text{d}3\)!. Now, however, on 32...\(\text{d}3\), would follow 33.\(\text{Qc}3\) and it is not so simple to exploit Black's passed pawn. Nevertheless Black should play this, so as, after 32...\(\text{d}3\) 33.\(\text{Qc}3\), to continue 33...\(\text{Qd}7\) 34.\(\text{Qc}4\) (34.\(\text{Qfc}1\) \(\text{Qc}8\)) 34...\(\text{Qxc}4\) 35.\(\text{Qxc}4\) \(\text{d}2\) 36.\(\text{Qd}1\) \(\text{Qed}8\) and White cannot resist for much longer.

32...\(\text{dxe}5\) 33.\(\text{Qxe}3\) \(\text{Qd}3\) 34.\(\text{Qe}2\)

Of course not 34.\(\text{Qxc}5\) \(\text{Qxc}5\) 35.\(\text{Qxc}5\) \(\text{Qxd}2\). Incidentally, White threatens to take the \(h5\)-pawn.

34...\(\text{Qed}8\) 35.\(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Qxc}4\)

To divert the rook from the second rank. On 35...\(\text{Qg}4\), there would possibly follow 36.\(\text{Qf}3\).
36.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xC4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}e5}}}} 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xg1 \textcolor{red}{g6}}}!  

...ending the important h5-pawn. On \textit{...xg6} would follow 38...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}e6+}} and on \textit{...\textbf{wa2}}, simply 38...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g7}}.

38.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f2 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}d4}}}  

things good comes out of 38...\textit{\textbf{d}d2} + \textit{\textbf{xc5 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}b2}} 40.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}h1}}.  

39.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd4}}}  
Here, Mieses misses his chance, though \textit{...a2! \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g7}} 40.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xd4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xd4}}}} +0...\textit{\textbf{xd4 \textbf{e6}}} 41.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{we6}}} 41.\textit{\textbf{fxg6 \textbf{c4}}, White \textcolor{red}{\textbf{has a miserable position.}}}  

39...\textit{\textbf{xd4}} 40.\textit{\textbf{a2+}}  
And now better was 40.\textit{\textbf{xd4 \textbf{xd4}}} +1...\textit{\textbf{a3}} 42.\textit{\textbf{c1}} with slight chances of a draw.

But after the text move, White’s game is totally bad.

40...\textit{\textbf{c4}} 41.\textit{\textbf{fxg6}}  
\textbf{It should be noted that 41.\textit{\textbf{c1 \textbf{xg3+}}} 42.\textit{\textbf{xg3 \textbf{wxe3+}}} 43.\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}h2 \textbf{wxf4+}}} 44.\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g2 \textbf{wxe4+}}} 45.\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f2 \textbf{wxf4+}} and ...\textit{\textbf{xc1}} leads to a hopeless queen ending.}  

41...\textit{\textbf{wd7+}}  
And White resigned, since after 42.\textit{\textbf{g2 \textbf{wd2+}}} he would lose his queen.

In this game, Chigorin showed his mastery in two ways: firstly he outplayed his opponent in the positional struggle, and then, after the fault on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} move, showed his excellent tactical skill.

The move 4...\textbf{c6} is not as advisable as 4...\textbf{f6}, but Chigorin aims at his usual method of reinforcing the centre.

The opening phase of the game is interesting in that Chigorin, for the first time in practical play, refrains from the development with the bishop on \textbf{d6}, after which he allows the advance of the white pawn to \textbf{e4}, and, on the contrary, attempts to make this advance more difficult, not fearing an exchange of bishop for knight.

Later, Nimzowitsch relied on this idea as a basis for his now so popular defence.

5.\textbf{a3}  
Half a century of experience of playing similar positions has shown that the exchange of bishop for knight, when the other white knight is placed on \textbf{f3}, makes it difficult for White to fight for the \textbf{e4}-square; from this point of view it would be more useful to play 5.\textbf{wxb3}.

5...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{x}xc3+}} 6.\textbf{bxc3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}}} 7.\textbf{e3 \textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}d7}}} 8.\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c2}} 0-0 9.\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d3}}}
Blumenfeld: As shown by Black’s reply, this natural ‘active’ move fails. He should play 12.c4.

12...c5!

Splendid. Now White finds himself rejecting the programmed 13.f4 because of 13...c4 14.e2 g6, after which Black occupies the e4-square (...g6-h4-f5-d6 or ...g6-h4 and ...f5). Not wishing to resign himself to the loss of the initiative, Marshall tries to make his bishops more lively.

13.c4 cxd4! 14.exd4 dxc4 15.xc4 xe6

White has obtained diagonals, but at a high price – the d4-pawn is weak, or rather not so much the d-pawn as the adjacent squares: c4, d5, e4. This consequence of the weakness of the isolated pawn was first formulated by Nimzowitsch and one of the best illustrations of it appears in the present game – which was played when Nimzowitsch was still only beginning his chess career!

16.b2

An unfortunate position for the bishop. On e3 it would not only defend the pawn, but would also participate in the defence of the king’s flank.

16...b8 17.d3

The great master sets a trap, but Marshall fortunately sidesteps the
danger: 17.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}b3? \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}xc4!} 18.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}xc4} \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}d5}\text{+} 19.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}ac1 b5.

\begin{center}
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17...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc4

Blumenfeld: Consistent! In order to exploit the weak squares it is necessary to exchange the light-squared bishops.

18.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc4 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g6

This is where the mistake in the choice of position for the bishop on c1 tells – the f4-square is left undefended.

19.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}e1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}f4 20.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f1

There is no other move.

The queen must defend both the \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c4 and the g2-square: 20.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}b3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d5!; 20.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc4 21.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xf4 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}c2!, winning the bishop in an amusing way, thanks to the absence of a flight square for the white bishop.

20...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d5!

Blumenfeld: A clear demonstration of Black’s positional advantage.

21.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xe8+ \textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xe8

Over the last five moves, White’s position has sharply deteriorated. His rook and bishop do not take part in the struggle, his queen is tied to the defence of the g2-pawn, and only the knight is not badly placed. Now all he can do is cover the e-file so as not to allow a black invasion on e2.

On 22.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3, Chigorin intended to commence an attack by means of 22...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h5. Then White cannot play 23.h3 because of 23...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e2+ 24.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h2 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xe3 25.fx3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g4+ 26.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g3+, but it is not easy to demonstrate a sufficiently effective way of carrying out the attack after 23.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e1.

If Black makes the prophylactic move 23...h6, then White also replies 24.h3!. Therefore, after 22.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3, it is better for Black to operate on the queen’s flank rather than loosening the well-fortified defence of the white king. For this purpose, the move 22...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}b3 is very good. On 23.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}b1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e4 24.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}c4 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc4 25.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc4 would follow, as also in the game, 25...b5, and, on 23.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}b1, the beautiful attack 23...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xe3 24.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xe3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xe3+ 25.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g4 26.\textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f2+...
27.\texttt{g1} \texttt{h2}+ 28.\texttt{h1} \texttt{e2}! is decisive.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{22.\texttt{e5} \texttt{e4} 23.\texttt{wc4}}

It is not easy to give good advice here. The threat of 23...\texttt{d2} is too unpleasant. On 23.\texttt{d1} would follow 23...\texttt{wb3}; on 23.f3, the simple 23...\texttt{d6} 24.g3 \texttt{e6} 25.\texttt{d1} f6 is good\textsuperscript{80}; on 23.\texttt{c1}, decisive is 23...\texttt{xg2}; on 23.\texttt{f3}, strong is 23...\texttt{b3} 24.\texttt{c1} \texttt{h3}+. A faint hope of fortifying the defence lay only in 23.\texttt{d3}.

\textbf{23...\texttt{xc4}!}

Chigorin chooses the clearest way to realise his positional advantage, transposing to an endgame where a decisive role will be played by the activity of the black rook and the obvious superiority of the knight over the bishop. Another tempting continuation was the effective 23...\texttt{g3}! 24.f3 (24.\texttt{wxh5} \texttt{fe2} mate!) 24...\texttt{xe4} 25.\texttt{xc4} \texttt{f5}, for example, 26.\texttt{xe1} b5 27.\texttt{e5} (27.\texttt{xe1} \texttt{d3}) 27...\texttt{f6} 28.\texttt{g4} h5 29.\texttt{f2} \texttt{e3}+ 30.\texttt{g1} \texttt{c4}.

\textbf{24.\texttt{xc4} b5!}

Black consistently carries out his plan, rejecting the tempting 24...\texttt{d3} 25.f3 b5! 26.fxe4 bxc4, or 25.\texttt{b1} b5 26.\texttt{e5} \texttt{exf2}.

\textbf{25.\texttt{e5} f6 26.\texttt{f3} \texttt{c8}}

The same iron consistency, although 26...\texttt{d3} 27.\texttt{b1} \texttt{exf2} 28.\texttt{c3} \texttt{e4} would have allowed Black to win a pawn at once as well as hold on to his initiative.

\textbf{27.\texttt{e1}}

White defends both squares of invasion – d3 and c2.

\textbf{27...\texttt{d2} 28.f3?}

28.g3 was more tenacious.

\textbf{28...\texttt{c4}}

\textbf{29.g3}

All other moves lose at once; 29.\texttt{c1} \texttt{e2}+; 29.\texttt{b1} \texttt{xb2} 30.\texttt{xb2} \texttt{c1} 31.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{xe1}!.

\textbf{29.\texttt{e6}}

On 29.\texttt{xb2} 30.gxf4, the wrecked pawn chain is a sorry sight, but Chigorin produces a classic example of the domination of the black knight over the bishop and isolated d-pawn.
30. \( \text{a}c3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 31. \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 32. \( \text{Ed}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \)

Blumenfeld: It is clear that he must not allow the d-pawn to move. White, now, in the future, refrains from the move \( \text{E}c1 \), as an exchange on c4 would only hasten the occupation of dominating squares by the black knights.

33. \( \text{d}f2 \)

The exchange of rooks (33. \( \text{Ec}1 \)) would change the character of the struggle.

33...\( \text{Cd}5 \) 34. \( f4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 35. \( \text{Ed}2 \) \( \text{a}4 \)

Here it is, the triumph of Chigorin’s light-square strategy! Now, as White’s defensive resources are running out, Black continues to improve his position and is almost ready to justly reap the fruits of his splendid play.

36. \( \text{g}2 \) \( a6 \)

Blumenfeld: Threatening to exchange on \( a2 \) and win the d4-pawn.

37. \( \text{E}e3 \) \( \text{Exe}3 \) 38. \( \text{Exe}3 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 39. \( \text{xb}2 \)

Blumenfeld: Rook endings are well known for their drawing tendencies. In the present ending, Black has a range of advantages: a pawn majority on the queen’s flank, weak white pawns on a3 and d4, domination of the open c-file. In the earlier stages of the game, Chigorin rejected various tempting continuations and prepared to transpose to this rook ending. In appraising this rook ending as a win, and, as the manner of his handling of it shows, Chigorin reached the heights of chess mastery in his understanding of such endgames – as was later achieved by only a select few, e.g. Rubinstein, Lasker and Capablanca.

39...\( \text{e}6 \)!

The exchanges have not improved White’s position at all. Blumenfeld: Excellent! Black refrains from 39...\( \text{Ec}3+ \) 40. \( \text{E}e4 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) with the win of a pawn and a formation of two connected passed pawns. Actually, after this, White, by continuing 41. \( \text{Ec}2 \), combines play of the king, rook and d-pawn to set up strong threats; however, the advance of Black’s passed pawns is hampered by the white rook from the b7 or a7-squares. It is doubtful whether Black can win with this continuation.

40. \( \text{E}b3 \)

Now Black was threatening 40...\( \text{Ec}3+ \), since on 41. \( \text{E}e4 \) would follow 41...f5#.

40...\( \text{d}5 \) 41. \( \text{E}d3 \) f5! 42. \( h3 \) \( h5 \)
White is in zugzwang. The pawn ending is hopeless: 43...d2 f3+ 44.e3 xg3+ 45.xg3 a5 etc., with an elementary winning pawn endgame, thanks to the obtaining of the distant passed pawn.

43.e2 xg4 44.e3 e4+

The last fine point.
Black forces the white king to move away from the pawns on the king's flank, since, after 45.e3, would follow 45...f4 46.b3 c4 47.b4+ d3 48.b3+ c2.

45.e2 d4 46.c7

59...e2+

Blumenfeld: Driving the king away from the f1-square, since 60.e5 h2 threatens both mate and the h-pawn.

60.e1 h2 61.a4 b4 62.h7 xh7
63.xb4 h1+ 64.d2 f2 65.b8 f1w 0-1

A beautiful positional game! A classic example of a consistently carried out master-plan, with the gradual accumulation and realisation of advantages and the technical execution of the game in the rook ending. This is probably one of Chigorin's finest creative achievements.

46...h3

Yet again, Chigorin chooses the clearest way to win, rejecting 46...a4 47.xg7 xh3 48.gxh4 e4 49.h5 f3 50.h6 xh3 51.h7 a5, after which the opponent is allowed some practical chances.

47.xg7 xf4 48.xg3 e5

50.e2 d4 51.e6 a4 52.b3 c4 53.f1
Blumenfeld: If White advances 53.h4, the pawn would quickly be lost. White's game is hopeless.

53...e4 54.h4 f3 55.e1 f4
56.h5 c1+ 57.e2 c2+ 58.e1 g3 59.h6

59 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Georg Salwe
Match, Lodz 1908 (6)
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.c3 c6 4.g5
5.dxe4 e4 6.xf6
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6...gxf6

A twist on the bishop is considered not to promise equal chances. Practice shows that Black’s pawn weaknesses on the king’s flank serve as objects of attack, and this is far more important than the advantage of the two bishops and the half-open g-file. A serious drawback of the system is that Black, as it were, takes it upon himself to bring about a decision in the middlegame, because in the ending he pays dearly for his pawn weaknesses. At the same time, the system with 6...gxf6 was warmly recommended by Lasker and was readily adopted by Rubinstein and Salwe.

Chigorin, right from the start, had a poor opinion of this opening set-up and therefore his encounter with Salwe bore the character of a principal creative argument. Interesting is Chigorin’s remark on the plan of play in the event of the more solid 6...dxf6: ‘In the good old days, 4...dxe4 was avoided, as the continuation 5.dxe4 c6 6.exf6 bxf6 7.g3 was considered as being not quite acceptable for Black. After he castles on the king’s side, before he has time to bring the queen’s bishop into play (e.g. on b7), White, by playing d3 and h2-h4, sets up a strong attack on the king’s flank, often with a sacrifice of bishop or knight for the h-pawn.’

We should mention that occasionally the system with 6...dxf6 is seen today in competition of the highest class. Thus the game Spassky-Petrosian, from the 1966 World Championship Match, continued 7.d3 f5 8.g3 c5 9.gf3 d7 8.gd2! c6 9.dxg6+ fxg6 10...c5! 0-0 11.0-0-0 d7 12...c6 bxc6 13.h4 ab8 14.h3 c5 15...g5! and White obtains a greatly superior ending.

It is not necessary for Black to create tension in the centre. 8...d7 is better.

9.b5+

Chigorin also played 9.dxc5 c5 10.gxd8+ cxd8 11..c4, but convinced himself that Black’s pieces obtain great scope for action. With 9.b5+, White plays for an advantage in development and creates threats in the centre.

9...c6?

A serious mistake which allows White to deploy his pieces in the very best way. Necessary was 9...d7 10.gxd7+ cxd7 followed by ...c6. Admittedly, in this case, Black has in prospect a long struggle with equal chances, albeit in a position without any hint of activity, e.g. 11.dxc5 gxd1+ 12.bxc1 c6 13.0-0...c5 14.bf1 c7.

10.c3

Rubinstein, in a game played against Chigorin in the match-tournament at
Lodz, a little later, played 10...0-0, but was forced to lay down his arms even sooner. See Game 152 in Part Two.

11.\textit{We}2\textit{cxd4} 12.\textit{Qxd4} \textit{\text{\&d7}} 13.0-0
Black experiences serious difficulties in the further development of his pieces. His king cannot castle because of 14.\textit{Qgxf5}. Salwe endeavours to weaken White's threats in the centre by preparing the exchange ...\textit{\&xd4}.

13...\textit{\&d8} 14.\textit{\&xc6!} \textit{\text{\&xc6}}
There is no choice. On 14...\textit{\&xc6} follows a sacrifice on f5: 15.\textit{Qgxf5} exf5 16.\textit{\&xf5} \textit{\text{\&d7}} 17.\textit{\text{\&f1}} (Chigorin gives 17.\textit{\text{\&ad1}} \textit{\text{\&c7}} 18.\textit{\text{\&xd7}} \textit{\text{\&x7d7}} 19.\textit{\text{\&e1}} and White wins) 17...\textit{\text{\&c5}} 18.\textit{\text{\&g4}} with a very strong attack.

15.\textit{\text{\&e1}} \textit{\text{\&c5}}

16.\textit{\text{\&ad1}}!
White does not hurry to force events and brings into play his last piece. He threatens 17.\textit{\text{\&dxf5}} exf5 18.b4 or 17.\textit{\text{\&gxf5}} exf5 18.\textit{\text{\&b3}}, and, on 16...\textit{\text{\&c8}}, with the idea of parrying 17.\textit{\text{\&dxf5}} with the intermediate 17...\textit{\text{\&xd1}}, to follow with the beautiful combination 17.\textit{\text{\&gxf5}} exf5 18.\textit{\text{\&xe7+! \text{\&xe7}}} 19.\textit{\text{\&xe7+ \text{\&xe7}}} 20.\textit{\text{\&xc6+}} and White has two extra pawns.

16...\textit{\text{\&f4}} 17.\textit{\text{\&e4}} \textit{\text{\&e5}}
At the cost of new pawn weaknesses, Black endeavours to transfer the queen to the safer square \textit{c7}, where it will also take part in the defence.

18.\textit{\text{\&f3!}}
In view of the threats 19.\textit{\text{\&b3}} or 19.\textit{\text{\&e2}}, the black queen is forced to immediately retreat.

18...\textit{\text{\&c7}} 19.\textit{\text{\&h5!}}
Once again he threatens the incursion of the knight on f5.

19...\textit{\text{\&c8}} 20.\textit{\text{\&g5}} \textit{\text{\&xg5}} 21.\textit{\text{\&xg5}}

After the exchange of the dark-squared bishop, Black's position is left defenceless. White threatens both 22.\textit{\text{\&xc6}} and 22.\textit{\text{\&f5}}, and on 21...\textit{\text{\&d5}} would follow 22.\textit{\text{\&g7 \text{\&f8}}} 23.\textit{\text{\&xe6 \text{\&xe6}}} 24.\textit{\text{\&xd5 \text{\&cxd5}}} 25.\textit{\text{\&xe6+}}, winning. Black's further resistance is of a purely symbolic character.

21...\textit{\text{\&h5}} 22.\textit{\text{\&f5}}
Chigorin: White could play 22.\textit{\text{\&xc6}}, after which would follow 22...\textit{\text{\&d6}}. White would of course still win the game, but after the text move he achieves his aim more simply and accurately. Now 23.\textit{\text{\&g7+}} is threatened.

22...\textit{\text{\&d5}}
23.c4!

Chigorin: On 23...\texttt{Wg7}, Black could reply 23...\texttt{Exf5!}, which would considerably delay White’s victory, even if that is all we can expect.

23...\texttt{Exd1} 24.\texttt{Exd1}

Chigorin: White could win by the continuation 24.\texttt{Dg7+ }\texttt{Exf8} 25.\texttt{Exd1}, but this would not force the opponent to resign more quickly; by playing 23...\texttt{Wg8} 26.\texttt{Exe6+ }\texttt{Exe6} 27.\texttt{Exd8+ }\texttt{Exd8}, Black would prolong the game for quite some time.

24.\texttt{Exf5} 25.\texttt{Wg7} \texttt{Exf8} 26.\texttt{Ee1+ }\texttt{Exe6} 27.\texttt{Exe6+ }\texttt{Ed7} 28.\texttt{Edh6! }\texttt{Wa5} 29.\texttt{Wd4+ }\texttt{Exe8} 30.h3 \texttt{f6} 31.\texttt{Wxf4} \texttt{Ed7} 32.\texttt{Exh5} \texttt{Wxa2} 33.\texttt{Eh7+} 1-0

60 Queen’s Gambit Declined

Georg Salwe

Mikhail Chigorin

Match, Lodz 1906 (13)

1.d4 d5 2.\texttt{Qf3} e6 3.c4 \texttt{Ed7} 4.\texttt{Cc3} \texttt{Qf6} 5.\texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qe7} 6.e3 0-0

7.c5

Whilst shutting in the dark-squared bishop with the white pawn chain, Salwe endeavours to gain space on the queen’s flank. However, such an early advance of the c-pawn removes the tension in the centre and presents Black with a clearly defined plan of action – to prepare a break in the centre by ...e6–e5.

Levenfish: Salwe was well known for being a ‘natural player’ and was not an expert of opening theory. The text move facilitates Black’s defence.

7...\texttt{c6} 8.\texttt{Ed3} \texttt{h6}

A questionable move, which could seriously hamper his preparations for ...e6–e5, since Black drives back the bishop to a diagonal on which it participates in the struggle for the e5-square. Deserving attention is another plan: 8...\texttt{Ee8} 9.\texttt{Wc2} \texttt{Ee8} 10.\texttt{Exe5} \texttt{Ed7}, for example: 11.\texttt{Exe7} \texttt{Exe7} 12.f4 \texttt{f6} (or 12...\texttt{Exe5} 13.fxe5 \texttt{f6} 14.exf6 \texttt{Wxf6}) 13.\texttt{Exd7} \texttt{Exd7} 14.e4 \texttt{e5}! 15.fxe5 \texttt{fxe5} 16.exd5 \texttt{Exd4+}.

9.\texttt{Ed4} \texttt{Ed5} 10.\texttt{Qg3?}

A serious positional mistake, after which Black at once advances ...e6–e5. It was absolutely necessary to leave the bishop on f4 and either castle or firstly play 10.b4 (or even 10.h3). Then, after the inevitable exchange 10...\texttt{Qxf4} 11.fxe4, it would be far more difficult for Black to carry out the break ...e6–e5.

10...\texttt{Exg3} 11.\texttt{hXg3} e5 12.\texttt{Cc2} \texttt{e4} 13.\texttt{Ed2}

Black can be altogether satisfied with the opening. His central outpost on e4 is stronger than White’s c5-pawn. This outpost cannot be undermined by means of f2-f3 as that would immediately weaken the g3-pawn. The
open h-file for the white rook has a purely symbolic meaning.

13...\textit{\emph{\textbf{f6}}}

This move seems to be the most natural, since it opens the way for the bishop on c8 and also prepares ...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{g4}}}}}.

However, Black could begin immediate play against the c5-pawn: 13...\textit{\textbf{b6}} 14.\textit{\textbf{b4}} a5 15.a3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f6}}}}}! 16.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a4}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a6}}}}}.

14.\textit{\textbf{b4}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c7}}}}}

\textbf{Levenfish: Preventing 15.f3.}

15.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{b3}}}}} \textit{\textbf{b6}} 16.\textit{\textbf{e2}}?

Now Black gains the initiative on the queen's flank.

Castling was necessary.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{0}}}}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

16...\textit{\textbf{a5}}! 17.a3

There is no choice -- 17.\textit{\textbf{bxa5}} bxc5, or 17.\textit{\textbf{cx}}6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{x}}}}6}+.

17...\textit{\textbf{axb4}} 18.\textit{\textbf{axb4}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{g4}}}}} 19.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c1}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xa1}}}}} 20.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xa1}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{b7}}}}} 21.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c3}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a8}}}}} 22.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{b2}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a6}}}}} 23.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{d2}}}}}!

In a difficult position, White finds a good defensive resource. Making use of the closed nature of the position, he is willing to leave his king in the centre in order to quickly introduce the rook on h1 into play.

23...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c4}}}}}!

\textbf{Levenfish: This move requires deep calculation. It also testifies to the fact that, until the end of his life, Chigorin maintained his wonderful combinative talent.}

Black takes very energetic measures to change the momentum of the struggle once and for all to his advantage, but nevertheless White has still sufficient defensive resources.

White is obliged to exchange rooks -- 24.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a1}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xa1}}}}} (24...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{b8}}}}} 25.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a3}}}}}) 25.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xa1}}}}} (25.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xa1}}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f1}}}}}). Chigorin considered that White could then put up a successful defence. All the same, in our opinion, his position remains very difficult, though not after 25...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a8}}}}}+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{h7}}}}} 27.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{xc6}}}}}, but after the cunning 25...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f8}}}}}, as a result of which the white queen remains tied to the defence of the b4-pawn and the f1-square. Instead of this, Salwe makes a tempting and seemingly useful move.

It not only defends the b4-pawn but prepares the break f2-f3. However, it is highly doubtful whether there is any benefit from the advance f2-f3, and once again the white rook is cut off from play and this has a decisive effect on the following events.

24.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c1}}}}}? \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{d7}}}}}!!

\textbf{Levenfish: This conception had already been thought out by Chigorin on the preceding move!}

25.\textit{\textbf{f3}}

\textbf{Levenfish: Salwe, unsuspectingly, thought that he had 'caught' Chigorin. Alas, a cruel disappointment awaits him.}
25...\textit{bxc5!}

Rebutting White’s idea. On 26.fxg4 would follow 26...cxd4 27.c3a2 (27.cxd1 \textit{xb+}; 27.exd4 \textit{xd4+} and ...\textit{xb4}) 27...\textit{g5!} and, on 26.bxc5, Black succeeds in both taking the f3-pawn and getting out with the queen: 26...\textit{b8} 27.a3 \textit{exf3} 28.d3 \textit{b4}.

26.dxc5 \textit{exf3}

Another obvious continuation, which is equally unpleasant for White, would be 26...\textit{f6} 27.fxg4 d4!, but Chigorin consistently carries out his plan.

27.d3 fxg2 28.g1

Material loss for White is inevitable. After 38.g5! 39.h5 \textit{e5!} or 39.g2 d4!, Black would win very quickly. Chigorin chooses a different, albeit longer method.

28...\textit{e5!}

In this lies the whole point of Chigorin’s idea.

\textit{Levenfish:} This blow crowns Chigorin’s deep combination. Black not only saves the queen, but also remains with an extra pawn as well as the better position.

29.\textit{xc4}

29...\textit{xc4}

On 29.\textit{xc4} would follow the calm 29...\textit{b8} and Black wins another pawn, e.g. 30.\textit{a3} 31.\textit{xc3} 32.\textit{xc5} 33.\textit{e5} \textit{a7}.

29...\textit{xc4+} 30.\textit{c2} \textit{xb2} 31.\textit{xb2} \textit{f3}

The storm is over and White’s position is in ruins.

32.d3 \textit{f6} 33.e1 \textit{e4} 34.xg2 d3

Levenfish: As it happens, in this game Chigorin is in possession of the two bishops. Even though he was not ‘bishop-inclined’, here he manages the bishops excellently.

35.f4 \textit{c4!} 36.c2 d3 37.d1 d2+ 38.c1

Material loss for White is inevitable. After 38.g5! 39.h5 \textit{e5!} or 39.g2 d4!, Black would win very quickly. Chigorin chooses a different, albeit longer method.

38.d4 39.e1 e1 40.e4 d4

41.exd5 \textit{xd5} 42. \textit{xd5} cxd5
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43.\(\text{xe8+}\) \(\text{h7}\) 44.\(\text{ed8}\) \(\text{ac4+}\) 45.\(\text{td2}\) 
\(\text{xc5}\) 46.\(\text{td3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 47.\(\text{e7}\) \(\text{g6}\) 
48.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{cc3+}\) 49.\(\text{f6}\) \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e5}\) 
51.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{h5}\) 52.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{h6}\) 53.\(\text{d8}\) \(\text{g6}\) 
54.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e5}\) 55.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 56.\(\text{d7}\) \(\text{e4}\) 
57.\(\text{b7}\) \(\text{g5}\) 58.\(\text{b1}\) \(\text{c2+}\) 59.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{d3}\) 
60.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{c3}\) 61.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{hxg4}\) 62.\(\text{exg4}\) 
\(\text{g2+}\) 63.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{a2}\) 0-1

Chigorin’s manoeuvre \(...\text{wc7-b7-a6-c4}\) and the subsequent blow \(...\text{f6-d7-e5}\) makes a striking impression, as did his exploitation of the two bishops.

61 Old Indian Defence

Georg Salwe

Mikhail Chigorin

Match-tournament, Lodz 1906

1.d4 \(\text{f6}\) 2.e4 \(\text{d6}\) 3.\(\text{ac3}\) \(\text{bd7}\)

Thus outlining the contours of the King’s Indian Defence. However, when Chigorin, in the last years of his career, introduced into practice the system with the fianchettoed bishop, it was placed only under the heading ‘irregular opening’. Of course, Black, without a fight, allows the white pawns to occupy the centre and only later begins to attack them. It must be mentioned that Chigorin did not discover the King’s Indian Defence by chance. His 2.\(\text{we2}\) system against the French Defence, which he started playing in 1893 in his match with Tarrasch, is very similar to the King’s Indian set-up.

Thus, the position reached in the game Chigorin-Schiffers, St.Petersburg 1895, after 14 moves, was repeated (with reversed colours) 76 years later in the game Taimanov-Fischer, played in the quarter-final match for the World Championship. And to whom is not well known the position 1.d4 \(\text{f6}\) 2.e4 \(\text{f6}\) 3.e4 \(\text{g6}\) 5.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{g7}\) 
6.\(\text{d3}\) d6 7.\(\text{xe7}\) 0-0 8.e4 \(\text{bd7}\) 9.\(\text{xe3}\) e5, and is this not as was played by Chigorin even in 1898? Contemporary Yugoslav masters have spent a lot of time and energy analysing the position after 1.d4 \(\text{f6}\) 2.e4 \(\text{c5}\) 3.d5 \(\text{d6}\) 4.\(\text{ac3}\) 
\(\text{g6}\) 5.e4 \(\text{g7}\). They have also examined the system 6.f4 0-0 7.\(\text{xe3}\) \(\text{g4}\) 8.h3 
\(\text{xf3}\) 9.\(\text{xe3}\) \(\text{bd7}\), and is it not true that this is a position from the game Burn-Chigorin, played in 1898? The great majority of Chigorin’s King’s Indian Defences consisted of the set-up in which the dark-squared bishop is developed on e7. From the Old Indian formation for Black, it is interesting to look at another opening of a game Schiffers-Chigorin, played in 1903: 1.e4 \(\text{g6}\) 2.d4 \(\text{g7}\) (the Ufimtsev Defence!) 
3.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 4.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 5.h3 \(\text{bd7}\) 
6.\(\text{xe2}\) e5 7.c3 \(\text{we7}\) 8.\(\text{xd2}\) 0-0 9.\(\text{wc2}\) 
\(\text{f8}\) 10.0-0 d5! 11.f3 exd4 12.cxd4 
\(\text{dxh4}\) 13.\(\text{fxe4}\) \(\text{d5}\)!

4.e4 e5 5.d5
Chapter 22 - Feverish final years

Chigorin considered that, as a result of this move, 'White's king's bishop is inactive until the end of the game'. It seems he was not quite right in his judgement. If White will later commence preparations for a queen's side pawn offensive, the bishop placed on e2 could be useful for him. Of course, instead of 5.d5, White could maintain the tension in the centre, as a very early advance of the d4-pawn rather prematurely determines the pawn structure, which somewhat limits White's possibilities.

5...\textit{\textit{\textbackslash}textbackslash}e7 6.d3 \textit{\textbackslash}f8

Nowadays, the knight would be attracting to the c5-square, but Chigorin, in the system with the development of the bishop to e7, as a rule transferred the knight to g6.

7.\textit{\textit{\textbackslash}textbackslash}f3 \textit{\textbackslash}g6 8.h3

A move useful in itself, but here connected also with the beginning of a not very justified diversion on the king's flank.

8...0-0 9.g4

White should play simply 9.0-0 and then \textit{\textbackslash}e3 and b2-b4.

9...\textit{\textbackslash}e8 10.\textit{\textbackslash}e2 \textit{\textbackslash}f8 11.\textit{\textbackslash}c2

The first pause – instead of the natural continuation of White's chosen plan of development (11.\textit{\textbackslash}g3), he has to defend the e4-pawn, which could find itself under threat after 11.\textit{\textbackslash}f4.

\textbf{11...c6!}

Black, in good time, gets down to operations in the centre and on the queen's flank. His plan is clear: after 12.\textit{\textbackslash}d7, to place his rook on c8 and play b7-b5.

\textbf{12.\textit{\textbackslash}g5 \textit{\textbackslash}d7}

Black would also have a very good position after 12...h6, but he does not want to spend time on operations which do not fit in with the plan.

\textbf{13.\textit{\textbackslash}b3}

It is difficult for White to do anything against the opponent's growing initiative. On 13.\textit{\textbackslash}h4, good are both 13...\textit{\textbackslash}f4 and 13...h6 14.\textit{\textbackslash}xg6 hxg6. The queen leaves the c-file, but, all the same, finds itself faced by the black rook.

\textbf{13...\textit{\textbackslash}b8 14.\textit{\textbackslash}f1 h6 15.\textit{\textbackslash}e3}

The exchange 15.\textit{\textbackslash}xf6 \textit{\textbackslash}xf6 16.\textit{\textbackslash}g2 would allow White to hold his pawn chain, but abruptly weakens his king's flank.

\textbf{15...b5!}

Strategically the game is decided. White cannot prevent the opening of lines in the centre. The forcing operation 16...\textit{\textbackslash}xc4 17.\textit{\textbackslash}xc4 cxd5 18.exd5 e4 is threatened. It works also after 16.\textit{\textbackslash}xa7, since, on 16...\textit{\textbackslash}xc4, White cannot play 17.\textit{\textbackslash}xb8 \textit{\textbackslash}xb8 18.\textit{\textbackslash}xb8 because of 18...cxd5!.

\textbf{16.dxc6 \textit{\textbackslash}xc6 17.cxb5}
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White has managed to avoid the opening of the b-file, but now his position in the centre collapses. Probably, 17...\texttt{\textsc{c}}xe4 would be good enough, but Chigorin opens the centre more effectively and powerfully.

17...d5! 18.\texttt{\textsc{c}}e1
There is nothing better, and the variation 18...dxe4 19.\textsc{c}c4 would suit White.

18...d4!
Black intends to capture the e4-pawn, but under more favourable circumstances. White decides to ‘pay off’ the b5-pawn.

19.\texttt{\textsc{w}}c2 dxe3!
As Chigorin notes, this is stronger than 19...\texttt{\textsc{a}}a8 20.dxe2 \texttt{\textsc{c}}c8 21.\texttt{\textsc{w}}b1.

20.bxc6 \texttt{\textsc{w}}b6
White has somehow managed to stabilise the position in the centre, but at a high price: Black seizes the b- and c-files, and, in addition, there are beginning to be unpleasant threats to the white king on the g1-a7 diagonal.

21.fxe3 \texttt{\textsc{h}}ec8 22.\textsc{c}c1 \texttt{\textsc{w}}xe3 23.\texttt{\textsc{g}}g2 \texttt{\textsc{w}}b6!
Black rejects the doubtful 23...\texttt{\textsc{w}}f3+ and returns with the queen in order to capture the c6-pawn. White’s position is hopelessly lost, with his pieces out of play on the king’s flank.

24.\texttt{\textsc{a}}a4 \texttt{\textsc{e}}e7 25.b3 \texttt{\textsc{c}}xc6 26.\texttt{\textsc{c}}xc6 \\
\texttt{\textsc{c}}xc6
The active white rook is exchanged (though White will still fight for the c-file): Black’s next rook move takes the d-file and it becomes clear that Black has an extra rook in play.

27.\texttt{\textsc{w}}c4 \texttt{\textsc{d}}d8 28.\texttt{\textsc{e}}e1

28...\texttt{\textsc{d}}b4!
All goes according to plan. Against the threat of ...\texttt{\textsc{w}}e3, there is no defence, and White decides to hasten events. He could have put up a longer resistance by means of 29.\texttt{\textsc{g}}g1 followed by \texttt{\textsc{g}}g3.

29.a3 \texttt{\textsc{a}}xd3 30.\texttt{\textsc{d}}xd3 \texttt{\textsc{w}}e3
The bishop on f8 enters the game and the struggle is over.

31.\texttt{\textsc{c}}xe5
Somewhat more tenacious is 31.\texttt{\textsc{f}}f2 \texttt{\textsc{c}}c5 32.\texttt{\textsc{h}}h2 \texttt{\textsc{f}}f3! 33.\texttt{\textsc{e}}e1 \texttt{\textsc{e}}e3!, though White finds himself in zugzwang and must suffer defeat. However, he chooses an instant death.

31...\texttt{\textsc{c}}c5 32.\texttt{\textsc{w}}xf7+ \texttt{\textsc{h}}h8 33.\texttt{\textsc{d}}d4 \\
\texttt{\textsc{w}}xd4 0-1
Chapter 22 - Feverish final years

62 Spanish Game
Oldrich Duras
Mikhail Chigorin
Nuremberg 1906 (6)
1.e4 e5 2.\(\mathcal{f}3\) \(\mathcal{c}6\) 3.\(\mathcal{b}5\) a6 4.\(\mathcal{a}4\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 5.0-0 \(\mathcal{e}7\) 6.\(\mathcal{e}1\) b5 7.\(\mathcal{b}3\) d6 8.c3 0-0 9.h3 \(\mathcal{a}5\) 10.\(\mathcal{c}2\) c5 11.d4 \(\mathcal{c}7\) 12.\(\mathcal{b}d2\)

Here we have a genuine pearl from Chigorin's legacy of openings. Nowadays, this position is continually encountered in competition of the very first rank. Analysis of it has been carried out by many theoreticians around the world. In the Soviet Union, this includes Rauzer, Panov, Boleslavsky and Furman. Chigorin also employed a similar opening set-up before this game, for example, against Lasker at London 1899 - but here \(\mathcal{c}3\) was played on the 6th move and d3 on the 8th, and the opening debate did not take place. The richness of ideas contained in Chigorin's conception was not at once realised. Some time already after his death, the system was considered bad, but subsequently it proved its worth and thereafter its reliability was never in doubt. Later analysis polished up Black's method of defence, making it more active.

Romanov: In Schiffer-Chigorin, 11th game, 6th match, St.Petersburg 1897, were played the following moves: 1.e4 e5 2.\(\mathcal{f}3\) \(\mathcal{c}6\) 3.\(\mathcal{b}5\) a6 4.\(\mathcal{a}4\) b5. 'On the way to the Chigorin system' would be how we might define the 'theme' of this game. Not a single chess player did so much for the resolution of the 'eternal' problem in chess - how to defend with black in the Spanish Game - as Chigorin. Chigorin's first significant achievement on this path was the system with \(\mathcal{c}d7\), neutralising the pressure on the e5-square and considerably tapering the sphere of activity of his king's bishop. In 1893, during the match with Tarrasch, where this plan received its baptism of fire, Chigorin played tens of games with this system.

However the system with \(\mathcal{c}d7\) forced Chigorin to go on a lengthy manoeuvring struggle, when White adopted the d4-d5 pawn advance. But Chigorin disliked these kinds of closed positions. And though in this struggle he was able to create counterchances on the queen's flank, and defended stubbornly and well, from the point of view of creative taste the positions he reached did not fully satisfy him.

In the 90s Chigorin patiently played many games with this line, but all this time his innovatory thoughts were on the search for other paths for Black. The first attempt resulted in the idea of a 'pawn storm' on the queen's flank and there appeared the plan with ...b7-b5 and ...\(\mathcal{b}7\), which Chigorin employed in the game against Schiffer which continued 5.\(\mathcal{b}3\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 6.0-0 d6 7.c3 \(\mathcal{e}7\) 8.d3 \(\mathcal{f}6\) 9.\(\mathcal{e}1\) 0-0 10.\(\mathcal{b}d2\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 11.\(\mathcal{f}1\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 12.\(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{d}8\) 13.\(\mathcal{g}5\) h6 14.\(\mathcal{c}3\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) 15.a4 \(\mathcal{g}6\), and in a series of other encounters from 1897-1900. Shortly afterwards, in the same year, Chigorin, as Black, finally formulated
his idea in a game against Lasker, played in the 14th round of the London international tournament 1899. In it were made these opening moves: 1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{d}f3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 3.\(\text{b}b5\) a6 4.\(\text{a}a4\) \(\text{f}f6\) 5.0-0 \(\text{e}e7\) 6.\(\text{c}c3\) b5 7.\(\text{b}b3\) 0-0 8.d3 \(\text{d}d6\) 9.\(\text{e}e3\) \(\text{a}a5\) 10.\(\text{c}c2\) c5 11.c3 \(\text{xb}3\) 12.axb3 \(\text{c}c7\). Although Chigorin lost on move 49, this position is just like a modern-day Spanish!

At first, the Chigorin system was given a hostile reception by the majority of "authorities". Gunsberg said, that "the defence is bad". This was echoed by Mieses: "I consider the whole manoeuvre unsatisfactory, since it gives the opponent enough time to achieve a positional advantage on the king's flank." Disagreeing with his critics, Chigorin wrote in one of his letters about the London tournament: "The English newspapers and magazines are full of news about the tournament, but as usual they include far more journalistic fantasy than chess truth. Here, for example, is what was written in the Morning Post by one of its columnists81 about the move 3...a6 in the Spanish Game (the game Lasker-Chigorin from the 1st round): "This move", said Lasker in one of his lectures, "is against the principles of play and leads to an unequal game. The present game shows the practical correctness of this opinion." For the reporters, obviously, later mistakes in the game do not exist; they turn their attention only to the first moves which necessarily should correspond with the "principles" of the infallible analytics and practice of Mr Lasker."

The invasion of the knight on d5 is more dangerous for Black. After 15.dxe5 dxe5 16.\(\text{c}d5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 17.exd5, the two bishops guarantee White the initiative.

15...\(\text{f}f6\) 16.d5

White goes over to a scheme of attack which was popular at this time. After closing the centre, he will launch an attack with the g- and h-pawns. In reply, Chigorin begins to prepare the advance ...f7-f5 – a method which even nowadays is considered to be the most effective.

16...\(\text{d}d7\) 17.g4 \(\text{g}6\) 18.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{g}7\) 19.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{c}4\) 20.\(\text{d}2\)

20...\(\text{b}6\)

Objectively stronger was the exchange of knights, since the position of the

81 The same Gunsberg — Isaac Romanov.
The knight on b6 is only a little better than that on a5. Chigorin, apparently, simply wants to avoid exchanges. After 20...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxd2}} and 21...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wd8}}, Black would impede the further advance of the g-pawn.

21.h4

A sharp conception, at the basis of which lies the correct idea of opening the h-file at the cost of a pawn.

21...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wd8}}! 22.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg2}}

Of course, not 22.g5 because of 22...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f6}}!, after which the initiative on the king's flank passes completely over to Black, e.g. 23.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd1}} fxg5 24.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxg5}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Exf2+}} followed by ...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wf8}}.

22...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Whxh4}}

Black makes a principal, though also risky decision. Never in the game is his position as dangerous as it is now.

23.f3?! 

Losing an important tempo for the attack. He should play at once 23.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah1}}, after which extremely dangerous for Black would be 23...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wxg4}} because of 24.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf3}}! when both king and queen are shown to be in danger. The strength of White's threats can be illustrated by the following variations: 24...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qe8?}} 25.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Exh7+}}! and 26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg5+}}; 24...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qc8}} 25.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah4}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wd7}} 26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh1!}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf6}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg5}}; 24...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf6}} 25.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wg1}} with the threat of 26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd1}}. It seems Black has to retreat the queen to d8, but then, after 24.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qdf1}}, he does not succeed in creating such strong counterplay on the dark squares as he obtains in the game.

23...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah6!}} 24.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah1}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wf6}}

An important moment. White decides not to make the further sacrifice – 25.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Exh6}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxh6}} 26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g5}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wxg5}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qc4}} – and his initiative abruptly decreases. Chigorin considered that he would repulse the attack by 27...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh4}} 28.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxb6}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh3+}} 29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf2}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh2+}} 30.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qe3}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wxg3}} 31.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxd7}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Exd8}} 32.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf6}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wf4+}} 33.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxe2}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wxf6}} 34.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxh6}} g5 followed by ...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg8-g6}}. However, after 35.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh1}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg8}} 36.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh3}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg6}} 37.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah1}}, the advantage remains with White.

Nevertheless Black has a defence: instead of 28...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wh3+}}, he should play 28...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qh3+}} and the white king is already shown to be in danger – 29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qf2}} (29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qh2}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg4+!}}) 29...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qb8}}. After 30.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wd2}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qg8}} or 30.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qe3}} f5 31.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxh6}} f4, Black seizes the initiative.

25.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ah3}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Wg7}}

Because of the threat 26...f5, White must move his king off the g-file, so losing yet another tempo.

26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Af2}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Af4}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qdf1}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Aae8}} 28.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qe3}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Ee7}}

A little uneasiness in the conduct of the strategical plan. Stronger was 28...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f6}}, since White could now, by means of
29...\textit{\textit{g}2}, force Black to exchange bishops at a not very favourable moment.

29.\textit{\textit{h}1} f6

30.\textit{\textit{g}2}

Bogoljubow mentioned that if 30.\textit{\textit{d}2} (to prepare \textit{\textit{g}1}) then 30...\textit{\textit{c}4!} 31.\textit{\textit{xc}4} bxc4 32.\textit{\textit{xf}4} exf4 33.\textit{\textit{e}2} g5! 34.e5 fxe5 35.\textit{\textit{xh}7+} \textit{\textit{xh}7} 36.\textit{\textit{xe}7} \textit{\textit{xh}7} 37.\textit{\textit{g}2} \textit{\textit{f}6} 38.\textit{\textit{d}1} \textit{\textit{e}8} etc., with the irresistible threat of ...e5-e4.

30...\textit{\textit{g}5!}

After this excellent move, Black can calmly prepare the breakthrough ...f6-f5. White has no counterplay whatsoever. After the exchange 31.\textit{\textit{xg}5} fxg5, Black's pressure on the f-file is decisive.

31.b3 \textit{\textit{xf}7} 32.\textit{\textit{e}3} \textit{\textit{e}7} 33.\textit{\textit{h}4?}

 Hastening the end, since, with the king on e3, the advance ...f6-f5 is carried out with particularly great force. He could put up a more stubborn resistance by 33.\textit{\textit{h}1} followed by \textit{\textit{h}1}.

33...\textit{\textit{xe}3+} 34.\textit{\textit{xe}3}

34...f5!

And so White has failed in his preparations to meet this breakthrough, as a result of which his position now literally falls to pieces. The rest is clear even without comments.

35.\textit{\textit{gx}f5} \textit{\textit{xf}5} 36.\textit{\textit{ex}f5} \textit{\textit{wg}5+} 37.\textit{\textit{e}2} \textit{\textit{b}xd} 38.\textit{\textit{e}1} \textit{\textit{w}e} 3+ 39.\textit{\textit{e}2} \textit{\textit{f}4} 40.\textit{\textit{h}2} \textit{\textit{xe}2} 41.\textit{\textit{xe}2} \textit{\textit{xc}3+} 42.\textit{\textit{f}2} \textit{\textit{d}4+} 43.\textit{\textit{g}2} \textit{\textit{g}7+} 44.\textit{\textit{g}6+} \textit{\textit{xg}6} 45.\textit{\textit{fxg}6} \textit{\textit{c}6} 46.\textit{\textit{xf}2} \textit{\textit{xf}3}

After 46...\textit{\textit{e}4} the end of the game would come even quicker.

47.\textit{\textit{xf}3} \textit{\textit{xf}3+} 48.\textit{\textit{xf}3} \textit{\textit{wc}3+} 49.\textit{\textit{e}4} \textit{\textit{xc}2+} 50.\textit{\textit{d}5} \textit{\textit{d}3+} 51.\textit{\textit{c}6} \textit{\textit{xg}6} 52.\textit{\textit{b}6} \textit{\textit{d}5+} 53.\textit{\textit{xc}5} \textit{\textit{ec}7+} 54.\textit{\textit{xd}5} \textit{\textit{ed}7+} 55.\textit{\textit{xe}5} \textit{\textit{we}8+} 56.\textit{\textit{f}4} \textit{\textit{f}7+} 57.\textit{\textit{g}3} \textit{\textit{we}3+} 0-1

63 \textit{Scandinavian Defence}

\textit{Mikhail Chigorin}

\textit{Siegbert Tarrasch}

\textit{Ostende 1907 (14)}

1.e4 \textit{\textit{d}5}

\textit{\textit{G}rekov}: Tarrasch, over the course of many years, repeated a countless number of times that the King's Gambit was 'incorrect' and that Black should accept the gambit or decline it with 2...\textit{\textit{d}5}, obtaining the better game. However, in his encounters with Chigorin, this spokesman of the 'scientific' in chess nearly always preferred to 'seek shelter'
in the French, Sicilian or Scandinavian Defences.

2. exd5 \textit{W}xd5 3. \textit{Q}c3 \textit{W}a5 4. \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}f6 5. d4 \textit{Q}g4

Contemporary theory recommends to find out at once the intentions of the bishop on g4 by playing 6.h3. After 6...\textit{Q}xf3 7.\textit{W}xf3, White has a rich choice of promising plans, and, after 6...\textit{Q}h5, it considers favourable for White Lasker’s variation 7.g4 \textit{Q}g6 8.\textit{Q}e5 c6 9.h4 \textit{Q}bd7 10.\textit{Q}c4.

6. \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}c6 7. \textit{Q}e3 0-0-0
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Black has positioned his forces quite successfully and threatens to still further increase the pressure in the centre after ...e7-e5. Chigorin plays the move recommended by Duras, which uses tactical means to eliminate the pressure on the d4-pawn.

8. \textit{Q}d2! \textit{Q}xe2

Retreating the bishop is less favourable: 8...\textit{Q}f5 9.\textit{Q}c4 \textit{W}b4 10.a3; 8...e6 9.\textit{Q}b3 \textit{W}b4 10.a3 \textit{W}d6 11.\textit{Q}b5 \textit{W}d5 12.0-0 a6 13.c4 \textit{W}f5 14.\textit{Q}c3.

9. \textit{W}xe2

In this capture lies Duras’ idea. The d4-pawn cannot be taken – 9...\textit{Q}xd4 10.\textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}xd4 11.\textit{Q}b3; also 9...e5 cannot be played because of 10.\textit{Q}c4 \textit{W}b4 11.dxe5! \textit{Q}xe5 12.\textit{Q}xe5 \textit{W}xb2 13.0-0 \textit{W}xc3 14.\textit{Q}xf7. The game will now assume a quiet positional character.

9...\textit{e}6 10. \textit{Q}b3 \textit{W}f5 11.0-0-0 \textit{Q}d6

Deserving attention is 11...\textit{Q}b4, with the aim of preparing ...\textit{e}6-\textit{e}5, by preventing \textit{d}5 after this move.

12.h3
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12...\textit{Q}a5

Tarrasch goes against his own principles, offering an exchange of knights, the position of which, on b3, he considered to be very bad. Of course, without any particular risk, Black, by playing 12...h5, could prevent White seizing space on the king’s flank.

\textit{Tarrasch:} In order to obtain the a5-square for his queen, which, though it occupies an open line, has no move.

13.\textit{g}4 \textit{Q}xb3+ 14.\textit{axb}3 \textit{W}a5 15. \textit{Q}b1 \textit{Q}d5 16. \textit{Q}a4

White avoids the exchange of knights, since the knight on d5 is about to be dislodged from the centre after 17.\textit{Q}d2 and c2-c4.

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

16...\textit{Q}xe3?
The critical moment of the struggle. Black voluntarily exchanges his centralised knight for the passive $e_3$. To crown the misfortune of this exchange, it strengthens White's position in the centre and opens the f-file for him. After 16...c6! Tarrasch would have retained a solid position, control over the $f_4$-square and the possibility of the break ...e6-e5.

17.fxe3 h5 18.$h_f1$ $d_f8$ 19.e4

Of course, it is pleasant for White to play such a position. He has the possibility of playing in the centre (e4-e5 or d4-d5) and then on one of the flanks. Meanwhile, Black is obliged to concern himself with the defence of his weaknesses, without any particular chances of creating active counterplay. Now he must transfer the queen to the king's flank – 19.$g_g5$, in order to try to isolate the relatively weak pawns on h3 and $g_4$. Instead of this, with a careless move, he not only weakens the e6-pawn, but also gives the opponent the opportunity to cut off his queen from the king's flank.

19...f6?

Tarrasch: On 19...hxg4 would follow 20.e5 $e_7$ 21.$x_g4$, when White threatens not only to take the g-pawn but also to gain the advantage by a rook sacrifice on f7.

20.$d_5!$ $e_8$ 21.$x_h5$ exd5 22.$g_4+$ $b_8$ 23.$x_d5$ $b_4$ 24.$c_3$

Tarrasch: White now has an extra pawn, and even if his pawn formation does not have great attacking power, it is still an advantage which can be favourably exploited, since, above all, he still has the attack.

24...$e_5$ 25.$a_2$

25.$x_g7$ deserved attention.

25...$f_8$ 26.$f_d1$ $d_6!$

26...$f_7$ would be a mistake because of 27.$d_d7$, whereupon Black cannot capture the h-pawn because of the threatened mate on d8.

27.$c_3$ a6

White has positioned his pieces well and seized the d-file, but to speak of it as a clear advantage would at this stage be premature. Black has counterplay, especially on the weakness of the pawns on e4 and h5. With the rooks on e8 and $h_8$, Black can attack the h5-pawn by
placing the queen on f7 and the bishop on e5, or the e4-pawn by placing the queen on e7. Over the next six moves, Kharbin tries to transfer the knight to d3 or exchange one of the rooks.

28...e2 Wf7! 29.d1d4 d6 30.xe5 xg5

Tarrasch: It was probably better to again play 32.d5. Then 33.xd7 was not to be feared since Black could attack the e3-pawn by 33...Wxh5.

33.d5

White has not strengthened his position with this series of moves, and, after the retreat of the rook to e7, followed by ...d8, it is doubtful whether he would manage to obtain the advantage for organise active operations on the queen’s flank.

33...e5

After this exchange, Black deprives himself of counterplay and White can immediately transfer the knight to the ideal d3-square.

34.d5 e5 35.ed5 Wd7 36.d4!

Wd2 37.d3

After 37.Wxg7 d8, White, to avoid worse trouble, would have to allow perpetual check by 38.d5 We1+.

82 Here Black might try to play for the win after 39.xa2 Wxe4 40.xe5 Wxg5. However, a draw would arise from 38.xd3 dxd3 39.xe5 fxe5 40.xd3 dxd3 41.xa2 Wxh5+ etc.

37.d8

Black tries to hold the position by tactical means.

38.d2

Tarrasch: 38.xe5 would again allow perpetual check.

38...We5 39.d4

Tarrasch: Of course not 39.Wxg7? because of 39...dxd3 etc.

39.Wb5 40.d4

Tarrasch: 40.xe5 Wxe5 would increase Black’s drawing chances.

40...d7 41.d4!

By attacking the a7-square, White creates the threat of 42.h6 gxh6 43.f6+ followed by mate.

41.d4 42.d7 43.d6 We8 44.Wg3

Though Black, as before, keeps the e4-pawn under attack, the situation has clearly changed in White’s favour. He has successfully regrouped his forces and now once again creates the threat of 44.h6. To repulse this, Black must allow an exchange of rooks and the g7-pawn for the h5-pawn.

44...Wb5 45.d5 Wxg7 46.d6 Wxg7

Wxh5 47.Wg4

There follows a technical phase of the game, and the win for White is already only a question of time.

47...Wxh6 48.h4 Wd2 49.h5 d3

50.d3 f5 51.b4

339
51...\textit{b6}
Now Black has created a weak square on \textit{c6} and White still further improves his position by obtaining, in addition to a passed h-pawn, an attack on the king.
\textit{Bogoljubow}: This weakens the king's position. He could have put up a longer resistance by the waiting move 51...\textit{\texttt{a8}}.

52.\textit{\texttt{w}g4} \textit{\texttt{b}7} 53.\textit{\texttt{e5}!} fxe5 54.\textit{\texttt{w}e4+} \textit{\texttt{b}8}

55.\textit{\texttt{d}xe5!}
The invasion of the knight on \textit{c6} promises White more advantage than securing the advance of the passed pawn. But, besides the threat of 56.\textit{\texttt{c}6+}, White threatens the transfer of the knight to \textit{f7} or \textit{g4}. Therefore Black has no choice.

55...\textit{\texttt{w}d1+} 56.\textit{\texttt{a}2} \textit{\texttt{xh}5} 57.\textit{\texttt{c}6+} \textit{\texttt{b}7}
After 57...\textit{\texttt{c}8}, White wins the bishop:
58.\textit{\texttt{w}f5+} \textit{\texttt{b}7} 59.\textit{\texttt{d}8+} \textit{\texttt{b}8} 60.\textit{\texttt{e}6}.

58.\textit{\texttt{a}5+} \textit{\texttt{c}8} 59.\textit{\texttt{w}f5+} \textit{\texttt{d}8}
\textit{Tarrasch}: After 59...\textit{\texttt{b}8}, the bishop would again be captured by 60.\textit{\texttt{c}6+} followed by 61.\textit{\texttt{d}8+} and 62.\textit{\texttt{e}6}.

60.\textit{\texttt{c}6+} \textit{\texttt{e}8}

61.\textit{\texttt{w}c8+}
\textit{Grigor}: It was possible to win a piece by 61.\textit{\texttt{e}5} followed by \textit{\texttt{f}3}, but Chigorin prefers to take the pawns. In practice this is not worse.

61...\textit{\texttt{f}7} 62.\textit{\texttt{w}xc7+} \textit{\texttt{g}8} 63.\textit{\texttt{w}xb6}
The rest is simple.

63...\textit{\texttt{w}f7+} 64.\textit{\texttt{a}3} \textit{\texttt{w}f3+} 65.\textit{\texttt{c}3} \textit{\texttt{w}f1}
66.\textit{\texttt{w}d4} \textit{\texttt{f}6} 67.\textit{\texttt{w}d5+} \textit{\texttt{f}8} 68.\textit{\texttt{b}3} \textit{\texttt{w}e2} 69.\textit{\texttt{b}8} \textit{\texttt{g}7} 70.\textit{\texttt{d}7} \textit{\texttt{w}f1}
71.\textit{\texttt{w}d6} \textit{\texttt{g}5} 72.\textit{\texttt{e}5} \textit{\texttt{f}6} 73.\textit{\texttt{w}d7+} \textit{\texttt{h}6} 74.\textit{\texttt{w}d3} \textit{\texttt{g}1} 75.\textit{\texttt{h}3+} \textit{\texttt{g}7}
76.\textit{\texttt{w}g4+} \textit{\texttt{w}xg4} 77.\textit{\texttt{w}g4}
and Black resigned on the 94th move.

An excellent positional game. Tarrasch set up a solid defence, but Chigorin displayed fine, skilful positional manoeuvring and perfect technical realisation of his advantage.
Epilogue

In June 1914, a month before the outbreak of the World War, Chigorin’s remains were transferred from Lublin to St. Petersburg and buried in the cemetery of Novodevichy monastery. In all, eight people followed the coffin, not everyone going as far as the cemetery. This was the final tribute to the great chess player by his contemporaries.

Many years passed. Chess made great progress, others acquired knowledge, technique, mastery of fashionable openings. But it is modern chess players who are most appreciative of Chigorin, as they are able to estimate at true value his great contributions to the treasured ancient game.

Particularly significant – in both variety and durability – are the contributions of M.I. Chigorin to opening theory. And this is all the more astonishing in that Chigorin himself was by no means universal in the openings, while several systems which he quite often employed, e.g. in the Italian Game, French Defence (and even his system with $2.\textit{Nc}3$), in our view, are not particularly in accordance with his style. But, none the less, Chigorin’s ideas lie at the basis of such contemporary opening systems as the Slav Defence, the Nimzowitsch Defence, the Spanish Opening, the King’s Indian Defence, and sometimes find themselves applied in those openings for which Chigorin did not intend them. Without doubt, under the influence of Chigorin’s methods of struggle against the mobile pawn centre were born such popular systems now as the Alekhine Defence, Grünfeld Defence, Cambridge Springs Defence. And even the outline of the so-called Marshall Attack in the Spanish Game was drawn several years before its first application in the famous game Capablanca-Marshall. And the Chigorin Defence to the Queen’s Gambit – this was a whole and original chapter of opening theory. Chigorin was so far ahead of his time in understanding the openings, that many of his ideas received recognition only after his death. So it happened with the famous Chigorin system in the Spanish Game, while positions in the ‘Scheveningen’ variation were brilliantly played by Chigorin as long ago as 1881; the well-known modern position in the Caro-Kann ($4...\textit{Nf}6$ with subsequent queen’s side castling), which was time and again met in the 1969 World Championship match, appeared in the games Chigorin-Von Popiel and Chigorin-Cohn as far back as 1902, and was decided by quite modern methods.

Chigorin contributed valuable ideas, which were ahead of their time, also to the middlegame. Blockade of the pawn centre, sacrifice of a pawn for the initiative, a concrete approach to making a decision in a position – all these are seen clearly in Chigorin’s games. Amongst his games are both those in which he convincingly demonstrated the strength of the two bishops, and, no less convincingly, where the knight triumphed. In each position he tried to understand precisely its distinctive features.
Mikhail Chigorin, the Creative Chess Genius

Also in the endgame, when there were still no reference books and fundamental analyses, Chigorin was, in great part, a pioneer, creating standards of intricate work to convert to victory an advantage which seemed insignificant to his contemporaries.

Chigorin was particularly strong in endgames where rooks were left on the board, whether a simple rook endgame or a complicated one with minor pieces.

Striking traces of the creative work of Chigorin remain in all three stages of the game.

Readers will see in the pages of this book the traits of both the chess player Chigorin and the man Chigorin, and we dare hope that they will find in him much that is constructive and useful for themselves. This is why Russian chess players honour the memory of Chigorin. Chess clubs bear his name, tournaments are dedicated to his memory, books are written about him...

But the most worthy monument, which is 'not of human making' and which Chigorin erected himself - is his inexhaustible creative legacy, the storehouse of his ideas.

These are alive even today...
Part Two

Mikhail Chigorin
His Friends, Rivals and Enemies

by Vasily Panov

Featuring over 150 annotated games
Chapter 1

From the thicket of the people

There could hardly be such a famous man, about whose childhood, youth and early career so little is known, as that of Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin. It is clear that Chigorin himself, even in the bloom of fame, did not like to recall his difficult past, did not want to open hardly cauterised mental wounds, and did not share memories even with close friends.

Chigorin has every right to be called a proletarian by hereditary. The grandfather of Chigorin, a soldier of the age of Alexander I, was appointed into service at the Okhtensk gunpowder works. His son, father of the great chess player, Ivan Ivanovich Chigorin, after finishing pyrotechnical school, went to work in the same factory as a master and was employed there for 22 years – up to his very death in 1859.

About the second of his wives, the mother of the chess player, Natalia Egorovna, I know nothing.

Mikhail Ivanovich was born in the Okht region of St. Petersburg, 31 October 1850, old style, or 12 November 1850, new style. He soon was left without a father or mother. His mother died when Misha was six years old, his father, when his son was still not yet nine. The stepbrother of Misha, Peter Chigorin, was already working at the Okhtensk gunpowder works, and with help from its administration got Mikhail Ivanovich into the Gatchinsk Orphans Institute.

Established in 1803, in the capacity of the Rural Foundling Hospital, in 1837, the Institute was changed into a middle closed educational institution (a sort of legal school) ‘for the education of sons of military over-officers and civil servants up to 9th class exclusively,’ i.e. for orphans of petty officials and officers. The education of the children prepared them for office duties and as future trustworthy ‘servants of the Czar’, unquestioning, pure Akakiev Akakievich! According to the programme, the students ought to be studying mathematics, chemistry, physics, geography, history, French and Latin language, Russian literature and ‘the law of god’, being at this time a very obligatory subject – with future political loyalties hallmarked in stone. The old teachers in the Czarist high schools will tell you how important it was before the revolution for students to receive a high grade, at least a ‘4’, in ‘the law of god’. Otherwise this would represent real failure and be an ominous foreboding of future trouble. Indeed such a very poor debut in life at times led directly to ‘transposition to the endgame’ – exclusion from the high school with a ‘wolf’s passport’. Yet, at this fanatical time, Chigorin contrived to receive only a year’s ‘3’ in this very important subject, which of course bore witness to a lack of piety.

Yes! The young Chigorin did not find it easy to believe in the good god and even displayed purely superficial religiousness. The nine-year-old at once became enveloped in very gloomy domestic conditions, similar to that which was described
in such a lively way in Pomyalovsky's *Essay on a Seminary*. As appears from its official title, the Gatchina Nikolayevsky Orphans Institute bears the name of the state executioner of Nicholas I, whose furious favourite was the discipline of the cane. Or even the unfailing weekly thrashing with the birch in the punishment cell. The food was abominable (watery soup, stale porridge, rancid butter, mouldy bread). All this accompanied the daily routine in a system which encouraged provocative fault finding and humiliation of the students by the Institute authorities. In this respect, the director, Dolivo-Dobrovolsky, particularly distinguished himself, as did the master Ignatius. Of course, all this shocked the nervous system of the pupils and undoubtedly had a telling effect on the future life of M.I. Chigorin and on his sporting staying power during chess competitions.

It should be mentioned, however, from time to time you would find amidst the teachers, as they said in those days, a 'shining' personality. In the obituary of the educator P.M. Zeidler it was said 'Thanks to him, in the Institute there was a cessation of corporal punishment and the handing over of pupils to soldiers, for the least offence. This heightened the students' interest in knowledge, so that some of them went on to higher educational institutions.'

And thanks to another class supervisor -- the teacher of German language, Schuman, the game of chess became the favourite and probably the only cultural entertainment of the students. Many gave up secret drinking and gambling games, which flourished in the almost prison-like atmosphere of the Orphans Institute, and took up chess instead.

V. Malachi, in the magazine *Historical Herald* for 1912, remembered Schuman in this way:

'See, what happens, the pupils call to each other in the break.
What are we going to do?
And, as if at the wave of a wand, appears a chess board and the teacher and pupil endeavour to beat one another.'

Schuman acquainted the 16-year-old Chigorin with the basic rules of the game, awakened in him a passionate interest in chess, and it must be said -- to his own disadvantage! Schuman himself played very weakly and soon came to receive from Chigorin a rook start, since already he could not compete with him on equal terms, even though, apparently, both teacher and pupil had no idea either of openings or of typical combinations and middlegame manoeuvres, or of endgame technique. But precisely because the teacher and pupil were equally unsuited in chess science, Chigorin's exceptional natural talent gave him an overwhelming advantage over Schuman.

Chess became both the delight of Mikhail and a means to cope with the oppression. We are reminded of those prisoners in the Czar's prison cells, who communicated the moves by tapping to one another when playing blindfold chess games.
Chapter 2

The Director makes a mistake, but...

The proud, passionate, freedom-loving nature of Chigorin could not be reconciled to the barbaric regime of the Institute in which, apparently, even the lessons were delivered wretchedly. In 1863 there was a change from five-year education in the Institute to seven years, but this did not improve the situation. It is sufficient to say that such a gifted youth as Misha Chigorin, installed in the Institute from the age of eight, fully completed only four years in the upper school. From the fifth year, the 17-year-old Chigorin was excluded for his participation in a riot by the pupils. The trouble started after the students had gone to the master Ignatius and filed a collective protest against the constant humiliation and the bad food. The protest was turned down. On the following day, one of the pupils demonstrably refused to kiss the hand of a priest after divine service, for which he was immediately placed in the prison cell. But when the delegation of classmates went to the director to petition for their comrade, Dolivo-Dobrovolsky responded with the serious threat to hand them over to the soldiers. The patience of the youths was exhausted, and the director was beaten unmercifully until he lost consciousness – ‘in the dark’, since the kerosene lamp had been wisely cleared away at the start of this spontaneous outburst.

So the deed was done, which in the immemorial times of Nikolayevsky could have led to a sad end for the youths. For example, there was an analogous historical precedent given by Lev Tolstoy in Cadet’s Cloister: ‘For an insignificant wound of a penknife, inflicted by a student on a professor, on the decision of the Czar, the student was led twenty times “through the system”, which meant a slow, agonising death.’ But at the moment of the riot in the Gatchina Orphans Institute, the political situation in Russia was changing. Nicholas I had long since died, while defeat in the Crimean War evoked the growth of a mood of opposition in the country, which compelled his successor Alexander II to start on the road to bourgeois reforms. The violence against pupils of the orphanage would be roundly condemned by public opinion. Therefore the pedagogical investigation commission, not wishing to expose the brutality reigning in the Institute, nor to wash its dirty linen in public, tried to hush up the affair. After interrogating all the pupils of the 5th and 6th classes, who displayed uncommon steadfastness and unanimity, the director was retired due ‘to ill health’ while the seven pupils, amongst whom was Mikhail Chigorin, were expelled from the Institute. However, each ‘rebel’ was given a certificate, indicating the completion of his education and the right to enter a job without relying on the examination in force at the time, on a lower grade and with the ‘mutually agreed sum’ of 60 roubles, apparently in return for saying nothing about the sombre, provoked riot. It is to be supposed that both sides – both the administration of the Institute and the pupils – breathed a sigh of relief when the whole business was hushed up.
interesting to note that according to the certificate given to Chigorin, he had an excellent '5' in algebra and geometry, but a poor '2' in Russian language! I have already recalled his '3' in 'the law of god.'

The 17-year-old Chigorin, after leaving the Institute, was given accommodation by his aunt (the sister of his late father), Fekla Ivanova, who had a small house on the outskirts of St. Petersburg.

What exactly Mikhail Ivanovich was doing for the next three years is unknown. My guess is that he made do with casual earnings, while free hours were given over to reading and self-education, since it is difficult otherwise to imagine how the poverty-stricken, semi-literate youth, in a few years time, could develop into a versatile, cultured man, a public spirited figure with a keen interest in the fate of his country, and a passionate writer, aware of the power and significance of the printed word for promoting his favourite pursuit.

At the end of 1871, Chigorin, who had still not reached full legal age, succeeded in obtaining a permanent job 'working for a head of a department'. But Chigorin did not make a success of his bureaucratic career, in fact it seems he did not pursue it in the least, considering this position only as a possibility after a working day to give himself up to chess. After being in service for eleven and a half years, Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin resigned in the rank of governor's secretary, i.e. in all those years he remained only a petty office worker. As we will see later, a great part of the insignificant salary Chigorin received in the last few years before resigning, he spent on the publication of a loss-making chess magazine. Of course, Chigorin's first wife, Olga Petrovna, was very displeased with all this. He married her at the end of the 1870s, had a daughter, but, after some time, the wife, not coping with her continual needs, left him, taking away the child. The future relationship with the husband was limited to the estranged wife sending to her husband bills for payment - an original form of alimony. Chigorin's second marriage, coming considerably later, also failed. And chess, to which Chigorin selflessly gave himself, took the place of everything to him!

A plaque on the wall of the Gatchina Orphanage reads 'In this building from 1859-1868 studied the great Russian chess player and founder of the native chess school Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin'
Chapter 3

Only age old quiet

For a young chess player of our day, accustomed to the mighty wingspan of Soviet chess sport, to thousands of spectators at the USSR championships and matches for the World Championship, to tens of thousands of participants in mass Union and Republic competitions, the scale of pre-revolutionary chess life must seem pitiful. The more so in the 1870s, when Chigorin took his first timid steps in the capacity of a novice chess player.

Indeed, the number of organised amateurs of chess — members of chess clubs and societies — was then estimated only at tens of people.

The first Russian chess club, which opened 27 March 1853 in the house of a rich patron, Count Kushelev-Bezborodko, who did much for both Russian literature and for chess, was reckoned to have fewer than 100 members. Amongst these were such famous names as Tolstoy, Turgeniev, and such outstanding chess specialists as Petrov, Urusov, Shumov, and B. Mikhailov. Besides a few professional chess players, the club was mainly visited by important officials, soldiers, representatives of St. Petersburg aristocracy. However, their interest in the game gradually cooled and at the end of 1860 the club closed.

The significance of this club lay in the fact that it was the first Russian chess organisation, and it is precisely from 1853 one has to reckon the jubilee date of the native chess movement. Another merit of the club was the fact that its highly qualified chess players had drafted a carefully thought out and edited New Chess Manual — the first Russian chess code — and in the course of 1859-1863 published a magazine called Chess Sheet.

The 'Society of Chess Amateurs' remained in existence for only half a year, after opening in January 1862 and gaining only a few dozen members. It was closed by the St. Petersburg Governor General because, in the club, alongside the playing of chess, discussions were taking place on current public affairs of this time. Frequent visitors to the club were the leader of the Russian democratic revolution, N.G. Chernishevsky, and other progressive activists. But it would be a mistake to conclude that the insignificant number of members of this or other Russian clubs reflected a low level of chess culture in Russia of the 19th century, or of the lack of interest in chess in the country. Of course, it is impossible to compare those days with the number of our present socialist societies, estimated at two and a half million organised chess players, but it is possible to boldly maintain that the number of chess amateurs in Czarist Russia was not less than any other country of that time and considerably more than in our contemporary capitalist chess unions. Even now, for example, under the present International Chess Federation, the USA is reckoned to have a total of 3,000 organised chess players, in France — 2,000, in
Only less than 1,500, in Austria 3,500, etc. while, you know, in the 19th century these were considered leading countries in respect of chess.

At the end of the 1870s, in Berlin, there were two chess clubs. In one – 64 chess players, in the other – 28. In Vienna, Paris, London, the number of chess club members fluctuated from 100 to 120.

Amongst the Russian intelligentsia of the 19th century, there were an estimated 19,000 chess amateurs. Not by chance, though also purely spontaneously, there emerged a series of chess players of international class, such as Petrov, Shumov, the Urusov brothers, Winawer, Jaenisch, Alapin, Asharin, Beskrovny, Klements, Salovtsov, Khardin and many others.

But the fact of the matter is that chess in Czarist Russia, before the appearance of Chigorin, was only a chamber, society game, conducted either in tight circles of people who knew each other, or in ‘coffee-house’ play, where professionals practised in a small world, playing for a stake in a café against well-to-do ‘amateurs’. Chess did not appear, as it does today, as an international sport and represented only a distant sphere of national culture.

Of course, also telling was the hostile regard of the Czarist government to any form of public unification, as seen by the closing of the chess club in 1862 and the refusal to allow Chigorin to organise an All-Russia Chess Union – as well as dozens of other such projects.

As a consequence of the salon or ‘coffee-house’ character of play, it is only natural that its public authority was undermined and that the very character of the game deservedly made fun of, as in Alexander Kuprin’s well-known story ‘Marabou’. Kuprin chose to liken chess players to the Marabou Stork in his 1909 short story, which was based on the legendary Warsaw Café of turn-of-the-century Kiev.

But, to Chigorin belonged the great merit of understanding the game of chess in the eyes of Russian society, as a high art, and taking it out of the confines of private homes and cafés onto the beaten track of Russian and international competitions.

Chigorin himself was aware of the weak organisation of Russian chess life and set himself the task of putting things right, and also expressed his views in print. On reading the fragments from magazine articles by Chigorin given below, in relation to 1885, it is of course necessary to take into account the prevailing conditions of censorship, as a consequence of which he, as also any other progressive journalist of that time, was forced to resort to the language of Aesop.

‘There exists the widespread, firmly established opinion’, wrote Chigorin, ‘that in Russia, compared to Western European countries, Germany, Austria, France, particularly however England and the United States of America, we have an insignificant number of chess amateurs. And, to the point, seeing the open, lively and brilliant chess life in the West – in contrast to the insurmountable listlessness and deadness of the various phenomena of chess life in Russia –, coming to such a conclusion is not surprising.

82 In 1963.
But whether this conclusion is true or not is another question. Chess has been known to Russians since olden times and it would be astonishing to suppose that there are no chess players in Russia. It is easily possible that there are sufficient chess players in Russia, and even more than sufficient, but only a few chess players who are not ashamed to play publicly. Whether or not it happens, you observe how the Russian chess player does not like to play in person, publicly, and how he considers himself in the event of play, forever inviolably in disgrace.

From here we characterise the difference between Russian and foreign chess players. The latter, schooled in the development of public life, are not ashamed when they are called upon to study chess publicly, to test their skill without restraint, to take up theory, books — and all of this, of course, for their own pleasure, in moments of leisure, whereas our chess player avoids any publicity, playing only in his own secluded corner. The absence in our chess life of a public character does not fail to have an influence on our chess literature, in that we meet almost exclusively a land of ill-considered publications... But the absence of public life in our chess activities and the lack of chess literature does not indicate to us any lack of chess players at all. Those who would seriously defend the above thoughts, about the comparatively large number of chess players in Western Europe, would be shown their very ignorance of the facts. The chess players there are perhaps no more than we have, but they are all visible, all act publicly.

After describing the activity of foreign chess players, Chigorin posed the question: 'The picture of chess life in the West comes out as in no way brilliant, striking What, however, of us in Russia — only "age old quiet".'

Chigorin took this expression from his favourite poet Nekrasov. Nine years later, in 1894, he presented in another article the stanza of Nekrasov fully:

In the capital noise, thunder of orators
In full swing, war of words
But there in deep Russia
There, age old quiet.

... and replied to the question himself in this way: 'We have full basis to remain with our assertion that the absence among Russian chess players of public spirit hides the true essence of the matter, the true regard of the Russian man to our noble game.'

'In community work, increasing tenfold the strength of individual persons', Chigorin wrote further,'is something wonderfully attractive. Matches, competitions, tournaments and cooperation in chess matters, makes for a sharing of knowledge and enjoyment, and in this way members of chess societies find that connection, which is not easy to tear asunder. Furthermore, by engaging with lively forms of chess life in foreign countries, is provided a guarantee of stability.

Is this the answer to our question?' — was Chigorin's conclusion.
Chapter 4

To the sound of billiard balls

Running ahead a little, I shed light on those ideas and attitudes which troubled the young chess player Mikhail Chigorin. When, at the beginning of the 1870s, he had the possibility of giving himself up to his beloved game in the evenings, he saw it lacked appropriate conditions for serious, creative play. The St.Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs, founded in 1869 and whose ‘president’ was Shumov, had its premises near the town. Later on they joined ranks, in the capacity of a chess club, with the ‘German Assembly’, otherwise known as the ‘Schusterklub’, which united the foreign merchants of the Russian capital and provided them with a separate large room.

However, the sedate and luxurious conditions of the Schusterklub had a depressing effect on the ‘admission’ there of Russian chess amateurs – minor office workers, journalists, artists and every sort of representative of Bohemian St. Petersburg. They felt like uninvited guests, intruding into a distinctly foreign settlement, a jackdaw in peacock’s feathers.

Russian chess players were also admitted into the English club, the chess champion of which was Mr. Field, a rather weak player. In 1874 he lost a match to Schiffer by the score of -4 +1.

More willingly, the St.Petersburg chess players went to a location in the centre of town on Nevsky Prospekt, the ‘Dominic’ restaurant, named after its first Swiss owner, Dominic Ritz-à-Port. There, in addition to drinking and eating, visitors were allowed the possibility to play a little billiards, dominoes, draughts and chess. Here, the cost of playing chess per hour was 20 kopeks – a high price at that time.
Thus, in order to play throughout the evening – 5 hours, it would be necessary to pay a rouble, while the salary of a petty bureaucrat at this time ranged from 25 to 50 roubles. In the middle of the 1870s, Chigorin, with a lengthy period of official service, received 50 roubles.

Therefore chess players overcrowding the Dominic restaurant were divided into two kinds: well-to-do chess amateurs for whom a few roubles for the evening was insignificant, and the professional chess players, playing against the clients for money stakes. The professional chess players were jokingly called ‘Dominicans’, their clients – ‘Dudes’, while the standard money stake was 25 kopeks – a franc, according to the contemporary correlation of Russian and French currency. However, at times the stake was higher, right up to several roubles for a game.

Of course, to play ‘at even’ was not interesting either for the Dudes or the Dominicans. The first would lose in a few minutes, without any struggle, to their skillful opponent and then the so costly pleasure would scare them away from playing in the café. The Dominicans knew this only too well. But, you know, each of them would be interested in securing for himself a regular partner, even if weak, but who would willingly pay for a game with an expert. Indeed, also purely sporting ambition forced the Dominicans to strive for a game with approximately even chances. Therefore – not only in Russia, but also in the whole world – in the 19th century, indeed even earlier, playing for money stakes between opponents of different strength stimulated the giving of odds at the start.

At this time, there were no players bearing the official title of master and grandmaster, while the strongest chess players were called by the old Italian title of ‘master’, just like, for example, musicians or singers.

In St.Petersburg and Moscow, chess players were divided into five categories to denote strength of play. Usually the following odds were adopted. Chess players of the first category, the very strong, gave odds to second category of pawn and move, i.e. they were obliged to play with black and without their f7-pawn. Chess players of the third category received from first category odds of pawn and two moves, i.e. they gave the opponent the white pieces and two moves at the start, and removed their f7-pawn. However, a chess player of the fourth category was obliged to play against first category with black, but received in return the advantage of the queen’s knight. Chess players of the fifth category also played Black against first category, but received odds of a rook. The same proportion was kept in meetings between chess players of different categories. For example, a chess player of the second category gave a knight start to chess players of the fifth category; chess players of the third category gave to a chess player of the fourth category – pawn and move, etc. A queen start was given only to very weak, novice chess players.

This system was not only applied to individual games in the café but also whole tournaments played in a club, right up to the beginning of the 20th century. At that time there were very few qualified chess players and even fewer chess players of high categories, so that, for example, to hold a tournament of exclusively category players, even if only with ten players, was not possible. Therefore so-
called ‘handicap’ tournaments were organised. For example, there would play 3 first-category players, 4 chess players of second, 6 – 3rd, 5 – 4th, 2 – 5th category, and in accord with the above-mentioned ‘table of chess ranks’ each participant gave the possessor of a lower category appropriate odds. No wonder that such handicap tournaments at times finished with a chess player of 3rd or 4th category emerging in first place, outstripping very experienced 1st-category players. But usually, victory was still gained by the strongest, most experienced, most talented chess players.

Handicap tournaments went out of practice only at the beginning of the 20th century, firstly because of the appearance of a great number of chess players, which allowed the organisation of tournaments of chess players of equal strength, secondly because of the sharp rise in the standard of play and the growth of understanding of elementary opening strategy, thanks to which, giving odds of pawn and move or the more so! knight or rook, became simply impossible. However, play at stakes in our country was maintained right up to the creation of the centralised Soviet Chess Federation, while abroad it flourishes even today.

Even in the first years of the revolution, Moscow ‘Dominicans’ cultivated play at a stake, not disdainng any opponent. When I, a 14-year-old boy, in 1921, shyly entered the Moscow Chess Club, the grey-haired veteran G.A.Gelbak at once came running to me and suggested that we play at a stake, promising me a knight start. I was greatly dismayed, since it had not been suggested that I would play for money and I recalled that Gelbak was considered a strong 1st-category player of Chigorin’s time, but, after calculating my personal resources, I agreed to play. After several losses, at odds of a knight, and then at pawn and move, the discouraged ‘head hunter’ suggested to me that we play ‘on even terms’ and then the struggle passed with changed success. Nevertheless I went home with the winnings of several million roubles.

However, do not take me, dear reader, for a chess Munchausen, or Gelbak for the Count of Monte Cristo. ‘Millions’ then surprised nobody. At this time, on the eve of the appearance of the solid Soviet ‘gold’ rouble, there was wild inflation. With my winnings, I could buy neither a yacht, nor an automobile, but only make a limited purchase of a solid portion of ice cream and the old Teach Yourself Chess by Schiffer, while, incidentally, an issue of the magazine Chess in 1922 cost 2,500,000 roubles!

It is interesting that play at a stake predominated even in simultaneous exhibitions. In the 19th century a master did not receive a firm fee for an exhibition, even though each participant in the exhibition paid in two roubles. Everything depended on the skillful play of the participant, whether he was left crying over his money or having it returned to him, perhaps even with a profit. If the participant lost, the money went to the exhibitioner. If he made a draw then he got his money back. But if the master lost, then the participant in the exhibition not only received his money back but the exhibitioner paid him also as much again. Put more simply, the creative work of the master was not paid for entirely, he simply played for a stake not against one, but many opponents.

Such were the chess customs, flourishing in the jungle of Russian capitalist society, where even chess players were wolves to chess players!
Here, such a furious chase for 'francs' - 25 kopeks, such play for a stake on even terms with strong opponents or giving odds to weak players, under the slogan 'Purse or mate!' flourished in the Café Dominic in St.Petersburg at this time. Meanwhile the disinterested idealist severely censured any money-grubbing and sacrificed himself and everything else that was possible for the benefit of chess commerce. Mikhail Ivanovich became a regular visitor to this distinctive chess centre of the capital of Russia. This was in 1873. At first Chigorin was a habitué of the café, and categorised as a 'Dude', but very quickly he became one of the strongest 'Dominicans', though despising to the bottom of his heart these petty hack-workers and the very conditions of play with which he had to reconcile himself and which were utterly unsuitable for serious creative chess work:

'What strong nerves, what a hard head, a chess player had to have to play at the Dominic! If a famous player at times attributed the reason for his defeat on his mood or that he felt unwell, he would say so, or better still, that it was because they were playing in a stuffy, smoky atmosphere, amidst the noise of players of other games (dominoes, billiards). It is hard to imagine that playing in such unfavourable conditions would be a combination of correctness and grace.' But despite this, all the same the Dominic was more often visited than the chess club.

When the Dominic was closed for refurbishment in 1877, the chess players migrated to another restaurant. Shumov, in his lofty style, described both chess centres:

'A chess refuge has existed for many years in the Dominic café-restaurant, which has recently closed. The chess players, gathering there, finally had to abandon their favourite corner, and choose for themselves another battlefield; they acquired a room in the Prada restaurant, thanks to the fact that the owner himself is a great chess enthusiast. After their corner at the Dominic, an entire room has transported the chess players to no more, no less than the whole world. On the other hand their previous corner was far more animated; at times the billiard balls reached as far as the chess boards, while the continuous knocking from these and from the bones of the dominoes seemed like superficial fire, holding the battalion, and the whole of this noise was frequently drowned out by triumphal cries, resembling "Hurrah!", forever spreading dense smoke which prevented players from seeing the chess pieces and even the people - making it necessary first to wave away with their handkerchief, if not the smell of gunpowder, then - far worse. In general, it seemed as though a real battle was taking place. Now, in the new premises, the battle passes in silence, peculiar to chess players alone.'

Here, in such 'Dominican conditions', Chigorin developed his talent. But it is clear that these also shattered the nerves and health of the great chess player, not to mention the fact that the very playing of chess in the restaurant led to the use of spirits; in fact each chess player, imperceptibly, little by little, was drawn to its gradual use, the more so that it was partaken by them not as a simple pleasure, but as a drug, as they wanted to whip up themselves with alcohol.
Chapter 5

Difficult first step

Chigorin appeared in the chess arena at the beginning of the 1870s, in the rank of a very weak chess player, 5th category, but began to take part systematically in handicap tournaments, quickly advancing up the qualification ladder.

It is necessary to say that the handicap tournaments had both good and bad sides. For strong chess players of the 1st category, of course, to play, for example, without a knight or rook against a weak chess player was definitely harmful. He not only got used to the bad play of his opponent, but also the whole opening stage of the game had to be consciously developed incorrectly, i.e. not in accord with opening theory, while, in spite of this, stood his basic aim, to avoid any exchanges, confuse the opponent in a complicated position and then outplay him in a perplexing struggle. Indeed, the 1st category players also developed tactical resourcefulness and combinative gifts, but not in the creative sense, since, in a struggle against an opponent of equal strength, it would be along the lines of devising at times a cunning, sometimes naive, but always purely psychological trap. For example, supposedly putting a pawn or piece en prise. The tempted opponent joyfully took it, so that after a few moves he was subjected to a forced mate. The strong player could not even perfect his gambit play in handicap tournaments.

In return for the weak, but talented, fast improving chess player, the handicap provided an exceptional opportunity to encounter experienced, strong opponents, learning from them the mastery of combinations and accuracy of calculation, and in the course of practical play be convinced of the utility of the basic principles of chess strategy, such as the quick development of pieces, the importance of quick mobilisation of all forces and coordination of the activity of the pieces. Amateur chess novices of our time do not have such possibilities and cross swords with the masters only now and then in simultaneous exhibitions, and this is a far cry from one to one tournament games.

A contemporary of Chigorin, L.Velikhov, in his memoirs, witnessed the way that Chigorin 'saw particular benefit in handicap tournaments... The use of handicap tournaments for very weak players, who play with chances of success against strong chess players and gain experience from them, is obvious. 'I myself', wrote Velikhov, 'once upon a time played against Chigorin at rook and move, and later, subsequently went through all the categories (winning a prize gave the right for a promotion in qualification) – rising to first.'

For the reader, there naturally arises the question, where did the prize money come from, if play took place in a café, while the club was closed because of a lack of means. The reply is simple. Each participant of the handicap tournament was charged a tournament fee and out of it an overall sum was apportioned for several prizes. The winner of the tournament (if they were not first category) received prizes and went up to the next category. First-category players, naturally,
had better chances for chess earnings, while, for the remaining participants in the tournament, the fee was effectively paid for a chess lesson.

The same opportunity to practice with very strong chess players had amateurs playing for money also at odds. And though for a master it was neither satisfactory, nor beneficial to play against a weak opponent, the power of money in a capitalist society, unfortunately, was such that in place of competing in play against equal opponents, the leading chess players of the capital sat at the Dominic the whole evening, laying in wait for rich clients, like spiders, waiting until the fly gets tangled in its web.

The strongest St. Petersburg chess player in the 1860s was considered to be the one time Admiralty bureaucrat, Ilya Stepanovich Shumov. He was not only a sharp practical player, but also composed chess problems, which he usually furnished with lively comments expressed in verse. These problems of Shumov were called scaccographics, i.e. figurative, because the arrangement of the pieces in them reminded one of this or that topic or was a crude symbolisation of some kind of sensational political event. Shumov conducted a regular chess column in the popular magazine Universal Illustrated. In the course of many years this was the only printed organ which, though skimpy, nevertheless reflected the chess life of St. Petersburg, Moscow, the provinces, and the abilities of promising new talent. An example of a scaccographics composition of Shumov is shown later.

At the beginning of the 1870s, the place of Shumov was taken by the young mathematics teacher and, in fact, new champion of the Russian capital, Emanuel Stepanovich Schiffer, who was the same age as Chigorin and several years later became his continual rival. Schiffer came from a family in which everyone – father, mother, brothers, and sisters – played chess, and he himself, ever since childhood, had understood the rules of play and tirelessly practised it with his kinsfolk.

While Chigorin was still a 5th-category chess player, Schiffer was already playing at the strength of a master and knew, in the words of Shumov, ‘all chess theory like the Lord’s Prayer, Our Father...’ Indeed, he was a versatile, cultured connoisseur of theory, who later published the excellent, for its time, Teach Yourself Chess and contributed much to native chess literature. A man of enormous stature, imposing looks, an artist and linguist, chess journalist, translator of the chess manuals of Dufresne, which were very popular before the revolution, editor of columns in magazines and newspapers, a friend of chess youth – this is how E.S. Schiffer comes across in chess history.

When still a student, Schiffer acquired a reputation as an outstanding chess player, while at the beginning of the 70s he became a true ‘General of the Order of Dominicans’, an unsurpassed specialist at play at odds. As M.S. Kogan wrote: ‘Schiffer’s table in the restaurant was always surrounded by a dense crowd of people, looking on with satisfaction as Schiffer dealt his final blow by means of a decisive sacrifice.’ The veteran Shumov, who in 1872 was already over 50 years of age, could not withstand the young master for very much longer.

In the obituary of Schiffer that was published in the ‘Literary Supplement’ to Field in 1904, Chigorin characterised his late colleague in this way:
In St. Petersburg, Emanuel Stepanovich Schiffers was very well known for his practical play. His talent showed particularly in casual games – quick play. Many of his games played in the 1870s and 1880s were distinguished by no less sharp and beautiful combinations than his famous encounter with Harmonist, for which, in the international tournament at Frankfort, he was awarded a special prize for the most beautiful game.

It is clear that the young Chigorin, with his creative passion and ardent love of chess, from his very first steps, fell under the spell of the colourful figure of Schiffers and endeavoured to play only with this, at the time, strongest chess player of the Russian capital, in order to overtake and surpass him. At first Chigorin received from Schiffers odds of a rook, then knight, then pawn and move and, finally, began a play against Schiffers (and gain a victory!) on equal terms.

'Many times I overspent, paying Schiffers 25 kopeks for knowledge, and being left at times without even a slice of bread and butter', Chigorin later recalled, 'but successes came my way. I passionately loved and valued chess, and the first, far from lucky victory over the strongest player in Russia, was achieved by me with exceptional joy and predestined my fate.'

Up to 1874, Chigorin was already a chess player of the 2nd category and he entered the important handicap tournament of the St. Petersburg Chess Club. In it took part 15 chess players of all categories. In the 1st category were Shumov, Schiffers, Seskrovny and Petrovsky. This quartet gave chess players of the 2nd category (and, in particular, Chigorin) odds of pawn and move, 3rd category – knight, and the remaining participants – rook. It was played in two circuits. The first prize was won by Schiffers, the 2nd – Shumov, 3rd – Chigorin. In Universal Illustrated, Shumov published a game won by him against Chigorin and characterised his opponent in this way:

'Third prize was gained by the young 2nd-category chess player, who in a very short time had had brilliant success, and, to the astonishment of amateurs, growing old in the 5th category and still not long ago defeating him in play on equal terms, he joins battle with them now without a knight, and with players of the 1st category without concern.'

1 Nimzowitsch Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Ilya Shumov
St. Petersburg 1874
Notes by Yudovich
(Remove Black’s f7-pawn)
1.e4 Qc6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 Qf5 4.Qb5
Qd7 5.Qc3 e6 6.Qge2 Qe7 7.h4
a6 8.Qa4 h5 9.Qg5 Qh6 10.Qf4
Qf7 11.Qxe7 Qxe7 12.Qxc6+
Bxc6 13.f3

On 13.Qxh5 Black intended to castle queenside, and then set about winning the h4-pawn. Chigorin obviously feared this and avoids complications.

13...g5 14.Qxg5 Qxg5 15.Qce2
Qb8 16.b3 h4 17.Qd2 Qe7 18.Qg4
18.0-0-0 is dangerous in view of 18...Qa3+ 19.Qb1 Qxb3+! 20.axb3
Qxb3+ 21.Qc1 Qa3+ and Black has at least a draw. Correct was 18.Qf2.

18...Qg5
19.\textit{\textbf{g}}22?
But here this move is already weak. 19.\textit{\textbf{w}}c3 or 19.\textit{\textbf{w}}e3 \textit{\textbf{x}}c2 20.\textit{\textbf{c}}cl should have led to victory.

19...\textit{\textbf{x}}g4
Chigorin did not notice this simple move and immediately falls apart.

20.\textit{\textbf{e}}g1?
The bold counterattack 20.\textit{\textbf{g}}6!? would have led to great double-edged complications.

20...\textit{\textbf{d}}xf3 21.\textit{\textbf{w}}d3 \textit{\textbf{x}}g1 22.\textit{\textbf{w}}g6+ \textit{\textbf{d}}d7 23.\textit{\textbf{w}}xg4 \textit{\textbf{x}}e2 24.\textit{\textbf{d}}xe2 \textit{\textbf{h}}g8 25.\textit{\textbf{g}}6 \textit{\textbf{w}}g7 26.\textit{\textbf{h}}g1 h3 27.\textit{\textbf{w}}f4 h2

White resigned.

A book about Chigorin, and the first game in the book is one of his defeats. Isn't that strange? Not at all! Champions are not born, and each of them had to serve his apprenticeship. And as for losses, well, you need to know how to cope with these too...

This was the first game of Chigorin’s to appear in the press. So began the chess career of the future champion of Russia.

2 King’s Gambit Accepted

Mikhail Chigorin

A. Davidov

St. Petersburg 1874

Notes by: Panov

1.\textit{\textbf{e}}4 \textit{\textbf{e}}5 2.\textit{\textbf{f}}4 \textit{\textbf{e}}xf4 3.\textit{\textbf{f}}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}5 4.\textit{\textbf{c}}4 \textit{\textbf{g}}4 5.0-0

Now we have the famous Muzio Gambit, which over the course of a century captured the hearts of contemporary players with its beautiful and complicated variations. Though Black lags seriously behind in development after the win of the piece, he has rich defensive resources. It is not at all simple for White to develop an attack: to achieve victory he must display enterprise, daring and even real genius – as is shown for example in this game by the brilliant performance of the young unknown Chigorin.

5...\textit{\textbf{g}}xf3 6.\textit{\textbf{w}}xf3 \textit{\textbf{w}}f6

At first sight this move seems weak, since the queen serves as a convenient object of attack; however, at the same time, it is quite well-founded. The key to the position is the \textit{\textbf{f}}4-pawn; if White is allowed to gallop along, be develops a decisive attack on the \textit{\textbf{f}}7-square, and that is why the struggle revolves around the \textit{\textbf{f}}4-pawn. After the move...\textit{\textbf{w}}f6, White, of course, cannot take this pawn, since this would involve an exchange of queens in a position where he has sacrificed a piece.

7.\textit{\textbf{e}}5 \textit{\textbf{w}}xe5 8.\textit{\textbf{d}}3 \textit{\textbf{h}}6 9.\textit{\textbf{c}}3 \textit{\textbf{e}}7 10.\textit{\textbf{d}}2

The whole of this variation, the entire system of attack and defence, would in those days have been fashionable
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...studied as in our time has been the Orthodox Variation of the Queen's Gambit. It is appropriate to mention the lively analysis of this variation continued for a long time, even up to the beginning of the 20th century.

10...\(\text{c}c_6\) 11.\(\text{a}e_1\) \(\text{f}5\) 12.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}8\)

A complicated position. How should White proceed with the attack? For the moment, Black is managing to defend his position and, after ...d7-d6, ...\(\text{e}6\), ...\(\text{d}7\) and ...\(\text{ae}8\), threatens to obtain a winning position. If 13.\(\text{w}e2\), then...

\(\text{w}e6\) (! bad is 13...\(\text{xd}5\) 14.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) because of 15.\(\text{c}3\) etc.) and White must move his queen away. If 13.\(\text{xf}4\), then 13...\(\text{xf}4\) 14.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{d}6\) ...

As a consequence of this, Chigorin works out a complicated plan involving positional bind.

13.\(\text{c}3\)

\[\text{Diagram 1}\]

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

A very natural move, but not the best. Of course, 13...\(\text{xd}5\) cannot be played because of 14.\(\text{w}d5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 15.\(\text{f}6\)+. But both 13...\(\text{g}8\) and 13...\(\text{f}8\) are better rook moves.

14.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{g}5\)

But Black can return some of his extra material to defend the vulnerable f6-square by 15...\(\text{g}5\). After 16.\(\text{h}8\) \(\text{we}6\) 17.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{g}6\), Black stands much better.

If 14...\(\text{f}8\) then 15.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 16.\(\text{g}5\) with \(\text{xf}4\) or \(\text{xf}4\) to follow.

15.\(\text{g}4\)! \(\text{g}6\) 16.\(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 17.\(\text{h}4\)!

Now the defects of Black's 13th move are revealed. If the rook was on f8, Black could then take the \(\text{d}5\), simplifying the defence. Now, however, on this would follow mate in three moves.

18...\(\text{d}6\) 19.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{e}5\)?

The decisive mistake. He should play 19...\(\text{f}8\).

\[\text{Diagram 2}\]

20.\(\text{xe}5\)! \(\text{dxe}5\) 21.\(\text{we}5\)

Threatening 22.\(\text{d}4\)+.

21...\(\text{xe}4\)

Or 21...\(\text{e}6\) 22.\(\text{d}4\)+ \(\text{c}8\) 23.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{fxe}6\) 24.\(\text{d}7\)+ \(\text{b}8\) 25.\(\text{xe}8\)+ \(\text{c}8\) 26.\(\text{d}7\) mate!ns

22.\(\text{d}4\)+ \(\text{c}8\) 23.\(\text{e}6\)+!!

A brilliant final blow.

84 Then White's attempt to continue the attack by means of 20.\(\text{d}4\), with a subsequent doubling of rooks on the e-file, can be met 20...\(\text{e}5\), turning the tables. Now follows one of Chigorin's ingenious combinations.

85 But better is 22...\(\text{d}5\)! 23.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{g}3\)+ 24.\(\text{g}2\)+ \(\text{d}6\). Black also has 21...\(\text{d}7\) 22.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}6\) 23.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{xe}1\)+ 24.\(\text{xe}1\) \(\text{xd}5\) 25.\(\text{xe}8\) \(\text{xe}8\), leaving him with rook, bishop and knight for queen.
23...\textit{b}b8
If 23...\textit{fxe}6, then mate in 3 moves with the knight on d7.
24.\textit{d}d7+ \textit{c}c8 25.\textit{c}c5+ \textit{b}b8
26.\textit{a}a6+ \textit{b}xa6 27.\textit{w}b4 mate

3 Italian Game
Victor Knorre
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1874

NOTES BY: Romanov
The publication of this game in his chess column in Field (1900) Chigorin preaced with the following paragraph: 'At times chess games are repeated from the first move to the last. This happens because, at the start of a game, inexperienced players make some sort of move, apparently quite natural and even very good, but actually leading to a loss. One such game, the start of which is frequently met in practice by amateurs of little experience, is given below. Interestingly, the player of the black pieces came to play it four times. Though it has already appeared in the press, we suppose that the majority of chess playing readers of Field will not be familiar with it. Possibly, an opportunity will arise for them to benefit from it, in order that they might win against inexperienced players in "brilliant fashion"'.
The first of these 'brothers' was played by Chigorin as far back as 1874 (see Chess Sheet, 1877, No.2-3, pages 59–60). The name of the opponent was not given there, but it was revealed later by Schiﬀers in his book Teach Yourself Chess.
1.e4\textit{e}5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}c6 3.\textit{c}c4 \textit{c}c5 4.0-0 \textit{d}d6 5.d3 \textit{f}6 6.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 7.\textit{h}4
White makes a well-known opening mistake from earlier times, that of pinning the knight on f6 before the opponent castles; by retreating the bishop to h4, he, in Chigorin's own words, 'places his game in an extremely cramped and dangerous position. Even though it loses time, retreating the bishop to e3 was better.'
7...\textit{g}5! 8.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}5!

9.\textit{x}xg5
In the famous game Dubois-Steinitz, London 1862, White defended by 9.h4, but after 9...\textit{g}4 10.e3 \textit{w}d7 11.d4 \textit{exd}4 12.e5 \textit{dxe}5 13.\textit{xe}5 \textit{c}xe5 14.\textit{c}xe5 \textit{w}f5 15.\textit{x}xg4+ \textit{hxg}4 16.\textit{d}d3 \textit{w}d5 17.b4 0-0-0 he came under an irresistible attack along the h-file. Steinitz gained a very beautiful victory. In subsequent analysis Steinitz also examined the consequences of the reply 9.\textit{x}xg5. It is interesting that the present game coincided with the main variation in Steinitz's analysis.
9...h4! 10.\textit{xf}7
Yudovich: 10.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{e}7 does not rescue him.
10...hxg3 11.\textit{xd}8
For an ordinary chess player the temptation to take the queen is too great... But even if White were 'content' with the rook, he would also not avert

86 But instead 15.\textit{w}a4+ complicates matters, as on 15...\textit{c}d7 or 15...\textit{f}8, White plays 16.\textit{xf}7 and if 15...\textit{e}7 16.cxd4, in both cases with advantage.
12. $\text{Wd2}$

Nor would White escape his 'fate' by returning the queen: 12. $\text{Dxc6 gxf2+}$
13. $\text{Dh1 Dxd1}$ 14. $\text{Dxd1 Dg4}$ 15. $\text{h3 De3}$
or 12. $\text{Dxf7 Dh5}$ 13. $\text{Dxg3 Dxg4}$ 14. $\text{hxg3}$
$\text{Dd4}$ 15. $\text{Dc3 c6}$ 16. $\text{a3 d5}$.

12... $\text{Dd4}$ 13. $\text{Dc3 Df3+!}$ 14. $\text{gxf3}$
$\text{Dxf3}$

White resigned.

'White can delay mate only by five moves, by playing 15. $\text{Df7+ Dxd8}$
16. $\text{Dh6 Dxhr6}$ 17. $\text{h5 Dxhr5}$ 18. $\text{h4}$
$\text{Dxhr4}$ and 19... $\text{Dh1 mate}.'

---

* But if we continue this line, White has $\text{Dg8!}$ and if $\text{Dxd5}$ then 18. $\text{Df7+}$ and a
  perpetual check follows; therefore it seems
  White is not in fact losing.
Chapter 6
Chigorin – Master

Success in the handicap tournament in December 1874 – February 1875, as it were, introduced a distinguished period of chess study and youthful creativity for Mikhail Chigorin. The 24-year-old chess player had made a start in public life! Particularly – public, since though his transfer to the 1st category was then morally of equal strength to the present awarding of the rank of master, and such chess players were indeed called 'master', this was nowhere legitimately formalised. Simply this gave Chigorin the possibility to play handicap tournaments at odds, and with other masters at evens. But, of course, the authority of Chigorin in St.Petersburg chess circles was greatly heightened, since he was now included amongst the strongest.

A preserved portrait of Chigorin at the beginning of the 1870s is very unlike the widely known photographs of the Russian champion in his mature years. Looking at us is a thoughtful, lean youth with jet black hair and dark eyes, straight nose, and determined, strong-willed chin. Not an ordinary face – the face of a thinker, a visionary, a poet. In this face there was neither calmness nor complacency nor satisfaction with life. One senses a fascinating, outstanding nature, and it is clear why the strong, individual personality of the young Chigorin invariably evoked the sympathy of friends and the hatred of enemies.

In the memoirs of contemporaries, Chigorin was distinguished by his great nervousness, quick temper ('flying into a rage as a youth, but quickly calming down') and very principled nature, both in questions of chess theory as also in his personal relations with people.

D.N.Pavlov, who was acquainted with Chigorin in the 1890s, wrote that in Chigorin 'it struck one as surprising, his steadfastness in his dealings with his associates, cultivated probably in years of stubborn struggle against stormy temperaments and only partly abandoned in moments of severe agitation. It would be possible to observe this trait of Chigorin particularly well during serious competition; he always sat at the board totally upright and calm, maintaining customary correctness, while at times I would even chance to observe how, at a sharp, tense moment of the game, he convulsively sat on his hands, in a position with two sides of his body on the bottom of the chair, in order to control himself from any involuntary contact with the pieces by his hands. This steadfastness made for a particularly imposing appearance of Chigorin and conveyed some sort of great inner strength.'
This interesting inner struggle with his passionate temperament and lightning evaluation of a position, was noted by another Russian chess player, N.P. Zelikov:

'During the tournament\(^88\) several games were analysed by members of our circle, together with Chigorin. He shared with us his rich experience and took an active part in analysis of certain variations arising at the board. Of course, each of us hurried to give our opinion, suggest our continuation, often unconsidered to the end. Chigorin reproached us for our haste and recalled that lively temperament in youth was at times the reason he had made poor moves himself.

'In particularly sharp positions', he said, 'I always try to keep my hands in my pockets, so as not to make a hasty move.'

The already cited by me, L. Velikhov, described the conduct of Chigorin during play like this: 'In manner, Chigorin distinguished himself by his awkward shyness and at the same time some sort of turbulent impetuosity. He moved around quickly and noiselessly, as if floating, suddenly appearing first here, then there. Only during play did Chigorin sit firmly on the chair, as if rooted to the ground, and he could sit like this for hours, nervously rocking his feet at a moment of difficulty and fixing a scorching look at the board. He did not smoke and could not stand the tobacco that was at times used by calculating opponents, who would blow a cloud of smoke from a strong cigar across the chess board.'

Chigorin's psychological make up was complex – and is difficult to unravel. One senses highly original natural gifts, with a self-contained character, little easy of access or influence from without. One of the distinguishing traits of his character was an ailing self-esteem because of what he had frequently had to suffer.

From the further elucidation of Velikhov, however, it is evident that under 'ailing self-esteem' he understood a strained sense of dignity for Chigorin, the absence of servility before contemporary titled or rich chess patrons, of which the reader, time and again, is made certain. From poverty, from the lower-class people, Chigorin punched his way through to world fame and naturally felt that the public respect which he enjoyed should make him at least equal to any of his contemporaries – even if it were the 'Shining' Prince Dadian of Mingrelia or millionaire Bosranzhoglo. But his interlocutors got used to worshipping the titled and rich and did not always understand correctly the noble sensitivities of Chigorin.

However, whether it be connoisseurs of chess, experts, young players or even persons unknown to Chigorin, none of them felt they could make 'deals' with him.

At the end of 1875 there was a visit to St. Petersburg by Simon Winawer, who, though spending his whole life (1837-1919) in Warsaw, was counted as a Russian subject and competed in international tournaments as a representative of the Russian empire. In his first appearance in the Paris tournament of 1867, Winawer surprisingly won 2nd prize, above Steinitz, and 11 years later repeated his success – also in Paris, outdistanceing such chess players as Blackburne and Anderssen. In 1882, at the major international tournament in Vienna, Winawer shared the first

\(^88\) In 1907.
two prizes 'jointly' with Steinitz, while in the tournament at Nuremberg in 1883 he took 'clear' first prize.

Winawer showed his worth as a bold, ingenious tactician and a great master of the endgame, which was the Achilles heel even of many outstanding chess players of the last century. In St.Petersburg, Winawer competed in a small tournament, where, besides him, took part Chigorin, who the same year had won a match against another St.Petersburg 1st category player, N.I.Petrovsky (the score of the match has not been preserved), Shumov and Asharin. Though Winawer captured first place, he was so taken with Chigorin that he tried to persuade him to take part in an international tournament. On his own further trips abroad, Winawer fervently recommended Chigorin to the bosses of contemporary chess movements and several years later(?) this led to an invitation for Chigorin to compete in the Berlin tournament.

However, Chigorin could not take Winawer's advice immediately. He was tied to his office duties and, at the same time, probably considered that he had first to defeat all his native rivals – above all Schiffer and Alapin, who was now beginning to advance. Besides this, an enterprising plan had now matured in Chigorin's mind to publish his own magazine. How bold this idea was for its time is seen from what was written by Shumov, who had a friendly regard to Chigorin, in his column in Universal Illustrated. Amidst the solutions of the published compositions, he referred to Chigorin, 'who intends to set himself the very difficult problem of publishing a chess magazine.' (with the characters spaced out in the word 'problem' in order to draw the attention of the reader to Shumov's play on words).

4 King's Gambit Accepted

NN

Mikhail Chigorin
St.Petersburg 1875

Notes by: Bogoljubow
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.♘f3 g5 4.♗c4 g4 5.♗e5 ♝h4+ 6.♗f1 ♗h6 7.d4 f3!
The Salvio-Zilberschmidt gambit gives Black the better game.

8.♗f4

Best here is 8.♗c3, as played repeatedly by Steinitz against Zukertort.

8...d6 9.♗d3 ♝g7 10.c3 0-0 11.♗f2 fxg2+ 12.♔xg2 ♗c6 13.♗d2 ♗h8
14.♖g3 ♝g5 15.♗e2 ♗f5 16.exf5 ♛xf5 17.♗ae1 b5!

Energetic! On 18.♗xb5 follows 18...♗xd4!

18.♗b3

18...♗xd4!

Very strong!
Black obtains three pawns and a strong attack for the knight.

19.cxd4 ♗xd4 20.♗e3 ♝h5
21.♗hf1 ♗b7+ 22.♗g1 ♛ae8
23.♗d3
6. \( \text{Qb5} \ \text{Qe7} \ 7. \text{Qf4!} \ a6 \ 8. \text{exd5} \ \text{exd5} \)
On 8...\text{axb5} clearly follows 9.\text{Qxb5}.

\[ \text{23.\text{Qxf4} } \text{Qxf1}+ \ 24. \text{Qxf1} \text{ (if 24.\text{Qxf1} \text{Qe5} \ 25. \text{Qg5} } \text{Qh3+ followed (\ldots \text{dxe4}) 24...d5 25.\text{Qg5} \ \text{Qe2+ and wins.}} \]

23...\text{Qf3! 24.\text{Qb1}}

\[ \text{24.\text{Qxe8+ then 24...Qxe8 and ...Qe2+ etc.}} \]

24...\text{Be2!}
Black also wins by an immediate
24...\text{Qxg3+ 25.hxg3 Qe2+.}^{89}

25. \text{Qd1}
There is no way for White to save the game.

25...\text{Qxg3+ 26.hxg3 Qh1+ 27.\text{Qxh1 \text{Qg2 mate}}}

5 Sicilian Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Andreas Asharin
St. Petersburg 1875
Notes by: Romanov
1.e4 c5 2.\text{Qc3 \text{Qc6 3.\text{Qf3 e6 4.d4}}
\text{cxd4 5.\text{Qxd4 d5?}}}
This operation in the centre with completely undeveloped pieces is obviously premature.
Chigorin energetically refutes his opponent’s mistake, soon dealing out harsh punishment for his opening transgressions.

\[ \text{9.0-0! \text{Qd7}} \]
The bishop still (as on the next move) cannot be taken in view of 9...\text{axb5}
10.\text{Qxb5 Qe6 11.\text{Qc7!}}

10.\text{Qe1 \text{Qxd4 11.\text{Qxd4}}}
And now the ‘fearless’ bishop really is doomed to be sacrificed.

Later, commenting on the game in Chess Sheet, Chigorin was rather critical of this move.

‘More solid’, he said, ‘is 11.\text{Qxh7+ Qxh7 12.Qxd4 Qd8 (12...0-0-0? 13.Qa4!) 13.Qad1 and White gains a pawn with a winning position.’

11...\text{Qxb5 12.Qxd5 f6 13.Qc7+ Qf7 14.We4}}

\[ \text{14...g6} \]
This position interested many St. Petersburg players. Some of them, including Winawer, present at the
game, claimed that Black could beat off the attack with the move 14...g5, retaining an advantage in force.

Chigorin responded with the following variations: 15.\textit{\_d}1 \textit{\_c}c8 16.\textit{\_d}d6 \textit{\_g}6 (16...\textit{\_g}8 17.\textit{\_d}5+ \textit{\_g}6 18.\textit{\_x}a8 \textit{\_x}a8 19.\textit{\_x}f8 \textit{\_x}f8 20.\textit{\_x}b7 and White has rook and two pawns for bishop and knight together with an excellent position) 17.\textit{\_d}5+ \textit{\_g}7 18.\textit{\_e}6+ \textit{\_h}6 19.f4 g4 (19...\textit{\_g}xf4 20.\textit{\_d}5 threatening 21.\textit{\_x}f6 and 21.\textit{\_h}3; or 19...\textit{\_x}f4 20.\textit{\_x}f4 \textit{\_g}xf4 21.\textit{\_d}5 and wins) 20.\textit{\_f}5 \textit{\_d}7 (20...\textit{\_x}d6 21.\textit{\_x}f6 or 21.\textit{\_d}5) 21.\textit{\_x}f6 \textit{\_x}f6 22.\textit{\_x}e6 \textit{\_x}d6 23.\textit{\_g}5+ \textit{\_g}7 24.\textit{\_d}xd6 with decisive threats for White.

Now Chigorin decides the game with a beautiful combination. True, for the lost queen Black obtains three pieces, but with the undeveloped and uncoordinated forces (it is remarkable that the bishop on f8 has still not made a single move!) he will not succeed in constructing a solid defence.

15.\textit{\_e}6+ \textit{\_g}7 16.\textit{\_h}6+ \textit{\_x}h6 17.\textit{\_w}3+ \textit{\_g}7 18.\textit{\_e}6+ \textit{\_f}7 19.\textit{\_x}d8+ \textit{\_x}d8 20.\textit{\_e}6+ \textit{\_g}7 21.\textit{\_a}d1 \textit{\_x}d1 22.\textit{\_a}d1

22...h5 23.\textit{\_d}6 \textit{\_g}8 24.\textit{\_d}8 \textit{\_h}7 25.\textit{\_c}8 \textit{\_e}7 26.\textit{\_c}7 \textit{\_h}6 27.\textit{\_x}f6+ \textit{\_g}8 28.\textit{\_w}6+ \textit{\_f}7 29.\textit{\_x}b7

and White won.

6 Danish Gambit

Mikhail Chigorin

Ilya Shumov

St-Petersburg 1876

Notes by: Romanov, Yudovich and

higorin

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.\textit{\_c}4 cxb2 5.\textit{\_x}b2

Romanov: The only time in his life that Chigorin employed the Danish Gambit was 'at the dawn of beautiful youth'. Back then, supposing that 'White has a strong attack,' he had posed the question 'does White have compensation for the two pawns lost?' Soon Chigorin convinced himself that Black could 'repulse the attack whilst retaining one or two of his extra pawns', which is why 'strong players act soundly, when they do not risk offering the Danish (Nordic) Gambit in serious competitions with the strongest players.'

Yudovich: This gambit, worked out by the Danish masters V.Nielsen and P.Krause in the second half of the 19th century, despite its superficial attractiveness, is not dangerous for Black. It was the only time in his life that Chigorin adopted this gambit and this, probably, was guided by psychological considerations. You see, the strong practical player Shumov was not very well versed in opening theory.

5...\textit{\_b}4+

Romanov: Modern theoretical manuals recommend the defence 5...d5 or 5...d6, and condemn the bishop check since it facilitates White's conduct of the attack. The present game confirms this assessment.

Yudovich: Of the many defences Black has at his disposal, this is one of the least successful. The romantic halo of the gambit was largely dispelled
the cold-blooded reply 5...d5!, e.g.
6.exd5 (or 6.exd5 Qf6 7.Qc3 Qd6) 6.f6 7.Qxf7+ Qxf7 8.Qxd8 Qb4+
+Qd2 Qxd2+ 10.Qxd2 Re8, and Black has no difficulties in the
complicated endgame.

Chigorin himself, considering White’s
attack not really so dangerous, more
than once played 5...We7, repelling
the tactical thrust and holding on to his
material advantage.

6.Qc3 Qf6
Yudovich: 6...d6 is more promising.

7.Wc2
Yudovich: It was not obligatory to defend
the e4-pawn, as after 7.Qe2 Qxe4 8.0-0
Qxc3 9.Qxc3 White has a dangerous
initiative. Chigorin, however, decides
to castle on the long side.

7...0-0 8.0-0-0 We7

Yudovich: As Chigorin expected, Shumov
has played the opening poorly. The
queen manoeuvre is not in the spirit of
the position, he should continue 8...Qc6.

9.e5! Wxe5?
Chigorin: This move costs a piece. Though
Black has four pawns for it, he cannot
hold on to them.

Yudovich: Better is 9...Qxc3.

10.Qd5 Qg5+ 11.f4 Qh6 12.Qxb4
Qxf4+ 13.Qb1 d5 14.Qd4 Qf5
15.Qxf4 Qxc2+ 16.Qxc2 dxc4
17.Qxh6 gxh6 18.Qd5 Qa6 19.Qf3
b5 20.Qb1 Qd8

21.Qxh6+ Qg7 22.Qh5+ Qg6 1-0
Romanov: White announced mate in four
moves: 23.Qf6+ Qxh5 24.g4+ Qxg4
25.Qg1+ Qh5 26.Qg5 mate.
Yudovich: A confident win by Chigorin
over the best chess player in Russia.

---

90 10..c5 is usually considered best. After
10...Qxe8 White can set a trap with 11.Qxf3 when
11...Qxe4 loses the exchange after 12.Qe5+!
Chapter 7

Journalist and theoretician

'Acquire, acquire, acquire! This is the cry which rings out on all sides in our practical, very practical age, amidst a whirlpool of speculation, stock-broking, amidst the roar, the noise of machines... amidst the rattling of dice and the rustling cards of countless numbers of games of chance, on which the practical contemporary man spends all his free time, his leisure.'

Thus began the introductory article of the first number of the magazine Chess Sheet, dated '1 September 1876' and which was first delivered to the proofreading room of the inexperienced editor/publisher, Mikhail Ivanovich Chigorin.

Before Chigorin, there had only been one attempt to publish a chess magazine in Russia. This chess magazine was launched in 1859, and ran for five years, at first — in the form of a 'supplement' to the periodical Russian Word, published by G.A. Kushelev-Bezborodko, and before the end — as an independent organ. It was called Chess Sheet and edited by the St. Petersburg writer and passionate chess amateur V.N. Mikhailov. Initially, the magazine was fed mainly by foreign news items and widely illustrated by the creativity of Morphy and other foreign chess celebrities, but later it came to publish original home-grown articles and theoretical analyses by Petrov, Urusov and other leading Russian chess players of this time.

M.I. Chigorin began to publish a chess magazine in September 1876. Wanting to emphasise the creative and natural succession of the chess press, he named his magazine also Chess Sheet. In his Chess Sheet Chigorin conducted a campaign for the need to unite Russian chess into an All-Russia Chess Union and at once began a struggle for the formation of home-grown chess culture.

From the very first number of Chess Sheet, Chigorin's personality comes across to us as a versatile, cultured, public-spirited man, as well as a chess historian and theoretician.

It was not easy for Chigorin to get the magazine together and up and running! He was, at the same time, publisher, editor and proof-reader, and basically, collaborator, producer and distributor — all this, besides his office duties and active participation in the chess life of St. Petersburg.

In view of its insignificant circulation (120 subscribers!), Chess Sheet brought not profit, but loss, however Chigorin had launched the publication without having any particular illusions on this account and had anticipated every possible material sacrifice. Unselfishness was his basic trademark.

As seen from the introductory editorial to his magazine, Chigorin generally regarded the speculative employer's spirit, characteristic for this age, as gradually developing Russian capitalism.

In his leading article, Chigorin, in detail, developed the idea about the social utility of chess for 'development of imagination, reasoning and the ability to analyse deeply and memorise'. He called for a deep mastery of chess theory, and
for maximum collaboration of all Russian chess players in the magazine that was
coming into existence.

In the same number we find a review of 'International Chess Congresses and
Tournaments', an article 'Chess in Russia', six games of Russian chess players,
news items 'from the whole world' and five games of leading foreign players. Then
followed a historical article on the origins of chess and an exposition of different
theories on the time and place of the beginning of the game. Chigorin himself
considered that chess was invented in India, from where it immediately penetrated
into Russia. The first issue of the magazine contained a section which was the most
valuable for practical chess players of this time. From number to number, Chigorin
serialised a 'Course on the Openings' and a 'Course on the Endgame.' It is interesting
that in the first issue of the magazine, Chigorin analysed 'The King Knight's Opening'
(1.e4 e5 2.\f3) after which followed 'the Petroff Defence or the Russian Knight
Game'. At the end there were studies by Russian and foreign composers.

Such a many-sided and all-embracing type of magazine was strictly maintained
also in the future. Added to the above-mentioned sections were a bibliography
and critical comment. A series of articles by Chigorin himself and the historian
M.Gonyaev was devoted to native chess culture and the history of Russian chess.

As time passed, Chess Sheet became all the more interesting and original. One senses
how, from year to year, was formed the creative character of Chigorin, his passionate
ethical standards, his full independence on all questions of chess theory. Chigorin
also gave due attention to the theoretical legacy of his predecessors. For example,
in numbers 2 and 3 for 1876, over five pages were devoted to an enunciation of
the work of C.Jaenisch.

Psychologically interesting is that Chigorin not infrequently placed in the
magazine games lost by himself, not fearing such self-criticism could undermine
his authority.

From the 4th issue of Chess Sheet there was already a sub-heading: 'A monthly
magazine, devoted to the game of chess and its literature'. From the very beginning,
Chigorin perceived chess as a distinct area of national and international culture.

The quality of the magazine improved from number to number. If the first issue
teemed with misprints, then in the following years there were hardly any of these.
Chigorin became a practiced journalist and a thorough professional, acquainted
with both the technical typesetting and with all the fine points of layout and
presentation. There was a noticeable improvement in the language and style of the
articles, although, as a consequence of the conditions of censorship, bold thoughts
were disguised in a highly obscure form. For example: 'This lack of community
interest, which is expressed in such political, chess and country reticence, is
unfortunately the sole reason why the spirit of general responsibility and mutual
benefit has not, up to now, been developed.' Or 'Religion and natural science arise
from one incentive, but give different results as a consequence of different points
of practice. The listing of the development of knowledge represents the listing of
the development of mankind's brain and its function.'
The readers probably agreed that his statements on the lack of democracy in Russian society and materialistic attitudes towards science and religion had a rather weak relationship to chess, but they witnessed the broad journalistic range of Chigorin.

Complaints were periodically met in the magazine about the passivity of provincial correspondents and the resulting paucity of native information. Actually, news items consisted almost exclusively of the illumination of St. Petersburg chess life and reprints from foreign chess journals.

Unfortunately, Chigorin's selfless publishing venture still did not guarantee a circulation which would defray the production costs of the magazine and provide him with a living wage, so that he could wholly devote himself to his favourite business. In the middle of 1878, the publication of the magazine was suspended for six months. In No.2-3 for 1879 was placed an editorial: 'From the publisher'. 'I decided to undertake the publication of Chess Sheet without sufficient financial means for publication. I supposed that the subscriptions of money collected would be enough to easily cover the costs of the printing, paper, publication and any minor expenses. If this assumption had been justified, then Chess Sheet would have come out regularly and not been suspended, since the editorial and literary work were not paid for. I and other chess players devote their work to the magazine free of charge. Unfortunately, the sum of subscriptions could not cover the expenses.' Furthermore, Chigorin turned to well-to-do subscribers with the request to subscribe not to one number of the magazine, but several. In order not to incur a loss, with a subscription price of 5 roubles, the magazine needed to have no less than 250 subscribers.

Chigorin's appeal produced a totally surprising result! Out of 120 subscribers, after a period of time there remained only 98, though, it is true, a certain Kondratiev from Tbilisi subscribed at once to 11 copies. But nobody else followed his generous example.

In the first number for 1880, we read these bitter lines: 'Our enterprise – to publish in Russia a chess magazine – was a business born exclusively out of our love for chess and the desire to spread it in Russia, and not some kind of business calculation. The magazine has already existed four years but, for us, at the present time it still suffers only loss.'

The first number of the magazine for 1881 bore the character of a farewell to the readers. In No.1 appeared a lithographic portrait of Chigorin, who at this time was established as one of the strongest chess players in the world. After this only a further two numbers came out, and both – in a bold mourning frame. In fact this was evoked by the official mourning of the Czar, killed by the 'People's Will' movement, but here it gave the impression that the magazine was laying a wreath on its own grave.

In all, 52 numbers were issued of Chess Sheet, which played a great role in uniting Russian chess players and raising the general level of play in Russia. In 1877, Shumov published in Universal Illustrated a 'scaccographic' study, where the arrangement of the pieces depicted the first letter of Chigorin's name – Ч (in Cyrillic).
After the problem followed commentary, which in Russian reads as rhyming verse.

After studying the Course of Openings
In our Chess Sheet
Each of us gains strength
Grows to love the chess board
Against us here Black has many men
But amateurs such as us
We are not terrified, we use
Our skill against them!
Friends choose their places
Become stronger and the two of them
Force Black to concede a draw
By their quick-witted conduct.

White changes the position and with his first move, despite the fact that Black has far more forces than his opponent, he has to renounce victory.

As can be seen, the good intentions of the chess poet atone for the defective versification. The meaning, however, of the last few lines hints at the solution of the problem. White rearranges his king on e3 and plays 1.c6, after which stalemate is inevitable.
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The strongest player in Russia

Chigorin's tense struggle for the creation of a first class home-grown chess magazine by no means exhausted his creative energy. To be precise, from the founding of Chess Sheet in 1876, it is possible to count out a glorious 30 years in the course of which Chigorin improved all aspects of chess culture, played in handicap tournaments and in customary Russian and international tournaments, met dangerous rivals in matches, played games in consultation and by correspondence and telegraph, solved endgames and studies, published and edited magazines, wrote chess columns in newspapers and magazines, corresponded in magazines about current affairs, gave simultaneous exhibitions — often 'blindfold', delivered lectures on the theory of the game, conducted, for many years, polemics with other important theoreticians of that time, spared no energy in forming the St.Petersburg Chess Club, undertook guest tours in Moscow, the Russian provinces, Central and Western Europe, the USA and Cuba, promoted the idea of the creation of an All-Russia Chess Union, personally organised the first three Russian championships, and twice challenged for the world chess crown.

All this, without any government and public support and, not infrequently, in spite of callous and heartless chess patrons, and his struggles against enemies, envious people and underhand schemers.

The only thing that Chigorin missed over a quarter of a century of his tireless activity — and what is impossible not to be surprised at — is that he did not gather together material and write a manual of chess, which would have still further promoted the spread of the game in Russia, and would of course provided a refreshing change from the wretched editions of text books in chess literature of that time. It is interesting that another great Russian player, Alexander Alekhine, who was very similar to Chigorin both in style and in creative belief and versatility, also did not write a manual of chess.

But let us return to Chigorin at the end of the 1870s — to Chigorin, publisher of a magazine, which he virtually produced entirely by himself, to Chigorin — the petty bureaucrat, to Chigorin, striving for the championship — at first of St.Petersburg, then Russia, then the whole world.
The chess magazine had been launched, and Chigorin hoped that the number of subscribers would increase year by year, as a consequence of which the publication would eventually become a paying concern. But he simply did not fulfil that dream and so endeavoured to create a firm basis for the flourishing of the magazine. Side by side with passionate appeals for the unification and development of public initiative in the Russian provinces and in Moscow, Chigorin strove to organise a series of interesting national competitions, to stir up the 'age old quiet'. Chigorin displayed particular activity in 1878-1880, and even refused an invitation, received by him in May 1878, to take part in the Paris international tournament. Only a chess player can appreciate such a self-sacrifice! Going into the international arena, receiving the recognition of the chess world, fulfilling the norm of master – that is what would seem to be more attractive than anything else for the young, bustling Chigorin.

But Chigorin preferred to direct all his thoughts to the organisation of the first All-Russia tournament, and, being at the head of an initiative group, sent an invitation to all the well-known Russian chess players to arrive at the end of 1878 in St.Petersburg. But in fact, from the very beginning, he made a mistake in view of his attempt to lay all material burdens on the shoulders of the other towns' participants. The competitors in the All-Russia tournament themselves were due to bear all the expenses of travel and maintenance during the competition, and, besides this, had to pay for the right to compete! The organisation committee, with Chigorin at its head, had hoped, by means of subscriptions received from chess patrons, to guarantee only the finance for hiring the tournament premises and (partially) for prizes.

In the same year, 1878, Chigorin organised four games by correspondence between St.Petersburg and Kharkov, which in fact he conducted on his own. After three years play by correspondence, Chigorin achieved victory in all these encounters!

And at the same time as work, bringing out the magazine, preparing for tournaments, playing, engaging in correspondence games, Chigorin fulfilled his very old dream 'to overtake and surpass' the hitherto invincible Schiffer. Probably, at the same time, he decided it would represent thorough training before the All-Russia tournament.

In Spring 1878, Chigorin met his same-age rival in a match. The score went to 7 won games. Apparently, Schiffer was still remembering the times when he gave Chigorin odds of knight – after which he remained penniless – and underestimated Chigorin, the master. The match ended in a brilliant victory for Chigorin by a big margin: +7 -3 =0 (draws at that time were not in vogue!).

The proud Schiffer took seriously this surprising defeat at the hands of his former 'client' (this is how the Dominicans, in their professional jargon, termed chess players who continually lost to the others). He challenged Chigorin to a return match, which took place the same year with the same conditions. The struggle was stubborn. The first two games Chigorin won. The following seven games produced
an equal score (after three wins each and one draw), but a blunder by Chigorin in a winning position, in the next game, apparently demoralised him and inspired Schiffer, who at the finish scored four wins, suffering only one defeat. The overall score of the match was thus $+7 -6 =1$ in favour of Schiffer.

This was a good lesson for Chigorin, who improved himself in matches (a very difficult form of chess competition) and over the following two years devoted himself to this form of competition.

At the end of 1878, it became clear that ‘enlightened patrons’ did not properly support the idea of the championship of Russia; and the provincial chess players were not that well off to be able to travel to St. Petersburg, stay there ten days, and furthermore have to pay to compete in the tournament. The organisers managed to attract, besides seven players from the capital, a further two very strong Muscovites – Solovtsov and Von Schmidt. Nevertheless, the tournament, taking place during the Christmas holidays (when all the bureaucrats, and therefore also Chigorin, were on leave from work), proved to be a first-class competition and passed in a highly tense, interesting struggle.

The main rivals of Chigorin, besides of course Schiffer, were Alapin and Solovtsov. The remaining participants were weaker.

Out of Chigorin’s rivals, the most interesting was Simon Zinovyevich Alapin, whose judgement was destined to cloud the rest of Chigorin’s life because of his eternal claims to creative and sporting superiority and his tireless intrigue – which effectively represented a ‘power struggle’ in the St. Petersburg Chess Club. Being six years younger than Chigorin, Alapin was by nature an antipode of the great Russian chess player. Ambitious, energetic, egotistical, making a living from commodities and other commercial operations, in which he helped his rich father, Alapin could switch to chess for years, without any cares about tomorrow. In chess theory, Alapin was a confirmed follower of the new school, headed by Steinitz, and was himself a prominent opening theoretician, creating original systems, which, however, have not stood the test of time.

Moving out of the 1870s and the Dominican period, as a master of the positional style of play, Alapin subsequently made many appearances abroad, where he often went on business trips and where later he settled once and for all, only making flying visits to Russia. Alapin played in international tournaments with average success, at times occupying a place among the prize winners, at other times
appearing in the tail of the tournament table. Not once did he capture a first prize in an international tournament. In matches against strong opponents he played poorly, winning against minor masters. Chigorin experienced evident antipathy from Alapin because of his theoretical dogmatism and the aplomb with which he stated and defended his mistaken views. Tireless theoretical polemics passed between them in the chess press and, as the reader will be convinced later, Alapin did not refrain from using any means in endeavouring to prove the correctness of his analysis.

The regard between them was always politely hostile. It was only after the death of Chigorin that Alapin twice took a demonstrative step which at first glance suggested a changed, friendly regard to the memory of his great contemporary.

At the beginning of 1908, immediately after the death of Chigorin, Alapin took upon himself the duty to put together a ‘Chigorin collection’, which he announced beforehand would include a ‘biography, selected games and theoretical analysis of the late master,’ based not only on Chigorin’s published works but also his personal archives, passed to his widow by the St.Petersburg Chess Society.

It would be difficult, of course, to find a more unsuitable compiler of such a ‘monument not of human making’ of the great Russian chess player! You know, for the whole of his life, Alapin fought against Chigorin, disclaimed his theoretical viewpoints, belittled his importance. And, actually, the ‘Chigorin collection’ never was put together by Alapin, while to this day the whereabouts of the Chigorin archives is unknown. Apparently, the real objective of Alapin’s ‘claim’ was not to do honour to the memory of Chigorin, nor to recreate the brilliant ways of the great chess player, but to spoil a similar arrangement – by giving advance notice of the possibility of putting together a Chigorin collection to others – for writers to honour the memory of Chigorin. This was the more probable in that Alapin, who died in Munich 15 years later, neither in Russia, nor abroad, published any memoirs about Chigorin, though he had known him for more than 30 years.

The second demonstrative step Alapin made in 1914, when the remains of Chigorin were transferred from Lublin, where Chigorin died in 1908, to St. Petersburg Alapin sent to the burial ground a wreath with the inscription ‘To a talented, untimely deceased friend. S.Z.Alapin.’ The immodestly condescending tone of the inscription, the epithet ‘talented’ in respect to a genius chess player, who was recognised as such by all the foreign world, not to mention Russia, can hardly be considered as a tribute of respect to the memory of Chigorin. No, this was an emphatic attempt, on Alapin’s part, to ‘revitalise’ his own authority and link his name with the estate of the great Chigorin.

Involuntarily recalling this event, the journalist Faddey Bulgari recounted how Alapin had cruelly hounded the writer and historian, N.A.Polev – who had turned up at Chigorin’s funeral –, requesting to be a coffin bearer. P.A.Karatigin came up to Alapin and said loudly: ‘Well, why should you carry the deceased? You know, in his lifetime, you abused him enough times!’

Returning to a description of the St.Petersburg ‘Christmas’ tournament 1878/79, Alapin, knowing very well the public significance of this competition, bringing
together, apart from Winawer, all the strongest chess players of the Russian empire, played very well. He scored 6½ points from 8 games, losing only to Chigorin and making a draw with Asharin. However, Chigorin scored as many points, losing to Solovtsov (in the last round!) and making a draw with Schiffer. To clear up the first and second prize-winners, a deciding game was played between Chigorin and Alapin, which Chigorin won, thereby obtaining first prize. 3rd and 4th prizes in the tournament were shared by Schiffer and Solovtsov, scoring 5½ points, and two additional games between them ended in a draw.

At that time Alexander Vladimirovich Solovtsov was a colourful, brilliant figure on the chess board. He was born in Kazan in 1847 and already at eight years of age had learned the rules of chess from his father, who became his regular partner. In 1869, Solovtsov relocated to Moscow, where he began to perform as a pianist and occupied himself with the teaching of music, at the same time being fascinated by the study of chess openings. Solovtsov quickly gained a reputation as the strongest chess player in Moscow. The game he won in the above-mentioned tournament against Chigorin speaks sufficiently about the strength of Solovtsov, while in the following year, 1879, he achieved a new, brilliant success. A match by correspondence was organised between Moscow and St.Petersburg. From the northern capital – the allies, Solovtsov, Von Schmidt and Novkin, gained a victory in which the main credit belonged, of course, to Solovtsov. How seriously Solovtsov regarded the match is seen from the fact that he analysed the positions, not only by day but in the night. Close by his bed was placed a chess board, and he did not go to sleep until he had exhausted all the possible variations and found the best moves in both games. He was a typical, naturally gifted person, with a bold, brilliant, initiative-seeking style, greatly resembling that of Chigorin. Unfortunately, in 1900, Solovtsov for some reason gave up chess, though he died only in 1923.

Running forward, I mention that subsequently Chigorin proved his complete superiority over Solovtsov. In 1884 a match began between them, although it had to be broken off with the score at 1-1, since Solovtsov could not continue play because of personal business and Chigorin, purely formally, was counted winner. However, before the match, five training games played between them ended in Chigorin’s favour with the score 4-1. Still more convincingly, Chigorin won a match against Solovtsov in 1893, making a ‘clean’ score of 4-0.

Though Chigorin’s victory in the St.Petersburg ‘Christmas’ tournament of 1878/79 showed that he was in fact the champion of Russia, the public was still not formally convinced that he was definitely stronger than the remaining masters. Above all, it was necessary for him to prove his superiority over the correct Schiffer and the restless Alapin. However, before he went over to a decisive skirmish with these rivals, Chigorin played four(!) training matches in 1879 with Eugen von Schmidt.

Chigorin’s choice fell on Von Schmidt probably for the following reasons. Already in 1877, he had won a game against Von Schmidt and thus knew the strength and style of his play. In the ‘Christmas’ tournament, Von Schmidt, after losing four games
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On particular to Chigorin) and finding that the tempo of play (20 moves per hour) was too much for him, withdrew from the tournament, but shortly afterwards, in a tournament of Moscow chess players, he shared the first two prizes with Solovtsov, while in the short match that followed he achieved a 1-1 score. Von Schmidt was a very experienced, qualified chess player and, at the same time, nearly 30 years older than Chigorin. A native of Estonia, Von Schmidt lived for a long time in Germany, where for two years he edited the famous chess magazine Deutsche Schachzeitung before setting off for Russia to be a German language teacher. A prominent theoretician and analyst of this time, Von Schmidt represented for Chigorin, striving to master the whole classical heritage of chess as well as the latest theoretical information, a particularly attractive opponent, and at the same time Von Schmidt played only a little worse than Solovtsov, of whom Chigorin had a high opinion.

All the matches between Chigorin and Von Schmidt ended in a victory for Mikhail Ivanovich with an overall score of +15 -4 =5.

However, to prove his superiority over Schiffer was more difficult. Indeed, in the 3rd Chigorin-Schiffer match, taking place in 1879, Chigorin gained a victory to the tune of +7 -4 =2, but in the handicap tournament of 1880, Schiffer outdistanced Chigorin, who finished in 2nd place, and repeated his success in the tournament of the St.Petersburg merchants club, where they scored an equal number of points, but with Schiffer winning the tie-break match for first place with the score 2-1.

However, the next, 4th match between the two famous chess players of the same age, in 1880, finished with a decisive victory for Chigorin by the score +7 -1 =3, after which Schiffer, for a long time, acknowledged the superiority of Chigorin and only in 1895 and 1897 renewed the struggle against him, though so unsuccessfully, as we have already mentioned previously. In total, Chigorin and Schiffer played against each other 100 match and tournament games, out of which Chigorin won 51, lost 29, with 20 draws. This result was honourable for both masters and a pretty accurate reflection of their respective strengths. These statistics, of course, do not include the countless 'casual' games, played by both masters in their Dominic encounters, at odds, at a stake or taking place in handicap tournaments. There were, most likely, no fewer than a thousand!

At the end of 1880 there came the time for 'settling a score' with Alapin too. This match ended with a result +7 -3 =0 in favour of Chigorin, which forever removed from Alapin any desire for prolonged single combat with his great countryman.

In the course of the following 27 years, Alapin no longer made even one attempt to organise a match against Chigorin, though with Chigorin's need for material security this would not have been difficult.

In the strongest chess players of St.Petersburg tournament of 1880/81, Chigorin and Alapin finished on the same score, but afterwards Chigorin won a short playoff match by 2-1, and thereby took first prize.

As a curiosity, I mention that in the handicap tournament, taking place the same year, first prize was won by the 2nd category Sakharov, while Chigorin was second, but of course on play at odds the results do not reflect the relative strengths.
Side by side with passionate chess activity and publishing a magazine, Chigorin, at the end of the 1870s, made an energetic attempt to revive the St.Petersburg Chess Club, in place of the wealthy and quietly passing away chess circle in the 'Schusterklub'.

After a lot of fuss, the regulations of the Society of Chess Amateurs were established on 31 October 1879 – Chigorin's birthday, which seemed a good omen. However, the 'gift' for the 29-year-old secretary of the new society, Mikhail Chigorin (the chairman was a certain 'honourable man' O.I.Korbut), was made under rather difficult preliminary conditions. For the inauguration of the Society it was necessary to have a minimum of 60 members, but these could not be recruited at once. Only due to agitation in Chess Sheet did Chigorin succeed in organising the necessary number of amateurs, and on 11 January 1880 the Society, or, as it was called, the 'Chigorin club', was opened.

Thus, for several years, Chigorin, practically, over the board, proved to all his rivals and public opinion that he was the strongest chess player in Russia, and he had founded a chess club, independent both of St.Petersburg foreigners and of the moods of the proprietors of restaurants. Unfortunately, the pet child of Chigorin – the magazine Chess Sheet – had one foot in the grave and because of a lack of means ceased its existence at the beginning of 1881.

But, on the plus side, Chigorin was now not tied to his painstaking, loss-making, publishing work and could think about the international chess arena.

7 Spanish Game
Mikhail Chigorin
I. Miasnikov and V. Kolokoltsev
Correspondence game 1876
Notes by: Romanov
1.e4 e5 2.€f3 c6 3.€b5 a6 4.€a4
€f6 5.0-0 €x€4 6.d4 b5 7.€b3 d5
8.a4

From his first steps in chess, the creative outlook of Chigorin was characterised by an unceasing search for the new and unknown. In the present game he tried the system with 8.a4 for the first time, which soon led to international practice in his encounters with Wemmers (Berlin 1881) and Rosenthal (London 1883).

The plan with 8.a4 was for a long time considered the strongest weapon for White in opening variations of the Spanish Game, and only in 1910 did Schlechter (in his match with Lasker) succeed in demonstrating the correct defence: 8...€xd4! 9.€xd4 exd4.

8...€b7
A poor response, dooming the bishop to 'vegetation' on the a8-square.
9.axb5 axb5 10.€xa8 €xa8
11.dxe5 €e7
In Chigorin's opinion, 11...€a5 was better.

12.€e1
Here, it would almost be better to play 12.€d4 and on 12...€d7 (to make possible ...c7-c5) 13.c3 (threatening 14.€xb5) etc. With the move made
White threatens 13.\( \text{Rx} \text{e} 4\) \( \text{dxe} 4\) +. \( \text{gx} 7 + \).

12...\( \text{c} 5 \) 13.\( \text{d} 4\) \( \text{xb} 3\) 14.\( \text{xb} 3\) \( \text{g} 6\)

Black's misfortune is the fact that the whole of his king's flank is frozen. Therefore he gives up the b5-pawn, if only to complete his development by \( \ldots \text{c} 5\) and \( \ldots \text{0-0}\). Chigorin, of course, does not agree to such a cheap 'sale'.

15.\( \text{we} 2!\) \( \text{c} 6?\)

Chigorin wrote: 'After this move it can be categorically stated that it is not possible to hold Black's game for long. Better was – at the cost of a pawn – to develop his forces by playing 15...\( \text{e} 7\) 16.\( \text{xb} 5\) + \( \text{d} 7\) 17.\( \text{c} 3\) \( \text{c} 6!\) 18.\( \text{d} 3\) 0-0. However, even then White, having won the pawn, has not worsened his position.'

16.\( \text{e} 6\) \( \text{f} 6\) 17.\( \text{d} 2!\)

White prepares the decisive move e6-e7.

17...\( \text{e} 7\) 18.\( \text{f} 5\) 0-0

'A little better is 18...\( \text{f} 8\); but even then Black cannot save the game', claimed Chigorin.

19.\( \text{w} 4!\)

19...\( \text{h} 8\)

White threatened h2-h4 – for example, 19.\( \text{e} 8\) 20.\( \text{h} 4\) \( \text{f} 8\) 21.\( \text{h} 5\) \( \text{e} 5\) 22.\( \text{xe} 5!\) \( \text{fx} 5\) 23.\( \text{h} 6+\) etc., which will now be met by the reply \( \ldots \text{g} 8\).

20.\( \text{e} 3!\)

This 'quiet' move forces Black's resignation. White's main threat is the transfer of the rook to h3 followed by \( \text{h} 7+\), \( \text{h} 5+\), \( \text{h} 6\) and mate in two moves. He cannot play 20...\( \text{e} 8\) 21.\( \text{h} 3\) \( \text{g} 8\) 22.\( \text{h} 5\) \( \text{h} 6\) 23.\( \text{h} 6+\) \( \text{g} 6\) 24.\( \text{h} 6\).

8 Sicilian Defence

Mikhail Chigorin

Andreas Asharin

St. Petersburg 1877

Notes by Bogoljubow

1.\( \text{e} 4\) \( \text{c} 5\) 2.\( \text{f} 3\) \( \text{c} 6\) 3.\( \text{d} 4\) \( \text{cxd} 4\)

4.\( \text{cxd} 4\) \( \text{a} 6\)

Not particularly good for Black is also the variation 4...\( \text{f} 6\) 5.\( \text{c} 3\) \( \text{e} 6\) 6.\( \text{d} 5\) \( \text{b} 4\) 7.\( \text{a} 3\) \( \text{xc} 3+\) 8.\( \text{xc} 3\) \( \text{d} 5\) 9.\( \text{exd} 5\) \( \text{xd} 5\) 10.\( \text{e} 3\).

5.\( \text{c} 3\) \( \text{e} 6\) 6.\( \text{e} 3\) \( \text{b} 4\) 7.\( \text{d} 3\) \( \text{g} 7\)

8.0-0 \( \text{xc} 3\) 9.\( \text{bxc} 3\) 0-0 10.\( \text{f} 5\)

Not particularly good for Black is also the variation 4...\( \text{f} 6\) 5.\( \text{c} 3\) \( \text{e} 6\) 6.\( \text{d} 5\) \( \text{b} 4\) 7.\( \text{a} 3\) \( \text{xc} 3+\) 8.\( \text{xc} 3\) \( \text{d} 5\) 9.\( \text{exd} 5\) \( \text{xd} 5\) 10.\( \text{c} 3\).

5.\( \text{c} 3\) \( \text{e} 6\) 6.\( \text{e} 3\) \( \text{b} 4\) 7.\( \text{d} 3\) \( \text{g} 7\)

8.0-0 \( \text{xc} 3\) 9.\( \text{bxc} 3\) 0-0 10.\( \text{f} 5\)

11.\( \text{xf} 5\) \( \text{xd} 4\) 12.\( \text{xd} 4\) \( \text{xf} 5\)

13.\( \text{c} 5\)

13...\( \text{f} 6\)

Rather better would be 13...\( \text{f} 7\). If 13...\( \text{d} 6\), then 14.\( \text{a} 3\), threatening 15.\( \text{xf} 5\) and then 16.\( \text{xd} 6\), but possibly this would not be so bad for Black.

14.\( \text{g} 4\) \( \text{b} 6\) 15.\( \text{c} 2\) \( \text{e} 7\) 16.\( \text{h} 4\) \( \text{f} 7\)

17.\( \text{f} 3\) \( \text{e} 8\) 18.\( \text{h} 3\) \( \text{g} 6\) 19.\( \text{f} 5\)

Now the attack is irresistible.
Chigorin valued highly Kharidin’s skill, considering him one of the best chess players of Russia.

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.c4 d5 4.exd5 
f6 5.c3 d4 6.f3

Yudovich: One of Morphy’s games, undoubtedly well known to both opponents, showed that 6.d3 is bad because of 6...exd5 7.exd5 0-0, and the white king comes under fire.

6...xc3 7.dxc3

Romanov: Chigorin recommended as best the continuation 7.bxc3, so as after 7...exd5 to play 8.exd5 0-0 9.0-0 wxd5 10.d4.

7...0-0

Romanov: Now, however, in Chigorin’s opinion, Black has the possibility of equalising the position by 7...c6 8.c4 wxd1+ 9.xd1 0-0 10.xf4 xe4 11.e1. This recommendation entered into the theoretical manuals, but without indicating the author (as with the case of P.Keres), and in Contemporary Openings even attributing it to the German Handbuch.91

8.0-0 c6 9.c4 wxd1 10.exd1 
e4 11.xf4 d7 12.e1

Romanov: Once again in the cited manuals this position (in which White, thanks to his better development and two active bishops, has a clear advantage) is linked to the game Blackburne-Pillsbury, played in the Hastings tournament 1895. Meanwhile the author of the present position almost twenty years earlier was Chigorin...

12..df6 13.ad1 g4 14.ad4 
e8

91 However, in this line, after 11...f5 (forced) White has 12.g5, regaining his pawn. With the black king stuck in the centre White’s two bishops will eventually take control.
15. Δe5 Δe6

Romovin: Black has no better move.

16. Δdxe4 Δxe4 17. Δxe4 f6 18. Δd3

Romovin: But this is an inaccuracy. Correct was 18. Δf3 Δxc4 19. Δxc4 Δe2

Δd2 Δd8 21. Δd4, and Black must

18. ...Δxc4 19. Δxc4 Δe2 20. Δd4

Δxc2 21. Δd7 b6

Romovin: Played too cautiously! The maneuvre ...Δa8-e8-e2 (also possible in the following moves) would allow Black to exploit the counter-chances created by White's 18th move and give him real chances of saving the game.91

22. h4 c5 23. h5 h6 24. Δh2

Romovin: This move is necessary, in order to be able to carry out the intended attack.

24. ...c4 25. Δb4 Δxb2 26. Δd5 Δxa2

Yudovich: A pawn is more than enough for Black, the trouble is that his king is left without reliable defenders.

27. Δc7+ Δf8 28. Δe6

Romovin: It was better for Black to play 28. Δf7 and on 29. Δd8+ Δh7 30. Δf8+ Δxf8 31. Δxf8; but even in this case Black could hardly make a draw, for example: 31... Δc2 32. Δf7 a6* 33. Δb7 b5 34. Δd6, and if 34... Δxc3, then 35. Δf8, and Black will not manage to exploit his pawns before White, after capturing the g- and h-pawns, decides the game with the assistance of the h-pawn.

Of course Black also had another kind of defence, but even upon this, as shown by our analysis, he does not achieve a draw.

29. Δxg7 Δe2

Yudovich: This invasion comes too late.

30. Δf5 Δxg2+ 31. Δh3 Δgc2

32. Δh6+ Δh8

Romovin: The other reply does not save him in view of 32... Δf8 33. Δd6+ Δe8 34. Δe7+ Δd8 35. Δf7+ Δc8 36. h6.

This is unfair criticism; the idea of the move was not only to save the pawn but to prevent the knight from entering the c5- and e6-squares.

21... Δe8 aids the advance ...c6-c5 followed by ...c5-c4, attacking the knight which is guarding b2. The counterattack by 21... Δe8 can in fact be ignored: 22. Δxb7 Δe2 23. Δxa7 Δg3+ 24. Δf1 g5 24... Δg3 h5 25. Δf2, winning, is one pitfall.

93 White can force a draw with 27. Δxh6 gxh6

28. Δxf6+ Δf8 29. Δh7+ etc., but obviously wants more.

94 Instead of this tame move, Black could play 32... Δxc3. Then after 33. Δxa7 b5 34. Δd6 Δg8 35. Δb7 Δd3 36. Δb4 Δd5 37. g4 f5, it is not apparent how White can win.
33.\texttt{Ad}8+! \texttt{Ah}7 34.\texttt{Ag}4 \texttt{Exc}3+ \\
35.\texttt{Ah}4 \texttt{Baa}395 36.\texttt{Ed}7+ \texttt{Ah}8 37.\texttt{Gxf}6 1-0

10 Spanish Game
Eugen von Schmidt
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1878

Notes by: Bogatirchuk

1.\texttt{e4 e5} 2.\texttt{Gf}3 \texttt{Cc}6 3.\texttt{Gb}5 \texttt{Gf}6 4.0-0 \\
\texttt{Gxe}4

An old defence which later virtually went out of fashion. Despite its apparent harmlessness, there are quite a few submerged reefs which an expert navigator such as Chigorin could skillfully exploit to destroy an opponent in a sea of endless sharp conflicts.

5.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{Ge}7 6.\texttt{We}2

Considered the best continuation of the attack. The drawback of the move is that it results in an exchange of the king's bishop and this weakens White on the light squares. The present game graphically illustrates the disadvantage of this exchange.

6...\texttt{Gd}6 7.\texttt{Gxc}6 \texttt{bxc}6 8.\texttt{dxe}5 \texttt{Gb}7 \\
9.\texttt{Gd}4 0-0 10.\texttt{Gc}3 \texttt{Cc}5 11.\texttt{Gf}5?

As is well known, the best move in the present position has proved to be 11.\texttt{Ge}1! in order, after the obligatory 11...\texttt{Gxe}6 12.\texttt{Ge}3 \texttt{Gxd}4 13.\texttt{Gxd}4 \texttt{Cc}5 \\
14.\texttt{Ge}3 \texttt{d}5 15.exd6, to force Black to take on d6, not with the pawn but the bishop (the so-called Rio de Janeiro Variation). The hasty white attack is, of course, easily refuted by Chigorin.

11...\texttt{d}5!

Of course not 11...\texttt{Ga}6 12.\texttt{Wg}4.

12.\texttt{Gxe}7+ \texttt{Wxe}7 13.\texttt{Ge}1 \texttt{Ge}6 14.f4

95 35.\texttt{Ed}3! is Black's best chance of saving the game.

A masterly move! Thanks to the knight blockade, the e5-pawn is not to be feared; however, the f5-pawn is extraordinarily strong, since it strengthens Black's command of the light squares in the centre of the board.

15.\texttt{Wf}2 \texttt{d}4! 16.\texttt{Ge}2 \texttt{c}5

Little by little, Black has opened the strong a8-h1 diagonal, which will soon be completely in his possession.

17.\texttt{Gd}2 \texttt{Gb}7 18.\texttt{b}4 \texttt{Gad}8 19.\texttt{bxc}5

With his last two moves, White has only increased the range of action of the black pieces.

19...\texttt{Wxc}5 20.c3

This attempt to develop activity only hastens the inevitable end for White.

20...\texttt{d}3! 21.\texttt{Ge}3

The exchange of queens is also hopeless for White, despite the opposite-coloured bishops.

21.\texttt{Wc}4 22.\texttt{Gd}4 \texttt{Cc}5 23.\texttt{Gec}1 \texttt{Ge}4 \\
24.\texttt{We}1 \texttt{c}5 25.\texttt{Gf}3 \texttt{Wd}5 26.\texttt{Ed}1

382
26...g5!
Chigorin carries out the attack masterfully and with his customary energy and precision. Characteristic for Chigorin is the timing of the attacking blow. Thus, for example, many masters, in the present position, would have occupied themselves with the preparation of the move ...g7-g5, by moving away the king to h8, placing the rook on g8 etc.; however, the text move typifies Chigorin's energy and dash.

27.fxg5 f4 28.c4 wc6 29.ad2
Exg5 30.h4 ad4!
Rapidly introducing the last piece into the attack.

31.ac3 Me4 32.Wf1 f3 33.xf3
Also 33.g3 f2+ loses instantly.
33...xf3+ 34.gxf3 Mxg4+ 35.xh1
Wxf3+ 36.Wxf3 xf3 mate
The attack was conducted very powerfully by Chigorin.

11 King's Gambit Declined
Mikhail Chigorin
Emanuel Schiffer
1st Match, St.Petersburg 1878 (9)

Notes by Romanov
1.e4 e5 2.f4 ac5 3.cc3 d6 4.cf3
c6 5.cc4 f6 6.d3 ag4 7.h3
xf3 8.Wxf3 We7 9.b5 xf4
10.xf4 0-0-0 11.xc6 bxc6
12.Gg5 We6 13.Me1 ad4 14.Ee2
Chigorin said: 'Isn't it risky to sacrifice two pawns just to place Black's queen and bishop in a poor position and open the a- and b-files for an attack? It is difficult to answer this question. The continuation of this, and the replayed game given below, shows that Black does not have easy play after White's 18th move.'

14.xb2 15.Eb1 Wxa2 16.cf2
eh8 17.Eg1 Me6

After the game, in joint analysis, Schiffer spoke in favour of the move 17...Ee5. This is justified upon the reply 18.d4 (18...xc2), but after 18.c3! Black, in Chigorin's opinion, does not have a satisfactory defence. For example, 18...d5 19.d4 dx4 20.Wf5+ Ed7 (20...Wxe6 21.dxe5!) 21.dxe5 h6 22.exf6 hxf5 23.fxe7! Wxe2 24.Eb8+ xb8 25.Wxd7 etc.

18.c3

18...d5 19.e5!! Exe5 20.xf6 gxf6
21.Ed4
Creating the threat of 22.Wf2.

21...xc3 22.xc6 Ed6 23.Eb8+
Ed7 24.Ee5+ Exe5 25.Wg4+
Me6

26.Wg8 Me7 27.Ed8+ Ec6 28.Ec1+
Ee6 29.Eb8+ Ea5
'The game was played', wrote Chigorin, 'under highly unpleasant conditions,
taking up the greater part of the evening and finishing in the small hours.'
Only tiredness from the four-hour struggle can explain why Chigorin missed the possibility of forcing mate by 30.\[c5+ d4 31.d3 g4+ d4 32.d1+ and played an immediate 30.g4?.
Schiffers defended with the move 30...c3, and Chigorin had quite a lot of trouble securing victory.
After acknowledging his defeat, Schiffers offered to replay the game on the following day (considering it as a new encounter in the match) from the position depicted in the last but one diagram.
This time the matter was concluded even more rapidly: 18...\[a3 19.e3 xc3 20.xc3 xc3 21.xc1 wa5 22.xc6 d7 23.wc1 d5 24.wb2 dd6 25.wb3+ d7 26.xd2 xc6 27.xa5 dxe4 28.dxe4 xe4 29.wf8 d6 30.xb8 c1+ 31.xh2 e2 32.d8+ e6 33.xc7, and Schiffers resigned. This victory gave Chigorin the seven points necessary to win the match.

12 King’s Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Kharkov
 Correspondence game 1878/79
NOTES BY: Chigorin
This was one of two games played by Chigorin against four Kharkov chess players. The second game was also won by Chigorin.
1.e4 e5 2.f4 xf4 3.g3 g5 4.c4 g4 5.0-0 gxf3 6.xf3 f6 7.d3 h6
Better, all the same, is 7...d5; also worthy of consideration is 7...Cc6.
8.C3 Ce7 9.Cf4

9...d6
Not a bad defence. There is also 9...xf4 10.xf4 xf4 11.xf4 f5 12.exf5 c6 13.xe1 d8.
10.xh6 xh6 11.xf7+ d8
12.f6 g5!
Black must defend the g7-square.
13.a1
The attack by 13.h4 does not lead to anything: 13...xh4 14.xg7 gh6! etc.

13...h3
Here and on the next move, after 13...g8 14.xg8+ xg8 15.f8+ d7 16.xg8, White wins easily.
14.xf2 xc6 15.xe6 xe6
16.xe6 g6 17.d5!
On 17.xf7 would follow 17..Cc7.
17..Ce7
If 17...e5, then 18.xh3! Ce7 19.xf7 (or 19.xe6 f8 20.xg8), winning at least a pawn and threatening xf6.
18.xf6 xf8 19.xf7!
White needs to provoke the move ...g6, so that Black cannot defend the
with the move ...\( \mathcal{D}g6 \), when the \( \mathcal{K} \) is attacked by the white queen (see next note).

19...\( \mathcal{W}g6 \) 20.\( \mathcal{W}b3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b8 \) 21.\( \mathcal{Q}d5! \) \( \mathcal{W}g7 \)
White threatened 22.\( \mathcal{W}c3 \), attacking the rook on h8 and the pawn on c7. If the g6-square were vacant, then Black would have prevented this attack by White with the move ...\( \mathcal{Q}g6 \).

22.\( \mathcal{Q}xe7 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe7 \) 23.\( \mathcal{W}f7 \)
White could obtain the advantage in another way, namely by playing 23.\( \mathcal{W}c3 \). Then best for Black would be to sacrifice the queen: 23...\( \mathcal{Q}g6! \) 24.\( \mathcal{W}f7 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \).

23...\( \mathcal{W}e8 \) 24.\( \mathcal{W}c3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 25.\( \mathcal{W}g7 \) c5
Black cannot save the piece.

26.\( \mathcal{W}xd7+ \) \( \mathcal{W}xd7 \) 27.\( \mathcal{W}xh8+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}c7 \)
28.\( \mathcal{W}f6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e8 \) 29.\( \mathcal{W}f5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e6 \) 30.\( \mathcal{Q}f3 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 31.\( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c7 \) 32.\( \mathcal{D}d4 \) \( \mathcal{Cxd4} \) 33.\( \mathcal{Cxd4} \)
\( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 34.\( \mathcal{W}f7 \)

34...\( b5 \)
If 34...\( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \), then 35.\( \mathcal{W}c4+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}d8 \)
36.\( \mathcal{W}g8+ \) etc.

35.\( \mathcal{W}g8 \) \( \mathcal{W}d7 \) 36.\( \mathcal{W}a8 \) \( \mathcal{C}b6 \) 37.\( \mathcal{W}b8+ \)
\( \mathcal{W}b7 \) 38.\( \mathcal{W}xb7+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}xb7 \) 39.\( \mathcal{J}f4 \) 1-0

13 Ponziani Opening
Eugen von Schmidt
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1879 (1)
Notes by: Chigorin

1.e4 e5 2.\( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 3.c3 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 4.d4
\( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 5.d5 \( \mathcal{Q}b8 \) 6.\( \mathcal{D}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 7.\( \mathcal{Q}xe5 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 8.0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}xd3 \) 9.\( \mathcal{Q}xd3 \) 0-0
10.\( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) d6 11.\( \mathcal{W}f3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 12.\( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) f6
Black would obtain a far freer game with 12...f5!

13.\( \mathcal{W}g3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 14.\( \mathcal{Q}f7 \) 15.\( \mathcal{Q}d2 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}h6 \) 16.\( \mathcal{E}ae1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 17.\( \mathcal{W}f2 \) c5
18.\( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 19.c4 \( \mathcal{Q}e8 \) 20.\( \mathcal{Q}f3 \)
b5 21.b3 \( \mathcal{W}c8 \) 22.h3 \( \mathcal{W}a6 \) 23.\( \mathcal{W}c2 \)
bxc4 24.bxc4 \( \mathcal{Q}a4 \)

25.\( \mathcal{W}c1 \)
After 25.\( \mathcal{W}c3 \) Black would win the exchange – 25...\( \mathcal{Q}g3 \) 26.\( \mathcal{W}f2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \).

25...\( \mathcal{Q}d8 \) 26.\( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g3 \) 27.\( \mathcal{W}f2 \)
The exchange of rooks would have entailed at least the loss of a pawn:
27.\( \mathcal{Q}xe8+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe8 \) 28.\( \mathcal{E}ae1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g6 \).

27...\( \mathcal{Q}c7 \) 28.\( \mathcal{E}h2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 29.\( \mathcal{E}fe2 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xd2 \) 30.\( \mathcal{Q}xd2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}a5 \) 31.\( \mathcal{Q}xe8+ \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xe8 \) 32.\( \mathcal{W}a3 \)
This and the next two moves seem quite useless, as later White has to lose a lot of time transferring his pieces to the king's flank. However, after 32.\( \mathcal{E}e2 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xd2 \) 33.\( \mathcal{E}xd2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g6 \), White is saddled
with weak a- and c-pawns, which have to be continually defended.

32...\textbf{W}b6 33.\textbf{Z}b1 \textbf{W}c7 34.\textbf{B}b3
34.\textbf{C}f3 was better.

34...\textbf{A}b6 35.f5 \textbf{W}d7 36.g4 h5
37.\textbf{A}f4 \textbf{A}f7 38.\textbf{C}e6 \textbf{H}xg4 39.\textbf{Z}g1

39...\textbf{A}xe6

It would seem that White now obtains a strong passed pawn, however it will be seen from the continuation of the game that the e6-pawn is not dangerous.

40.\textbf{B}xe6

It would be very bad to take with the d-pawn, since then would follow 40...\textbf{W}c7 with the threat of 41...d5+.

40...\textbf{W}e8 41.\textbf{Z}xg4 f5 42.\textbf{Z}g2 \textbf{A}d8
43.\textbf{A}d2 \textbf{A}f6 44.\textbf{A}f3 \textbf{W}h5 45.\textbf{W}e3
\textbf{Z}b8 46.\textbf{W}f4

46...\textbf{Z}b1!

With this move Black begins a bold combination, which appears to be fully justified; as a result Black gains a significant advantage in position.

47.\textbf{A}f2

Forced. Black threatened to decide the game by 47...\textbf{Z}f1.

47...\textbf{C}e1!

Black could exploit the poor positions of the white pieces by playing 47...\textbf{Z}b6 here and then ...\textbf{W}g8-f8-e7 with the better game; however the chosen continuation is more decisive. It seems that the sacrifice of the d6-pawn is too risky, but after a close examination of the position I did not find any way that White could exploit his passed pawns.

48.\textbf{W}xd6

I do not think White could have won with his passed pawns after giving up his queen for two pieces: 48.\textbf{C}xe1 \textbf{Z}e5 49.\textbf{W}xe5 \textbf{D}xe5 50.d6 \textbf{W}h4 etc. However, perhaps then White could play for a draw?\textsuperscript{96}

48...\textbf{E}e3 49.\textbf{C}g2

Now it seems that White has some grounds for giving up his queen for two pieces, by playing 49.\textbf{W}g3 \textbf{C}e5 50.\textbf{Z}xe5 \textbf{A}xg3 51.\textbf{A}xg3, but I do not think that he would then win. E.A. von Schmidt had only six minutes left for eleven difficult moves, and he could not foresee all the consequences of this combination.

49...\textbf{A}h4

\textsuperscript{96} In fact White is probably winning after 51.\textbf{Z}g3. For example, if 51...\textbf{W}d4 52.\textbf{A}g2 \textbf{W}f6
53.\textbf{A}g7 \textbf{A}f7 54.\textbf{A}g6! \textbf{W}f5 55.\textbf{A}xg7+ or 51...\textbf{C}e4
52.d7 \textbf{A}f7 53.\textbf{A}xe5+.
50.\textit{Q}xh4?
A mistake. E. von Schmidt later noted that he should have played 50.\textit{Q}b8+ 50...\textit{Q}f4 \textit{Q}e4) 50...\textit{Q}h7 51.\textit{Q}b2, but in this case Black does not take the rook at once but continues 51...\textit{Q}g6+ 52.\textit{Q}f1! \textit{Q}g3 and then, according to Black’s reply, 52...\textit{Q}h5 or 52...\textit{Q}f4 and 53...\textit{Q}xf2. 50...\textit{Q}g5+! 51.\textit{Q}f1 \textit{Q}xh4 52.\textit{Q}h2 \textit{Q}xc4+ 53.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}c1+ 54.\textit{Q}f2 0-1

Kerek: This tense and rich in content struggle is one of the most interesting games of Chigorin in the period leading up to his international appearances.

14 Italian Game
Andreas Asharin
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1879 (3)

Notes by: Chigorin and Grekov
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6 3.\textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}c5 4.0-0 d6 5.d3 \textit{Q}f6 6.\textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}e6 7.\textit{Q}b3 0-0
8.\textit{Q}e3 \textit{Q}b6 9.\textit{Q}e2? \textit{Q}h5!

Chigorin: A good move. If White now plays 10.\textit{Q}g3, then follows 10...\textit{Q}xg3 and 11...\textit{Q}xe3; if however 10.\textit{Q}xb6, and then 11.\textit{Q}xg3, then 11...\textit{Q}f4.

10.\textit{Q}h1
Chigorin: After 10.d4 Black replies 10...\textit{Q}g4.

10...\textit{Q}f6 11.h3

11...\textit{Q}f4!
Chigorin: Black cannot win a pawn by 11...\textit{Q}xh3 in view of 12.\textit{Q}g5; the sacrifice 12...\textit{Q}xg2+ 13.\textit{Q}xg2 \textit{Q}g6 14.\textit{Q}h1 h6 15.\textit{Q}e3! does not give Black sufficient attack.

12.\textit{Q}xf4 exf4 13.\textit{Q}d2 g5 14.\textit{Q}h2 \textit{Q}h8 15.c3 \textit{Q}g8 16.d4 \textit{Q}e7 17.\textit{Q}g1 \textit{Q}g6 18.\textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}g7 19.g3 \textit{Q}ag8
20.\textit{Q}f3

20...\textit{Q}xh3
Chigorin: Although Black obtains the attack after this sacrifice, by taking advantage of the bad position of the white king and knight, it would have been better to play without risk 20...c5!. After 20...h5 White would reply not 21.\textit{Q}xh5+ (in view of 21...\textit{Q}h7 followed by 22...\textit{Q}xh3) but first of all 21.\textit{Q}xe6!.

Gerek: With a daring and original sacrifice, Chigorin justifies his attack, carried out with great flair and fine understanding of the features of the position.

21.g4 \textit{Q}e7 22.\textit{Q}xh3
Chigorin: Possibly better was to defend the e4-pawn by 22.\textit{Q}c2, but in this case White has a difficult game after 22...\textit{Q}xg4 23.\textit{Q}xg4! \textit{Q}h4.

22...\textit{Q}xe4+ 23.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}e7 24.\textit{Q}ae1 \textit{Q}h4 25.\textit{Q}xb7 \textit{Q}f6 26.\textit{Q}f6 \textit{Q}g6
27.\textit{Q}c1 c5 28.\textit{Q}e4
Chigorin: 28.\textit{Q}e7 was the best move.

28...\textit{Q}xd4! 29.\textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}f6 30.\textit{Q}e1 h5
31.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}h7 32.\textit{Q}c2 \textit{Q}h6 33.\textit{Q}c3

387
\[ \text{\textcolor{white}{W}g7} \notag \text{34.\textcolor{black}{A}b3} \notag \text{\textcolor{black}{E}f8} \notag \text{35.\textcolor{white}{E}d5} \notag \text{hxg4} \notag \text{36.fxg4 f5 37.gxf5 \textcolor{black}{E}xf5} \notag \text{Chigorin: Also upon other continuations,} \notag \text{White could hardly have saved the} \notag \text{game.} \notag \]

\[ \text{38.\textcolor{black}{E}xf4} \notag \text{Chigorin: On 38.\textcolor{black}{E}g2 likewise would} \notag \text{follow 38...\textcolor{white}{W}h7! with the threat to win} \notag \text{the queen or the knight.} \notag \text{38...\textcolor{white}{W}h7! 39.\textcolor{black}{W}g2 gx\textcolor{black}{f}4 40.\textcolor{black}{W}f2} \notag \text{\textcolor{black}{W}b7+! 41.\textcolor{black}{E}g2 \textcolor{black}{E}e3 42.\textcolor{black}{E}d3 \textcolor{black}{W}e4} \notag \text{43.\textcolor{black}{E}c2} \notag \]

\[ \text{43...\textcolor{black}{E}g8?} \notag \text{Chigorin: Stronger would have been} \notag \text{43...\textcolor{black}{E}xc2 and White cannot take the} \notag \text{knight because of 44...f3.} \notag \text{44.\textcolor{black}{E}xe3 \textcolor{black}{E}xg2 45.\textcolor{white}{W}xg2 \textcolor{white}{W}xg2+} \notag \text{46.\textcolor{black}{E}xg2 \textcolor{black}{E}xe3 47.\textcolor{black}{E}f3} \notag \text{Grekov: The ill-fated white knight} \notag \text{remained on h2 from the 14th move to} \notag \text{the 47th – 33 moves, in the course of} \notag \text{which a lively battle took place with} \notag \text{the active participation of all the other} \notag \text{white and black pieces. How accurately} \notag \text{Chigorin assessed this feature of the} \notag \text{white position – the dead position of the} \notag \text{knight – when sacrificing the piece!} \notag \text{Now, of course, White could already} \notag \text{resign the game, but he continued his} \notag \text{resistance further.} \notag \text{47...\textcolor{black}{E}f6 48.\textcolor{black}{E}d3 \textcolor{black}{E}g7 49.\textcolor{black}{E}g3 \textcolor{black}{E}f8} \notag \text{50.b3 d5 51.\textcolor{black}{E}g2 \textcolor{black}{E}e7 52.\textcolor{black}{E}g3 \textcolor{black}{E}d6} \notag \text{53.\textcolor{black}{E}g2 \textcolor{black}{E}f8 54.\textcolor{black}{E}b5 \textcolor{black}{E}c8 55.\textcolor{black}{E}d3} \notag \]

\[ \text{55...\textcolor{black}{E}c3 56.\textcolor{black}{E}e2 \textcolor{black}{E}c2 57.\textcolor{black}{E}f1 \textcolor{black}{E}xa2} \notag \text{58.\textcolor{black}{E}e1 \textcolor{black}{E}a5+ 59.\textcolor{black}{E}f1 \textcolor{black}{E}c3 60.\textcolor{black}{E}d1} \notag \text{\textcolor{black}{E}f2+ 61.\textcolor{black}{E}g1 \textcolor{black}{E}e2} \notag \text{And Black won.} \notag \]

\[ \text{15} \notag \text{King's Gambit Accepted} \notag \text{Simon Alapin} \notag \text{Mikhail Chigorin} \notag \text{St.Petersburg 1879 (Play-off for 1st place)} \notag \text{NOTES BY: Romanov, Yudovich and} \notag \text{Bogoljubow} \notag \text{1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textcolor{black}{E}c4 d5 4.\textcolor{black}{E}xd5} \notag \text{\textcolor{black}{W}h4+ 5.\textcolor{black}{E}f1 \textcolor{black}{E}g5} \notag \text{Yudovich: By returning the pawn, Black} \notag \text{obtains the possibility of a comfortable} \notag \text{development of pieces, but all the} \notag \text{same he needs to take into account} \notag \text{the advanced position of his queen.} \notag \text{Also played here is 5...\textcolor{black}{E}f6 6.\textcolor{black}{E}c3 \textcolor{black}{E}b4} \notag \text{7.\textcolor{black}{E}b3 \textcolor{black}{E}c6 8.\textcolor{black}{E}f3.} \notag \text{6.\textcolor{black}{E}f3} \notag \text{Romanov: Later, against Didier in Monte} \notag \text{Carlo 1901, Chigorin played 6.g3! \textcolor{black}{E}xg3} \notag \]
8...g5 9.xg5 h6 10.e5 g6 11.c3 0-0 12.h5
d: Chigorin did not approve of 11...

Romanov: Chigorin did not approve of 11...

13.\text{\textasciitilde}e4

Bogoljubow: Worthy of consideration is

13.xc6+, but after 13...bxc6, Black is

still better.

13...f5 14.fxf5 xf5 15.d5 0-0-0

16.e2

Bogoljubow: Or 16.e1 xex5! (17.xe5 xe5 18.xe5 xe8) etc.

16...g3 17.c4 xex5! 18.xe5 xe5 19.b5

19.e4

Yudovich: The simplest. The endgame is

hopeless for White.

20.e4

Romanov: Also unsatisfactory is 20.xa7+

b8 21.e4+ xe4 22.b5 xd5.

20...xe4 21.c4 g3

22.d2

Romanov: The loss of the exchange is

the 'less evil'. If 22.h3, then 22...a6

23.c3 d4+ 24.h2 f1+ 25.h1

he8 26.d3 e1, and Black wins at

once.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{97} But 26.xf4 gxf4 27.xf1 would leave

White only a little worse.
After the exchange, the white pawn formation would be better.

12...\textit{e}f1!

White does not play 12.c3, so as not to weaken the d3-pawn; however, even this move would have been good in the continuation 12.c3 \textit{a}5 13.0-0 \textit{a}ad8 14.d4. Black would have difficulty in breaking up the white centre.

12...\textit{a}ad8 13.\textit{g}3 \textit{w}e6 14.h4 a5

An insipid move; it seems Black is merely playing a waiting game.

15.\textit{g}1 \textit{h}8

After 15...g6 White also replies 16.f5.

16.\textit{f}5! g6 17.a3

Necessary, in order to push back the bishop to d6, as only in this case is the following knight sacrifice correct.

17...\textit{d}6

18.\textit{e}e2! \textit{g}xf5

It would have been better for Black not to have accepted this sacrifice.

19.\textit{g}xf5 \textit{w}d7

If 19...\textit{w}f6 then 20.\textit{g}5.

20.\textit{h}6!

Weaker would be 20.\textit{w}g4, after which Black should play not 20...\textit{g}8 in view of 21.\textit{g}5, but 20...\textit{xf}6.

20...\textit{g}8 21.\textit{g}5 \textit{xf}5

Black is forced to sacrifice the exchange.

98 However then White has the strong 21.h5!. But even the better 20...\textit{xf}5 21.exf5 \textit{g}8 22.\textit{w}h5 is bad for Black.
22. hxg5 c5 23. h1 g8
White threatened 24. xh7+ xh7
25. h5 g7 26. h6+."

24. f6!
Again threatening to sacrifice the rook.
24... f8

25. h3
A rather interesting rook sacrifice presents itself: 25. xh7+ xh7 26. h1+, but it
would be mistaken because of the reply
26... h6! (if 26... h6? then 27. xh6+
= h6 28. h5 and White mates in a
few moves) 27. xh6+ = xh6 28. h5
f6++!

25... c4 26. a1 cxd3+ 27. cxd3 h6
28. g6 fxg6 29. f7 e7?
Black ought to give up the knight and
play 29... g7!.

30. xh6+ h6 31. f8+ xf8
32. xf8+ g8 33. xh6+ 1-0

17. King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Eugen von Schmidt
1st Match, St. Petersburg 1879 (4)
Notes by: Bogoljubow
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3. c4 Wh4+
4. f3 c6
A better continuation here is 4... d5.
5. d4 g5 6. c3 g7 7. f3 Wh5
8. h4 h6 9.e5 c5e7 10. g1 g4
11. h2 h3 12. e4 f5
d3.. Whxh4 is not possible due to 13. xf4.
13. c3

13... g8
Black derives no benefit from 13... xg2
14. xg2 cxd4 15. g1.
14. g3 b6 15. f4 b7 16. d5 0-0-0
17. f1
So as to meet 17... e7 with 18. e3.
Still, Black should have played this, for
now he weakens the position of his king:
17... g7 18. x7 e7+ x7 19.a4
g6 20.a5 xf4 21.xf4 g3

22. axb6!
The winning move. On 22...g2 now follows 23.\texttt{c5+ c6} (or 23...\texttt{c8 24.b7+ b8 25.a6+ xb7 26.wb3+}) 24.wa4+ d5 25.wa2+\texttt{c6 26.d5+ xc5 27.b4+ b5 28 wa6 mate.\textsuperscript{100}} If however 22...f2+, then 23.g2 xd1 (23...\texttt{xh4+ 24.xh4) 24.xd1 axb6 25.exg3 and White wins a pawn with the better position.

18...axb6 23.c5+! b8 24.wa4 1-0

13.wg4

This is better than 13.fxe5 wg6 14.wxf8+ xf8 15.exd6 xd6 and Black obtains a strong attack; he threatens 16.wg3. If 16.wg4 c5+ 17.hh2 ef1 and Black wins.\textsuperscript{102}

13...wf7 14.de2

A weak move. The logical continuation is 14.f5, after which Black would reply as in the game, 14...d5.

14...d5 15.\texttt{e3 f6} 16.wf3 dxe4 17.dxe4 exf4 18.\texttt{xf4}

No better is 18.xf4 g5! 19.e2 wg6 when Black has a strong attack.\textsuperscript{103}

18...wg6 19.gg3 ef7 20.wb3 \texttt{c5+}

On 20..\texttt{xe4 White would reply 21.wxb7.}

21.hh2

After 21.hh1 Black could take the pawn on e4.

\textsuperscript{100} Quicker is 25.wb3+ c6 26.d5+ xc5 27.a5 mate or 25.c4+ xd4 26.ad1+ xc5 27.wb5 mate.

\textsuperscript{101} But after 22...g2 23.c5+ b8! White probably has only a draw after 24.bxc7+ xc7 25.a7+ c8 26.a8+ c7 27.a7+ etc.

\textsuperscript{102} True, but White doesn't have to play 15.exd6, opening up diagonals which can be exploited by Black. Better is 15.wg4, when White's position is definitely not inferior.

\textsuperscript{103} Actually 18.xf4 is probably the best move as after 18..g5, 19.ed3! White is not worse.
21...h5!
A very strong move. If 22.\texttt{\textbf{Wxb7}} then 22...\texttt{\textbf{Af8}} and White cannot repulse the attack. Black threatens 23...\texttt{\textbf{Qg4+}}\texttt{\textbf{h}gx4} hxg4. If, however, White retreats the bishop on the 23rd move, then Black plays ...h5-h4 and after that ...\texttt{\textbf{Qg4+}}.
22.e5 \texttt{\textbf{Qd}5} 23.\texttt{\textbf{Qd}2} h4 24.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}2} \texttt{\textbf{Aaf8}}
25.\texttt{\textbf{Exf7}} \texttt{\textbf{Exf7}} 26.\texttt{\textbf{Wd3}}
It is no other way can White prevent the decisive blow ...\texttt{\textbf{Wf2}}; after 26.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}1} would follow ...\texttt{\textbf{Qe}3}!
26.\texttt{\textbf{Wxd3}} 27.\texttt{\textbf{cxd3}} \texttt{\textbf{Ef2}} 28.\texttt{\textbf{He1}}

28...\texttt{\textbf{Gd}4}! 29.d4 \texttt{\textbf{Cc}2}!
29...\texttt{\textbf{Qd}3} would be a mistake in view of 30.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}3}.
30.\texttt{\textbf{Qc}1} \texttt{\textbf{Qxd4}}
Obviously stronger than 30...\texttt{\textbf{Qb}4}.\footnote{30...\texttt{\textbf{Qxd4}} is in fact inferior to 30...\texttt{\textbf{Qb}4} since White could now play 31.\texttt{\textbf{Qxd4}} \texttt{\textbf{Qxd4}} 32.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}3} and all of Black’s advantage disappears. Best is the simple 30...\texttt{\textbf{Qxe}2} 31.\texttt{\textbf{Qxc}2} \texttt{\textbf{Qxd4}} or 31...\texttt{\textbf{Qb}4}, both of which win.}

31.\texttt{\textbf{Cc}3} \texttt{\textbf{Qxe}5+} 32.\texttt{\textbf{Qxe}5} \texttt{\textbf{Qxe}2}
White resigned.

19 Two Knights Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Eugen von Schmidt
3rd Match, St. Petersburg 1879 (1)
\textbf{Notes by: Chigorin, Yudovich and Bogoljubow}
1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\textbf{Qf}3} \texttt{\textbf{Qc}6} 3.\texttt{\textbf{Qc}4} \texttt{\textbf{Qf}6}
4.\texttt{\textbf{Qg}5} d5 5.\texttt{\textbf{exd}5} \texttt{\textbf{Qa}5} 6.\texttt{\textbf{Qb}5+} c6
7.\texttt{\textbf{Qxc}6} bxc6 8.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}2} h6 9.\texttt{\textbf{Qf}3} e4
10.\texttt{\textbf{Qe}5} \texttt{\textbf{Qd}6}
Yudovich: A well-known position in this sharp opening, which has been actively analysed even in modern times. But such is chess: this position was debated a hundred years ago, and remains under debate also today.
11.f4
Yudovich: The other plan is linked to the advance 11.d4.
11...\texttt{\textbf{Wc}7} 12.d4 exd3
Chigorin: 12...0-0 is better.
Bogoljubow: This is worse than 12...0-0. In this variation Black ought to create an attack with the help of the e4 pawn.
13.\texttt{\textbf{Qxd}3}!
Chigorin: Better than 13.\texttt{\textbf{Qxd}3}. If Black now wants to win back the pawn, by playing 13...\texttt{\textbf{Qxe}5}, then White obtains an attack, and his bishops become very significant for attacking the castled position.
13...0-0

Chigorin: On 13...\( \text{exe5} \) would follow 14.\( \text{Wxe2} \).

14.0-0 \( \text{exe5} \) 15.\( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 16.\( \text{Ac2} \)

16...\( \text{Ag4} \)

Chigorin: It is very difficult to find the absolutely correct reply for Black. For the purpose of analysing this position, E. von Schmidt tried in casual games some other moves:

A) 16...\( \text{Ab4} \) 17.\( \text{Wc1} \) \( \text{Ad8} \) (Bogoljubow: In my opinion the only possible continuation here is 17...\( \text{Ab7} \)!, which gives Black hopes of equalising the game) 18.\( \text{Ac3} \) \( \text{Wc5}+ \) 19.\( \text{Ah1} \) \( \text{Ad5} \) 20.b4! \( \text{AXB4} \) 21.\( \text{Wf4} \) and wins;

B) 16...\( \text{Ac4} \) 17.\( \text{Axc4} \) \( \text{Wc5}+ \) 18.\( \text{Ah1} \) \( \text{Wxc4} \) 19.\( \text{Ah6} \) winning a pawn;

C) 16...\( \text{Ab7} \) 17.\( \text{Wf3} \)! \( \text{Ad5} \) 18.\( \text{Ac3} \) \( \text{Ac5} \) 19.\( \text{Ab5} \) \( \text{cd5} \) 20.\( \text{Ac3} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 21.\( \text{Axg7} \)! \( \text{Ag7} \) 22.\( \text{Wf6}+ \) \( \text{Ag8} \) 23.\( \text{Ab3} \) \( \text{Ag4} \) 24.\( \text{Ag3} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) (if 24...\( \text{h5} \), then mate in three moves) 25.\( \text{Af5} \) and wins.

Yudovich: Chigorin pointed out that Von Schmidt tried to neutralise White's advantage in other games with 16...\( \text{Ab7} \), 16...\( \text{Ag4} \), 16...\( \text{Ac4} \), but in all these cases White gained a clear advantage. With regard to the present game, Chigorin's variations were reproduced in the Yugoslav Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings in 1984.

17.\( \text{Af4} \) \( \text{Wc5+} \) 18.\( \text{Ah1} \) \( \text{Wh5} \)

Chigorin: After 18...\( \text{Af2+} \) 19.\( \text{Bxf2} \) \( \text{Wxf2} \) 20.\( \text{Axh5} \) White obtains two pieces for a rook.

19.\( \text{Ag1} \)

Bogoljubow: Of course, he cannot play 19.\( \text{h3} \) because of ...\( \text{Af2+} \), winning the queen.

19...\( \text{Af6} \) 20.\( \text{Ac3} \) \( \text{Ab7} \)

21.\( \text{Axh6}! \)

Yudovich: The signal for a decisive attack.

21...\( \text{gxf6} \) 22.\( \text{Ac4} \) \( \text{Wh4} \)

Chigorin: Upon any other defence of the f6-pawn would follow 23.\( \text{Ac3} \).

23.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Wh3} \) 24.\( \text{Af6+} \) \( \text{Ag7} \)

Chigorin: Or 24...\( \text{Ah8} \) 25.\( \text{Ac3} \) etc.

25.\( \text{Wd4} \)

Chigorin: Threatening mate in two moves (25...c5 26.\( \text{Ac8}+ \), or 26.\( \text{Ah5}+ \)).

25...\( \text{Ag8} \)

Chigorin: 25...c5 26.\( \text{Ac8}+ \)

26.\( \text{Ac7+} \) \( \text{f6} \) 27.\( \text{Wxf6} \) mate

20 Evans Gambit

Mikhail Chigorin

N. Yakubovich

Correspondence game 1879

Notes by: Romanov

1.\( \text{e4} \) e5 2.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 3.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 4.b4

\( \text{BxB} \) 5.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{C6} \) 6.0-0 d6 7.d4 exd4

8.exd4 \( \text{Bb6} \) 9.\( \text{Ac3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 10.\( \text{Ag5} \)

This variation is called the Göring Attack, after the German chess player who published a short analysis of it in
Chigorin stated: 'After this weak move Black cannot hold the game.'

18.\(\text{x}b6\) axb6 19.e5 fxe5 20.\(\text{g}5!\) \(\text{xf}4\) 21.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{h}6\)

'On 21...\(\text{h}6\) 22.dxe5 dxe5 would have followed 23.\(\text{e}3\), which would also lead to a winning position', said Chigorin.

22.dxe5 d5 23.\(\text{xf}8+\) \(\text{d}7\) 24.\(\text{c}5!!\)

Black resigned in view of the variation 24...\(\text{b}5\) 25.e6+ \(\text{xe}6\) 26.\(\text{g}7+\).

21 Scotch Game
Mikhail Chigorin
Emanuel Schiffer

4th Match, St. Petersburg 1880 (6)
Notes by: Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3.d4 exd4
4.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 5.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 6.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{g}7\)
7.\(\text{c}4\) d6
8.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}6\) 9.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 10...\(\text{xf}6\) 11.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 12.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{e}4\)

The capture of this pawn was at least hazardous at this juncture.

10.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{g}6\)

'Necessary; if 10...0-0, then 11.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 12.c4 and wins', was Chigorin's comment.
11.\(\text{\textbf{Q}}\text{xc6} \text{\textbf{Q}}\text{xe3}+ 12.\text{\textbf{Q}}\text{xe3} \text{\textbf{B}}\text{xc6} 13.\text{\textbf{W}}\text{e2} \text{\textbf{W}}\text{f6} 14.\text{\textbf{O}}\text{d2} \text{d5} 15.\text{\textbf{O}}\text{d3} \text{\textbf{Q}}\text{e6}\)

16.\text{\textbf{hf1}}!

An excellent move which obviously prevents Black castling at once, as he threatens to win a piece by 17.f5.

16...\text{g6} 17.\text{\textbf{O}}\text{b3} 0-0 18.\text{\textbf{g4}}!

White might have also recovered the pawn with the better game by 18.\text{\textbf{O}}\text{c5}, but, as will be seen, this is much stronger. He again threatens 19.f5 etc.

18...\text{\textbf{Exe8}} 19.\text{\textbf{O}}\text{c5} \text{d4}

Weak. 19...\text{\textbf{Wh}}\text{h4} was his best play.\textsuperscript{105}

20.\text{\textbf{g5}} \text{\textbf{Wh}}\text{h8}

Foreseeing the sacrifice of the exchange, which White would recover with a pawn plus after 20...\text{\textbf{Wg7}} 21.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{fxc6} 22.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{\textbf{Wf7}} 23.\text{\textbf{Qxf6}} \text{\textbf{Qxf8}} 24.\text{\textbf{cxd4}}, and should Black attempt 24...\text{\textbf{Wxa2}}, the reply 25.f5!, opening the f-file, would win for White. But, no doubt, he would have chosen this line of play as the lesser evil had he perceived the fine combination which White wins up with...

\textsuperscript{105} But then 20.f5 d4 (if 20...\text{\textbf{Qc8}} 21.f6 \text{\textbf{Qg4}} 22.\text{\textbf{Wf1}} \text{\textbf{Qxe6}} 23.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} wins a piece) 21.\text{\textbf{cxd4}}
\text{\textbf{gxg5}} 22.\text{\textbf{gxf5}} \text{\textbf{Qd5}} 23.\text{\textbf{Qd7}} \text{\textbf{Wxd4}} 24.\text{\textbf{Wf2}} \text{\textbf{Wh8}} 25.\text{\textbf{Qxf8+}} \text{\textbf{Qxf8}} 26.\text{\textbf{Qc3}} with material advantage.

\textsuperscript{106} 21.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{\textbf{fxe6}} 22.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{\textbf{dxc3}} 23.\text{\textbf{bxc3}} \text{\textbf{Wf7}}
24.\text{\textbf{Qe4}} \text{\textbf{Wf4}} 25.\text{\textbf{Qc4}} \text{\textbf{Wg5+}} 26.\text{\textbf{Qh1}} \text{\textbf{Qh8}} 27.\text{\textbf{Qxe7}} instead wins a piece.

21.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{\textbf{fxe6}} 22.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}}+ 22.\text{\textbf{Qxe6}} \text{\textbf{Qd5}}! (22...\text{\textbf{Wf7}} 23.\text{\textbf{Qxf8}} \text{\textbf{Qxf8}} 24.\text{\textbf{cxd4}}) when play might continue 23.\text{\textbf{Qxg7}} \text{\textbf{Qxe2}} 24.\text{\textbf{Qxe2}} \text{\textbf{Qxg7}} 25.\text{\textbf{cxd4}} \text{\textbf{Qxf4}} with a balanced endgame where both players have weak pawns.

22...\text{\textbf{Qg7}}

Of course, if 22...\text{\textbf{Wf7}}, White wins by 25.\text{\textbf{Qc4}}.

23.\text{\textbf{Qe1}}!

A masterly move which leaves no escape for the opponent.

23.\text{\textbf{dxc3}}

Of course overlooking the opponent's deep design. But he could not save the game, since if the knight moved White would win by 24.\text{\textbf{Wd7}}+.

24.\text{\textbf{Wxe7}}!!

A highly ingenious and brilliant termination.

\textsuperscript{107} Apparently Steinitz had the queen on g7 here too, but it's on h8.
22 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Simon Alapin

Match, St. Petersburg 1880 (1)
Notes by: Romanov and Chigorin

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5

Romanov: The exchange variation of the French Defence in the 1880s was included among Chigorin's favourite weapons; he also frequently employed it in later years. This is one of the creative threads, linking Chigorin to his predecessor and teacher — the first Russian master, Tenchish, who even called the exchange variation the 'normal variation' of the French Defence.

This link also extended the other way. The Exchange Variation, under the undoubted influence of Chigorin, was adopted by the young Alekhine.

3...exd5 4.f3 f6 5.d3 d6
6.0-0 0-0 7.c3 c6 8.g5 g4
9.h3 xf3 10.xf3 xd4 11.wxe3

Romanov: It would be dangerous to hold on to the pawn — 11...c5 12.xf6 gxf6 13.h6.

12.xf6 xf6 13.xd5 wh4
14.e1 c6 15.xc3 xf4 16.wxe2
d4 f5 17.bd1 18.e2

Chigorin: The only move, repelling the attack.

18...ad8 19.xf4 xf4 20.c3

Chigorin: In view of the following correct sacrifice of the black knight, it would be better to play beforehand 20.e7, and White would win the pawn in any case; then he threatens c2-c3.

20...xf3+

Chigorin: A forced, but perfectly well-founded sacrifice. If 20...b5, then 21.b3+ and he wins a pawn.

21.gxf3 ed6

Romanov: White's position is unenviable. Here, the attempt to hold on to the piece would lead to consequences such as: 22.e3 g6+ 23.h1 h6 24.mf1 xh3+ 25.0g1 (25.mg2 h2+ and 26.h4) 25...h4! 26.xf1 h2 27.hc2! (27.wd2 wh3+ and 28.xf2+; therefore the queen must move to a square where it will be defended by another piece) 27...f4 28.me5 ('or to e4; but not to e6 or e7 because of wh3+, or h1+', wrote Chigorin) 28...h8.

Black has a very strong attack against the extremely cramped positions of the white pieces, 'and in practical play, in
all probability, White would very soon lose', said Chigorin. 108
However, Chigorin finds a combinational defence.

22...e6! exf6 23...b3 f6 24.e1

g6+ 25...f1

25...xf3

Romanov: Here Alapin misses the draw which could have been achieved by 25...d2 26.e6 (26.d1? g5)
26...xd3+ 27.e2+ f8 28.xb7 d1+. However, not 27.h8 28.c2!

26.e3! g2+ 27.e1 f8

Romanov: Or 27...f7 28.c4.

28.e6 h1+ 29.d2 g1
30.b4+ g8 31.e8+ f7
32.e7+ g6 33.e6+ 1-0

23 Queen’s Gambit Declined

Simon Alapin
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, St.Petersburg 1880 (10)

Notes by: Chigorin

1.d4 f6 2.c4 e6 3.d3 d5 4.e5

108 In reality all these variations are in White's favour.
109 But Black could then still put up stiff resistance by 29...d1+ 30.e1 f1+ 31.xg1!

xe1+ 32.yg2 f8. Therefore the right path to go down is 29.d2! e8 30.e1, winning.

Grekov: The defence chosen by Chigorin gained in popularity at the end of the 19th century. Later on it also included the move ...h7-h6, which was frequently played by Capablanca and Tartakower. Credit for the modern treatment of this variation belongs to the Soviet grandmaster, Bondarevsky, and master Makogonov.

7.cxd5 exd5 8...d3 b7 9.0-0

bd7 10.e4 11.xe7 xe7

Grekov: It is interesting that this position also occurred, after a slight transposition of moves, in the game Botvinnik-Stoltz, played in 1926!

12.b3 c6 13.a3?

A useless move.

13...h6 14.e2 f5 15.a4

We do not understand the point of this move. Possibly White wanted to follow up with a6, in order to weaken the defence of the c6 pawn? This would have been all very well if Black did not have an attack on the king's flank.

15.g5 16.e5 17.b4 18.f4

18...g3! 19.hxg3

It is obvious that after 19.fxg3 would have followed 19...d2 20.xd2 xe3+ and Black wins. 110

110 But instead 19...xe4 fxe4 20.e2 gxf2+ 21.xf2 keeps Black’s advantage to a minimum.
19...\textit{Qxf2!!} 20.\textit{Exe1}  
20.\textit{Qxf2}, then 20...\textit{Qg4+} 21.\textit{Qg1}  
\textit{Exe3+} 22.\textit{Qh1} \textit{Qxg3}! 23.\textit{Qf1} \textit{Qxf4}  

20...\textit{Qxd3} 21.\textit{Qxd3} \textit{Qe4} 22.\textit{Qf1}  
\textit{Qg8} 23.\textit{Qe5} \textit{Qxg3} 24.\textit{Qxg3} \textit{Qxg3}  
25.\textit{Qe2}  

25.\textit{Qxc6}, Black would have replied 25...\textit{Qg5} or 25...\textit{Qh4}, threatening  
\textit{Qxg2+}.  
25...\textit{a5} 26.\textit{Qxc6}  

Thanks to this sacrifice of the exchange,  
White wins three pawns and obtains  
passed pawns for himself; however,  
this is not to his advantage.  
26...\textit{Qxc6} 27.\textit{Qxc6} \textit{Qd8}! 28.\textit{Qxb6}  
\textit{Qc8} 29.\textit{Qxa5} \textit{Qc1}+ 30.\textit{Qf2}  

30...\textit{Qxg2+}!!  
30...\textit{Qh4} would be a mistake in view of  
31...\textit{Qd8+}! \textit{Qxd8} 32.\textit{Qf7+}.  
30...\textit{Qg8} 31.\textit{g3} \textit{Qg7} 32.\textit{g4}! was not  
decisive.  
31.\textit{Qxg2} \textit{Qg5}+ 32.\textit{Qf3}! \textit{Qh5}+  
33.\textit{Qf4} \textit{Qh6}+  

After the win of the rook by 33...\textit{Qf1+}  
34.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qxf3}+ 35.\textit{Qe5} \textit{Qxe2}, White  
gives perpetual check by 36.\textit{Qd8+} and  
37.\textit{Qf6+}.  
34.\textit{Qf3}!  

Obviously after 34.\textit{Qg3} \textit{Qg1+} Black  
mates easily.  
34...\textit{Qh1}+ 35.\textit{Qg2}  

If now White places his king on \textit{f4}, then  
Black can choose a continuation such as  
35.\textit{Qf4} \textit{Qh6}+ 36.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qf1}+ 37.\textit{Qf2}  
\textit{Qh5}+ 38.\textit{Qg3} \textit{Qg1}+ 39.\textit{Qf4} \textit{Qg5}+  
40.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qg3}+ 41.\textit{Qe2} \textit{Qxe3+} 42.\textit{Qf1}!  
\textit{Qc1}+ 43.\textit{Qe1} \textit{Qg1}+ 44.\textit{Qxg1} \textit{Qxe1}+  
45.\textit{Qg2} \textit{Qe4}+ 46.\textit{Qf3} \textit{Qg7} and Black  
should win with the help of his \textit{f-} and  
\textit{h}-pawns.  
35...\textit{Qh3}+ 36.\textit{Qf4}! \textit{Qf1}+  

37.\textit{Qf3}?  
White could prolong the game by  
37.\textit{Qg5} \textit{Qxg2}+ 38.\textit{Qf6} \textit{Qg7}+ 39.\textit{Qe6},  
but it is difficult to say whether he could  
save the game after 39...\textit{Qg8}+ 40.\textit{Qf6}  
\textit{Qf8}+ 41.\textit{Qe6} \textit{Qh1}.  
37...\textit{Qxf3}+ 38.\textit{Qe5} \textit{Qxe3}+ 39.\textit{Qd6}  
\textit{Qxg2} 40.\textit{Qd8}+ \textit{Qg7} 41.\textit{b4} \textit{Qg6}+  
42.\textit{Qxd5} \textit{Qe6}+ 43.\textit{Qc5} \textit{Qe7}+  
0-1 111  

24 Sicilian Defence  
Simon Alapin and Mikhail Beskrovny  
Mikhail Chigorin and G. Klements  
Consultation game, St.Petersburg 1880  
Notes by Romanov  
1.e4 c5 2.\textit{Qf3} e6 3.\textit{Qc3} \textit{Qc6} 4.\textit{Qb5}  
\textit{Qg7} 5.0-0 \textit{Qg6} 6.\textit{Qxc6} bxc6 7.d3  
\textit{Qe7} 8.\textit{Qe2} 0-0 9.\textit{Qg3} f5 10.\textit{Qe1} \textit{Qf} 

111 Or 43...\textit{Qc3}+ 44.\textit{Qb5} \textit{Qc6}+ 45.\textit{Qa5} \textit{Qxa3}  
mate.
11. Qf1 e5 12. Wh1 d6 13. Qg1 Wh8
14. b3 We8 15. Qb2

25 Scotch Game
Simon Alapin
Mikhail Chigorin
St. Petersburg 1881
Notes by Chigorin
1. e4 e5 2. Qf3 Qc6 3. d4 exd4
4. Qxd4 Qf6
This move is as good as 4... Qc5.
5. Qxc6
The strongest move now is 5. Qc4; if
5... Qxe4 then 6. Qxf7+ Qxf7 7. Wh5+
Qg6 8. Qd5+ Qg7 9. Qxe6! Bxc6 10. Qxe4
etc. 113
5... Bxc6 6. Qd3 Qc5 7. 0-0 h6
On 7... 0-0 would follow 8. Qg5, when
Black should play 8... Qe7.
It seems this continuation would be
better than the move played in the
game.
8. e5 Qh7 9. Wg4 Qg5 10. Wh1 d5

11. Wa4?
This move, made with the intention
of gaining a tempo for the advance of
the pawn, f2-f4, seems weak, since the
queen moves away from the attacking
zone.
Stronger would be 11. Qg3.
11... Qd7 12. f4 Qh7 13. f5 We6!
0-0 17. Qb3

---

112 It wasn’t necessary to defend the e2-knight.
The game might have opened up with interesting
play and imbalance after 28. gxf4 Qxe2 29. Qg3
Qxg3 30. Qxg3+ Qf8 31. fxe5 Qh6 32. Qh3
Qxh3 33. gxh3 Qxd1 34. Wf2 etc.

113 In fact Black can now continue 10... We8!
with advantage.
17.f6 Black would play 17...gxf6
\( \text{xh6 fxe5!} \), and for the exchange
gets a pawn and a very strong
position.\(^{14}\)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

17...\( \text{b6}! \)
The best move. Black, exploiting the
advantage of the position of the white queen, has
an excellent basis to sacrifice the exchange,
gaining a pawn and an attack in return;
otherwise White would be in a difficult position and allow the exchange of knight for
two pawns on the board.

18.c3 \( \text{xf4} \) 19.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 20.\( \text{xf1} \)
c5 21.\( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{d6} \) 22.\( \text{b1} \) c4!

Grekov: Now the white queen is cut off
and White has to spend a great deal of
time in freeing her. In sacrificing the
exchange, Chigorin had of course also
taken into account this advantageous
feature of the position, which gives him
time to prepare an attack on the white
king's flank.

23.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 24.\( \text{wa3} \) c5 25.\( \text{e3} \)
\( \text{c6} \) 26.b3

Necessary; the queen has no other way
out than via the b2-square.

26...\( \text{c7} \) 27.\( \text{wb2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 28.g3
d4! 29.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 30.\( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \)

\( \text{f4} \) But instead of taking the exchange
immediately White can play 19.\( \text{xh7} \)
and then 20.\( \text{xf8} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 21.\( \text{f3} \), with threats
of his own.

31.cxd4 cxd4 32.\( \text{xd4} \)
Grekov: It is obvious that giving up
the exchange is White’s best chance;
otherwise the advance of the black
pawns in the centre easily decides the
game.

32...\( \text{b6}! \) 33.\( \text{wc3} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 34.\( \text{xf1} \)
\( \text{xd8} \) 35.\( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 36.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{d5} \)
37.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 38.\( \text{d3} \)

38...\( \text{g5}! \)
Clearly, Black could not take the f5-
pawn with the rook; now he threatens
to capture it.

Grekov: At the same time a very fine trap
into which the opponent falls.

39.\( \text{fxg6} \)?
Now White loses the knight.
After 39.\( \text{g4} \) Black would have continued
the attack by playing ...\( \text{h6} \)-\( \text{h5} \). After
the loss of the knight, White all the
same has chances of making a draw.
In any case, it would not be easy for
Black to bring the game to a winning
position.

39...\( \text{c3} \) 40.\( \text{gxh7} \) \( \text{g7}! \)

Apparently, White had calculated only
40...\( \text{xf7} \) 41.\( \text{d7} \) when he would
win the queen.

41.\( \text{f8}+ \) \( \text{xf8} \) 42.\( \text{e6} \) \( \text{xf3} \)+
43.\( \text{xf3} \)+ \( \text{xf3} \) 44.\( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{f1} \)+
45.\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f2} \)+ 46.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{xa2} \)
And White resigned on the 77th move.

King’s Gambit Accepted

Mikhail Chigorin

Pavel Otto

St. Petersburg 1861

Notes by: Chigorin

(Remove White’s QB1)

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5 4.Qc4

g4 5.0-0 gxf3 6.Qxf3 Qf6 7.d3

Qh6 8.Qd2 Qe7 9.Qc3 Qb6+

10.Qh1 0-0 11.g3 d5 12.exd5

Qe3? 13.Qh5 f3 14.d6! Qg6

15.Qae1 Qg5 16.Qxf3 Qf5

The position is rather interesting. On

16...Qe6 would follow 17.Qxe6!; if, however, 16...Qg7, then White mates in

four moves, beginning with 17.Qxf7+!

17.Qe2 Qd7 18.Qh5 Qg7

19.Qe7! Qxe7

The feature of this game lies with the

present position: if not this move, then

there is an interesting and surprising

sacrificial variation. If Black had played

19...Qh3, then 20.Qxf7! Qxf7 21.Qxf7

Qxh5 22.Qxg7+ and 23.Qxg8 mate.

Or 21...Qxc3 (instead of 21...Qxh5)

22.Qxh7+ Qh8 23.Qf7+ Qe8 24.Qxg6

and White wins.

20.Qxf7 115 Qc6+ 21.Qf3+ Qh8

22.Qd5 116 We8

Black loses his queen if he plays

22...Qxd5.

23.Qh6

Here too, 23.dxe7 decides, e.g.

23...Qxe7 (or 23...Qf5 24.Qxf8 Qxh8

25.Qxg7+ Qxg7 26.Qxf5, mating in a few moves) 24.Qxf8+

Qxf8 25.Qxg7+ Qxg7 26.Qg5+ Qh8

27.Qe5+ Qg7 28.We8+ Qg8 29.Qxg8

mate, again demonstrating the power

of White’s two bishops.

115 Missing a quicker way to victory by

20.Qxf7+ Qh8 (or 20.Qxf7 21.Qxf7+ Qh8

22.Qxg7 mate) 21.Qxg7+ Qxg7 22.Qe5+ Qh6

23.Qxf4+ Qg7 24.Qf6 mate.

116 White can win by 22.Qxg7 23.Qf8 23.Qxg7+

Qxg7 24.Qg6+ Qg6 25.Qxg6+ Qxg6 26.e8Q

Qc6 27.Qg8+ Qh6 28.Qh8+ Qg5 29.Qh4+

Qf5 30.Qe4+ Qf6 31.Qxf3+ etc
24...hxg8 25. hxg8 hxg8 (25...we1+ 26.wxg2 we2+ 27.wxh2 and White wins) 26.wxg7+ wxg7 27.hh8 mate.  
25. lxe1 lxe617 26. cc3+ ef6  
27.lxf6 dg7 28.exf4+ cg6 29.lf7+ cg5 30.lf6 mate  

27 King’s Fianchetto Defence  
Sergey Polner  
Mikhail Chigorin  
St. Petersburg 1881  
Notes by: Chigorin  
(End Black’s d7-pawn and allow White to commence with two moves)  
1.e4 – 2.d4 d6 3.f4 g6 4.cf3 cg7  
5.cc3 hh6 6.dd3 0-0 7.0-0 cc6 8.h3  
Intending to play the bishop to e3, White prevents the move ...cg4. It is over-cautious, since the move of the bishop to e3 is useless for attacking purposes. Better was 8.5.  
8...lf7 9.de3 e5 10.fxe5 dxex5  
11.d5 le7  

112. c4  
This move greatly restricts the activity of White’s king’s bishop.  
12..b6 13.cc3 c5 14.wd2 h6  
15.de2 g5 16.hh2 cg6  
The aim of White’s preceding moves is clear, however, in preventing the move ...lf4, White worsens his  

117 25...lxf5 would have prevented the mate and left plenty of play in the game.  

19.g2  
If 19.gxg4, then 19..w7+ 20.oh5  
ob6 21.oh4 (if 21.oe1, then 21..og8  
22.oh4 ohf4+! 23.exf4 exf4 and Black will win118) 21..oh4 22.gxh4  
h7 and White can hardly save the game; he cannot take the h6-pawn with his bishop because of ...we8+,  
Black, however, threatens ...gg8 or ...xd6-e6-f6+. On 23.dxh5 would follow  
23..xf5+! 24.exf5 e4 25.cg3 le5 and then ...gg8; if 26.lxe4, then 26..we7+  
and mate on the following move.  
19..gxh5 20.lxf5+ 21.lh7  
18.wg4 22.cg1 cg5 23.wxg5 hgx5  
24.cf2 lxf5+ 25.cf3 lxf8+ 26.wf3  

118 This isn’t so clear. Instead 23..lxf4+ forces  
mate after 24.exf4 ef6+ 25.cg6 we7+ 26.cf5  
h5! 27.lxe5 eg4+ 28.cg5 lh6 mate.
26...\textit{\textbf{xf4!}} 27.\textit{\textbf{gxf4}}

White is practically forced to take the knight. On 27.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xf1}}} could follow 27...\textit{\textbf{h5}} 28.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \texttt{h6,} and White's king is in an extremely cramped and dangerous position.

27...\textit{\textbf{exf4}} 28.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{we2}}} \textit{\textbf{wg3+}} 29.\textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{g4}}
30.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{f3}} 31.\textit{\textbf{h2}} \textit{\textbf{wh2}} 32.\textit{\textbf{d1}} \textit{\textbf{g3}}
33.\textit{\textbf{dd2}} \textit{\textbf{dd4}} 34.\textit{\textbf{xf3}} \textit{\textbf{xf3+}}
35.\textit{\textbf{gg2}} \textit{\textbf{e3}} 36.\textit{\textbf{bb1}}

Despite the extra pawn, together with two passed pawns, the best result for White is a draw.

36...\textit{\textbf{ff7}} 37.\textit{\textbf{dd3}} \textit{\textbf{ee1}} 38.\textit{\textbf{ff3+}} \textit{\textbf{ee7}}
39.\textit{\textbf{ff1}} \textit{\textbf{xf1}} 40.\textit{\textbf{xf1}} \textit{\textbf{xb2}} 41.\textit{\textbf{gg2}}
\textit{\textbf{ee5}} 42.\textit{\textbf{ff3}} \textit{\textbf{a6}}

43.\textit{\textbf{a4}}

After this move, White apparently already cannot save the game. Better was 43.\textit{\textbf{dd3,}} which, moreover, would not deprive Black of the possibility of subsequently playing ...\textit{\textbf{b6-b5;}} besides this, he would also have available another way to win the game, namely:

43...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{b8}}} 44.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{f1}}} \textit{\textbf{f6}} 45.\textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{g5}}
46.\textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{h4}} 47.\textit{\textbf{g2}} \textit{\textbf{g4}} and then \textit{\textbf{f4-e3}} etc.

43...\textit{\textbf{b5!}}

The position is interesting. Now Black obtains a second passed pawn, which also decides the game.

44.\textit{\textbf{axb5 axb5}} 45.\textit{\textbf{cxb5 dd7}} 46.\textit{\textbf{dd3}}
\textit{\textbf{cc7}} 47.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{f1}}} \textit{\textbf{bb6}} 48.\textit{\textbf{gg2}} \textit{\textbf{aa5}}
49.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{f3}}} \textit{\textbf{bb4}} 50.\textit{\textbf{b6}} \textit{\textbf{c4}} 51.\textit{\textbf{b7}} \textit{\textbf{c3}}
52.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{d3}}} \textit{\textbf{bb3}} 53.\textit{\textbf{gg2}} \textit{\textbf{c2}} 54.\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xc2+}}}
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{xc2}}}

And White resigned.
Chapter 9

Breaking through a window into Europe

The name of Chigorin was a bright new star in the Russian chess firmament — already he was widely known not only in Russia but also abroad, from the magazine Tea Sheet and the chess columns of Russian and foreign newspapers. There were enthusiastic opinions of Chigorin by Winawer, Von Schmidt, Beskrovny, who all had great connections with foreign chess organisations.

After receiving a new invitation to participate in an international tournament, on 5 July 1881, Chigorin gave notice to the official authorities: 'For the purpose of going abroad to Berlin, from 12 August to 3 September of the current year, I now have the honour to ask for 28 days leave from 10 August.'

On 4 August the gentleman minister deigned to allow Chigorin leave. And that's all! But, you know, he was very well aware of why Chigorin was about to go abroad. He could not but know that this modest petty bureaucrat represented the pride and hope of Russian chess, that Chigorin strived to bring fame to the name of Russia in the individual area of eminent chess culture. But the gentleman minister also did not think about ways to somehow help Chigorin. And this would have been so simple: to grant Chigorin a small allowance out of the public purse, to give him two weeks additional leave, for rest and training before Chigorin made his debut in the international arena, etc. For the first time in his life, Chigorin set off for an international tournament, but at the expense of his leave and on his own paltry salary. This is how Czarist Russia 'helped' people of talent!

How were the conditions in the chess world at that time? These were the early years of international chess sport. International tournaments were still unusual and held rarely. For the previous 13 years there took place, in all, ten tournaments that could be considered in any way significant. Far more in vogue were the old form of competitions, a match between two opponents, for the organisation of which was required neither such lengthy 'diplomatic' negotiations as now — nor the drawing up of a complicated procedure with arbiters, judges, seconds, trainers. The play usually went on a serious stake, but since at that time even the leading masters did not possess great means, then, for each participant of the match, the fees were made up by collective subscription of his supporters, as on one or other bird in cock-fighting. Defeat of a competitor also entailed the loss of the money placed on him, but in the event of a win, the 'subscribers' received their payment back, plus 50 per cent cash profit for the win. The remaining 50% went to the winner of the match. By comparison with cock fighting this was nevertheless a step forward!

At times, matters were organised even more simply. In one little German tournament, first prize was taken by the famous Adolf Anderssen (winner of the first two international tournaments), who had already outlived his glory and after three more years went to his grave. The 2nd prize was not money, but material goods, and fell to the lot of two amateurs who ought to have played for these
knick-knacks in a match. But they decided that it would be more interesting to watch celebrated masters engage in single combat and suggested this 'worthy' present (as we now put it) – that Louis Paulsen play a match against Anderssen or another famous chess player of this time, on the notorious condition that 'winner takes all'!

So what, decided Anderssen, to receive one prize is good, but two is better.

Against me, the old man will hardly hold out, thought Paulsen. And they played a match of ten games! The course of the match was amusing: in the first three games, Anderssen won, then the next three – Paulsen; the 7th Anderssen, the 8th was a draw, the 9th and 10th games and also the match, Paulsen won, receiving the 'valuable present.'

Who, however, at the moment of Chigorin's entry into the international arena, entered into the cadre of the strongest masters?

We are already acquainted with Simon Winawer, who was then in the prime of life, and with Louis Paulsen – a fine and clever master of the positional style – forerunner of the hypermoderns of the 1920s. Already not so far behind him in strength was his brother Wilfried Paulsen, his fellow countrymen, crossing over from the USA, Mackenzie and Mason, the prominent and talented Englishman, Bird, the Austro-German, English, the Hungarian, Schwarz, and others.

But all these were eclipsed by the famous chess players: the English champion, Joseph Blackburne, the Czech immigrant taking up residence in London, Wilhelm Steinitz, and Johannes Zukertort, coming from Czarist Poland and also taking up residence in the English capital, which in the 19th century was the centre of world chess.

Blackburne was a brilliant master of attack. Colleagues in jest nicknamed Blackburne the 'black death' in analogy with his surname and of course the deadly killer plague! The many times champion, Blackburne, appeared in international tournaments over the course of a remarkable 52 years. After beginning his career with struggles against Anderssen and Steinitz in the London tournament of 1862, he finished it with his participation in the St.Petersburg tournament of 1914, where he encountered Lasker, Capablanca and Alekhine, and thereby included in the span of his creative work all the World Champions of his time!

But Blackburne had a serious psychological defect, peculiar to many chess players, even the most outstanding ones – he was an excellent tournament fighter, but played considerably weaker in matches against opponents of equal class and therefore was never a pretender to the World Championship.
At the time of Chigorin’s tournament debut in 1881, the question about the World Championship was due to be settled between the other two great chess players.

Wilhelm Steinitz became famous as victor and prizewinner in international tournaments in London (1862 – 4th prize), Paris (1867 – 3rd prize), Baden Baden (1870 – 2nd prize), where the vice-president of the organising committee was I.S.Turgenev, London (1872 – 1st prize), Vienna (1873 – 1st prize), and as winner in the matches against Anderssen in 1866 (+8 -6 =0), Blackburne in 1863, 1870 and 1876 with the staggering overall score +19 -1 =3, and Zukertort in 1872 (+7 -1 =4). Up to this time, Steinitz already had a reputation as an innovator of chess theory, expounding the principles of the so called ‘new school’ in the chess column of the English newspaper The Field.

In 1881, Steinitz was already 45 years old. He was a well trained, experienced master of the positional style, but by no means averse to the opportunity of conducting a combinative and bold attack, if it should turn up. For Steinitz’s characteristic was great self-control, evenness of success and boundless belief in himself (an extremely important factor in sporting success!). When Steinitz was asked about the chances of the participants before the start of one tournament, he replied ‘The most chances of taking first place, of course, are mine. Take this into account – all the remaining participants have to play Steinitz, but not me!’

On the other hand, Johannes Zukertort, the rival of Steinitz, did not have enough of this self-belief. In the final reckoning, in his 1886 match against Steinitz, he suffered a defeat to the tune of +5 -10 =5, after which Steinitz was proclaimed World Champion, while Zukertort weakened sharply as a chess player and died after only two more years.

But in 1881, the 38-year-old Zukertort was in the bloom of his brilliant combinational gifts, combined with high technical play for this time. The list of his successes was less impressive than Steinitz’s: the tournament in London (1872, 2nd prize), Leipzig (1877, 3rd prize), Paris (1878, 1st prize), plus a won match against Anderssen (1871 +5 -2 =0).

Despite the fact that Steinitz did not participate in the Berlin tournament 1881, the line-up of the competition was first-class.

However, there was in fact no struggle for first prize. Blackburne was in such brilliant form that long before the end he secured victory for himself, and at the finish outdistanced the next player, Zukertort, by 3 points, winning against him in their personal encounter. Out of 16 games, Blackburne won 13, lost to Mason and made draws with Witteck and Berger. 3rd and 4th prizes were shared by Winawer and Chigorin, scoring 10½ points, which of course for a novice was a great success. Indeed, Chigorin lost his first game in the tournament, but in the following ten rounds scored 8½ points and got the better of Blackburne. But here Chigorin did not have enough self-control and most of all lacked sporting practicality (which even later he regularly suffered from), the ability to restrain his fiery temperament and be satisfied with half a point, when there were not any real chances of a win. In the decisive personal encounter with the English champion, Chigorin shunned
an honourable draw and lost, after which he became demoralised and conducted the finish poorly.

The high prize taken by Chigorin, and the quality of his play, made a strong impression on the chess world.

The magazine *Universal Illustrated* wrote about the game Chigorin-Von Schmidt: 'Chigorin finished the game brilliantly with a combination, attracting universal attention. Out of the number of foreigners, arriving in Berlin to participate in the congress, the most interest was excited by the secretary of the St.Petersburg Chess Club, Chigorin, Blackburne and Mason.'

For connoisseurs of our day, also highly interesting is Chigorin’s encounter with one of the strongest foreign masters, Louis Paulsen, who, as Black, chose his favourite Sicilian Defence against Chigorin. The Russian chess player conducted the whole game in excellent, harmonious style. At first he positionally outplayed Paulsen – the master of defensive manoeuvring, then methodically opened the king’s flank and inflicted a decisive blow on the pawn cover of the black king. If this game were published now, ascribing it to two leading contemporary grandmasters, nobody would doubt its authorship, since strategically it is not out of date.

The German chess magazine’s view of this encounter was: ‘A brilliant victory! One such game would be sufficient to recognise the representative of Russia as a first-class master.’

After the tournament, such an important authority as Zukertort wrote: ‘Russia’s representative, Mr. Chigorin, is generally admitted to be the coming man. His style is dashing, his combinations very ingenious, but a little too daring. We congratulate him on his splendid debut. Mr. Chigorin is the editor of the Russian chess magazine, Chess Sheet, and we knew him only as a local celebrity. With one leap he has bounded into the ranks of the masters… we feel confident Mr. Chigorin will be a formidable opponent in future contests.’

Chigorin’s next appearance – at the international tournament in Vienna in 1882 – did not bring him success. He shared only the 12th and 13th places. The first two places were shared by Winawer and Steinitz, scoring 24 points out of 34 games. Only one point away from them lagged Mason and, a further half a point, Mackenzie and Zukertort. Blackburne only came 6th this time, scoring 21½ points. Chigorin had a total of 14 points (from 34 games).

The only real achievement of Chigorin in this ‘marathon’ was his result against both pretenders to the World Championship – Steinitz and Zukertort. Chigorin won one and lost one against each of them.

What was the reason for Chigorin’s failure, even though the tournament was hardly stronger than Berlin? Probably, most of all, the long distance (18 contestants playing two circuits!), as a consequence of which the tournament lasted seven weeks and the strain proved too much for the inexperienced Chigorin. Possibly also, because of nervous failure, non-sporting reasons played a great role on the impressionable Chigorin. The chess club, formed by him with such difficulty, despite the desperate attempts of its ‘secretary’ – M.I.Chigorin, to defend this centre
of Russian chess life, ceased its existence because of a lack of money. And, of course, Chigorin was overworked by his bureaucratic office duties, which did not offer him the possibility of either rest, or preparation for an important international competition. There were enough reasons for his bad, non-combative mood.

Chigorin understood the reason for his failure. Returning to St. Petersburg, he took the firm decision to break with the bureaucratic drudge, the more so since his financial situation, already a year before, had significantly improved. On 17 October 1881, the editorship of Universal Illustrated reported to its readers—chess amateurs: 'The death of our dear co-worker, I.S. Shumov, had unfortunately resulted in a discontinuation of the 'Chess' column. However, the editorship announces the resumption of it in this number, and that the conduct of the column will now be taken on by Mikhail Chigorin, representative of Russia in the Berlin international chess congress.' Such were the first fruits of his creative chess work and the reaction of public opinion! It became clear to Chigorin what exactly was his future direction!

And the day before accepting his new responsibility of appearing in the international arena, on 22 February 1883 Chigorin presented to the gentleman minister his final statement: 'Due to my domestic circumstances, I am no longer able to carry on with the duties of my post as a registration clerk and ask you to accept this application and make arrangements to release me from office.'

The gentleman minister deigned to give his agreement to dismiss the petty bureaucrat, Chigorin, and the great Russian chess player, Mikhail Ivanovich, left the hated office and at last breathed a sigh of relief.

And this moral freedom, the possibility of giving himself up completely to his favourite pursuit, immediately brought great theoretical success and made up in full for the previous year's failure in Vienna.

After resting, bringing himself up to date with theory, training, Chigorin set off for the international tournament in London with its very strong line-up of participants. The contest again took place in two circuits, but this time with 14 participants. It is interesting that in this tournament for the first time was used the double chess clock, well known to Soviet chess players but specially invented for this tournament by the Manchester clockmaker and chess amateur, Wilson. Looking at the overall results we can see how sensational this tournament was for its time. You know, even dry 'book-keeping' columns of figures of chess tables can sometimes be very interesting. Who won against who? Why did so and so lose to so and so, though they would seem to be of equal strength? Who outdistanced who, and by how much? These are questions to be answered by analysing the technical results of the contest.

From the tournament table we see the brilliant success of Zukertort, finishing ahead of Steinitz by 3 points, and the excellent result of Steinitz, outdistancing the other competitors by 2½ and more points. The results of the tournament proved to world public opinion that only a match between these leading masters could determine the strongest player in the world.

Blackburne, playing in his native land, won 3rd prize, while 4th prize was gained by Chigorin, conducting this very difficult competition with great enthusiasm.
Of particularly important significance for the future creative path of the Russian chess player was the fact that he won both games against Steinitz – and in first rate, fighting style. The tournament book said: 'Chigorin, the winner of the fourth prize, ought to have a great future before him. He has not yet the experience of Zukertort and Steinitz, but he possesses that energy which is requisite to make a great master, and throughout the tournament he played persistently to win and not to draw his games, and happily obtained his deserved reward.'

At the end of the tournament, the London Chess Club nominated Chigorin as an honorary member – the English regarded this as a high honour, the more so when awarded to a foreign player.

Incidentally, to this day, the foyer of Simpson's restaurant in London is adorned with a chess board and preserved chess pieces with which Chigorin played.

During the tournament in London, lasting about two months (i.e. with far less rigid rules of play than in the Vienna tournament of 1882), games with living chess pieces were regularly held in a circus arena. This is what Chigorin had to say about it, after directing the play, together with Zukertort and Gunsberg:

'There were games played with living chess pieces; soldiers in rich costumes, moving about on a huge chess board as indicated by the players... The spectacle was an enormous success and each time a foreign master was conducting a game, there was excitement amongst the public.'

At the end of the London tournament, Mikhail Ivanovich, who no longer needed to hurry back to his secretarial work for the by now defunct chess club, nor for his official duties, travelled to Paris. There he had an offer to play a match with the venerable French master Arnous de Rivière, who many years before had been the regular partner of the genius Morphy. Chigorin won the match with the score +5 -4 =1 and returned to his native land, joyfully met by the St. Petersburg chess amateurs. The Russian people understood that Chigorin had raised the authority of Russian chess in the international arena, and that, by his appearances in foreign competitions, three years in succession, he had 'broken through a window into Europe!'

28 King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Carl Schmid
Berlin 1881 (3)

Notes by: Bogoljubow

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Qf3 g5 4.Qc4
Qg7 5.d4 d6 6.0-0 h6 7.c3 Qe7

Here the knight is badly placed. I would prefer 7...Qc6! (and then ...Qf6). If 8.g3, then a preliminary 8...g4 9.Qh4 f3 and only then ...Qf6.

8.g3 g4 9.Qh4 f3

\[ \text{Diagram:} \]

10.Qa3 0-0 11.Qf4 Qbc6 12.h3!
Qa5 13.Wd2 Qxc4 14.Qxc4 h5
Necessary was 14...\( \text{Q}g6 \) 15.\( \text{Q}xg6 \) \( \text{fxg6} \), which would still give good chances. Now, however, the position of the king becomes weak.

15.\( \text{Q}h6 \) \( \text{Q}g6 \)

16.\( \text{Q}f5! \)
The decisive move!

16...\( \text{Q}xf5 \) 17.\( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{Q}h8 \) 18.\( \text{Q}xg7 \) \( \text{hxg7} \) 19.\( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \) 20.\( \text{W}f4 \) \( \text{Bg8} \)

21.\( \text{Rae1} \)
White with full justification plays for mate.

21...\( \text{h}7 \) 22.\( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Bg5} \) 23.\( \text{Rh}1+ \) \( \text{Q}g7 \)

24.\( \text{f6+!} \) \( \text{Q}g6 \)
\( \text{Ef2} \) \( \text{xf6} \), then 25.\( \text{Rh}7+ \).

25.\( \text{Rh7!} \) \( \text{W}xf6 \)
Also hopeless is 25...\( \text{Q}xh7 \) 26.\( \text{W}xg5 \) with the threat of 27.\( \text{Rh}1+ \).

"Instead of this passive move why not inter-attack with 17...\( \text{d}5 \) ? If 18.\( \text{Q}xg7 \) \( \text{Q}xg7 \) e3 then 19...\( \text{W}d6 \) poses problems for White.

26.\( \text{R}h6+ \) \( \text{Q}xh6 \) 27.\( \text{W}xf6+ \) \( \text{Q}g6 \) 28.\( \text{R}h1 \) mate

29. King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Simon Winawer
Berlin 1881 (11)

Notes by Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\( \text{Q}f3 \) g5 4.\( \text{Q}c4 \) g4 5.\( \text{Q}e5 \) \( \text{Wh}4+ \) 6.\( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{f3} \) 7.d4 \( \text{Qf6} \)
The best move here is 7...\( \text{Q}h6 \); it is bad for White to take the knight, and then the f7-pawn with the bishop, since, after 8...\( \text{Q}e7 \), Black obtains a strong attack.

8.\( \text{Q}c3 \) \( \text{fxg2+} \) 9.\( \text{Q}xg2 \) \( \text{Wh3+} \) 10.\( \text{Q}g1 \) \( \text{d}5 \)
A mistaken combination; the best reply here was 10...\( \text{d}6 \).

11.\( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}xd5 \) 12.\( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}d6 \)
13.\( \text{W}e1! \) \( \text{Q}d7 \)
13...\( \text{Q}c6 \) was best, but even then White obtains the better game after 14.\( \text{Q}xc6 \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 15.\( \text{e}5 \) etc.

14.\( \text{Q}xd7 \) \( \text{Q}xd7 \) 15.\( \text{e}5 \) 0-0-0
After the retreat of the bishop, Black, of course, loses a rook.
Winawer counted on obtaining an attack, but White's decisive 17\( ^{th} \) move escaped his notice.

16.\( \text{exd6} \) \( \text{Q}de8 \) 17.\( \text{W}a5! \)
Black resigned.
Romanovsky explained: ‘The idea behind Black’s piece sacrifice would be very good – White’s king is exposed and in imminent danger from the threats of ...g4-g3 and ...f6 – if he could manage to avoid mate. However, on 17...b6 follows 18.a6+ b8 19.dxc7+ a8 20.xb6 mate. Chigorin was also ready to conclude the game effectively after 17...b8 18.f4! c6 (18...f6 19.xc7+ a8 20.b8+! (but not 20.d7??, threatening 21.b8+!, because of 20...xd5) 20...xb8 21.d7+ a8 22.c7+ b8 23.xe8+ a8 24.d8 mate. Unfortunately, in reply to 17.a5, Winawer resigned and so the brilliant combinative idea remained in the notes.’

30 Centre Game
Mikhail Chigorin
Pavel Otto
St. Petersburg 1881

NOTES BY: Chigorin and Bogoljubow
1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.wxd4 c6
4.Ke3

Bogoljubow: Played for the first time by W. Paulsen. Also 4.wa4 deserves attention. On 4.wc4, as Mieses tried against Rubinstein (Berlin 1918), Black obtains a good game with the surprising move 4...d5!

4...g6
Chigorin: Apart from 4...g6, worth considering is 4...b4+ (5.c3 a5) and 4...f6.

Bogoljubow: As frequently played by Blackburne. Best, however, is 4...f6.

5.c3 g7 6.d2 d6 7.e2 0-0 8.0-0 d6 9.h4 e5 10.h5 e4
11.g3!

119 But 18...b6 19.a6 c6 20.dxc7+ a8 would delay the end a little.

11...h4
Chigorin: No better was 11...hxh5 12.f3 e5 13.f4 g4 14.f5 and White threatens 15.xg4 hxg4 16.g5 winning back the pawn whilst maintaining a strong attack on the king.

12.exh5! gxh5 13.f3 e5
Chigorin: On 13...f6 (13...e5 14.f4 etc.) 14.g5 e6 15.e5 etc.

14.f4 g7 15.f5 e5 16.h3 f5
17.wxh5 xd1 18.xd1
Chigorin: It is best to take the knight with the king so that he has the opportunity to go to c4 with the bishop.

18...h8
Chigorin: Despite the fact that he is two exchanges up, Black has a very difficult defence; for example: if 18...xc3 19.xc3 f6 20.c4+ Wh8 21.f3 d5

120 But 13.h4!, forcing 14.wel, seems to be winning for Black.
Bogoljubow: White has overcome his opening difficulties and stands better.

12...\textit{d}7

Romanovsky: Interestingly played! Black does not fear 13.\textit{x}xh6 \textit{x}xh6 14.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{e}7 and Black threatens a counterattack after ...\textit{e}(any)\textit{f}8.

13.\textit{q}d2

Bogoljubow: Risky would have been 13.\textit{x}xh6 \textit{x}xh6 14.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{e}7 15.\textit{d}3 \textit{hf}8 16.\textit{c}c4 \textit{f}f4 etc., with a strong attack.

13...\textit{g}g7 14.\textit{ae}1 0-0 15.\textit{g}e3

Bogoljubow: Better would have been 15.\textit{g}g3.

27.\textit{g}6+! hxg6 28.\textit{w}h6+ \textit{g}8

29.\textit{w}h8 mate

Romanovsky: Chigorin's attack in this little game delights with its elegance and energy.

31 King's Gambit Accepted
Wilhelm Steinitz
Mikhail Chigorin
Vienna 1882 (10)

Notes by: Romanovsky and Bogoljubow

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.\textit{f}3 g5 4.\textit{c}c4 g4 5.\textit{e}e5 \textit{wh}4+ 6.\textit{w}f1 \textit{ch}6 7.d4 f3 8.\textit{w}c3 \textit{xc}6

Romanovsky: The opening reference books recommend 8...d6 9.\textit{d}d3 fxg2+ 10.\textit{g}xg2 \textit{g}7.

9.\textit{f}f4 d6 10.\textit{xc}6 fxg2+ 11.\textit{g}xg2\textit{bc}x6 12.\textit{ff}1

15...\textit{w}h8 16.\textit{ae}2 d5!?

Romanovsky: A surprising sacrifice of a pawn which leaves White no choice.

Bogoljubow: Thanks to this the knight retains free movement, and Black obtains a lively attack.

17.exd5 \textit{d}5 18.\textit{ed}3 \textit{wh}5 19.\textit{g}1 \textit{ch}4 20.\textit{g}3 \textit{w}g6 21.\textit{wa}5 \textit{d}3+ 22.\textit{h}h1 \textit{h}5

Romanovsky: Black has a counterattack! Steinitz finds the only antidote.\textsuperscript{121}

23.d6!

Romanovsky: Threatening 24.\textit{wh}xh5+.

23...f5 24.\textit{xc}7 \textit{ad}8 25.\textit{e}e3\textsuperscript{122} h4 26.\textit{ae}2

\textsuperscript{121} In fact 23.\textit{xc}7 and \textit{ax}c6 are also possible.

\textsuperscript{122} Anticipating 25...\textit{fe}8 followed by ...\textit{h}5-\textit{h}4.
26...\Boxxd4

Romanovsky: It was impossible to calculate the consequences of the move 26...\Boxxd2. Probably Chigorin decided not to go in for a position where he would have to defend without any sort of counterplay. Unpleasant is the variation 26...\Boxxd2 27.\Boxxe7 \Boxxf1 28.\Boxxg7+ \Boxxg7 29.\Boxxe5+ \Boxxh7 30.\Boxxf4 and, despite the loss of two 'exchanges', White has a dangerous initiative. All the same, it was necessary for Chigorin to go in for this, since after the move chosen by him White's initiative proves decisive.

Bogoljubow: A shortage of time does not give Chigorin the chance to find the right move 26...\Boxxd2!, after which Black obtains good prospects, e.g. 27.\Boxxe7 \Boxxf1 28.\Boxxd7 \Boxxd7 29.\Boxwxd7 g3 30.\Boxwxc6 (30.\Boxxe7? \Boxxg4!) 30...\Boxxh2 etc. The outcome of the game would be unclear.

27.\Boxxe7

Romanovsky: Why not 27.\Boxxd4 \Boxxd4 28.\Boxxe7 \Boxxc8 29.d7, winning a piece? After the move played Black could continue 27...\Boxxe6, attacking the bishop that is defending the knight.

27...\Boxxe2 28.\Boxxe2 g3

---

123 In fact this position is dangerous for White if Black now continues 30.\Boxxg3+ 31.hxg3 \Boxxh6 32.gxh4 \Boxxh4+ 33.\Boxxg2 g3.

Romanovsky: 28...\Boxxe6 is much better.

29.\Boxxf3 \Boxxg8 30.hxg3 hxg3 31.\Boxxg2 \Boxxh6 32.\Boxxe5+ 1-0

Romanovsky: In the second half of the tournament, Chigorin took full revenge. See Game 34.

32 Centre Game

Mikhail Chigorin
George Mackenzie
Vienna 1882 (12)

Notes by Rogozin
1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.\Boxwdx4 \Boxxc6 4.\Boxxe3 g6

The strongest continuation now is 4...\Boxxf6 5.\Boxxc3 \Boxxb4, followed by ...0-0 and ...\Boxxe8 to attack the e4-pawn and prepare to open the game by means of ...d7-d5, which would favour Black in view of the unfortunate position of the white queen. Mackenzie does not strive for great activity in the opening, setting himself the modest aim of developing his pieces.

5.\Boxxd2 \Boxxg7 6.\Boxxc3 d6

Now already White has the necessary means and time to prevent ...d6-d5, for example, 6...\Boxxg7 7.0-0 0-0 8.\Boxxc4 etc.

7.f4

Attacking the centre before deciding where on the king's flank to place his minor pieces. Now (after f2-f4) the knight on g1 will exert strong pressure on the centre from f3. Not bad now is 7.0-0-0 and, if 7...\Boxxg7, then 8.\Boxxc4 0-0 9.h4 with an immediate attack on the king's flank, as happened for example in a later game Mieses-Spielmann, Breslau 1912.

7...\Boxxg7

7...\Boxxf6 offered Black greater prospects.

8.0-0-0 \Boxxe6 9.\Boxxf3 \Boxwd7
16. \( \text{g}d4! \)
Tempting was 16.\( \text{g}g5 \), with the threat of \( \text{h}h3 \), but after this would follow 16...\text{xxf4}! 17.h4 \text{h}6! etc.

16...\text{d}d7
Relatively best.
16...\text{e}e4 would have lost immediately to 17.\text{h}h3+ f5 18.\text{he}1.

17.\text{b}b5! c6 18.\text{xa}7+ \text{c}c7
19.\text{xd}5!
Undoubtedly, when carrying out the manoeuvre \( \text{d}d4-b5xa7+ \), Chigorin had in mind this sacrifice of the exchange.

19...\text{xd}5 20.\text{b}b5 \text{e}e6
Also after 20...\text{g}g4 or 20...\text{f}f5, White’s attack on the opponent’s king would be irresistible.

21.\text{c}c3+ \text{b}b6 22.\text{e}e1 \text{xa}7
Black had already committed himself to this on his 20\text{th} move, as retreating the queen would lead to a catastrophe in view of the threat 23.\text{d}d4+ and 24.\text{e}e7+.

23.\text{xe}6 fxe6 24.\text{e}e3+ \text{a}a8
25.\text{a}a3+ \text{a}a6 26.\text{xa}6 bxa6
27.\text{xa}6+ \text{b}b8 28.\text{b}b6+ \text{c}c8
29.b4 \text{he}8 30.\text{wa}7 e5 31.b5
Black resigned.

33. Evans Gambit
Johannes Zukertort
Mikhail Chigorin
Vienna 1882 (15)
Notes by: Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.\text{f}f3 \text{c}c6 3.\text{c}c4 \text{c}c5 4.b4 \text{b}b6 5.b5
This continuation of the attack is not as good as 5.0-0 or 5.a4.

5...\text{a}a5 6.\text{e}e2 d6 7.d3 \text{e}e7 8.\text{bd}2
0-0 9.\text{g}f1 \text{g}6 10.h3 a6 11.bxa6
\text{xa}6 12.g4 \text{h}4 13.\text{g}g3 \text{xf}3+
14.\text{xf}3 \text{d}d4 15.\text{b}b1 \text{c}c6
16.\textit{d}2

If White defends the pawn by 16.a3, then, irrespective of whether or not it remains defensible, Black obtains a counterattack, e.g. 16...\textit{Wh}4 17.\textit{Wh}2 \textit{g}6 18.\textit{W}d2 \textit{c}5 etc.

16...\textit{Exa}2 17.\textit{g}5

White would obtain a very strong position if Black allowed him to play his knight to f5. The next move destroys White's plan.

17...\textit{f}6!

The best move – to exchange off the menacing white pawn.

18.\textit{c}3

White wins the exchange, but for two pawns. After 18.\textit{h}4, Black would continue 18...\textit{fxg}5 19.\textit{hxg}5 \textit{Exc}2! 20.\textit{W}xc2 \textit{Exf}3, winning even three pawns for the exchange, and obtaining the better game.

18...\textit{Exd}2! 19.\textit{Wxd}2 \textit{fxg}5 20.\textit{E}f5

Worse would be 20.cxd4 \textit{Exf}3 21.dxe5 \textit{Exe}5, threatening 22...\textit{Exg}3.

20...\textit{b}6 21.\textit{E}g4 \textit{Exf}5 22.\textit{Exf}5 \textit{g}6 23.\textit{W}a2+ \textit{E}g7 24.\textit{fxg}6 \textit{Exf}2+ 25.\textit{E}d1 \textit{hxg}6 26.\textit{W}f1

If 26.\textit{Exb}7, then 26...\textit{b}6, and Black recovers the exchange.

26...\textit{b}6 27.\textit{Exf}8 \textit{Wxf}8 28.\textit{W}e2 \textit{Wf}4 29.\textit{Ea}1 \textit{a}5!

30.\textit{a}3

White cannot defend the pawn with the king: 30.\textit{Ec}2 \textit{Exc}3, and if 31.\textit{Exc}3, then 31...\textit{Wd}4+, winning the rook.

30...\textit{b}6 31.\textit{d}7 \textit{Ee}7 32.\textit{Ec}2 \textit{Ed}5 33.\textit{Ec}6 \textit{Ee}3+ 34.\textit{Eb}2 \textit{Ed}5 35.\textit{Ea}4 \textit{d}4 36.\textit{cx}d4 \textit{ex}d4 37.\textit{Wf}3?

Also on any other move by White, Black obtains a winning position: he threatens 37...\textit{Ec}3+ 38.\textit{Eb}1 \textit{Wg}3.

37...\textit{Wf}2+ 0-1

After 38.\textit{Ea}3 would follow 38...\textit{Ec}3 39.\textit{Eb}4 \textit{Exb}4+ and mate in a few moves.

34 Evans Gambit

Mikhail Chigorin
Wilhelm Steinitz

Vienna 1882 (27)

Notes by: Chigorin, Romanovsky, Zukertort and Bogoljubow

1.e4 \textit{e}5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.\textit{Cc}4 \textit{Cc}5 4.b4

Romanovsky: The first time Chigorin employed the Evans Gambit in international practice was at the tournament in Berlin 1881. Before this, Chigorin had chosen the opening in
Chigorin: White does not play an immediate 11.\&a3, because the next move of the black queen to f6 is necessary; if 11...\&f6, then 12.\&a3.

11...\&f6 12.\&a3 \&ge7

Bogoljubow: Now Black has the good fortune to be able to castle.

13.\&d5 0-0

Chigorin: 13...\&d8 should be played.

14.\&xc6 bxc6 15.\&b4

15...c5

Zukertort: Black should concern himself with eliminating one of the white knights, by continuing, for example, 15...\&e8 16.\&c4 (or 16.\&a5 \&g4 17.h3 \&xf3 18.\&xf3 \&f4 19.\&xc7) 16...\&f4! 17.\&a5 \&g4 with a defensible game.

Bogoljubow: A pawn sacrifice which unfortunately brings upon itself further losses. Though in such positions sacrifices are unavoidable, he could possibly obtain some counter-chances by continuing 15...\&e8 16.\&a5 \&e6 17.\&xc7 \&f4! (not 17...\&ac8 because of 18.\&a5!) and an opportune ...g6-g5 etc. It is possible that in this variation even better would be firstly 15...\&e8 16.\&a5 \&g4 (instead of 16...\&e6) 17.h3? \&e6 18.\&xc7 \&f4!, and then ...g6-g5 etc.

16.\&xc6 \&c6 17.\&c4 \&e8

Romanovsky: On 17...\&g4 it would follow 18.\&cxe5 \&xe5 19.\&xe5 \&xe5 20.\&xe5 \&xd1 21.\&xf8.
18. \( \text{Qd6} \)

Romanovsky: Obviously a combination which was seen beforehand.

Zukertort: In the course of the whole game Chigorin conducts the attack with very fine judgement of the position and rare mastery. It is pleasant to mention in the present game the absence of excessive bravado, frequently passing into risk, which characterised his play in the Vienna tournament.

Bogoljubow: Thanks to this White wins a pawn and obtains a decisive attack.

18...\( \text{cxd6} \) 19.\( \text{Wxc6} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 20.\( \text{Exd6} \) \( \text{Wg7} \) 21.\( \text{Ead1} \)

21...\( \text{Qg5} \)

Chigorin: Black has no better way out than to sacrifice two pieces for a rook. White threatened 22.\( \text{Wxa8} \). If 21...\( \text{Qac8} \), then 22.\( \text{Wxc8} \) \( \text{Qxc8} \) 23.\( \text{Bd8} \) and White wins. If 21...\( \text{Qxf3} \), then 22.\( \text{Wxa8} \) \( \text{Qxa8} \) 23.\( \text{Bd8} \) 24.\( \text{Wxf8} \) 25.\( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 26.\( \text{Bxa7} \), and Black will be forced to give up his bishop for the a-pawn; for example: 26...\( \text{Qc2} \) 27.a4 \( \text{Qxe4} \) 28.a5 \( \text{Qc5} \) 29.\( \text{Bc7} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 30.\( \text{Qd7} \) h6 31.a6 etc.

Romanovsky: Black gives up two bishops for the rook, but this only postpones defeat.

22.\( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) 23.\( \text{Exd1} \) \( \text{Qac8} \) 24.\( \text{Wa4} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) 25.\( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{We6} \) 26.\( \text{Bd5} \) \( \text{Wb6} \) 27.\( \text{Bb4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 28.\( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qce8} \) 29.\( \text{Bd6} \) \( \text{Wb8} \) 30.\( \text{Qd7}! \)

30...\( \text{Wd8} \)

Zukertort: Of course, if 30...\( \text{Qxe4} \), then 31.\( \text{Qf6}+ \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 32.\( \text{Wxe8}+ \).

31.\( \text{Qe5} \)

Chigorin: Even better was 31.\( \text{Qf6}+ \) \( \text{Wxf6} \) 32.\( \text{Wxe8}+ \).

31...\( \text{a5} \) 32.\( \text{Qa3} \)

Zukertort: Also possible was 32.\( \text{Qxa5} \) (32...\( \text{Qxe5} \) ? 33.\( \text{Qxe5}! \)).

32...\( \text{Exd6} \) 33.\( \text{Exd6} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 34.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Wg5} \) 35.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qg3} \)

36.\( \text{Cc5} \) \( \text{Exd6} \) 37.\( \text{Exd6} \) \( \text{Wc3}+ \)

38.\( \text{h2} \) \( \text{Wxc5} \) 39.\( \text{Wc8}+ \) \( \text{Qg7} \)

40.\( \text{Wc5}+ \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 41.\( \text{fxe5} \) 1-0

35 Evans Gambit

Simon Winawer

Mikhail Chigorin

Casual game, Warsaw 1882

Notes by: Chigorin

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 3.\( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 4.\( \text{b4} \) \( \text{Qxb4} \) 5.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 6.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 7.0-0 \( \text{Qb6} \) 8.\( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 9.d5 \( \text{Qa5} \) 10.\( \text{Qc3} \)
26...\textit{\texttt{\texttt{xg2}}}+ 27.\textit{\texttt{xg2}} \textit{\texttt{exe4}} 28.\texttt{wxf3} \textit{\texttt{de1+}}

White resigned.

36 Game Ending

Mikhail Chigorin

Joseph Blackburne

London 1883 (9)

Notes by: Romanovsky

White is a pawn ahead, but Black’s pieces are very active. He threatens to decide the game with the move 33...\textit{\texttt{we1}} or 33...\textit{\texttt{df3}}. The defence 33.\texttt{d1} would lead, after 33...\texttt{f2}, to a position which had already occurred in the game (Black’s last move was 32...\texttt{g1}). Chigorin solved the complicated creative problem in the following way:

33.\texttt{wa4}!

White threatens mate in three moves by 34.\texttt{we8}+ etc. Blackburne, a very sharp and ingenious chess player, undoubtedly foresaw this attack, but reckoned that, having in reserve a sacrifice of the exchange on c1, he would be able to repulse the onslaught of the opponent.

33...\texttt{a5} 34.\texttt{d5}! \texttt{xc1+}

The only continuation, but seeming to be sufficient to save him.

35.\texttt{xc1} \textit{\texttt{we1+}} 36.\texttt{wb2}!

Black counted on 36.\texttt{d1}, which would have allowed him to carry out a beautiful combination: 36...\texttt{xd3+}!
8. \textbf{Bb3} \textbf{Be7} 9.\textbf{h3}

White voluntarily plays a move which nowadays would be regarded as artificial. Tarrasch, the foremost populariser of Steinitz' principles, used up a great deal of ink discussing such moves as h2-h3, a2-a3, ...h7-h6, ...a7-a6. Actually, moves like this weaken the pawn cover and should be avoided if they are not played in conjunction with a definite plan of play. Mason plays 9.h3 since he finds himself in an original zugzwang. For the time being, until the opponent's plan becomes clear, he does not want to castle. Mason was evidently afraid that Chigorin would castle on the opposite side and begin a violent attack on the king. This fear of the attack is a characteristic of Steinitz' comprehension of the chess struggle. It goes without saying that White could quietly castle.

9...\textbf{dxe3} 10.\textbf{fxe3}

The first consequence of the move 8.h3. On 10.\textbf{Bxe3} would follow ...\textbf{h5-f4} and the black knight cannot be driven away by g2-g3.

10...\textbf{h5} 11.\textbf{Wf2} \textbf{dxb3} 12.\textbf{axb3} \textbf{e4}!

An important move. The open a- and f-files are a very significant trump for White, though, on the other hand, the doubled b- and e-pawns restrict the mobility of the white pawn mass. The

37.\textit{cxd3} \textit{Bxc3+} 38.\textit{a1} \textit{xd3+} 39.\textit{Bxd3} \textit{Bxd3+}, securing a draw.

36...\textbf{d7} 37.\textbf{Bd4}! \textbf{f5}

If now 37...\textbf{d3+}, then 38.\textit{Bxd3} \textit{Bxd3} 39.\textit{Bc6}.

38.\textbf{b4} \textbf{c5} 39.\textbf{Bxc5} \textbf{dxc5} 40.\textbf{Bh4} \textbf{d2} 41.\textbf{Bh7+} \textbf{a6} 42.\textbf{Bb7+} \textbf{a7} 43...\textbf{d5}+\textbf{e6} 44.\textbf{Bb7+} \textbf{a7} 45.\textbf{Bg2+} \textbf{a6} 46.\textbf{Bf1+} \textbf{c4}

Or 46...\textbf{d3} 47.\textbf{Bd7}!.

47.\textbf{Bxc4+} 1-0

It's mate in two moves.

37 Italian Game
James Mason
Mikhail Chigorin
London 1883 (11)

Notes by: Levenfish
1.\textit{e4} \textit{e5} 2.\textit{Bf3} \textit{c6} 3.\textit{Bc4} \textit{Bc5} 4.\textit{Bc3} \textit{Bf6} 5.d3 \textit{d6} 6.\textit{Be3} \textit{Bb6} 7.\textit{Bxe2} \textit{Be6}

Worthy of attention is 7...\textit{d4}, which forces the reply 8.h3, and only then 8...\textit{Be6}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 126 43.\textbf{Bc8+} wins on the spot as after 43...\textbf{h8}
  \item 44.\textbf{Bxf5} a recapture by Black allows a back-rank mate.
\end{itemize}
...move prevents the manoeuvre £d5 -b4-b5, threatening to paralyse Black's pawns on the queen's flank.

13.0-0

Mason ensures himself against unpleasant consequences associated with this move on different sides. All the same, he prefer 13.0-0-0, which would rapidly allow him to realise the advantage of the open f-file and which, 17.8h1 8h8 18.8ae1 g6 19.8g3 c6 20.8e2 8ae8 21.8e1 8e6

22.8b1! c5 23.8d2!

An excellent manoeuvre. White transfers the knight sharply to the king's flank. On 23...£xc2 would follow 24.£f3 £xe1 25.£xg5, winning the exchange.

23...£h6 24.£f3! £e8

Now 25...£xh3+ is threatened, which on the previous move would have led to the loss of the queen after 25.8h2 and 26.£h4.

25.8h2 d5!

This counterattack in the centre obliges White to force his attack on the king's flank.

26.h4 d4 27.exd4 exd4 28.g5 £g7

29.h5 £g8! 30.h6

After 30.hxg6 fxg6 31.£h2 £d5! the initiative passes to Black.

30...£h8

16...£g5!

A characteristic move for Chigorin's style of play. It not only does not combat White's attack, but even provokes it. After 17.h4, the black queen must retreat to d8, since 17...£xg4+ 18.8h2 £xh5 (the threat was 19.£h6+) 19.£g1 £e5 20.£g5 leads to the loss of the queen.

17.h4 would follow 17...£d8 18.8h1 £e5 19.£h6+ £g7 20.g5 f6! 21.£g2 £g5 22.hxg5+ £e7! with the threat...

Here 22...£xc2 can be played immediately. Unless after 23.£xc2 £xg5 24.£f5+ £h8, the white knight is doomed and Black emerges at a pawn to the good.

128 Actually, after 22...£e7, White can reply with 23.£xf8 and get good play after 23...£xf8 24.£xa7; while other recaptures would concede the f-file to the white rook.

129 True, but after this sequence Black can continue 26...£xc2 27.£f2 £xe3! 28.£xg4 £xg4, when he obtains a rook and four pawns for the queen and a solid-looking position.
The black queen is driven into the corner and must lie in wait. White’s position looks very threatening, but Chigorin was a great master of defence: he does not fight ghosts and obtains a position which he had foreseen long before. The weak points in Black’s position, f6 and g7, are adequately defended; meanwhile, White has no means of strengthening the attack and so the course of the game inevitably changes.

31.\textit{Wd}2 f6! 32.\textit{Wf}4 fxg5 33.\textit{Wd}6

On 33.\textit{Wxg}5 would follow 33...\textit{Ze}5 34.\textit{Ze}xe5 \textit{Wxf}1+ 35.\textit{Wxf}1 \textit{Wxe}5, and White cannot avoid defeat. Mason makes a quite reasonable attempt to sharpen the game.

33...\textit{Ef}7 34.\textit{Hf}2 \textit{Wf}6 35.\textit{Wxf}6 \textit{Hxf}6

\textbf{36.e5!}

36.\textit{Cxc}5 \textit{Hxf}2 37.\textit{Hxf}2 \textit{Ze}5 is quite hopeless for White, since, after an immediate ...\textit{He}7 and ...\textit{Ef}7, Black wins the c2- or h6-pawns. The text move contains a trap: 36...\textit{Cxe}5? 37.\textit{Ce}4! \textit{Hxf}3 38.\textit{Wxf}3 \textit{Cxf}3 39.\textit{Wf}6+ \textit{Wf}7 40.\textit{Cxe}8 and White wins.

36...\textit{Ef}4! 37.\textit{Cxc}5 \textit{Hxf}2 38.\textit{Wxf}2 \textit{Hxe}5

If now 39 \textit{C}3e4, then 39...\textit{Cf}5, and, after the exchange of rooks, the knight ending is hopeless for White. Therefore he embarks on one last venture.

39.\textit{Cxc}7 \textit{Cxc}7 40.\textit{Cc}3

Striving to reduce the pawn material on the board.

40...\textit{Cxd}3 41.\textit{Hf}7+ \textit{Cxc}6 42.\textit{Cxd}7 \textit{Cxb}2 43.\textit{Cxd}4 \textit{Cxd}4 44.\textit{Cxb}7

On 44.\textit{Cxd}4 comes 44...\textit{Cf}3 followed by 45...\textit{Cxb}3, with an easy win.

44...\textit{d}3 45.\textit{Cc}7

\textbf{45...\textit{Wg}5}

45...\textit{Cc}5!, followed by 46...\textit{Cc}1+, 47...\textit{Cc}2+ and 48...\textit{d}2, decides the game more quickly.\footnote{46.\textit{Cxe}4 would prevent this manoeuvre but Black still wins eventually.}

46.\textit{Cxd}4 a5 47.\textit{Cgf}2 \textit{Wf}6 48.\textit{Wf}3 \textit{He}6 49.\textit{Cxe}4 \textit{Hh}5 50.\textit{Cfd}8 \textit{Hh}3+ 51.\textit{Cf}4 \textit{Hh}4+ 52.\textit{Cc}3 \textit{Wf}7 53.\textit{Cf}4 \textit{Hh}3+ 54.\textit{Cc}4 \textit{Wf}2
time trouble Chigorin finds himself being to make rather aimless moves until he reaches the control.

55. $\text{g}3 \text{e}2 56. $\text{g}3 \text{h}2 57. $\text{f}2 \text{g}5$

The cannot take the pawn, since $\text{g}3\text{h}5+$ would follow, with an exchange of all the pieces and a winning ending.

58. $\text{e}4 \text{b}5 59. $\text{d}2 \text{e}6 60. $\text{g}4 \text{f}5+$ 61. $\text{g}3 \text{g}5 62. $\text{d}4 \text{d}5$

63. $\text{e}4+ \text{e}5 64. \text{f}3 \text{d}5$

White now 64...$\text{xe}4 65 $\text{xe}4 \text{g}4 66 $\text{d}4$, followed by $\text{c}3$, White wins the pawn.

65. $\text{g}4 \text{c}5 66. \text{b}1 \text{e}1! 67. $\text{xe}5+$

$\text{b}4 68. \text{d}2 \text{e}3 69. $\text{g}2$

= 69. $\text{e}4+$ because of 69...$\text{xe}4$

$\text{xe}4 \text{d}2$ etc.

69...$\text{d}1 70. $\text{e}4+ \text{xb}3 71. $\text{d}2!$

38 Queen's Pawn Opening

Mikhail Chigorin

George Mackenzie

London 1883 (12)

Notes by: Romanov

1.d4

In his book M.I. Chigorin, N.Grekov writes that the only time that Chigorin opened the game with the Queen's Pawn was in his encounter with Albin at the Nuremburg tournament 1896.

This is inaccurate. In the creative legacy of Chigorin, there are two more games with the opening 1.d4 – against Mackenzie and Bird, played in the London tournament.

Yet there still remains the unalterable fact that Chigorin rejected the opening 1.d4 and its kindred closed openings. 'It has the smell of dead meat about it' – is how he explained his viewpoint.

It is clear that Chigorin associated the opening 1.d4 with the repugnant to him Steinitz school of avoiding lively piece play, rejecting combinational methods of struggle in favour of protracted manoeuvring, and accumulation of insignificant positional advantages.

Indeed, he had no respect at all for the Queen's Gambit and the Queen's Pawn generally! However, the creative content of these openings was sufficiently broad and many-sided to incorporate all of Chigorin's rich methods of strategy and tactics. This was shown during the life of Chigorin by his outstanding apprentice and follower, the prematurely deceased R.Charousek, and later by A.Alekhiine and the Soviet grandmasters and masters.

By not taking up the weapons of the closed openings, Chigorin undoubtedly limited his creative possibilities. The Evans Gambit and the King's Gambit
provided too narrow a base for an opening repertoire, when Chigorin's opponents replied to his almost invariable 1.e4 with 1...e5. However, when at the beginning of the 1900s Chigorin abandoned the Evans Gambit in international tournaments (and the Spanish Game, as is well known, he also rejected) he took up the weapon of the Italian Game and patiently played 60-move manoeuvring games.

Chigorin's disregard of closed openings rebounded on him in that he proved to be unprepared in his struggles with black against these openings in great matches in 1889-1893. It is sufficient to say that out of 18 such games Chigorin won only three, and suffered fifteen defeats. Chigorin had to get busy to avenge these heavy defeats and worked out his own method of struggle with black against the Queen's Pawn Opening, introducing some innovations and systems, such as the Chigorin Defence, the Chigorin system in the Slav Defence with 3...\texttt{c}b4, and the King's Indian Defence.

1...e6 2.e3 \texttt{c}6 3.d3 d5 4.\texttt{c}e2 c5 5.0-0 \texttt{c}c6 6.b3 cxd4 7.exd4 \texttt{d}d6 8.\texttt{c}c3 a6 9.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{w}c7 10.\texttt{e}e2 b6 11.\texttt{g}g3 \texttt{b}b4 12.\texttt{a}a3 \texttt{b}b7 13.\texttt{x}xb4 \texttt{x}xb4 14.\texttt{w}e2 \texttt{c}c3

Chigorin thought it would have been better to castle on the kingside.

15.\texttt{ad}1 g6 16.\texttt{we}3 h6 17.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{e}e8 18.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{b}b4 19.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{e}e4

Now castling was already dangerous in view of 19...0-0 20.\texttt{x}g6! fxg6 21.\texttt{e}e6 etc.\textsuperscript{131}

20.f3 \texttt{d}d6 21.\texttt{ex}g6 fxg6

22.\texttt{e}xg6+

\textsuperscript{131} But after 21...\texttt{wh}7 22.\texttt{xf}8 \texttt{xf}8, Black has two bishops for rook and two pawns.

22...\texttt{d}f7

Chigorin remarked: 'G.Waye (commentator of the game in the tournament book) enquired: perhaps Black would have had more chances to fight on with the continuation 22...\texttt{e}e7 23.\texttt{w}xe6+ \texttt{f}f8, when on 24.\texttt{w}c5 Black has the reply 24...\texttt{e}f7. In the game Mackenzie had two pawns less, but in the cited variation he would lose also the exchange: 25.\texttt{w}f6 \texttt{e}e7 26.\texttt{e}e6+ \texttt{w}e8 27.\texttt{x}b8+ \texttt{d}d7 28.\texttt{w}g7.'

23.\texttt{w}xe6+ \texttt{d}d8

On 23...\texttt{f}f8 would have followed 24.\texttt{w}f6; even worse was 23...\texttt{e}e7 24.\texttt{xf}7+.

24.\texttt{w}xf7 \texttt{w}xf7 25.\texttt{xf}7 \texttt{d}xc2

26.\texttt{w}xd5 \texttt{c}c8 27.\texttt{h}f2 \texttt{xf}2 28.\texttt{xf}2 \texttt{d}d7 29.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{d}d6 30.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{e}e8

31.\texttt{f}f7 \texttt{h}h7 32.\texttt{xe}8 \texttt{xe}8 33.\texttt{e}c1 \texttt{d}d8 34.f4

Black resigned.
Chapter 9 - Breaking through a window into Europe

Evans Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
Wilhelm Steinitz

Notes by: Chigorin and Bogoljubow

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.Qc4 Qc5 4.b4 a6 5.b5 Qa5 6.0-0 d6 7.d4 exd4
8.exd4 Qb6 9.Qc3 Qa5 10.Qg5 Qf6 11.Qf4 Qxc4 12.Qa4+ Qd7
13.Qxc4 Qf7 14.Qd5

Bogoljubow: This continuation of the King's Attack (10.Qg5) favours White.

14...g5?

Chigorin: A weak move which greatly compromises Black's game.

15.Qg3

15...Qe6

Chigorin: Steinitz at first intended to continue 15...h5, but now discovered that, after 16.Qxh5 axb6 17.Qxf7+ Qxf7 18.Qf1, he loses a pawn. However, in my opinion, this avenue of attack fails, because, after 18...c6!
19.Qxe6 Qe7, Black obtains a very good game due to the weakness of White's a2-pawn; if 20.a4, then 20...Qe6 etc. The move 15...h5 is not good on two counts, i.e. after the move 16.Qac1, if Black has no better move than 16...Qc6, then 17.Qxh5 axb6 18.Qb4, and White wins a pawn, keeps queens on the board and maintains the attack. If, however, after 16.Qac1 Black replies

16...h4? then 17.Qxd6! cxd6 18.Qxb6 axb6 19.Qxc8+ Qxc8 20.Qxc8+ Qd7
21.Qf1 Qe7 22.Qc1+ Qe6 23.d5+ Qxd5 24.exd5+ Qxd5 25.Qxf7, and White is left with knight against two pawns.

16.Qa4+ Qd7

Bogoljubow: If 16...Qd7, then 17.Qxe6 axb6 (it is characteristic of this variation that Black mostly has to take with the c-pawn, which weakens the pawns) 18.Qxd7+ Qxd7 19.d5 Qf7 20.Qd4 with the threats of Qb5 or Qf5. White recovers the gambit pawn with advantage.

17.Qa3 Qc8 18.Qfe1 g4 19.Qxb6

Chigorin: After 20.Qe7 would follow 21.e5 dxe5 (or 21...fxe5) 22.Qe4! 0-0
23.dxe5 Qxe5 24.Qf5 Qd5 25.Qad1, and White, threatening Qxa1 and Qb2, obtains a winning position.\[12\]

21.f4

Chigorin: White threatens f4-f5 and then e4-e5.

21...gxh3 22.Qxf3 Qe7 23.e5 fxe5

24.dxe5 d5 25.Qf1

25...Qf5

Chigorin: Steinitz, in his notes to the game, considers this move a mistake...

---

\[12\] 25...Qe8 26.Qa1 Qxe4 wins for Black.

26.Qg3 is better, but not 26.Qg5 Qxf2+ 27.Qh1 Qxe5, winning.
and indicates that the best reply is 25...\texttt{Qc6}. If Steinitz had played 25...\texttt{Qc6} in the game and seen the consequences of it, then he would admit that it is a mistake and indicate quite the reverse—that the best move is 25...\texttt{Qxf5}. One must not look for the cause of defeat in this move nor in the further continuation of the game, but in Black’s 14\textsuperscript{th} move, which led to a clearly unsatisfactory position for him. After 25...\texttt{Qc6} would follow 26.\texttt{Qg5}, and after 26...\texttt{We7}—on which Steinitz mainly bases his defence, with an analysis of the game right down to the ending—27.\texttt{We3 f8} 28.\texttt{Qxf8+ Qxf8} 29.\texttt{Qf1+ Qg8} 30.\texttt{Qf6 Qd8} 31.\texttt{Qh4}. We do not believe that Black can save the game.

\textbf{26.\texttt{Qd4 Qg6}}

Chigorin: If 26...\texttt{We7}, then Black loses a piece. White, however, threatens 27.\texttt{Qxf5 Qxf5} 28.\texttt{Qf1}. After 26...\texttt{c5} would follow 27.\texttt{Wb4+ Qd8} (27...\texttt{Qd7} 28.e6!) 28.\texttt{Qxf5\textsuperscript{133} Qxf5} 29.\texttt{Qh4+ Qc7} 30.g4 \texttt{Qhg8\textsuperscript{134}} 31.\texttt{Qg3} and White wins a bishop (31...\texttt{Qxg4} 32.\texttt{Wxg4}).

\textbf{27.\texttt{Qxf5 Qxf5} 28.\texttt{Qh4 c5} 29.\texttt{Qf3 Qd7} 30.\texttt{Waf1 Qh8} 31.\texttt{Qg3}}

\textbf{31...\texttt{Wb6}}

Chigorin remarks that, with the continuation 31...\texttt{We6} 32.\texttt{Wb4+ (32.\texttt{Qg7+ Qc6}) 32...Qc7! 33.\texttt{Qg7+ Qb8} 34.\texttt{Qe7 Qfd8} (34...\texttt{Qxe5} 35.\texttt{Qxf8 Qxf8} 36.\texttt{Qf4} and White wins the bishop on f5), despite the loss of the exchange, he would have had not only chances of a draw, but even of a win(?). However, if now White does not take the rook, but plays 35.\texttt{Qf4! Qd3} 36.\texttt{Qf3 c4} (36...\texttt{Qa6} 37.\texttt{Qxd8 Qxd8} 38.\texttt{Qf6!}) 37.\texttt{Qxd8 Qxd8} 38.\texttt{Qf7} or 38.\texttt{Qf6}, then he must win.

\textbf{32.\texttt{Qf6 Qe6}}

Chigorin: If 32...\texttt{Qxf6} 33.\texttt{Qxf6 Qxf6}, then 34.\texttt{Qa4+} and 35.\texttt{Qg3}.

\textbf{33.\texttt{Wa7!}}

Chigorin: It is interesting that the queen, which since the 17\textsuperscript{th} move has not assumed an active part in the attack, now delivers the decisive blow. Made earlier, this move would have been premature.

\textbf{33...\texttt{Qc7}}

Chigorin: After 33...\texttt{Qc6}, there would have followed 34.\texttt{Qb3 b5} 35.\texttt{Qxb5! Qxb5} 36.\texttt{Qb1+ Qc4} 37.\texttt{Wb4+} and White mates in a few moves.

\textbf{34.\texttt{Qb3 Qd7} 35.\texttt{Qxb6 Ac6} 36.\texttt{Qxb7+ Ac7} 37.\texttt{Qa6}}

Black resigned.

\textsuperscript{133} Chigorin overlooks 28.\texttt{Qxf5!}, since if 28...\texttt{Qxf5}, 29.\texttt{Qh4+ Wc7} 30.\texttt{Qb5+ Qd7} 31.\texttt{Qd6+} pockets the black queen.

\textsuperscript{134} Instead Black could rescue his position with 30...\texttt{Qd7?!}.
Chapter 9 - Breaking through a window into Europe

...-0 King's Gambit Accepted
Mikhail Chigorin
Jules Arnoux de Rivière
Match, Paris 1883 (4)
Notes by: Chigorin and Bogoljubow
1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.dxe5 d5 4.xd5
Wh4+ 5.c3 g5 6.e4 Wh5 7.h4 h6
Chigorin: This defence is inferior to
5...g7.
8.xf7+ Wh7 9.e5 Wh6 10.h5+
Chigorin: On 10...e7 would have
showed 11.Qg6+ Qd8 12.hxg5 and
1.exf7+ e7 12.Qh8 Wh8
13.hxg5 We5
Chigorin: This move forces White to
change queens. If 13...c6, then
h5, with an attack, stronger than
the exchange of queens.
Bogoljubow: If 13...d4, then 14.Qc3
e6 15.d3 and Black cannot defend the
pawn.
14.gxh6
Bogoljubow: Even stronger would be
14.c3!.
14...Wh5 15.Bxh5 Qh6

16.Qc3

35 In fact White has to play 12.Qxh8
immediately because after 12.hxg5 Black has the
resource 12...Wh6+ 13.d3 Qg4+.

Chigorin: It would not be good to go for
the win of a pawn: 16.d3 Qc6 17.g3,
since then would follow 17...Qd4
18.Qa4 Qg7 19.Qh4 Se2+ with a
strong attack for Black; on 20.Qf1 Black
would reply 20...fxg3 21.Qh6 Wh6
22.Qh6 Qh8 23.Qd2 g2 24.Qg6 Vf1
and 25.Qf3+.

16...e2 17.d3 Qd7 18.Qh4 Qf8
19.Qe2 Qe5 20.Qd4 Qd7 21.Qd2
c5 22.Qb3 Qg4
Chigorin: After 22...Qxf3 23.gxf3 Qf7
24.Qf2 White, by occupying the g-file
with the rook on a1 and threatening to
take two pieces for a rook, would win
the f4-pawn.

23.Qe2 Qf6? 24.Qah1

24.Qg6?
Chigorin: With the aim of playing
25.Qxe3. If an immediate 24...Qxe3
25.Qxe3 fx e3, then 26.g4 Qg6 27.Qg1,
and Black cannot defend the e3-pawn.
24...b6 would be better, but also in this
case White, by playing, for example,
25.b4 cxb4 26.Qxb4+ Qe8 27.Qd2,
would probably obtain chances of
winning the game thanks to his two
passed pawns.

25.Qh5 b6 26.Qh4 Qg7
Bogoljubow: If 26...Qh5, then 27.Qxg5
Qxg5 28.Qxf4 etc.

27.Qc3 Qf7 28.Qg6+ Qd8

427
29.\textit{\textbf{f3!}} \textit{\textbf{g7}}

Chigorin: White threatened 30.\textit{\textbf{e5}}
\textit{\textbf{xe5+}} 31.\textit{\textbf{xex5}} \textit{\textbf{f8}} 32.\textit{\textbf{h7}}; by winning the f4-pawn White also easily wins the game.

30.\textit{\textbf{h8!}} \textit{\textbf{e7}}

Bogoljubow: If 30...\textit{\textbf{xh8}}, then 31.\textit{\textbf{xh8}}
\textit{\textbf{xf8}} 32.\textit{\textbf{h1h7}} with the threat of
33.\textit{\textbf{xd7+}}.

31.\textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{f6}} 32.\textit{\textbf{g6!}}

32...\textit{\textbf{e8}}

Chigorin: If 32...\textit{\textbf{f7}}, then 33.\textit{\textbf{e5}} \textit{\textbf{e7}}
34.\textit{\textbf{xd7}} \textit{\textbf{xd7}} (34...\textit{\textbf{xd7}} 35.\textit{\textbf{e5}} and
36.\textit{\textbf{e6}}) 35.\textit{\textbf{e5}} \textit{\textbf{e8}} 36.\textit{\textbf{h1h7}} \textit{\textbf{xe6}} 37.\textit{\textbf{g4+}}
or 37.\textit{\textbf{xf4}} and White ought to win.

33.\textit{\textbf{e5}} \textit{\textbf{f8}} 34.\textit{\textbf{xd7}} \textit{\textbf{xd7}} 35.\textit{\textbf{e5}}
\textit{\textbf{h6}} 36.\textit{\textbf{xh6}} \textit{\textbf{xh6}}

Chigorin: The first move of the knight!

37.\textit{\textbf{exf6}} \textit{\textbf{e3+}} 38.\textit{\textbf{xf4}} \textit{\textbf{e2}} 39.\textit{\textbf{g7+}}
\textit{\textbf{xe8}} 40.\textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{g2}} 41.\textit{\textbf{g5}}

1-0
Chapter 10

In the name of public interests

1883, for Mikhail Chigorin, the 30-year-old international master, prizewinner in two important tournaments, to all intents and purposes the champion of Russia, there appeared to be a smooth road. He would be a desired guest in any country and, combining exhibition tours with journalistic work in Universal Illustrated and other organs of the press, could lead a sufficiently secure life. And principally — this life would be creative, gripping interest, with visits to towns and countries, lively, leading to the realisation of the secret dream of every gifted young chess player — win the World Championship.

Indeed, at that time the official title of the World Chess Championship had still not been introduced, but there was talk on this in connection with the projected Zukertort-Steinitz match. In fact, the idea was not new. Even in 1859, when Morphy returned from a tour of Europe, his admirers and friends wanted to proclaim the genius American as World Champion, but Morphy complained strongly that for him chess was not a profession, but an amusement, and declined this honour.

Chigorin had scored three points out of four games against Steinitz — and another one or two important successes in international tournaments would consolidate world public opinion that he was a fully justified rival to Steinitz and Zukertort. But, to the astonishment of chess historians, for the next six years Chigorin did not leave his native land and did not play in any international competitions.

Does this mean that Chigorin had such a low opinion of himself as a chess player that he decided not to compete with the famous fighters? No, he knew his own worth!

But Chigorin considered that more important than egotistical, personal interests was to create a Russian chess organisation and revive the Russian chess magazine. He did not want to be a champion without a native land, like a lone 'chess wolf,' roaming the world in search of prey, but wanted to be a representative of authority, firmly united to the creative and sporting interests of a national chess union, bringing together the whole of Russia, 10,000 amateurs of the game. Chigorin was above all a patriot and a public-spirited person!

Probably, Chigorin, as any creative worker, needed a sympathetic environment that appreciated his talent. And not because of the vain desire for flattery, although praise, if it did not involve grovelling, would be pleasant for him. In the chess organisation, Chigorin wanted to rally around himself people just as passionate and interested in chess culture as he, and
with whom he could share his creative and sporting plans, play training games, conduct simultaneous displays, carry out theoretical studies, cultivate the talent of young Russian chess players. In short, Chigorin, sensitively and passionately, dreamt of an enthusiastic audience of fans, so familiar to our present-day Soviet grandmasters and masters.

And, with stubborn fanaticism, after returning from abroad, Chigorin set about creating a St.Petersburg Chess Club, seeing this as a first step toward the revival of the magazine, as a first step toward creating an All-Russia Chess Union.

Already in 1884 Chigorin organised a chess club, which was first housed in two large rooms of an apartment, with chess tables, upholstered furniture, powerful kerosene lamps to light up the premises and stearin candles on each table. Then the club transferred to two rooms of the Hotel Angleterre, opposite St. Isaac’s Cathedral. In Autumn 1886, control was established with the drafting of the rules of the 'St.Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs'. Chigorin was unanimously elected as chairman, while the vice-chairman was his brother in law, A.N.Dubravin. His activities in the new chess club began in a large, spacious apartment on the Moika, in the centre of St.Petersburg.

The big hall was furnished with tables. On each table lay oil cloth chess boards and boxes with sets of classic ‘Staunton’ pieces. They were so called because of the large and strict dimensions, a noble form of chessmen with a design approved by the English 19th century champion, chess journalist and Shakespearean scholar, Howard Staunton.

In other rooms were housed the library and dining room.

The membership dues were fixed at 12 roubles a year.

Play in the club began about 8 o’clock in the evening. Some of the members played ‘casual games’ for a stake, while tournament participants took a seat at the board alongside Chigorin himself, who combined the duties of chairman with those of technical worker.

At 2 o’clock at night, Chigorin himself punctually put out the lamps in the hall and in the library, since the window looked out on the Moika, and the police inspector watched that the chess club closed at this time.

But, already from midnight to four o’clock in the morning, the members of the club filled the dining room, where lamps could not be seen from the street. There they drained bottles of wine and conducted heated arguments on a chess theme. Of course, playing for a stake and serving alcoholic drinks did not make the face of the new chess organisation attractive, but such were the customs of the age. Unfortunately, also Chigorin himself was no enemy of the bottle.

To many of Chigorin’s contemporaries, it seemed strange that such a strong-willed, principled man could so neglect his health. For example, L.Velikhov wrote in his already cited memoirs: "To argue with Mikhail Ivanovich was useless. He firmly and adamantly stood his own ground, hardly ever yielding. His manners, sympathies, views were very definite and invariable. All his life and career was like a heavy missile released in one direction. Unfortunately, together with such
character, energy and purposefulness, Chigorin displayed some weakness in willpower in the struggle with his own self, his personal passion, which to him was very strongly pronounced. For example, everybody knew his weakness for alcoholic drinks, which at times damaged his chess performances and his health, probably shortened his life.’

Actually, in his weak will was concealed the explanation of many, otherwise incomprehensible, creative failures of the great Russian chess player. But there were numerous reasons for this. In other areas of Russian culture of the 19th century, the effects of disappointment in a cheerless life, under the oppression of the Czarist regime, led people to seek comfort in spirits, while Chigorin, as we shall see later, was no more fortunate than them.

It is also necessary to take into account that at this time alcohol was the genre of drink for chess professionals, a means of artificially working themselves up before a decisive game or to combat spells of tiredness during a tense struggle. Other masters (like Lasker or Tarrasch) sought support in strong tobacco, some — in black coffee, others took narcotics.

Chigorin’s partiality for alcohol offers some explanation for his inability to refuse the invitations of friends who wanted to celebrate one or other of his victories or just raise his mood with a few drinks.

There comes to mind verse from the speech of Krilova: ‘God deliver me from fools’. For example, the dramatist Ge, who considered himself a bosom buddy of Chigorin, knew very well that ‘Chigorin did not smoke and during play never drank anything. ‘There was a time’, wrote Ge about the tournament in Ostende 1905, ‘when Chigorin drank in plenty, so much so that he no longer got drunk, but this time had already long passed.’ Yet, all the same, upon seeing that the old and sick Chigorin was playing badly, it crossed Ge’s mind (during a tournament game!) to shake him, so to speak, to set him in motion, and after waiting for a suitable moment... Ge whispered:

‘Mikhail Ivanovich, let’s pull out some champagne?’
He waved his hand.
‘No, thanks.’
‘A little glass.’
‘Oh, forget it!’... and he went away.

All the same, Ge continued his persuasion and several hours later literally forced Chigorin ‘to pull out...’ Dutch vodka, and then two bottles of ‘excellent claret’. As a result Chigorin lost the next game, without a struggle, to the US champion, against whom up to now he had invariably won. Such were ‘the friends of Chigorin’! What, however, is there to say about his enemies?

It is characteristic that public chess opinion did not at that time censure drinking during competitions. At the height of the All-Russia tournament in 1901, the Moscow Chess Club arranged a dinner for the competitors, at which, according to an enthusiastic account of the literary miscellany ‘A Chess Evening’, on the many coloured serviettes was spread out the ‘Russian Game’, where the role of a piece
was taken by bottles: king — champagne, queen — Rhine wine, rook — red wine, knight — vodka. All this, in the words of the almanac, promised amateurs cheer, interest and 'combinational' play.

A sad example, set to young people at that time by the leaders of the contemporary chess life!

Now we return to a description of the activity of the Chigorin Chess Club, 1884-1890.

In order to attract more amateurs to the club, Chigorin, as before, regularly competed in handicap tournaments.

In the handicap tournament of 1884 with 25 competitors, Chigorin was only 3rd. In 1st place came the 2nd category Otto, in 2nd — the 2nd category Polner.

In 1885, in the handicap tournament with 24 competitors, Chigorin emerged in 1st place.

In the handicap tournament of winter 1885/1886, where the participants played in two circuits, 1st place was occupied by a chess player of 3rd category (!) — Zhibin, 2nd — the 3rd category Simitsin, and only 3rd — Chigorin.

What is the explanation for Chigorin's individual failures in handicap tournaments? At this time Chigorin was carrying out a lot of work and study of classic theory of the openings and working out a series of original innovatory opening systems, and could not play 'with feeling' those forceful, incorrect, anti-positional openings that were required in handicap tournaments. He did play these, but... willy-nilly, in spite of his refined understanding of opening strategy, which was far removed from the trappy play of the Dominicans. He took part in the handicaps as a sad necessity, so to speak — 'to fulfil his duties' of chess club instructor, as his name attracted both novices and experienced chess players. But here, Chigorin did not enjoy either uplift or inspiration — which is the true guarantee of success.

In addition to playing in the St.Petersburg Chess Club, Chigorin began to undertake guest tours. In Spring 1884, he arrived in Kharkiv. There he took first prize in a tournament, winning all 12 games, won a match, giving odds of a pawn and move against the local champion Beklemishev, and then won four consultation games. On the return journey Chigorin stopped in Moscow, where he played two games against Solovtsov, which I have already mentioned.

In 1884/85 Chigorin organised a correspondence tournament, in two circuits, for readers of Universal Illustrated. Here, besides Chigorin himself, 11 players took part. Chigorin won 20 games and drew two.

Furthermore, we recall two matches which confirm the correctness of the saying 'Every baron has his fantasy'. On Chigorin's return from the London tournament of 1883, the St.Petersburg baron, E.F.Nolde, proposed that Chigorin play a match against him. The conditions: 150 roubles stake, but Chigorin would give his opponent odds of pawn and move. Chigorin duly won the match with the score of +5 -4 =3.

Three years later, the dissatisfied baron repeated his challenge to a match, under the same conditions. This time Chigorin won by the score +5 -2 =2.
The reader may be surprised why Chigorin, already enjoying world fame, agreed to play from their first meeting, if only for money? Is this not testimony to the self-interest of Chigorin? No. Such a conclusion would be mistaken. Then times were difficult. Being the first chess professional in Russia, Chigorin was always in need. To give pawn and move to a 1st category chess player, as was the baron, meant conducting a tense and difficult struggle with mutual chances, and was by no means hack-work. The earnings of 150 roubles, lawfully removed from the rich baron, were not too sumptuous compensation for a great deal of creative work.

There are many facts that bear witness to the unselfishness of Chigorin. For example, in approximately the same period, 7 November 1885, Chigorin conducted a paid blindfold exhibition of simultaneous play on eight boards, all the takings from which went to the formation of a prize fund for a competition arranged by the chess club. And, subsequently, the reader can time and again judge the readiness of Chigorin to make personal sacrifices in the public interest. Magazines spoke eloquently of Chigorin's efforts in reviving the 'Chigorin Chess Club' – and even before the official rules of the St. Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs had been ratified, he published the magazine Chess Herald in the name of this Society. Several St. Petersburg patrons financed the magazine but they soon tired of laying out money from their pockets, though the loss was minimal, since the work of the editor M. Chigorin and the published material of his and other articles was not paid for. Chigorin, of course, had foreboding of this, since already in the first number of Chess Herald was placed the appeal 'To lovers of the game of chess', in which it was hoped that he could depend on each of them to 'use all possible means to spread the magazine widely. On the number of subscribers will depend not only the possibility of gradually developing and improving the magazine in the coming years, but also its very existence.'

In the same number, the editorship emphasized the full personal and ideological continuity of the new journal Chess Herald, which represented an extension of Chess Sheet. Actually, in its format, it was the same magazine, but more full-blooded and interesting. Chigorin's comments to the games, his theoretical analyses, expressed thoughts, were more mature, more profound, more versatile. Before us was not a novice journalist, but a master and writer in the full prime of life, with a feeling of just pride in himself, rightfully demanding respect, and placing him at the head of Russian chess culture. 'Not without purpose has also passed four years for Russia', read the introductory article to the new magazine, 'the most important feature of Russian chess life in these years has been its rapprochement with the chess life of Europe and the whole world, with the participation of Russian chess players in international congresses.' Chigorin's participation in international tournaments at Vienna, Berlin and London, had gained a firm foothold for Russia in the chess world. 'Anyone in agreement with us', concluded an unnamed author of an article in Chess Herald, 'will appreciate that Chigorin's chess activities were not of personal importance to him, but to all Russia.'

Throughout the following year, 1886, Chess Herald published, under the heading 'Russian and foreign chess players', a series of agitational articles about the need to organize an All-Russia Chess Union. Particularly interesting for us is the fact that
here, Chigorin, with precise figures and calculations, showed that the scope of Russian chess life and the penetration of chess into Russian society was not a bit lower, but even higher than abroad.

'Organisation and activity! – this is the password and slogan of those who work for the future of chess in our land', was how Chigorin optimistically summed up his reasoning in No.4 of Chess Herald for 1885. 'It is not enough to love and study chess; all chess enthusiasts must unite in order to achieve common aims. It is not enough to unite in societies, these societies must live a full life, work, propel themselves and others forward.

Before us, directly and openly, arises the question', continued Chigorin, 'what, however, do we want from our understanding of the above comments? If it were a matter of our personal opinion, of our aspirations, then we would undertake right away, without vacillation, the proposal of a radical, very valid, foundation of an all-Russia Chess Union with annual congresses and tournaments held in turn by different cities.

And what is stopping us from doing this?'

After further argumentation, Chigorin came to the conclusion that 'it is prevented only by a lack of initiative and persistence.'

Shortly after, Chigorin was convinced that he was not right and that the matter did not lie quite in this, but in 'the lack in our chess life of public opinion'. He had written about this in No.1 of the magazine Chess Herald for 1885 (compare the quotation from Chigorin’s previously mentioned article), explaining it not by the passivity of Russian chess players, but by the general political oppression and tyranny of the Czarist government.

In No.1 of Chess Herald for 1886 was printed the draft regulations of the Russian Chess Union, and, in No.7, a circular that was intended to be distributed to Russian amateurs.

But the censoring committee, 22 August 1886, applied to the St.Petersburg governor with this significant enquiry:

'The editorship of the magazine Chess Herald, which is propagating the idea of forming a “Chess Union”, wants to print a circular, in which is announced the fact that they are already setting about the organisation of a Union and need help (1) with the attraction of amateurs to membership of the Union, and (2) with the subsequent collection of membership fees.

The censoring committee does not know whether to approve the regulations of the afore-mentioned Union, a draft of which has appeared in the January number of the magazine, and whether it is proper that such a circular should appear before permission is obtained from the government regarding the establishment of the afore-mentioned Union.

Therefore, also bearing in mind that the present circular, which does not contain anything literary, is subject rather to permission from the police authorities than the general censor, the committee, in forwarding a proof direct, has the honour of asking your excellency to report your decision as to whether it can be printed.'
Even a hint by the censor was enough to be understood and the gentleman governor took corresponding measures, as a result of which in No.10-12 of Chess Herald for 1886 appeared a report in which it was stated:

"For the present there can be no progress with the matter of the organisation of a Russian Chess Union". The printed circular, which we mentioned in No.7 of Chess Herald, cannot be distributed due to circumstances "independent of us". However, we do have evidence that the Union meets with great sympathy amongst Russian chess players; we have been sent quite a lot of statements about it, both on a personal level and also with regard to spreading the news of it and attracting members. With regard to the regulations, they will be drawn up and presented for approval at the beginning of next year, 1887. Until the regulations are approved, however, we cannot, for the present, openly and freely take steps to carry out our plan."

The future fate of Chigorin's petition was predestined.

The St. Petersburg governor, together with the gentleman minister of the interior, quietly suppressed the idea of the organisation of an All-Russia Chess Union. Chigorin's illusion about the possibility of public activity in Czarist Russia was dispelled.

In fact, Chess Herald itself also ceased to exist in 1887, in which year only the first number came out, and even that was delayed until March. Though there were not 120 but 180 subscribers, these did not offset the production expenses. Over one and a half years, 19 numbers were published, to which Chigorin, free of charge, gave up all his energy, talent and experience. And his second illusion (the possibility of issuing, in Czarist Russia, a chess magazine with a sufficient number of subscribers so as not to run at a loss) was also dispelled.

This was a heavy blow for Chigorin. The business of Chigorin's pet child, 'The St. Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs,' also went badly.

The matter of increasing the number of members of the club also ended in disappointment. Over time, squabbles flared up between the 'Chigorins' and the supporters of Alapin, which even concerned the government of the club and stubborn opposition to Chigorin himself. Today it is difficult to understand the situation of that time. According to the memoirs of the secretary of the club, G.A.Gelbak, Chigorin was accused of abruptness and tactlessness, with respect to the weaker chess playing members of the club. For example, after showing them how to achieve mate with bishop and knight, Chigorin carried the analysis right up to the position when it remained only to give mate in one move, when he said, 'Well, and the last move you can now make by yourself?' And one time, in reply to the request of a weak chess player to give an assessment of his chances, in this or that complicated position, Chigorin replied: 'You will lose, however you play.' Such tactless jokes, of course, offended people and afterwards were exploited by Chigorin's enemies, in order to heat up the atmosphere. But, you know, it would have been easy to prevent such friction, if Chigorin had paid attention to the inadmissibility of such witty remarks. From the other side, Chigorin was not bound to give lessons to novice chess players and evaluate positions, and his courtesy, obviously, at times was abused.
In these same memories is mentioned the supposedly 'totally exclusive disregard of Chigorin to somebody else's opinion', which also implied the 'opinion' of Alapin, who considered himself an outstanding analyst and exploited every opportunity to start a theoretical argument with Chigorin.

The 'disregard' consisted of the following: in 1886-1887 the St. Petersburg Chess Club played a match of two games with the London Chess Club. The St. Petersburg match committee consisted of five people, but, practically speaking, the analysis of the moves and the immediate telegraphing of them by Chigorin personally, without doubt breached the 'sacred right' of the other competitors. The interest in the match in St. Petersburg and in other towns in Russia, as well as abroad, was very great, the more so that St. Petersburg (Chigorin) played splendidly.

In the end London resigned the second game of the match, while in the first game the arbiter of the match, the well-known Hungarian master Kolisch, reported that he considered it should be called a draw, and thereby acknowledged London's defeat in the match.

However, Chigorin was not satisfied with this adjudication. Since Chess Herald had already ceased publication, he published in the French chess journal a detailed analysis of the final position of the first game of the match, in which he convincingly showed that the position was not drawn but winning for St. Petersburg. The English could not do anything against Chigorin's brilliant analysis.136

It is also interesting that this first game was published with detailed annotations by Chigorin in the French chess magazine, while shortly afterwards a translation appeared in the German chess magazine with this introduction by the editorship. 'We begin this number with the analysis, appearing in La Strategie, of the great Russian master Chigorin. This analysis represents to us the most remarkable of all those which, in the course of our many years' experience, has appeared in the area of analysis, and therefore deserves universal serious attention.'

After this triumph it is difficult to blame Chigorin in the fact that he, on his own, without consultation, gained victory in both games. In the interests of Russian society, the genius chess master, in the prime of life, declined to appear in the international arena and had only one opportunity to remind the chess world at large that he was still active – with his brilliant play by telegraph. It is impossible not to recall the statement of M.Botvinnik that 'Chigorin was the first chess player in Russia who began to occupy himself with analytical work. Before Chigorin, Jaenisch busied himself with this, but his analysis was only related to the area of the openings and not to the chess game as a whole.'

136 In fact 100 years later Smyslov and Levenfish found a drawing resource for London!
Could it really be that Chigorin had convinced himself (honestly and without prejudice) that, for example, Alapin would conduct the play better than him, that collective discussion of positions would not lead to delay in transmitting moves, to fruitless discussion, to nervous strain and, possibly, to sending weaker moves than those suggested by Chigorin, by dint of placing a move in 'a voting machine'?

Could Chigorin risk the reputation of the only chess club in Russia and himself personally?

Casting a retrospective glance at the history of the match, the outcome of which increased the glory of Russian 'chess arms', it is necessary to reply truthfully that Chigorin, formally, but possibly not correctly, acted this way, as a man placing above all else the interests of the cause and sporting honour of his native land.

41 Vienna Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
Alexander Solovtsov
Match, Moscow 1884 (2)

Notes by: Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.\( \mathcal{C} \)c3 \( \mathcal{C} \)c6 3.f4 exf4 4.d4
\( \mathcal{W} \)h4+ 5.\( \mathcal{A} \)e2 b6

Grekov: A better continuation here is
5...d6! 6.\( \mathcal{D} \)f3 \( \mathcal{D} \)g4 7.\( \mathcal{A} \)xf4 f5! with advantage to Black.
6.\( \mathcal{D} \)b5 \( \mathcal{A} \)a6 7.a4

Necessary, to prevent 19.\( \mathcal{D} \)g5!
19.\( \mathcal{W} \)c2 g5 20.\( \mathcal{D} \)d3 \( \mathcal{A} \)e7 21.\( \mathcal{D} \)c3

Now White cannot play to win the queen: 21.\( \mathcal{A} \)c5 bxc5 22.\( \mathcal{A} \)f5, as then 22...\( \mathcal{E} \)e2+!

21...\( \mathcal{A} \)g7

22.d5!
By playing 22.h3 White could force the black queen to go to e6; if then 23.d5, then Black does not take the pawn but retreats the queen to 23...\( \mathcal{W} \)f7 and, if 24.d6, then 24...\( \mathcal{A} \)f8 25.\( \mathcal{A} \)e4 c5. Black's position is indeed cramped, but White has difficulty in carrying on his attack.

22...\( \mathcal{C} \)xd5 23.h3 \( \mathcal{W} \)g3
If Black retreats to e6 then would follow 24.\( \mathcal{C} \)xd5 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd3 25.\( \mathcal{W} \)xd3 \( \mathcal{A} \)f5 26.\( \mathcal{W} \)a6 or 26.\( \mathcal{W} \)b5, and then a4-a5 or d5-d6, according to Black's reply, and White has a difficult position.

24.\( \mathcal{C} \)xd5 \( \mathcal{C} \)e6 25.b3 \( \mathcal{C} \)c8 26.\( \mathcal{A} \)a2
\( \mathcal{A} \)b7 27.\( \mathcal{A} \)e4 h5
If Black does not want to take the knight, then this is the best move; White was threatening 28.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c3.

\textbf{28.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c3 g4!}

\textbf{29.hxg4}

If 29.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}xb7 then 29...gxf3 30.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xf3 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d4 and 31...\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xf3.

\textbf{29...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xe4 30.\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xg4 31.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}d5 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c5 32.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}b1!}

After 32.\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}c2 Black could reply 32...e2+ 33.\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xe2 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xb3.

\textbf{32.\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}h6 33.\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e2 h4 34.\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}h3 a5 35.\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d4 \textcolor{red}{\text{h}}5}

\textbf{36.\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}f3! h3?}

This move leads to a quickly lost game. Better was 36...\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c5, giving up the e- and f-pawns: 37.\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xf4 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}g5 38.\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}xf5 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xf5 39.\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xf5 etc.

\textbf{37.gxh3 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xh3 38.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xh3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xh3 39.\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}g6!}

This move decides.

\textbf{39.\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}h8 40.\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}h2! \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}f8}

It is obvious that by taking the rook, Black gets mated in two moves.

\textbf{41.\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}xb6+ \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e8 42.\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}h7 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c6}

The bishop cannot move away anywhere because of the threatened queen check on g6.

\textbf{43.\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}b8+ \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d8 44.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xc6 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e6 45.\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}xd8+! \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xd8 46.\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c7 mate}

\textbf{42 Ponziani Opening}

\textbf{V. Sokulsky}

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

Yrsevo-St. Petersburg 1884

\textbf{Notes by: Romanov}

Chigorin was an untiring propagandist and organiser of correspondence play, which he saw as an excellent means of theoretical education, and also – in the conditions of the day – as a way to unify Russian chess players.

The first of many correspondence tournaments, organised by Chigorin, was a competition which he conducted in the capacity of editor of a chess column in the journal Universal Illustrated. In this tournament, begun on 1 March
15...\(g\)h4, threatening 16...\(x\)e2+`, was Chigorin's comment.

15...\(x\)xe2+! 16.\(x\)xe2 \(x\)xf3+
17.gxf3 \(e\)e8+ 18.\(f\)f2

Out of the frying pan into the fire!
The 'frying pan' is this variation, which
White avoided: 18.\(d\)d1 \(x\)xf3+ 19.\(c\)c2 \(e\)e4+ 20.\(b\)b3 \(d\)d3! with the threat of
21...b5.
And the 'fire' is mate, announced by
Black and coming no later than eight
moves:

18...\(g\)g3+! 19.\(g\)g1 \(e\)e2 20.\(f\)f1

20...\(h\)h4 21.\(h\)h2 \(x\)xh2+\(137\) 22.\(h\)h1 \(g\)g6 23.\(g\)g5 \(x\)xg5
And White resigned. He could have
delayed this mate by one move by
playing 20.\(d\)d1 or 20.\(c\)c4.

\(\text{-----------------------------}\)

137 21...\(x\)xf3+ 22.\(x\)xf3 \(x\)xh2+ 23.\(h\)h1 \(x\)xf3
mate was even quicker.
43 Evans Gambit
Mikhail Chigorin
Nikolai Urusov
St.Petersburg-Novgorod 1884
Notes by: Romanov, Yudovich and Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.d3 d6 3.d4 d5 4.b4 c5 5.bxc5 e6 6.c4 b6 7.d4 exd4
8.exd4 c6 9.d5

Yudovich: This simple developing move is to be preferred, and, as shown by the test of time, quite rightly approved by P. Morphy and M. Chigorin. The advance 9.d5, which was usually chosen by A. Andersen, after 9...a5 10.b2 c4! gives Black good possibilities. A mistake now would be 11.dxc5 dxc5 12.d6 cxd6 13.Wa4+ cxd4 14.Wxd4 in view of 14...cxd4! 15.c1 (15.c1 cxd4 15...c1+ 16.c1 c1 with an irresistible attack.

9...a5

Yudovich: Also here, this flank thrust does rid Black of his troubles. But correct is 9...g4 10.b5 f6! 11.g5 g5 and Black retains the extra pawn with a solid position (10...f6 was played in Game 17 of the Chigorin-Steinitz World Championship match in 1889).
10.g5 g5 11.d5 f6

12.cxf6

Yudovich: A risky decision. Against Steinitz, Chigorin played the stronger 11.f4.

12...gxf6 13.c1 c1 f8 14.g5

Yudovich: Chigorin also decided to test this position in correspondence games.

14...g8

Romanov: Later Chigorin showed that Black’s strongest reply is 14...c1c4; in his turn he gained a strong attack as White in a match game against Gunsberg (1890) with the move 11.c1xf7+. The present game Chigorin-Urusov was similar to a previous one. Not long before this in the Deutsche Schachzeitung appeared extensive analysis by I. Berger, where, in a variation of the Göring Attack with 10...e7, he suggested the new move 14...g8. This analysis was also followed by Urusov.

Yudovich: 14...c1c4 15.wf5 g7 16.wf7+ leads to a draw. Of course, with the king on h6, White’s attack is tempting, but Black has too great a material advantage.

15.gxh7+

Romanov: The only correct continuation in conjunction with the following move 16.xg8+. If, however, 15.d7f7+, then 15.g7 16.wf5 c1h6 (not 16...e7 17.f7) with possibilities of resistance.

15.g7 16.xg8!

16...xh7

Romanov: 16...xg8 17.wf5 leads to defeat for Black. For example: 17...cxd4 18.wg5+ c1h8 (18...f7 19.wf5+) 19.wf6; or 17...c1h8 18.wg5+ f7
...\text{h6} with the threat of \text{20.e5g5+}; or
\text{17.e5c6} \text{e5d5e5} \text{h6} \text{d6e5} with
threats of \text{20.e5g5} and \text{20.ad1}.
17.\text{e4h7 f4} 

\text{Romanov:} Berger’s analysis is based on
a mistaken move. He assessed the
position to be in Black’s favor...
However, Chigorin thought the move
\text{h4} was poor, but even after
a better reply \text{17.xg8} White,
continuing \text{18.g5 g6 19.e3},
would gain the better chances, ‘since
the material forces of both sides are
equal (rook and two pawns against two
queens), but the position of the black
king is not safe, when White launches
a pawn attack.’

Now events unfold with impetuous
speed.

\text{Yudovich:} Or \text{17.xg8} \text{h5} with a
very sharp attack.
18.\text{e4f3}!

18...\text{xg8}

\text{Chigorin:} On \text{18.e4g4} or \text{18.e4xd4}
follows \text{19.f7+ h8 20.f8} etc.\text{138}

19.\text{e4f6+ g7}

\text{Chigorin:} On \text{19.e4h8} would follow
\text{20.e4d5} etc., as occurs in the game.
20.\text{e4h5+ g6}

\text{138} \text{18.e4xd4} actually allows a mate by
\text{19.e4f8+ h8} (\text{19.e4g6} \text{20.f7+ xh7}
\text{21.e5g8+ h6} \text{22.e56} etc.) \text{20.e4f7+ xh7}
\text{21.e5g8+ h6} \text{22.e56} etc.

\text{Romanov:} If \text{20.e4h6}, then \text{21.e4f8+}
\text{xh5 22.e4h8+ g5 23.e4+ xf4}
\text{24.g7+}, winning the queen.
\text{Yudovich:} But \text{20.e4g8} is worth
considering.

21.\text{e4f4+ h7}

\text{Chigorin:} A little better would be the
retreat to \text{h6}, then \text{21.e4h6 22.g3} and
\text{e3} etc.
22.\text{e4d5!}

\text{Chigorin:} In order to obtain a conclusively
winning position, it is necessary for
White to exchange his knight for
the black bishop. However, if Black
manages to play \text{e6}, then he would
significantly improve his game by
obtaining a counterattack against the
d4-pawn and, after \text{e6}, against the
castled position.

22...\text{e6}

\text{Romanov:} Black cannot play \text{22.e4xd4}
in view of \text{23.e7+ g7 24.e7 c6b8}
\text{25.e8 h6 26.e7 c6 27.c1 etc.}
23.\text{e6b6 axb6 24.d5 g8 25.c1}
25...\textbf{We7}
Romanov: On 25...c5 the strongest continuation of the attack is 26.e5! 26...
dxe5 27.\textbf{Wf5+ Wh8} 28.\textbf{Wxe5+ Wh7} 29.\textbf{Cc3}.
26.\textbf{Wh3+} 1-0
After 26...\textbf{g7} (26...\textbf{g6} 27.\textbf{Cc3})
27.\textbf{Cc3+} a third pawn is lost.

44 Vienna Gambit
I. Dorrer
Mikhail Chigorin
Kharkov-St. Petersburg 1884
Notes by: Chigorin and Romanov
1.e4 e5 2.\textbf{Cc3 Cc6} 3.f4 \textbf{exf4} 4.d4
\textbf{Wb4+} 5.\textbf{e2}

Chigorin: This opening bears the name of Steinitz. He was the first player to
employ it successfully in a tournament game (Dundee 1867). In this very lively
opening, many interesting variations have been discovered also in games by
other players. Up to the present time a defence has still not been found for
Black which could be considered an undoubted refutation of Steinitz’s rather
strange development of the king on e2.

Romanov: Chigorin first came up against
this opening in practice in a game
against its creator, when competing in
the international tournament at London
1883. Then Steinitz suffered a crushing
defeat and he no longer played the gambit
bearing his name. ‘Probably’, noted
Minchin, the editor of the tournament
book, ‘this gambit will never again be
adopted in serious competitions.’
And yet there was a chess player who
continued to employ the Steinitz Gambit
with success, though by the same token
not with the dogmatic ideas of the
creator of the opening (‘the king is a
strong piece’), but with original plans
of attack – and his name was Chigorin!
Yes, now and then Chigorin offered the
gambit with white and equally (as in the
present game) accepted it with black. Such
an approach was in general characteristic
of Chigorin’s creative searching in the
majority of opening systems.
5...\textbf{Wg5+} 6.\textbf{Cf3} g5 7.\textbf{Cd5} \textbf{Cd8}
8.\textbf{g3 Cc7!}
Chigorin: Black gives up the gambit
pawn, but in return obtains a strong
counterattack. On the other hand, by
continuing 8...g4 9.\textbf{Cg4} f3+ 10.\textbf{Cf2},
Black would reach an unsatisfactory
position, as his pawns might subse-
quently be broken up by the move h2-h3.
9.\textbf{Exe7} \textbf{Exe7} 10.gxf4 g4 11.\textbf{Cc1}
\textbf{Cf6} 12.\textbf{Bg2} d5 13.e5 \textbf{Ce4} 14.\textbf{Cc3}

Chigorin: This move might have entailed
the loss of the exchange after 14...\textbf{Wxf2}
15.\textbf{Cxf2} g3+!\textsuperscript{139} After reviewing the
situation, however, Black preferred to
maintain the attack.
14...\textbf{f6} 15.\textbf{Cc4}
Romanov: It would be dangerous to accept
the pawn sacrifice: 15.\textbf{Cc4} dxc4
16.\textbf{Cc4} \textbf{Wh3!}, threatening 17...\textbf{f5+}
18.\textbf{Cd5} \textbf{Cf6}+ and 19...\textbf{Wf6+}; if 17.d5,
then 17...\textbf{Cc5}. But now the impression

\textsuperscript{139} In fact 15.\textbf{Cxf2} is best since after 15...g3+
16.\textbf{Cc3} \textbf{Wd1} 17.\textbf{Cf3} White recovers his queen
and no exchange would be lost.
treated that Black has himself fallen into a dangerous position.

15...fxe5\(^{140}\) 16.dxe5! \(\text{�e}8\) 17.\(\text{�d}3\)

Chigorin: An extremely interesting position. White cannot play 17.\(\text{�xd}5\), since there follows 17...\(\text{�c}5+\) 18.\(\text{�e}2\) \(\text{�xe}4\) and if 19.\(\text{�xe}4\), then 19...\(\text{�f}5\).

17.cxd5, then Black intended the following continuation: 17...\(\text{�f}2\) 18.\(\text{�a}4+\) \(\text{�d}7\) 19.\(\text{�d}4\) \(\text{�xh}1\) 20.e6 \(\text{�e}8\) 21.\(\text{�xd}7+\) \(\text{�xd}7\) 22.\(\text{�xh}1\) \(\text{�xf}4\) 23.\(\text{�xf}4\) \(\text{�g}5+\) 24.\(\text{�g}3\) \(\text{�h}4+\) 25.\(\text{�g}2\) \(\text{�f}8\) (threatening mate) 26.\(\text{�g}7+\) \(\text{�e}7\)

17...\(\text{�xf}8\) 18.\(\text{�xf}8\) 28.\(\text{�e}3(f4)\) \(\text{�d}6(c5)\) and wins easily.\(^{141}\)

17...d4+ 18.\(\text{�xd}4\)

Chigorin: If 18.\(\text{�xe}4\), then 18...\(\text{�c}5\), and White must sacrifice the knight.

18...\(\text{�f}5\) 19.\(\text{�xe}4\) \(\text{�d}8+\) 20.\(\text{�d}5\) \(\text{c}6\) 21.b4 \(\text{b}5\) 22.\(\text{�c}3\) cxd5 23.c5 \(\text{�h}3\)

24.\(\text{�f}1\) \(\text{d}4+\) 25.\(\text{�c}2\) \(\text{�h}6\) 26.\(\text{�d}2\) \(\text{�e}6\) 27.\(\text{�b}2\) \(\text{�c}4\) 28.\(\text{�e}1\) \(\text{d}3\)

29.\(\text{�c}1\) \(\text{�d}5\) 30.\(\text{�g}2\) \(\text{��e}6\) 31.\(\text{�a}1\)

31...a5 32.\(\text{�f}2\)

Chigorin: On 32.\(\text{�e}3\) would have obviously followed 32...\(\text{�d}4+\) and 33...\(\text{axb}4\); while on 32.bxa5 \(\text{�xc}5\).

\(\text{��}x\text{f}2\)

This time 15...\(\text{�f}2\) does win the exchange as the variation 16.\(\text{�xf}2\) \(\text{g}3+\) 17.\(\text{hxg}3\) \(\text{�xd}1\) 18.\(\text{�f}3\) allows the black queen to escape to d4 or a4.

141 28.\(\text{�f}4\) \(\text{�c}5\) actually mates in short order with ...\(\text{�h}3\) or ...\(\text{�f}2\).

40...\(\text{�f}5+\) 41.\(\text{�d}5\)

41.\(\text{�xf}5\) \(\text{�d}3+\) 42.\(\text{�xg}4\) \(\text{h}5\) mate.

41...\(\text{�d}3+\) 42.\(\text{�c}6\) \(\text{�d}7+\) 43.\(\text{�b}6\) \(\text{�d}8+\) 44.\(\text{�a}6\) \(\text{�c}6+\) 45.\(\text{�a}7\) \(\text{�e}4\) and mate on the following move.

Romanov: The final position of this variation with the picturesque position of the king on a7 deserves a diagram.

Romanov: Accepting this variation, Dorrer resigned the game and proposed
playing a new one, beginning from the 21st move. Chigorin willingly agreed.

21. $\text{e}3$ $\text{b}5$ 22. $\text{c}3$ $\text{cxd}5$ 23. $\text{c}5$ $\text{h}3$ 24. $\text{d}4$

Chigorin: If 24. $\text{w}d2$, then 24...$\text{d}4+$ 25. $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xc}5$ etc. However if 24. $\text{d}4$ then 24...$\text{b}4+$ 25. $\text{c}2$ $\text{c}8!$ 26. $\text{f}1$
$\text{xc}5$ 27. $\text{xc}5$ $\text{xd}3+$ 28. $\text{xd}3$
$\text{xc}5+$ 29. $\text{d}2$ $\text{g}2+$ 30. $\text{e}3$ $\text{c}4$ and wins.

24...$\text{g}2$ 25. $\text{c}3$

Chigorin: Or 25. $\text{f}2$ $\text{xc}5+$ 26. $\text{xc}5$ $\text{d}4$, and White must sacrifice his queen to avert mate; if, however, 27. $\text{xd}4$, then 27...$\text{d}5+$ 28. $\text{b}4$ $\text{a}5+$ etc.

25...$\text{d}4+$!

Romanov: At the same time Chigorin sent the following ten-move forced variation:

26. $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xd}4$ 27. $\text{xd}4$ $\text{e}4+$
28. $\text{c}3$ $\text{c}4+$ 29. $\text{d}2$ $\text{xd}3+$
30. $\text{c}1$ $\text{c}4+$ 31. $\text{d}2$ $\text{f}4+$
32. $\text{c}3$ $\text{c}4+$ 33. $\text{d}2$ $\text{d}3+$
34. $\text{c}1$

Or 34. $\text{h}1$ $\text{h}4$ mate.

34...$\text{g}5+$ 35. $\text{d}2$ $\text{xd}2$ mate

45. Evans Gambit

Mikhail Chigorin
Simon Alapin
St. Petersburg 1884

Notes by: Bogoljubow
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. $\text{c}3$ $\text{a}5$ 6.0-0 $\text{f}6$

Preferable is 6...$\text{d}6$.
7. $\text{d}4$ 0-0 8. $\text{xe}5$ $\text{xe}4$ 9. $\text{d}5!$ $\text{xc}3$
9...$\text{xc}3$ would be worse.

10. $\text{xe}4$ $\text{xa}1$ 11. $\text{h}7+$

11...$\text{h}8$?

Necessary was 11...$\text{h}7$, which leads to a draw: 12. $\text{g}5+$ $\text{g}6$ 13. $\text{d}3+$ $\text{f}5$
14. $\text{xf}6+$ $\text{xf}6$ 15. $\text{h}7+$ (or 15. $\text{c}3$
$\text{xc}3$ 16. $\text{xc}3+$ $\text{g}6$ 17. $\text{d}3+$, also a draw) 15...$\text{g}7$ 16. $\text{g}5+$ etc. There is no apparent way to win, and it hardly exists. But after the game continuation, White obtains an irresistible attack.

12. $\text{g}5$ $\text{g}6$ 13. $\text{g}4$ $\text{g}7$ 14. $\text{h}4$

$\text{xe}5$

142 Here Black can force mate with 28...$\text{c}4+$! instead. The main line runs: 29. $\text{a}5$ $\text{c}7+$
30. $\text{a}6$ $\text{c}8+$ 31. $\text{xb}5$ $\text{d}7+$ 32. $\text{b}4$ $\text{b}8+$
33. $\text{b}6$ $\text{xb}6+$ 34. $\text{a}3$ $\text{c}5+$ 35. $\text{b}4$ $\text{xb}4$

mate.

143 Also see Game 170.
15. \( \text{dxe6} \)!! \( \text{fxe6} \)
\( \text{fxe6} \) loses to \( 16. \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{xf6} \)
\( \text{g5+} \).
\( 16. \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) \( 17. \text{xg6+} \) \( \text{e7} \)
\( 18. \text{Wh4+!} \) \( \text{xf6} \)
He cannot save the game by \( 18... \text{d6} \) or \( \text{xf6} \), in view of \( 19. \text{a3+} \).
\( 19. \text{a3+!} \) \( \text{d6} \) \( 20. \text{Wh7+} \) \( \text{xf8} \)
\( 21. \text{Wh8+} \) \( \text{e7} \) \( 22. \text{Wg7+} \) \( \text{xf7} \)
\( 23. \text{xf7} \) mate

46. Game Ending
St. Petersburg
London
Correspondence Match 1866/87 (1)

Notes by: Yudovich

Regarding the game St. Petersburg-London, it is necessary to mention that when publishing it with Chigorin’s commentaries, the magazine Deutsche Schachzeitung wrote in 1888:

‘This analysis of the great Russian master represents the most remarkable of everything that has appeared in print in the area of analysis for many years, and therefore it deserves universal serious attention.’

As we have already pointed out, the first game of the match was left unfinished.

He based his claims on the following: ‘White’s plan... is to transfer the king to the queen’s flank in order to attack the black pawns. However, upon this, White should avoid certain positions, where Black could leave his a5-pawn undefended and attack the white f-, g- and a-pawns with his rook’ (Chigorin).

The position shown in the diagram is highly instructive and has entered into all theoretical manuals on the endgame. Here are the basic variations presented by Chigorin.

1... \( \text{e7} \) 2. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 3. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{a7} \) 4.\( f4 \)

Then follows:

A) 4... \( \text{a6} \) 5. \( \text{b7+} \) \( \text{d6} \) (5...\( e6 \)
\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{a8} \) 7. \( \text{b6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 8.\( \text{b5} \) 6.\( f5 \)
\( \text{gxf5} \) 7.\( \text{gx} \) \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{a8} \) 8.\( \text{b6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9.\( \text{c5} \)
\( \text{d8} \) 10.\( \text{b5} \) etc.;

B) 4... \( \text{d6} \) 5. \( \text{b6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 6.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{c7+} \)
\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{c1} \) 8.\( g5 \) \( f5 \) (8...\( f5 \) 9.\( f5 \)
\( \text{f7} \) 10.\( \text{cxd5} \) 11.\( \text{xf6+} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 12.\( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f4} \) 13.\( a5 \) \( \text{g1} \)
\( \text{f3} \) 14.\( a6 \) \( \text{f2} \) 15.\( \text{a7} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 16.\( g6 \)
14.\( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 15.\( a6 \) \( \text{g1} \) 16.\( a7 \) \( \text{a1} \)
\( \text{f5} \) and 18.\( \text{a5} \).

As the well-known theoretician grandmaster Y.Averbakh wrote: ‘Chigorin managed to show that upon passive defence Black loses.’

The endgame from the St. Petersburg-London game is completely modern and attracted the connoisseurs. In Y.Averbakh’s book Chess Endings (Physiculture and Sport, 1984) he talks about an original discussion in which former World Champion V.Smyslov and grandmasters G.Levenfish and R.Fine took part.

Developing Chigorin’s idea of the possibility of counterplay for Black, Fine suggested an immediate pawn sacrifice for Black, with the idea of activating the rook:

Now it was London’s move. The English considered that this position was an obvious draw. But Chigorin showed that White had real chances of victory.
1...c6! 2...xa5 c4+ 3...e3

Here Fine looked at the continuation
3...Cc3+ 4...e4 c4+ 5...d5 f4
6...a7+ c8 d8
assuming that Black was assured a draw. Levenfish and Smyslov didn’t agree with this, showing that
7...d6! c8 8...c7+

8...d8
(8...b8 9...c3 xa4 10...e6 f4
11...f7 g5 12...g6 b7 13...e3 c7
14...e6 etc.)
9...f7 e8 10...a7 xf3 11.a5 f5
12.a6 a3 13...e6 d8 14.g5 f4

15...f6 f3 16...g7! f2 17...f7 a2
18...f8+ e7 19.a7 xa7 20...f2
a6 21...f6

leads to a win for White.

All the same, Black can achieve a draw. As shown by Levenfish and Smyslov, to save the game it is necessary to activate not only the rook, but also the king.

In the position shown in the second diagram, correct is 3...f7! (instead of 3...c3+), for example: 4.a8 g7 5.a5 a4 6.a6 h6 f4 (7.a7 g5) 7...g5 8.fxg5+ fxg5 9...d3 g7 10...c3 xg4 with a draw. Or 4...a7+ e6 5.a5
a4 6.a6 e5 7.f4+ d5 8.a8 a3+ 9...f3 e4 and White does not win.

And so, Chigorin’s suggestion was supplemented and corrected. Well, that is quite natural and appropriate. It should not be forgotten that the more precise definition was made 75 years after the publication of the analysis, when the theory of rook endgames had moved far ahead.

So in fact the game was correctly adjudicated a draw.
Chapter 11

The World Champion throws down a challenge to Chigorin

Chigorin provisionally 'forgot' the foreign chess world, entirely giving himself over to the cares of the magazine, club, and organisation of the All-Russia Chess Union, then those from abroad in no way forgot Chigorin. Such a strong impression had been made by the first appearance of the Russian champion in an international tournament, long before, and his play in the telegraph match against London.

In 1886, Steinitz was in the heyday of his fame. He had just defeated Zukertort and was proclaimed the first World Chess Champion. But, all the same, his position was precarious: Zukertort had played the match clearly beneath his strength. Steinitz needed a new brilliant success, a victory over another very strong chess player of this time.

Who, however, at that time could pretend to the chess crown? Not Blackburne, despite his reputation as a brilliant tournament fighter, since he had already lost to Steinitz in a match the previous year, by a crushing score.

Public opinion on this question was expressed clearly. Even in 1886, the authoritative English player, H.Bird, wrote: 'Chigorin from St.Petersburg, at the present time, is probably not inferior to any player, with the possible exception of Steinitz.'

But in correspondence from Paris 1887 we read: 'How long will Steinitz hope to hold the sceptre in his hands? Not more than a few years... since he has already outlived his young years. Sooner or later his name will appear on the list of those who have departed from the scene of life and, in view of this possibility, in the Café de la Regence they believe that the world title will then pass to Chigorin in St.Petersburg, which, just like the whole Russian nation, is irrepresibly striving for a championship match.'

Steinitz was morally obliged to face Chigorin in a match for the World Championship and an opportunity soon presented itself.

At this time the Havana Chess Club developed energetic sporting activity. Its members — rich Creole planters and sugar merchants — spared no money in attracting American and European celebrities to their beautiful island. Fresh in their minds was the time when the famous Paul Morphy stopped over in Cuba and even played games of chess with the champion of the island, planter Felix Sicre, and his freed slave José Maria. As can be seen, love of chess already at that time broke through any class segregation and racial prejudice.

On the island of Cuba, in 1888, was born also the genius Capablanca — the future World Chess Champion, 1921-27, and, of course, in childhood (Capablanca played from the age of four!) he heard plenty of tales from eye-witnesses of the matches Chigorin played against Steinitz.

144 The centre of French chess life.
From 1883, Steinitz took up residence in the USA and his match against Zukertort was held in various towns of that country. In 1888, the World Champion visited Havana for a tour. There he played two matches of five games with the master, Vasquez and Golmayo, winning both with a 'clean' score, and was pleased to discover that the semi-tropical climate of Cuba did not have a negative effect on the quality of his play. Steinitz easily acclimatised.

Therefore, when the Havana Chess Club expressed the wish to hold a match for the World Championship on the island, between Steinitz and some other famous chess player, Steinitz decided to challenge Chigorin, whom he named 'the most worthy pretender to the World Championship.'

Here, as later, in the third person, the World Champion stated the grounds for his decision: 'Steinitz chose, in the capacity of his opponent, the Russian master Chigorin, whom he had already encountered twice before. The first time was in the international tournament in Vienna 1882. Then Steinitz shared the 1st and 2nd prize with Winawer. Chigorin, however, remained without a prize. But, in their personal encounters, each of them won one game. The second time they met was in the international tournament in London 1883, when the result of the tournament showed they finished closer to one another. Steinitz took 2nd prize, Chigorin – 4th. In their personal encounters, this time Chigorin turned out to be winner in both games. Chigorin enjoyed recognition as a first-class master. Particular admiration was aroused by the style of his play, characterised by sacrifices which displayed rare energy and brilliant combinations when conducting an attack on the king's flanks and also by fine calculation in the endgame.'

This was how Chigorin's play was characterised by the first World Champion.

60 years later, the 6th World Chess Champion, M.Botvinnik, completely adhered to the opinion of his predecessor. He said: 'Chigorin was a very great master of attack. He possessed excellent combinative vision and exceptional intuition in sharp complicated positions. When Chigorin sacrificed, then the subsequent line of play was not only the result of fine calculation, but was also guided by chess intuition.'

It is also necessary to mention another, creative, reason for such an unprecedented step in sport as a challenge to a match by a World Champion to a pretender. You know, up to and after this time, in all aspects of sport, not excluding chess, it was the pretender who challenged the World Champion to a match and the pretender prepared for a practical realisation of such a contest.

In the 1880s, Steinitz energetically pursued his literary-theoretical activity and called himself the head of the 'new' positional school. However, as far as Chigorin was concerned, Steinitz was completely mistaken when he referred to him as a defender of the 'old' combinative school, because of his brilliant tactical gifts. Chigorin never considered himself belonging to either the 'old' or the 'new' school. His creative work was original, it represented brilliant innovations, not coming out of the narrow limits of this or that school of chess thought.

It is impossible not to make an analogy with another great Russian chess player, Alexander Alekhine, who the fashionable 'hypermodern' chess movement tried to claim as one of its leaders: 'The pretentious determination with which the
...more or less, show goodwill towards me, by attempting to characterise my understanding of chess, seems to me devoid of intrinsic content," wrote Alekhine. I maintain, once and for all, that I am glad to refuse the honour to be one of the founders of the "neo-romantic" or "hypermodern school" for the benefit of the admiration of these magnificent names.

And, Chigorin, in his theoretical and polemic articles, time and again criticised the pedantry and dogmatism of the 'new school', leading to the impoverishment of the creative element of play, and even the personal claims of Steinitz, if they represented chess history. In Chess Herald for 1886, Chigorin came out sharply against Steinitz's tactless attempt to 'dethrone' the genius of Morphy. 'Steinitz attempts to cast aspersions on the brilliant names of the past, so as, against this background, to more clearly mark out a picture of his struggle with Zukertort', wrote Chigorin, who, though regarding Steinitz, as we see later, with great respect, never felt shy, either in print or face to face, to express his true opinion.

Chigorin would not tolerate any falsification in chess whatsoever. Any play with ideas, and always - distortion of the truth. Unfortunately, Steinitz and, particularly, other apologists of the 'new school' like Tarrasch and Alapin, acted otherwise. They proceeded from such sophisticated syllogisms: Steinitz was the representative of the 'new' positional school, Chigorin was not a chess player of positional style of play, so therefore Chigorin was an adherent of the 'old' combinative school.

Chigorin's creative approach, which fascinated the broad masses of chess players, was, like a blot on the landscape to Steinitz and his supporters, as they did not share the viewpoint that the theory and practice of chess were organically linked to one another and that practice was the basis, the well, of chess theory.

If we take their assertion at face value, then, supposedly, it means that theory does not have any practical significance, that it is possible to disregard the laws of strategy and tactics and nonetheless play excellent chess. Here is an example: 'Chigorin', wrote Steinitz, 'a genius of practical play, considers it his privilege, each opportunity, to throw a challenge at the principles of contemporary theory of the game of chess.'

While later Steinitz said to Lasker: 'The old school is bad, but its king Chigorin a genius.'

Tarrasch, already after the death of Chigorin, wrote: 'Frequently he played with enormous strength. It happened sometimes that his moves might be bad, but they were never weak... He did not have the knack of evaluating a position', he was only able to play chess well. But not to think chess, and this weakness was his greatest strength. Thanks to it, no self-criticism whatever would decrease his confidence in himself, and he would usually confirm that his position was good and the game ought to be won. There was something demonic in his play, ardently passionate and associated with stubborn self-approval.'

---

* Italics mine - Vasily Panov.*
Mikhail Chigorin: His Friends, Rivals and Enemies

A more reasonable characterisation of Chigorin's play was given in 1892 by an English magazine: 'Chigorin is a brilliant chess player, bold and courageous, but together with these qualities, he seldom descends into rashness. He possesses deep knowledge and though accepting many principles of the so called 'new school' - the prophet of which is Steinitz, he does not allow these principles to play the role of fetters, inhibiting his genius. Chigorin is not pedantic, his conceptions are high ideas splendid, style correct.'

What, however, for all that, is the explanation for such fundamentally contrasting judgements of important foreign authorities, evidently offended because Chigorin played in spite of these 'principles', and, so to speak, 'did not keep pace' with his colleagues and contemporaries?

Well, the answer lies in the fact that Chigorin, as a theoretician, was above his critics; he rejected the 'new' theory in general, because it was dogmatic theoretical pedanticism, and consisted of abstract, far-fetched laws, supposedly applying to every chess position and thereby drawing out the life blood of chess creativity and impoverishing it, instead of advancing it.

Chigorin wrote about the work of his foreign colleagues: 'Often theoretical is a synonym for the stereotyped. For this "theoretical" in chess is nothing more than that which can be found in the manuals and to which players try to conform because they cannot think up anything better or equal, anything original.'

In other statements, Chigorin, in detail, advanced his call for creative mastery of chess theory, for experimention, research, training: 'In chess books and magazines, just as in conversation, one continually hears: "Non-theoretical, more theoretical would be... etc." What is usually understood by "theoretical" are the generally accepted, constantly played moves, whose only advantage is that they have been studied more than others. In actual fact, in virtually all openings, it is possible to find moves which are not inferior to the theoretical ones, if an experienced and strong player is able to make them the initial point of a whole combination. The game of chess is far richer than it is represented on the basis of existing theory, which attempts to squeeze it into certain narrow forms.'

So, indeed, Chigorin 'did not keep pace' with theoreticians of his time, but was ahead of them – and by a great deal! He kept pace with us, Soviet chess players, his successors and pupils.

Steinitz, Tarrasch, Alapin and many others did not understand that Chigorin was not king of the 'old' school, but head of a third, foremost, progressive tendency of chess thought, which found its most brilliant development in the work of Alekhine and Soviet theoreticians, who showed its practical correctness – Alekhine, Botvinnik, Smyslov, Tal won the World Championship, and Soviet grandmasters and masters carried off victories in all the international team events.

We refer briefly to the aims of this chess school, as its detailed characteristics do not enter into the theme of this book and we must let Chigorin himself 'take the floor'.

We remind the reader that though the game of chess has existed over a thousand years, its present rules and resulting 'laws' were finally formulated only in the last century.
Chapter 11 - The World Champion throws down a challenge to Chigorin

At first the basic theme of the chess struggle was straightforward—it was essential to attack and deliver mate at any price. Characteristic for the old, so-called Italian, chess school, were games where either White rushed to exploit an opening mistake by the opponent and quickly mated the black king, or both opponents somehow developed their forces and began mutual attempts to storm the position of the enemy king, not being shy to sacrifice valuable material or create positional weaknesses in their own position. The play went a banque!

Very often the outcome of the game was decided not by skillful play of one or another chess player, but a lucky chance combination, perhaps incorrect but turning out well as a consequence of the opponent’s bad defence. Only correct calculation variations and combinational flair was at a great height. Brilliant representatives of the old school, in its last period, were, for example, Anderssen and Blackburne.

In contrast to this one-sided play, based on unhealthy adventurous risk, sometimes just traps, Steinitz’s play advanced a different approach to the chess struggle, based on the significance of the pawn formation, the raising of defensive technique, the principal recognition of the possibility to achieve victory, not only in a mating attack, but also by positional manoeuvring, with the aim of obtaining a small material advantage and then gradually realising this.

Steinitz was not an absolute innovator when he proclaimed the advantages of positional strategy. He exploited ideas and principles, either stated or demonstrated in practical play by genius masters of the past: Philidor, Petrov and (partly) Morphy. But Steinitz’s merits lay in his ability to summarise and formulate in print the aims of the ‘new’ positional school, even though he sometimes went too far and completely denied the importance of combinative play. For example: ‘Chess strategy’, wrote Steinitz, ‘ought not to seek the possibility of brilliant combinations, but, on the contrary, ought to fight against them and prevent them by solid and not brilliant means.’

His follower, Tarrasch, went even further: ‘I always hold this opinion’, he wrote, that the sacrifice of a piece or pawn hardly ever is a necessary condition of a correct and, so to speak, normal attack, and that a sacrifice to obtain or maintain an attack is necessary only in those cases, when, on the natural continuation of the attack, a mistake is made!’

Thus, according to the ideology of the ‘new’ school, the chess struggle should be reduced to careful manoeuvring and to waiting for a mistake by the opponent. Of course, if the leaders of the new school strictly adhered to this ideology in practice, they would not be able to display their chess mastery to the full. So, in reality, players did not allow themselves to be bound by restrictive principles nor to deny their passion for intuitive, creative play, and at times played as boldly and skilfully as any representative of the ‘old school’, which they so roundly condemned. The only real difference was that they did not voluntarily seek complications, but referred to exploit any favourable opportunity presented by their opponent. With Steinitz and Tarrasch, it is possible to find quite a lot of excellent combinational games, to which Anderssen, Blackburne and Zukertort would have gladly attached their name.
This was also noted by Chigorin, writing in 1891 to Steinitz: ‘True friends of chess must be thankful to you for the interest which you constantly awake with your innovations and for your aversion to routine-like play. As is known to you, I do not share your theory and principles completely, which, however, does not prevent me from appreciating them. But you are doing me an injustice, dear Mr. Steinitz, when you ascribe to me a one-sided view about the treatment of the king’s flank. After all, we are probably both right in our views about the conduct of the game. In some of your own best games, you have also not denied to yourself the attack on the royal flank.’

Interestingly, Steinitz, publishing this letter in his own magazine, considered it necessary to isolate himself from those who abused the great Russian chess player. With regard to the last part of the letter, Steinitz wrote: ‘Many critics continually attack Chigorin to the old school, to a larger extent than myself, and must take responsibility for reproaching him for one-sidedness.’

In fact, Chigorin was far from being creatively limited to either school – ‘old’ or ‘new’.

Chigorin was the first to put forward the principle of harmonious combination of chess strategy and tactics, the combinational and positional elements of play, which nowadays represent the basic standpoint of the Soviet chess school. He was a supporter of inspired chess creativity and a concrete approach to evaluating a position without premeditated recipes.

‘The ability to skillfully combine, the capacity to find in each given position the most expedient move, is the quickest way to execute a well conceived plan, and is higher than any principle, or, to put it more precisely, is (in fact) the only principle in the game of chess, yielding to fine definition,’ pointed out Chigorin.

Chigorin, the genial master of combinations, combined the strength of tactics with deeply conceived strategical planning, and attack with defence.

‘The desire to exploit, as quickly as possible, an opponent’s move which seems at first glance, unnatural, mistaken, can lure a player into an attack on a false path’, wrote Chigorin. ‘Only by gradual development of one’s forces and highly circumspect play, can one, little by little, acquire certain advantages in the position, and then an opportunity will arise to inflict a decisive blow.’

As can be seen, Chigorin was far from being an advocate of the rash, adventurous risk and mutual attacks of chess players of the old school. On the contrary, he emphasised the need for careful positional preparation before going over to the attack or counterattack.
most outstanding young foreign chess players, free from preconceived notions, 
how very well the versatility of Chigorin's play: 'There was never a master, who 
old, to such an extent, combine the art of attack and defence, as Chigorin', wrote 
Jubilee, the champion of the USA, at the end of the last century.

And here we come up against an interesting feature, providing evidence of 
vitality and organic harmony that pervaded Chigorin's theoretical stance. As 
theoretician, Chigorin favoured the gambits that were fashionable in his youth: 
the King's Gambit and Evans Gambit — and they firmly entered into his tournament 
match repertoire.

He made enormous contributions to the theory of gambits. But since nowadays 
no hardly enter into practice, the theoretical legacy of Chigorin in this area has 
seen little exploited.

And even the favourite systems he played as White against the French and Sicilian 
defences, with the fianchettoed king's bishop and further preparation of attack on 
the king's flank with the blockaded centre, are now rarely employed.

But Chigorin's ideas in black opening set-ups have entered into the arsenal of 
most grandmasters and masters. His defences in the Spanish Game, his Old Indian 
set-up, his method of struggle against the King's Gambit — for Black, his system 
of counterplay in the Queen's Gambit (Slav Defence) and even the risky Chigorin 
defence to the Queen's Gambit, just as in those olden times are constantly met 
tournament practice of our day. Do we need any better proof of Chigorin's 
enduring ideas and the harmonious coordination seen in his creative attacks and 
defences, initiative and seizing of the initiative?

L. Velikhov remembered that when articles appeared by adherents of the 'new' 
school, reproaching Chigorin for his love of complications and combinations, and 
irregard' of positional play, Chigorin forgot about his usual shyness with words 
and broke out into a whole Phillipic: 'They know more about me than I myself — 
what does "love of complications" mean? What normal man prefers complications 
the simple way? The fact of the matter is that I frequently foresee victory in 
each positions, where others perceive only complications. In the final analysis, this 
means that any suggestion of conflict between combinative and positional styles is 
absurd. Is it really possible to distinguish them purely mechanically? In chess there 
are only two styles — good, i.e. leading to victory, and bad, leading to defeat. In each 
position is concealed the possibility of combinations and each combination arises 
from the position.'

From the above quoted statements of Chigorin and his contemporaries, it is 
apparent that any individual sporting failures of the great Russian chess player are 
explained not by some kind of defect of his mighty gifts, nor erroneous theoretical 
standpoints, but deep social and psychological reasons, which I endeavour to 
investigate for the reader after a description of Chigorin's historical matches on the 
Island of Cuba.
Chapter 12

Columbus of Russian chess discovers the New World

It was the very first journey of a Russian chess master across the ocean, an original discovery of chess in America by the Columbus from the St.Petersburg Chess Club. Up to this time not one representative of Russian chess had set foot on the American continent, but Chigorin was sailing not only to Cuba, but afterwards also to New York, where he was due to take part in a great international tournament. For us Soviet people, it seems obvious, it even goes without saying, that the participants of an important international tournament do not have to worry about the material side of their journey. But in those days the case was somewhat different. All the burden lay on the master. Chigorin had to reach the USA at his own expense. The Havana Chess Club paid only for the return journey from the USA to Cuba, plus upkeep for the duration of the match. Besides this, Chigorin had to raise a stake of 2,000 roubles, i.e., as they used to say, 'lay a bet' on himself for the match against Steinitz. The sum total of payments of both opponents went to the winner of the match. The defeated player, despite putting in a gigantic amount of work, did not receive anything, apart from the fodder of an insignificant honorarium of 20 dollars per point.

All this required serious expenditure. And, of course, there was no mention of money for Chigorin. But he was already famous and Steinitz's challenge still further heightened his authority. Chigorin's St.Petersburg friends decided to help him. On behalf of the club members who made donations, a circular was distributed by the governor of the chess club, Arnold, to well-off amateurs, which said: 'Since neither Mikhail Ivanovich himself nor the St.Petersburg Society of Chess Amateurs have sufficient means, either for defrayal of expenses needed for the trip to America or for the required stake, then it is necessary for your obedient servant, authorised by the Society to organise the implementation of the match, to appeal to all Russian chess players, who, as is well known, are not indifferent to their regard of national pride, to help in this matter -- firstly, to participate personally in the subscription for the stake and, secondly, to invite other amateurs to do the same.'

Furthermore, in the circular, it was explained to the intellectual patrons, who were not so different from the usual unintellectual money-lenders, that the subscription of money for the stake was not a donation at all, but an ordinary speculation. If a chess player, who held a stake, gained victory in a match then the 'shareholder' not only received his money back, but also got an extra 50%. However, the winner himself earned only half of the payment made by the defeated opponent. For example, Steinitz, after winning $2,000 in his match against Zukertort, himself received only $1,000. One should add, in honour of the patrons, that in the event of the defeat of their champion, they did not drag him into court, nor did they abuse him, but simply sighed, recorded the sacrificed money in the 'loss' column, solemnly swearing never again to have anything to do with this chess player and become, once and for all, 'indifferent' to national pride.
Since Chigorin’s chances were regarded highly and there were prospects of being a fortune on him, the world showed itself to be not without good people. It was guaranteed by three amateurs of Havana itself. The rest of the sum was raised in Russia, but, apparently, only just enough, since Chigorin sailed at the beginning of December to the USA not on a solid liner from Le Havre, but on a tiny steamship from Copenhagen. But, by economising on Chigorin’s ticket, ‘patron’ did himself a disservice! The crossing to the USA, instead of the usual 15 days, lasted 23, and over a 24 hour period a fierce storm blew up, causing a lot of damage to the boat. Chigorin, whose sea-experience was limited to short crossings across the English Channel, felt terrible. As evident from a letter, written by him on arrival in New York, he did not sleep all the time he was sailing, anticipating that the steamship was just about to sink. Since this was the Atlantic Ocean, and not Lake Ilmen, then Chigorin could even reckon that the Czar of the sea (a passionate chess player according to a Russian epic) would treat him in no worse fashion than he, in his time, had greeted the Novgorod Post, Sadko.

Of course, for an older, nervous man, unaccustomed to a storm, such a prolonged voyage, instead of a cruise on a comfortable liner with the possibility of rest and training, was a strain on the nerves, and it exhausted Chigorin, physically and mentally, and played a fatal role in his struggle for the World Championship.

Since the steamship arrived late in New York, Chigorin did not have time to recuperate on dry land and was forced to leave immediately for Havana. ‘I could not rest right away either, because the local club was in a hurry to start the match, as they wanted the governor, who was on the point of going away, to inaugurate it. The local climate and food immediately began to have a harmful effect on my health and I was obliged to play in a half-sick condition.’ Indeed, the intensely hot climate of Havana was contra-indicated for Chigorin, a native of the Russian north, who had never before been in the Crimea, let alone the tropics. But the climate, as we will see later, was not the only reason for his defeat. On the other hand, though Steinitz was by now 53 years old, he easily endured the heat and played at full strength, demonstrating excellent theoretical preparation and a fine psychological appreciation of his dangerous opponent.

Overall, in his match with Chigorin, Steinitz clearly showed himself to be the better chess sportsman.

The match was played for the best of 20 games.

Chigorin’s strength was enough only for a decent start; he won the 1st, 3rd, 6th and 7th games, but then lost three games in a row and weakened sharply, while at the very end he again suffered three defeats. The match, which began on 20 January 1889, finished on 24 February with a victory for Steinitz by the score of 10½–6½.

In the 1st and all remaining odd games, Chigorin played with the white pieces. On looking at the games of the match, we are struck by the number of serious mistakes made by Chigorin, whereas Steinitz did not make oversights, nor miscalculations, and played with great self-control.
Interestingly, in the whole match, there was only one draw, and that was in the last game! The reader might think that Chigorin, seeing the hopelessness of the struggle after three successive defeats, made a classic 'short draw' with the victorious grandmaster and then packed his trunk and left. This is not the case. In the last game, Chigorin played the Evans Gambit, which he had employed in all the odd-numbered games, apart from the 3rd, and the draw was established only on the 70th move. The Russian champion accepted his sporting responsibilities with great honesty and integrity.

With white, Chigorin scored 5 ½ points out of 9, but, with the black pieces, only 1 point out of 8! An incredible result, even if the unfavourable climatic conditions are taken into account. However, what was the heart of the matter? Also it is here that we get to the basic reason for Chigorin’s defeat, which lay in a total lack of training and preparation for his opponent’s opening repertoire.

It is necessary to take into account that in the course of the preceding six years (1883-1888), Chigorin had met no strong opponents on equal terms, whereas he had played the overwhelming majority of his games in handicap tournaments, where opening theory had no significance at all.

Those same few opponents of Chigorin, who met him on equal terms, when playing White, usually employed the same classical openings as Chigorin: the Evans Gambit, King’s Gambit, Italian, Scotch and Spanish Game, the Two Knights Defence.

Half-open openings then were little analysed and came into wider practice considerably later. Closed openings, either with white or black, had hardly ever been employed by Chigorin, right up to the match with Steinitz.

Through his study of chess literature, Steinitz was aware of Chigorin’s lack of practical experience in closed openings, and all the games which he played as White began with a move of the king’s knight, followed by an advance of the queen’s pawn, in no way endeavouring to sharpen the game, but creating a solid position with a safe corner for his king. Chigorin had to solve complicated and new opening problems by means of improvisation at the board, but this required good sporting form and speed of orientation, which he did not have because of tiredness from the sea voyage and the intensely hot climate. Apparently striving to economise his strength by playing familiar openings, Chigorin chose one and the same variation, unfavourable for Black, linked to an immediate development of his queen’s bishop and a future exchange of it for Steinitz’s king’s knight, which, however, only strengthened the pawn cover of the white king.

It is interesting that from the second half of the 1890s, when Chigorin became a regular participant in international tournaments, he, in reply to the Queen’s Gambit, worked on a reliable and strategically original opening system as Black and scored a normal percentage of points.

The people composing humble circulars about the need for material help for Chigorin, as a chess player, were undoubtedly very favourably disposed towards their champion. However, it comes as a surprise that they did not think too much about providing the Russian pretender to the World Championship with even a month to rest on the lap of nature, when he could occupy himself with a study of
games of Steinitz and polish up those opening variations in which Chigorin
did not have any competitive experience. Even if the St.Petersburg enthusiasts were
to organise a few training games for Chigorin, playing closed openings with
him against him (as it was well known that Steinitz often chose these), then even
would have significantly helped Chigorin.

Though Mikhail Ivanovich was clearly in high spirits, he showed a complete lack of
preparation and obvious disregard of physical and theoretical preparation for this most
important contest. It is possible that he was planning to spend time on this whilst
enjoying the steamship, but, as we will see, this was not to be.

However, despite his failed result in the match with Steinitz, Chigorin's play in
match was praised highly by his contemporaries.

The German magazine Deutsche Schachzeitung wrote after the match that Chigorin,
with the style of his play, his lively, brilliant and dangerous combinations, out of
contemporary chess players bore the greatest resemblance to the great Morphy.
Indeed, not infrequently when looking at some game or other of the Russian
master, it seemed it had all the hallmarks of the great American.

Chigorin also left an excellent impression on the Havana Chess Club. The leaders
of the club saw with their own eyes how much the intensely hot climate of Cuba
affected the sporting form of the Russian master, but hoped that in the end he
would be able to acclimatise. They suggested that they immediately organise a new
match between Chigorin and Steinitz to 5 won games, pledging a stake of $500
for Chigorin. However, Steinitz did not want to tempt fate and declined the offer.

Instead of this, Chigorin and Steinitz, in company with local masters, played
three consultation games against each other, which gave the allies one victory each
with one draw.

After resting in Havana, Chigorin departed for the international tournament in
New York, accompanied by the very friendly wishes of the Cubans. As Chigorin
said in the previously mentioned interview: 'Despite the final result of my match
with Steinitz, I was invited to travel again to Havana for encounters with local
masters or against any foreign master of my choice. I chose Steinitz and already
secured his agreement to give me a return match.'

This agreement was purely on principle, but the Cubans wanted to receive
Chigorin again the following year, and some time later he put forward the
 candidature of the English master, Isidor Gunsberg, who had recently achieved
a series of important successes. Gunsberg's careful positional style of play greatly
resembled that of Steinitz and it was obvious that before entering into a new
contest – at least in principle – with the World Champion, Chigorin wanted to
train himself in manoeuvring play. How this occurred to him, or, more accurately,
if it did not occur, I will discuss in the following chapter, but for now let's go over to
the tournament in New York.

The tournament began on 25 March 1889 and lasted 54 days! 20 participants
played in two circuits. The line-up was strong: the majority of the leading players
of the age were competing in the event.
Chigorin conducted the tournament excellently and, after scoring 29 points, shared (following a supplementary match) 1st and 2nd prizes with the talented Hungarian master Max Weiss, a chess player with a refined positional-manoeuvring style of play. Two years previously, in the tournament at Frankfurt on Main, Weiss had shared 2nd-3rd prizes with Blackburne, being left behind only by Mackenzie, and he also played well in the tournament at Hamburg in 1885.

Behind Chigorin and Weiss stood Gunsberg, winning both games against Chigorin, which also served as a basis for Chigorin to suggest to the Havana Club that they organise his match specifically with Gunsberg.

In 4th place was Blackburne, in 5th Burn.

Chigorin gained 1½ points against Weiss (in the actual tournament) and Blackburne – and inflicted two defeats on Burn.

Overall, Chigorin had to play 42 games in the New York tournament since, in accordance with the rules, in the second cycle draws were replayed – while at the end he had to play another four tie-break games with Weiss, which all concluded in a draw. It would seem, for a man who had only just played 17 games in a match for the World Championship, this would be beyond his strength, and that Chigorin would begin to ‘slip and slide’ in the tournament, but the short rest in Havana and on board the steamship was enough for him to get into top form. The result of the New York tournament confirmed that Chigorin’s defeat in the match against Steinitz, in great part, could be explained by fatigue from the dangerous sea voyage and unaccustomed food and climate for a northerner.

It is interesting that Chigorin himself was not satisfied even with his result in New York. He wrote from New York to one of his St.Petersburg friends: ‘Here the tournament has finished, and not quite successfully. I should be content with sharing 1st and 2nd prizes in the tournament with Weiss… But in one game I played just like a patzer and managed to juggle and lose in a winning position… A draw with Mason (I did not want to conclude the game this way for the reason you already know) would deliver me first prize… Against Gunsberg (the last game) I also lost. Because of what? Because of various stories and gossip. Here, all sorts of people were gathered together just like wandering minstrels.’

In the interview he gave on his return to Russia, Chigorin interpreted the cause of his dissatisfaction with his colleagues in the tournament: ‘The majority of the players assembled in New York came there only for the dollars, very few were glad for the game of chess itself, but in such conditions the tournament could not show particular interest.’

Chigorin continued in the same interview:

‘As a player, Steinitz also has his weaknesses – he is rather capricious, over-particular… but Steinitz loves chess, as a game, not just as a means of making good money; it seems that the majority of the other international chess players look at the game of chess completely differently.’

A symptomatic statement, showing the principal standards that Chigorin applied to himself and to his contemporaries. He was a selfless creative worker to the core!
Chapter 12 - Columbus of Russian chess discovers the New World

Queen's Pawn Game

Wilhelm Steinitz
Mikhail Chigorin

And d Championship Match, Havana 1889 (4)

Notes by: Romanovsky and Bogoljubow

Romanovsky: The games in which Chigorin played Black in the match revealed his lack of preparation for defending positions arising from the Queen's Gambit. Out of eight of these encounters, Chigorin lost seven, in part, putting up only weak resistance. Particularly characteristic in this respect is this game.

1. e4 f5 2. d4 g4

Romanovsky: This move received its international baptism in a game of the telegraph match between London and St. Petersburg, which took place in 1886-1887. In his annotations to it, Chigorin wrote: 'The reason which prompted us to choose this move was above all the desire to avoid the usual way of development in the present opening. In the variation 1. d4 d5 2. c4 f6 3. e3, the move 3... g4 is not considered good for Black, though practice does not provide confirmation of this opinion. In five or six games known to us, appearing in the press, with these opening moves - above all in games in which Winawer was playing Black - we did not notice any negative side to the position of the bishop on g4.'

Bogoljubow: Steinitz considered this move premature, since the bishop is needed to cover the b7-square.

3. c4 xf3

Romanovsky: In making this exchange, Chigorin reckoned, in the event of 4. exf3, on making the d4-pawn an object of attack, while after 4. gxf3 it is difficult for White to castle - two concrete calculations! Steinitz, however, considered the exchange favourable for White in view of the 'advantage of the two bishops' which he obtains. And so we have a difference of ideas and evaluations from the very first moves! Later, Chigorin also exchanged on f3 in a Hastings game against Lasker.

Bogoljubow: Giving the opponent the advantage of the two bishops and reinforcing White's centre. Best here is 3... c6.

4. gxf3

Bogoljubow: Just as good as 4. exf3.

4... e6

Bogoljubow: If 4... dxc4 5. e3! e5, then 6. dxe5 w xd1+ 7. w xd1 c 6 8. f4 0-0-0 9. c d2 with the better game for White.

5. cxd5 w xd5

Romanovsky: It would have been better for Chigorin to play ... c6 on the 4th move, as he continued in the above-mentioned game against Lasker; now 5... exd5 is not good because of 6. wb3.

Bogoljubow: On 5... exd5 follows 6. wb3, which forces 6... b6, since on 6... c6 White plays 7. wxb7 cxb4 8. wb5+ w d7 9. w xd7+ w xd7 10. c d1 etc.146

6. e4 c 4+ 7. c 3 w a 5

Bogoljubow: The queen will take up a better position on h5.

146 But Black can instead meet 7. wxb7 with 7... cxd4.
8. \textbf{\&d2} \textbf{\&c6}?

Romanovsky: But after this error Black is faced with insuperable difficulties.

Bogoljubov: Black would have a bad position also after 8...\textbf{\&c7} 9.a3 \textbf{\&xc3} 10.\textbf{\&xc3} \textbf{\&h5}, but he could defend for a long time.

\textbf{9.d5 exd5} \textbf{10.a3}!
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Romanovsky: Material loss for Black is inevitable.

\textbf{10...\textbf{\&d4}} \textbf{11.\textbf{\&d3}}

Romanovsky: Not 11.axb4? at once, in view of 11...\textbf{\&xa1}. Black cannot retreat the bishop, upon which would follow \textbf{\&xd5}.

\textbf{11...0-0-0}

Bogoljubov: Black must lose a piece. On 11...\textbf{\&xe4} would have followed 12.\textbf{\&xe4} \textbf{\&e5} 13.axb4 \textbf{\&f5} 14.\textbf{\&a5}! \textbf{\&b5} (14...\textbf{\&we6} 15.\textbf{\&e3} etc.) 15.\textbf{\&f4} etc.

\textbf{12.axb4 \textbf{\&xf3}+ 13.\textbf{\&xf3}}

Bogoljubov: On 13.\textbf{\&c2} \textbf{\&d4}+ 14.\textbf{\&f1} \textbf{\&xb4} 15.\textbf{\&xd5} \textbf{\&b3} Black could still have put up prolonged resistance.

\textbf{13...\textbf{\&xa1}+ 14.\textbf{\&e2} \textbf{\&xb2} 15.\textbf{\&b1} \textbf{\&wa3} 16.\textbf{\&b5} \textbf{\&wa6}}

Bogoljubov: On 16...\textbf{\&a2} White would win by 17.\textbf{\&f4} \textbf{\&d7} 18.\textbf{\&a4} \textbf{\&e6} 19.\textbf{\&d6}+.

\textbf{17.\textbf{\&xf7} \textbf{\&b6} 18.\textbf{\&a1} \textbf{\&h6}}

Bogoljubov: Or 18...\textbf{\&c6} 19.\textbf{\&f4} \textbf{\&d7} (if 19...\textbf{\&h6} then 20.\textbf{\&xc6}+! 20.\textbf{\&e8}+!)

... 20.\textbf{\&xa7}+ is actually the real threat.

\textbf{\&d8 21.\textbf{\&xa7}+! \textbf{\&xa7} 22.\textbf{\&xc6}+ advance in two moves.}

\textbf{19.\textbf{\&xg7} \textbf{\&xe4} 20.\textbf{\&xc7}+ \textbf{\&xc7}}

\textbf{21.\textbf{\&xc7}+ \textbf{\&b8} 22.\textbf{\&xe4}} \textbf{1-0}

Bogoljubov: An excellently played game by Steinitz.

48 Queen's Pawn Game

Wilhelm Steinitz

Mikhail Chigorin

World Championship Match, Havana 1889 (6)

Notes by: Chigorin, Grekov, Steinitz and Bogoljubov

1.\textbf{\&f3} \textbf{d5} 2.\textbf{\&d4} \textbf{\&g4}

Chigorin: My motive for first playing this move in the match between London and St. Petersburg in 1887 was above all the desire to avoid usual paths of development in the present opening.

3.\textbf{\&c4} \textbf{\&xf3} 4.\textbf{\&xf3} \textbf{dxc4}

Chigorin: This move, in conjunction with the following, probably constitutes the best continuation for Black, giving him some superiority in position.

5.\textbf{\&e4}

Grekov: Later Steinitz made the more solid move 5.e3 here; Black, of course, did not obtain an advantage in position and thus the last part of Chigorin's previous annotation is inaccurate.

At the start of the same variation in a later consultation game in Havana 1891, Chigorin played otherwise – 3...\textbf{\&e6}.

5...\textbf{\&e5}! 6.\textbf{\&xe5} \textbf{\&xd1}+ 7.\textbf{\&xd1} \textbf{\&c6} 8.\textbf{\&e4} \textbf{\&d8+}

Bogoljubov: Black does not castle on the queen's side since his king must defend the f7-square.

9.\textbf{\&d2}

Chigorin: The white king cannot move away in view of 9...\textbf{\&d4}.

9...\textbf{\&c5} 10.\textbf{\&g1}

Bogoljubov: A loss of time. It was necessary to play 10.\textbf{\&xc4}.
10...\( \text{Qg}7! \)

11...\( \text{Qxc4} \)

Chigorin: If 11...\( \text{Qxg7} \), then possible was the continuation 11...\( \text{Qg6} \) 12.\( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 13.\( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) (or 13...\( \text{Qd3}! \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) and Black has the better game.

11...\( \text{Qg6} \) 12.\( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 13.\( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qd6} \)

14.\( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qd4} \)

Bogoljubow: In order to eliminate the important bishop on d2.

15.\( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qf3} \) 16.\( \text{Qxb6} \)

Chigorin: Better would be 16.\( \text{Qc3} \). Black, in our opinion, would retain the advantage in position, by continuing 16...\( \text{Qxf4} \) 17.\( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) etc.

16...\( \text{Qxd2} \) 17.\( \text{Qxd2} \) \( \text{axb6} \) 18.\( \text{Qxd8+} \) \( \text{Qxd8} \) 19.\( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 20.\( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)

21.\( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 22.\( \text{Qe6} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 23.\( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qf2+} \) 24.\( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qxd2} \)

25.\( \text{Qg5} \)

Greco: Steinitz considered this move the decisive mistake and expressed the opinion that the continuation 25.\( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 26.\( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qh3}+ \) 27.\( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) would have given him good chances of a draw.

Bogoljubow: On the other hand, 27...\( \text{Qd6}?! \) would be a mistake because of 28.\( \text{Qxe5} \) Black, upon 25.\( \text{Qf1} \), of course could simply make a draw: 25...\( \text{Qh3}+ \) 26.\( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qh2}+ \), and the white king must go back to e3, since after 27.\( \text{Qd1} \) or 27.\( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 28.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 29.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 30.\( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 31.\( \text{Qd8} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) etc. Black would have some chances of a win.

25...\( \text{Qh3}+ \) 26.\( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qf3} \) 27.\( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qf4} \)

28.\( \text{a4} \)

28...\( \text{h5}! \)

Chigorin: If 28...\( \text{c5+} (?) \), then 29.\( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qd3}+ \) 30.\( \text{Qd5} \)

29.a5 \( \text{h4} \) 30.\( \text{axb6} \) \( \text{c6}! \)

Steinitz: Excellently played; the rook is driven away from that flank where it occupies a strong position, and Black obtains the possibility of quickly deciding the game.

31.\( \text{Qf5} \)

Chigorin: If 31.\( \text{Qg5} \), then Black, firstly, could take the bishop; and, secondly, force an exchange of rooks by playing 31...\( \text{Qg3} \), after which the win would be even easier, e.g. 32.\( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxe6+} \) etc.

31...\( \text{Qe2+} \) 32.\( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \)

\( ^{1+8} \) In fact 28...\( \text{c5+} \) 29.\( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qg6+} \) 30.\( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd3} \) 31.\( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qe5+} \) is mate!
11...\texttt{wg6}

Chigorin: An interesting variation would be obtained after 11...c6, namely:
12.\texttt{ad1} f6 13.\texttt{dxc6} \texttt{wxc6} 14.\texttt{b5} fxe5 15.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{wxc5} 16.\texttt{d6+} \texttt{f8} 17.\texttt{xd7+!} threatening mate.\footnote{However this can be met by 17.\texttt{c6!!}.} No better would be 11...a6: then 12.\texttt{b3} and White wins a pawn.

Sogoljubow: Black is already helpless.

12.\texttt{he}e7 \texttt{dxe7} 13.\texttt{cxe5} \texttt{f6}
14.\texttt{c3} \texttt{xc3}

Sogoljubow: Black does not risk much with this move: his game is lost whatever he does.

If 14...d6, then 15.e5 dxe5 16.\texttt{exe5} and then 17.\texttt{e}e1.

15.e5 c6

Chigorin: Black has no moves, which would make possible the development of his game.

16.d6+ \texttt{f8}

17.\texttt{b3}!

Steinitz: An excellent move, thanks to which a connection is established between the white queen and the king's flank.

17...h6 18.\texttt{h4}

Chigorin: In order to provoke the obligatory move for Black ...g7-g5 and thereby weaken his king's flank.

18...g5 19.\texttt{h5}

Steinitz: 19.\texttt{xg5} was not possible in view of 19...\texttt{x}e5.

19...\texttt{d3}

20.\texttt{ad1}

Steinitz: Of course not 20.\texttt{xg5}? \texttt{f5}.

Romanovsky: 20.\texttt{xg5} \texttt{g6} would not be so energetic.

20...\texttt{h7}

Chigorin: If 20...\texttt{g6}, then 21.\texttt{xg6} fxg6 22.e6 and White wins a piece.

Romanovsky: Now, however, on 20...\texttt{g6} would follow 21.\texttt{xg6} fxg6 22.e6 Kg7 23.\texttt{f}e1! with the win of a piece.\footnote{But in fact Black can then play 23...\texttt{dxe6} 24.\texttt{exe6} dxe6 25.d7 \texttt{a8} 26.dxc8 \texttt{a}xc8, when he has three pawns for the piece and is only slightly worse.}

21.\texttt{c2}

Steinitz: White could immediately decide the game by playing 21.e6! \texttt{dxe6} 22.\texttt{exe6} fxe6 23.\texttt{e}e5 followed by \texttt{d}d3.

Romanovsky: In Steinitz's opinion, 21.e6 \texttt{dxe6} 22.\texttt{exe6} fxe6 23.\texttt{e}e5 followed by \texttt{d}d3 led at once to victory. The move 21.e6 is striking and Chigorin could hardly have missed the possibility pointed out by Steinitz. Did not Chigorin notice the fact that, after 23.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{g8} 24.\texttt{d}d3 g4!, with the threat 25...\texttt{g}g5, White's attack comes up against obstacles? The quiet bringing up
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of reserves, chosen by Chigorin, does not leave Black even the faintest chance to save the game.

21...\( \text{f7} \) 32.\( \text{f5} \) \( \text{x}f5 \) 33.\( \text{x}f5+ \text{exf5} \) 34.\( \text{f}1 \) with an irresistible attack.

22.\( \text{cd4} \) \( \text{Wg6} \)

Chigorin: White threatened 23.\( \text{c2} \). If Black took the knight on \( d4 \) with the bishop, then after the move \( \text{xd4} \) and subsequently \( f2-f4 \) he could not save the game.

23.\( \text{Wg4} \) \( h5 \)

Steinitz: Necessary: now on 23...\( \text{e6} \) could have followed 24.\( \text{c2} \) with a very strong attack (or 24.\( \text{xf5}+ \) and 25.\( \text{e7} \)).

24.\( \text{f5}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) 25.\( \text{Wxg5} \) \( \text{Wxg5} \)

26.\( \text{Wxg5} \)

Romanovsky: The pieces on Black's queen's flank find themselves paralysed and, to all intents and purposes, in the forthcoming battle White has a rook and bishop advantage. Instead of attempting to mobilise the forces on the queen's flank, say by means of ...\( \text{a5} \) and ...\( b7-b6 \) or ...\( a5-a4 \), Steinitz makes two insipid moves, which allows Chigorin to conclude the attack in brilliant style.

26...\( \text{h4} \)

Steinitz: Black has no satisfactory defence: if 26...\( \text{e6} \), then 27.\( \text{xc6}+ \text{fxe6} \) 28.\( \text{e7} \) \( \text{h7} \) 29.\( \text{h1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 30.\( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 31.\( \text{f4} \)
12...\textit{\textbf{W}}b8

\textit{Note:} If 12...\textit{\textbf{f}}6 13.\textit{\textbf{d}}xc6 \textit{\textbf{W}}xc6 14.\textit{\textbf{b}}5 \textit{\textbf{g}}5 (or 14...\textit{\textbf{a}}c5 15.\textit{\textbf{e}}e3 etc.) 15.\textit{\textbf{a}}xe5 \textit{\textbf{a}}xe5 16.\textit{\textbf{d}}6+ \textit{\textbf{f}}8 17.\textit{\textbf{w}}xd7!! with a stunning attack.\textsuperscript{151}

13.\textit{\textbf{a}}xe7 \textit{\textbf{a}}xe7 14.\textit{\textbf{d}}6+ \textit{\textbf{f}}8 15.\textit{\textbf{w}}b4

\textit{Note:} The most powerful continuation. It is a waiting move that prevents Black from playing ...\textit{\textbf{c}}c5, and keeps the latter's pieces shut up for a long time.

15...\textit{\textbf{f}}6 16.\textit{\textbf{a}}b3

16...\textit{\textbf{g}}7

\textit{Chigorin:} Steinitz tried to convince himself that, in the last game of the match, he lost only because here he did not make this move, which gives Black the advantage (?!), White's attack being refuted. The 17\textsuperscript{th} game of the match had continued 16...\textit{\textbf{g}}6 17.\textit{\textbf{c}}c4 \textit{\textbf{g}}7 18.a4 \textit{\textbf{f}}7 19.\textit{\textbf{a}}xb6 axb6 20.\textit{\textbf{a}}xf7 \textit{\textbf{a}}xf7 21.e5!!

21.e5!!

\textit{Steinitz:} This gives White a powerful attack, which is extremely difficult to parry.

\textsuperscript{151} Again, as mentioned in the previous game, then there is 17...\textit{\textbf{c}}c6!!.

\textsuperscript{152} 22...\textit{\textbf{c}}xe4 23.\textit{\textbf{a}}xf4+, mating in short order.

\textsuperscript{153} Bogoljubow gave 19.\textit{\textbf{f}}4+ 'with a strong attack'.
Bogoljubow: Brilliant!

21...fxe5

Steinitz: Certainly an error, but only on account of the most ingenious rejoinder which White had in store. The best defensive plan was 21...g7, with the probable continuation 22.wxf4 f8 23.e6 [Bogoljubow: 23.d3, and the attack would be very strong] 23...dxe6 24.d7 wxf4, and Black has three pawns for the piece with a good game.154 But 21...g5 was also of no use, on account of 22.wc4+ df8 23.d5 fxe5 24.wd4 ef6 25.cc4.

22.exf4+

Steinitz: As will be seen from an analysis, this sacrifice is as deep as it is beautiful, and forms one of the finest instances of brilliant combination play.

22...g7

Chigorin: If 22...exf4, then 23.wxf4+ g7 24.cf1 g8 (the only move; if 24...xh4, then 25.wd4+ g8 26.cc4+ g7 27.cc7+; if 24...b5 25.wf7+ h6 26.cf5+ gxf5 27.cf5+ g5 28.h4 and wins) 25.wd4+ w6 26.cf7+ g5 (to counter the threat 27.wd3 g5 28.cf5+ and 29.wh3+; if 26...g5 27.cc4 g6 (if 27...gxh4 28.wxh7+, followed by cf5+ and w4c5 mate) 28.wxh7+ g7xh7 29.wg6+ cf5 and wins) 27.wg4, threatening w7h3; if 27...g7, then 28.wh3 f5 29.cf5 mate, or if 27...xd6 28.cf5+ gxf5 29.wh3+ and wins.

23.cf5++!

Chigorin: By playing 23.cf1 White would force Black to take the rook, leading to play as in the position pointed out in the previous note. The move in the game is more decisive.

23...gxf5 24.cf5 g8 25.cf1 b5

Steinitz: The black allies might have somewhat prolonged the game by 25...h6, but after 26.g4 w6 26...g5 27.h4 cf5 28.cf5 wins 27.cc4 g5 (to prevent 28.cc5–h5–h4–f4) 29.cc4! wins.

26.cc4+

Chigorin: And White announced mate in four moves.

Steinitz: There is nothing to be done, for White will proceed with 27.cf8.

51 Queen's Pawn Game

Eugene Delmar

Mikhail Chigorin

New York 1889 (20)

Notes by: Chigorin, Steinitz and Grekov

1.d4 d5 2.e3 c6 3.d3 3.e4 d6 4.h3

Gorelov: There was no need to lose time in preventing the pin by ...g4, the more so that with this move White all the same
not prevent Black from playing at a favorable moment ...c7-c5. Far better would be at once 4.\texttt{Qd}f3, and if 4...\texttt{Qg}4, 5.\texttt{c}c4, as Steinitz played in similar positions against Chigorin in games of 1889 match. Later, by Pillsbury's example, in analogous positions, 5.\texttt{d}d4 was played. Not bad would be immediate 4.\texttt{b}3, as White plays on 6\texttt{c}c move; then on 4.\texttt{c}c7 White could have replied 5.\texttt{c}c3, not allowing ...c5. Such a plan of development was adopted by Janowski with great mastery at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

4...\texttt{Qbd}7 5.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{Wc}7 6.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{e}5 7.\texttt{dxe}5 \texttt{Wxe}5 8.\texttt{Qb}2 \texttt{Qd}6 9.\texttt{Qbd}2 \texttt{Qxd}3+ 10.\texttt{exd}3 \texttt{Wf}5 11.\texttt{We}2 0-0-0 12.\texttt{Qd}4

Chigorin: If 12.\texttt{Qxf}6, then the doubled pawns would not weaken Black's position; on the contrary, upon the opening of the g-file his attack on the king's flank would be strengthened; and it would be dangerous for White to castle on the queen's side.

12...\texttt{Qg}6 13.0-0 \texttt{Qb}8

Chigorin: So as not to fear the move \texttt{Qb}5.

14.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{h}5 15.a5 \texttt{a}6 16.\texttt{Af}c1 \texttt{Qd}7

17.\texttt{Qf}3 \texttt{Qde}8

\textbf{18.\texttt{d}4}

Chigorin: Steinitz supposed that taking the g7-pawn would be without danger for White: 18.\texttt{Qxg}7 \texttt{Qhg}8 19.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{c}c5 20.\texttt{Qe}1 and White, together with his extra pawn, apparently has a good position. But how would Steinitz continue the defence after 20...\texttt{Qe}6? Black intends ...d5-d4, ...\texttt{Qf}4, and, finally, \texttt{Qg}5, with the threat of sacrificing the knight on h3. Besides this, Black has in prospect an attack with the moves ...f7-f5-f4, ...\texttt{Qf}5, and even the sacrifice of a piece for the h3-pawn after doubling rooks on the g-file.

18...f5 19.\texttt{Qh}4 \texttt{Qh}7 20.\texttt{Wh}xh5

\textbf{20...g5!}

Steinitz: Chigorin launches an attack and conducts it with his usual strength.

21.\texttt{Qg}6

Chigorin: If 21.\texttt{Wh}xg5, then 21...\texttt{Qeg}8 22.\texttt{Wh}h5 \texttt{Qg}6 23.\texttt{Wg}5 \texttt{Qh}5.

If 21.\texttt{Qhf}3, then 21...\texttt{g}4! 22.\texttt{hxg}4 \texttt{fxg}4 (also not bad is 22...\texttt{Qeg}8, threatening ...\texttt{Qf}6 and ...\texttt{Qg}6) 23.\texttt{Wxg}4 \texttt{Qeg}8 24.\texttt{We}6 \texttt{Qd}3 25.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qg}6 26.\texttt{Wh}7 \texttt{Qf}8 27.\texttt{Wh}h7 \texttt{Qxg}2+, winning the queen.

21...\texttt{Qg}6 22.\texttt{Wh}h6

Chigorin: If 22.\texttt{Wxg}5, then 22...\texttt{Qg}7, winning a piece.\textsuperscript{155}

22...\texttt{Qhg}8 23.\texttt{Qe}5 \texttt{Qxe}5 24.\texttt{dxe}5 \texttt{Qg}6 25.\texttt{Wxg}6 \texttt{Qxg}6 26.\texttt{exf}6 \texttt{g}4

\textsuperscript{155} ... then giving up the queen for rook, knight and two pawns doesn't quite work out for White after 23.\texttt{Qxe}8 \texttt{Wxg}5 24.\texttt{Qf}7 \texttt{Wg}6 25.\texttt{Qxe}6 \texttt{g}8 26.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{Qh}5 and if White defends his knight with 27.\texttt{Qa}3 then 27...\texttt{Qxg}3 28.\texttt{fxg}3 \texttt{Wxg}3+ 29.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qxe}3 and mate in four.
27.g3
Chigorin: If 27.hxg4, then 27...hxg8 28.g3 h7 29.f1 xf4, threatening ...xd3+ with mate in a few moves.156

27...Exe3!
Steinitz: An artistic blow of the highest class!

28.fxe3 Exg3+ 29.h1
Chigorin: If 29.xf1, then 29...f4 (threatening 30...xd3 mate) 30.e2 f3+ and mate in a few moves.

29...Exh3+ 30.g1 Exe3+ 31.h1 g3 32.e5+ Exe5 33.e1 Ed4 0-1

52 French Defence
Mikhail Chigorin
Max Weiss
New York 1889 (28)

Notes by: Chigorin, Grekov and Steinitz
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 exd5
Grekov: In his practice, Chigorin liked to employ the Exchange Variation of the French Defence. However, his opponents would be cruelly mistaken if they naively thought that Chigorin’s choice of this variation was dictated by his desire to play for a draw, and his willingness to maintain symmetry. Of course, Black has the possibility of counterplay available; for example, in the game Winter-Alekhine from the Nottingham tournament of 1936, the continuation was 4.d3 c6 5.e2 d6 6.e3 h4! 7.d2 g4!, sacrificing a pawn for development in the variation pointed out by Alekhine: 8.b3 0-0-0 9.xd5 f6 followed by ...h8, into which White, however, did not enter. It is clear that against such an opponent as Chigorin, players of the black pieces were very often ready to be satisfied with a draw, but Chigorin with surprising skill was able to find a way to win even in apparently very simple positions. Highly characteristic in this respect is the present game.

4.d3 c6 5.d3 c6 6.0-0 0-0
7.g5 g4 8.bd2 bd7 9.c3 c6
Chigorin: In Chigorin-Blackburne, played two days earlier, the latter in the same position played 9.e8 and on 10.xc2 c8. Weiss intends to play for a draw.

10.xc2 xc7 11.h3 xf3 12.xf3 h6 13.f2 fe8 14.e1 f8
15.h4 f4 16.f5 e6 17.xe6 xe6 18.e1 e8 19.xc1 xd2
20.xd2 d4 21.xe8+ xe8
22 xe3 f8 23.c2 f6 24.f1
book) pointed out an interesting continuation, securing, in his opinion, a draw for Black: 48...f5 and if 49.c4 then 49...g4 50.fxg4 fxg4! 51.gxf5 Qf6+! 52.Qxe4 Qxe4+ 53.Kf3 Wh5+ 54.Qe3 Wh5+ etc. It is indisputable that this variation leads to a draw, but White, by replying on 48...f5! 49.Qc1, could have reinforced the attack; e.g.: 49.g4 50.Qg5 gxf3 51.Qxf3 or 49...Wh6 50.Qa3 Qxb5 (50...a6 51.Qxa5) 51.Qb4 Wh6 52.Qa4 Qd6 53.Qa5 etc.

49.c4!

Steinitz: White plays this wearisome game with surprising stubbornness and inspired endurance, extraordinary skill in exploiting the slightest chance to create an attack, and his persistence reaps its reward.

49...Qxc4

Chigorin: Black must take the pawn; if 49...b6 (White threatened Qa5), then 50.cxd5 cxd5 51.Qb4 Qe7 52.Qa4 a5 53.Qc6, and White wins a pawn.

50.bxc4 Qxc4 51.Qb3 b5 52.Qe4!

Steinitz: Upon this move was constructed White’s plan of attack, linked to a timely pawn sacrifice. It is obvious that Black cannot avoid the loss of two pawns.

52...Wh3 53.Qxc6 Qd7 54.Qxc4+ bxc4 55.Qxc4+ Qe6

Chigorin: If 55...Qe7 56.Qe3 with almost the same continuation as in the game.

56.d5 Qd8 57.Qe3 Qb7
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58. \( \text{We}4! \)
Chigorin: Better than 58.\( \text{Wc}6 \) \( \text{Wxc}6 \)
59.\( \text{dx}c6 \) \( \text{d}d6 \) 60.\( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{f}e6 \) 61.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}8 \)
etc.

58... \( \text{d}d6 \)
Chigorin: Black has no better move; if Black plays 58...\( \text{f}8 \), then 59.\( \text{d}4 \).

60.\( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 60.\( \text{Wxd}7+ \) \( \text{xd}7 \)
61.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 62.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 63.\( \text{a}4 \)
\( \text{c}7 \) 64.\( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 65.\( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{c}7 \)
66.\( \text{c}4+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 67.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 68.\( \text{f}5 \)

After 3.c3 by playing d2-d4 cannot be realised without harming White.

3... \( \text{d}5 \)
This defence is acknowledged by the textbooks as best. Besides this I would recommend the simpler continuation: 3...\( \text{f}6 \).

4.\( \text{wa}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \)
Introduced by Steinitz.

5.\( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 6.\( \text{ex}d5 \) \( \text{Wxd}5 \) 7.0-0

7... \( \text{d}7 \)
Here, very much into consideration came 7...e4 8.\( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 9.\( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{xc}6 \)
10.\( \text{e}1 \) 0-0-0 11.\( \text{xe}4? \), then 11...\( \text{a}6 \).
Therefore White, on 7...e4, would be forced to reply 8.\( \text{f}1 \) so as after 8...\( \text{f}5 \)
9.f3 etc. to obtain an equal game.

8.\( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 9.\( \text{fd}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \)?
A mistake! He should play 9...0-0-0.

10.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 11.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
Black should give up a pawn, in order to castle.

12.\( \text{f}7+ \) \( \text{e}7 \)?

53 Ponziani Opening
Mikhail Chigorin
George Gossip
New York 1889 (29)
Notes by: Bogoljubow
1.e4 \text{e}5 2.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 3.c3

This opening has presently gone out of fashion. The reason for this is that Black, by means of 3...\( \text{d}5 \) or, even simpler, 3...\( \text{f}6 \), obtains a good game. Besides this, it is now generally assumed that the idea of forming a strong pawn centre...
13. \textit{c4!} \textit{Wa6} 14. \textit{g5+} \textit{xf7} 15. \textit{d6} mate

... an entertaining finish!

\textbf{Spanish Game}

\textbf{Mikhail Chigorin}

\textbf{Jean Taubenhaus}

\textbf{New York 1899 (35)}

\textbf{Notes by: Steinitz}

1.e4 e5 2. \textit{f3} \textit{c6} 3. \textit{b5} \textit{f6} 4.d4 exd4 5.0-0 \textit{e7} 6.e5 \textit{e4} 7.\textit{xd4} \textit{d5} leads to a more complicated line.

8... \textit{xd4}

Better was 8...f6.

9. \textit{wdx4} d5 10.exd6 \textit{xd6} 11.\textit{c3} the chances of playing for a win remained with 11.\textit{d3} or 11.\textit{a4}.

11... \textit{f5}

The continuation 11...\textit{xb5} 12.\textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 13.\textit{xb5} c6 14.\textit{c7} \textit{xc7} \textit{xc7} would lead to a dead draw.

12. \textit{a4} \textit{f6}?

12...\textit{e4} would equalise the game, whereas now the game turns in White's favour.

13. \textit{wc5}!

Excellently played. White threatens to isolate the black pawn on d6 at once. If Black retreats the bishop to e7, then would follow 14.\textit{xd5}. Besides this, an attack is threatened in conjunction with the move \textit{d1}.\footnote{In fact 13...\textit{e7}? loses a piece to 14.\textit{xd6} \textit{xd6} 15.\textit{xf5}.}

13...b6 14.\textit{wc6} 15.\textit{xc3} 16.\textit{xc3} 17.\textit{e5}! \textit{xf6} 18.\textit{xf6} \textit{xf6}

Maintaining the possibility of the move 18...\textit{c5} in case of 18...\textit{xc7}; then Black will either win back the pawn, or exchange the white king's bishop, after which the board would remain opposite-coloured bishops.

18.\textit{f1} \textit{e8} 19.\textit{xc6} \textit{c5} 20.\textit{e7} \textit{xc2} 21.b4 \textit{d3} 22.\textit{h6}

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

Black finds himself under the influence of unjustified fear. 22...\textit{fd8} would not be dangerous, after which the game might continue: 23.\textit{b7} \textit{b8} 24.\textit{xc7} \textit{xb4} 25.a3 \textit{d3} 26.\textit{xa6} (or 26.\textit{e4} \textit{bc8} etc) 26...\textit{xc5} 27.\textit{xa7} (if 27.\textit{c4}, then 27...\textit{d7} etc) 27...\textit{a8} with an approximately equal game.

23. \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 24. \textit{b7} \textit{d8} 25. \textit{xc7} \textit{d2} 26.f4 \textit{d3} 27.\textit{d7} \textit{e2} 28.\textit{f3} \textit{e3} 29.\textit{c7} \textit{a4} 30.\textit{c3}! \textit{d7}
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A characteristic trait of Chigorin's style is a particular mastery in play with the rooks; I think that in this respect he has no equal. Wonderful examples of this skill of Chigorin are shown by his games against Mackenzie in the second round of the London tournament 1883 and in the 3rd game of the 1889 match with me. In both games of the telegraph match between London and St. Petersburg, in which Chigorin led the Russian players, there are many beautiful rook manoeuvres, quite original and deep.

Gleb: Here we ought to note the brilliant rook endgame played later by Chigorin against Schlechter in the Hastings tournament of 1895, two against Tarrasch (18th game of the match in 1893), and likewise against Marshall (from the Barman tournament 1905). In general, Chigorin's rook endgames gained universal recognition by his contemporaries, for example, one of the authoritative masters from Germany of that time, Von der Lasa, also, like Steinitz, once said of Chigorin: 'The Russian's mastery in rook endgames is worthy of particular admiration.' (Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1892, page 134)

31.\text{\textgld}d1! \text{\textgld}f5 32.\text{\textgld}f1!

White calmly prepares the threat 33.\text{\textgld}e2. Black has nothing else at his disposal, apart from the following product of desperation, a sacrifice which of course cannot save the game.

32...\text{\textgld}xf3+ 33.\text{\textgld}xf3 \text{\textgld}xb4 34.\text{\textgld}d4 a5 35.\text{\textgld}a3 \text{\textgld}a6 36.\text{\textgld}d6 \text{\textgld}c5 37.\text{\textgld}xb6 \text{\textgld}e6 38.\text{\textgld}b5 \text{\textgld}h3+ 39.\text{\textgld}f2

Black resigned.

55 Ponziani Opening

Mikhail Chigorin

Henry Bird

New York 1889 (36)

Notes by: Steinitz

1.e4 e5 2.\text{\textgld}f3 \text{\textgld}c6 3.c3 d5 4.\text{\textgld}a4 dxe4 5.\text{\textgld}xe5 \text{\textgld}d4 6.\text{\textgld}xc6!

This, we believe, is new and very ingenious in connection with the sequence.

6...\text{\textgld}xc6 7.\text{\textgld}c4 \text{\textgld}d6 8.d3!

White is sure to recover the pawn here given up.

8...\text{\textgld}xd3 9.0-0

9.\text{\textgld}e7

There seems to have been nothing better.

It was too hazardous to try and maintain the pawn by 9...\text{\textgld}f5, for then would follow 10.\text{\textgld}xf4 \text{\textgld}d7 (obviously if 10...\text{\textgld}xf4 11.\text{\textgld}xf7+ and wins) 11.\text{\textgld}e1+ \text{\textgld}e7 (or 11...\text{\textgld}d8 12.\text{\textgld}d2 followed by \text{\textgld}f3 with an excellent attack) 12.\text{\textgld}a5, recovering the pawn with the superior position.
10. \text{cxd3!} \text{d7} 11. \text{d1} \text{e6} 12. \text{c3} \text{g4} 13. \text{f4} \text{w5} 14. \text{g3} \text{d6}?

A ill-considered move which allows adversary a strong attack, whereas \text{h5} instead would have given White time for offensive operations.

15. \text{we4+} \text{f18} 16. \text{w3f3}

Necessary, as Black threatened 16... \text{xg3}.

16... \text{e6}

This weak move leaves the c-pawn without sufficient protection, of which circumstance the opponent clearly takes advantage. 16... \text{e5} was much better.

Stronger than 19. \text{xd6+} \text{cxd6} 20. \text{c7} \text{e5} 21. \text{xe6+} \text{g8} etc.

19... \text{cxd6} 20. \text{f5!} \text{g8} 21. \text{xe6} \text{f6e6} 22. \text{xc6} \text{f17}

If 22... \text{e8} (obviously the rook is lost by 23. \text{xd6} if he moves elsewhere) 23. \text{xd6}, and Black dare not retake on account of 24. \text{e8} mate.

23. \text{ab1} \text{c5} 24. \text{wd7+} \text{g6}

25. \text{b7} \text{ag8} 26. \text{f17+} \text{h6}

27. \text{exe6+} \text{g6} 28. \text{f4+} \text{g6}

29. \text{b3(?)}

Up to this, White has pursued his attack with masterly skill, but here he could have made an end of all resistance at once by 29. \text{d3}, which equally threatened 30. \text{g3+}, followed by 31. \text{h3} mate, with the important difference that Black’s king could not effect his exit by 29... \text{h6}, for after 30. \text{g3+} \text{h7}, White simply takes off the knight with the queen, winning a piece and preparing an unavoidable mate.

29... \text{h6} 30. \text{g3+} \text{h7} 31. \text{xd6} \text{wh5} 32. \text{c1?}

Feeble, as Black’s prompt reply shows.

32... \text{c8!} 33. \text{b1} \text{he8?}

Overlooking the opponent’s profound combination. 33... \text{d5} instead would have forced the exchange of queens, and though of course he would have remained under the disadvantage of a pawn behind, he could still hope to make a fair struggle for a draw.
Romanovsky: With this move Black finally introduces (with tempo) into battle his king’s rook. After a retreat of the queen, he reckoned on obtaining chances of counterattack by 34...\textit{e}4. However something quite different happens...

\textbf{34.\textit{exg7}+!!}

A magnificent sacrifice. Romanovsky: This combination required from Chigorin deep and accurate calculation, since it is carried out against a background of mating threats against also the white king.

34...\textit{exg7} 35.\textit{Mb7}+ \textit{g6} 36.\textit{Wf7}+ \textit{f5} 37.\textit{Wb5}+ \textit{e4} 38.f3+ \textit{e3}

Of course, 38...\textit{d4} would subject him to the additional loss of the knight, which the opponent would capture with a check.\textsuperscript{158} But 38...\textit{d3} would have avoided being mated. His game was, however, clearly lost even then.

39.\textit{Wb3}+

\textbf{39...\textit{e2}}

If 39...\textit{d2} 40.\textit{f4}+ \textit{e1} (or 40...\textit{e2} 41.\textit{Wb2}+ followed by 42.\textit{Wd2}+, etc.), 41.\textit{Wb1}+ \textit{e2} 42.\textit{Wf1} mate.

40.\textit{Wb2}+ \textit{d3}

A curious finish might have occurred if Black had played 40...\textit{d1}; for after 41.\textit{Wb1}+, the same kind of mate could be forced by White as in the actual play in reply to 41...\textit{e2} or 41...\textit{d2}, but if 41...\textit{c1} 42.\textit{Wd3}+ \textit{e1} 43.\textit{g3} mate.

41.\textit{Wb1}+ \textit{e2} 42.\textit{Wb2}+

All this is splendid: White disdains winning the queen, having calculated to a nicety that he will drive the opponent into a fine mating net.

42...\textit{e3} 43.\textit{Wf1}+ \textit{d4} 44.\textit{Wf2}+ \textit{c4} 45.\textit{Wb4} mate

\textsuperscript{158} In fact, after 38...\textit{d4}, White can finish the game at once with 39.\textit{Wb4}+ \textit{d3} 40.\textit{Wb3}+ \textit{e2} 41.\textit{Wb2}+ \textit{d3} 42.\textit{Wd4}+ \textit{e3} 43.\textit{f4} mate.
Chapter 13

Laurels and thorns

The interest, the excitement around the whole world (not only in chess!) in Chigorin’s first match against Steinitz and then his victory in New York, turned Mikhail Ivanovich into a national chess idol. However the Russian ruling circles showed only complete indifference both to Chigorin and to chess. Generally speaking, in all the 35 years of public, sporting and creative activity of the great Russian chess player, not one of three successive Czars, nor any of their ministers, ever spoke well of Chigorin, nor talked about sending him their regards or offering material help.

On the other hand, there was a keen reaction to the international successes of the Russian chess king by the St.Petersburg newspaper king, A.S.Suvarin, who played a similar role in the Russian press to that of Lord Rothermere in England and Hearst in USA. Suvarin himself was a topical satirist, fiction writer, dramatist, a generally versatile, cultured man, bringing himself out of poverty like Chigorin, but at the price of grovelling before the government and cynical selfish opportunism, to gain influence and wealth. He was a publisher and editor of the most widespread newspaper of the day, New Times, owner of an important book/magazine publishing house and the St.Petersburg New Theatre.

‘A poor man, a liberal and even a democrat at the beginning of his life – a millionaire, an arrogant and shameless bourgeoisie boaster, grovelling before any turn of political powers that be, at the end of it’ was how Lenin described Suvarin.

In his efforts to attract to his own newspaper, rising talent, which he could exploit, Suvarin did not disregard any means whatever. For example, he endeavoured to firmly attach Chekhov to New Times, recognising his enormous talent even at the time when Chekhov had only just started to become famous.

Here is what A.P.Chekhov wrote to his brother on 24 March 1888: ‘Suvarin, in a very serious way, suggested that I marry his daughter, who now moves her foot under the table…’

‘Wait a little, 5-6 years, my dear fellow, and marry. What the devil do you need? Even I would not want better.’

In jest, I begged for Shubinsky’s Historical Herald as dowry, and he earnestly promised half the profit from NewTimes. His wife has probably already let you know about this.’

Half a year later, 20 November 1889, A.P.Chekhov had occasion to recall the proposal in a letter to the same Suvarin, written in a humorous tone: ‘You write that Nastya talked to Anna Ivanov. It is necessary to grow not only upwards, but also in breadth. Tall growth when the shoulders are not broad, is not compatible with health… It is necessary to do gymnastics – but I cannot conceive of that marriage…’

159 Wife of Suvarin - Vasily Panov.
He then added a phrase which will be of interest to our physicultural readers: 'I'm a strong believer in gymnastics...'

We remind the reader that A.P. Chekhov did not pursue Suvorin’s daughter and later ceased to collaborate in New Times and even distanced himself from Suvorin.

Suvorin reckoned it was necessary to add Chigorin to the number of co-workers in New Times, though this time with not so eccentric a proposal. The sons of Suvorin were chess players – members of the Chigorin club. They suggested to Chigorin that he conduct a regular chess column in the newspaper, fixing him a salary – at first 50 roubles, then 75 roubles, and finally 150 roubles. This rate of pay presented itself as a kind of barometer of public opinion, reflecting the degree of authors Chigorin had throughout the land and the general increase in popularity of his chess column. It is interesting that even people detesting New Times still regularly bought this newspaper on the days when Chigorin’s chess column appeared in it.

Suvorin’s offer was very tempting for Chigorin. He obtained a regular creative tribunal for the propagation of his creative views in the newspaper, which was distributed not only in St.Petersburg and Moscow, but also got into the very ‘godforsaken’ Russian provinces. This guaranteed Chigorin many years of contact with tens of thousands of chess amateurs and promoted their unity. And the solid (by the end – rather good) rate of pay, considerably exceeding the pay of a petty bureaucrat of that time, secured Chigorin against poverty. However, Chigorin did not share the political views of the newspaper and throughout his whole life his collaboration with it was a unique compromise with his conscience, in the name of the development of chess progress in Russia.

Chigorin’s columns were approximately the size of two full columns in a newspaper of our day. Here were published problems, studies, tail pieces, games by Chigorin himself, and other Russian and leading foreign players, theoretical notes, information on the history of the game, news items of competitions in Russia and abroad, replies from the readers. In the very detailed comments could be felt: Chigorin’s innovatory approach to current problems of the opening, middlegame, endgame, while the deep analysis and brilliant erudition of the great Russian chess player made Chigorin’s chess column very valuable educational material for the mass of amateurs of the game. It was enough to take even a superficial look at the extent of Chigorin’s chess column to be convinced that he was an exceptional selfless worker.

160 The original book was published by the Soviet publishing house Physiculture and Sport!
No wonder that the newspaper was very valuable to Chigorin, since it extended his popularity.

Chigorin’s original views and adroit publicity appeared not only in the newspaper but even in separate supplements, and there were also subscribers to these among chess players.

Let’s now return to Chigorin’s competitive performances.

At the end of 1889, Chigorin again set off for Cuba, to play a match against Gunsberg. He began the match with two successive wins. In the second game of the match he carried out a combination which Steinitz estimated as ‘a combination of rare beauty and depth’, while Gunsberg declared that ‘the whole of this combination could have been created only by a great master.’ Other commentators described the entire game as ‘being conducted with the highest mastery’ and ‘the pearl of the match’. But after such an excellent start Chigorin made serious mistakes even in completely winning positions. A genuine ‘laughing with one eye and weeping with the other’ was aroused in the spectators. For example, the 9th game of the match. Chigorin, playing White, sacrificed a bishop to deprive Black of castling. Then followed new sacrifices and, under attack by Chigorin’s heavy pieces, the black king was driven off to the centre of the board, like a deer hunted by a lion. On the 21st move, Gunsberg had a material advantage of two bishops and knight but Chigorin could have delivered mate in a few moves. This possibility was also present on the 22nd move. Then, in the course of ten moves, there was still the opportunity to give perpetual check. Shunning the draw, Chigorin contrived to lose the game. After 1½ months the match struggle finished all square, each master had won nine games with five draws.

On returning to St.Petersburg, Chigorin gave an interview to a correspondent of New Times who noted that the master had come back suntanned and with a considerable loss of weight. Chigorin explained the drawn result of the match ‘by the unbearable heat which relentlessly pursued me in Havana. Here you have no idea of such heat. I was literally exhausted with the heat – even at night, Gunsberg endured it comparatively easily… All the time we played in a scorching, stifling atmosphere. If you will just please think and consider, when you sweat and your clothes cling like this. Several times, when a win was assured, I saw absolutely clearly that all I have to do is make such and such a move, but nevertheless I did not make it, missed the chance and lost several games in this way, all for nothing. If I had played in Paris, Berlin, London, St.Petersburg, wherever you like, but not
in this scorching heat, I would have won the match without fail, but in Havana I drew it.'

But there was also an analogous complaint. 'Another game was very tense, and eventually I achieved a clearly drawn position. And then suddenly my strength gave way. Reasons of a chess order do not have a place here. I had plenty of time at my disposal and the position was very simple, but, without thinking, I made a losing move. Apparently this was the effect of acclimatisation to the scorching heat and bright sun in Cuba. From what I could see, it gave rise to a state of tiredness and feeling of dizziness – a peculiar intoxication by the sun.'

But these words – are not Chigorin's! They were written 31 years later by World Champion Lasker, also playing a World Championship match in Havana – against the genius Capablanca.

The Cuban neuropathologist who treated Lasker advised him to 'keep the strictest rest' and gave him this curious explanation: 'There is too much light, heat and noise for you here. Sunlight has a far stronger effect on us than in the north. It forces the human body to eradicate and consume far more energy than in colder and darker zones.' 'Therefore, doctor', asked Lasker, 'this also forces me instinctively to look for rest? Probably therefore my brain will refuse to work, despite all my efforts.' 'Of course', replied the doctor. 'You need rest, your brain will be unable to carry out the demands you make upon it.' 'And he gave me', wrote Lasker, 'a detailed explanation. My experience confirms everything that I said. It explains my feeling of dizziness, my inability, after the expiration of a few hours play, to evaluate the position or even to see the position precisely.'

But Chigorin did not turn to a doctor for consultation, and generally it seems he did not pay due care to his own health nor did he pay attention to his sporting form. Just after his second brilliant victory over Gunsberg, Chigorin, instead of having a day's rest in quiet surroundings and getting his body used to the climate and the local food, agreed to give a simultaneous display against 25 strong Cuban chess players, on the day before the third game. Chigorin conducted the exhibition excellently (+23 -1 =1) but ran himself down and on the following day lost ignominiously to Gunsberg, who thereafter took heart.

And even more astonishing! When asked by the same correspondent, 'Do you propose returning to Havana for a new match?' he replied, 'If I am invited, but I would not want this. My dream is to play a match in St. Petersburg in our chess club, to join battle with Steinitz and gain my revenge.' Yet, a year later, Chigorin again set off for Cuba, whose climate was obviously contra-indicated to him. Why? To this question I will reply later.

But the practical Gunsberg, when challenging Steinitz to a match, negotiated the holding of the contest not in Havana but in New York, from 9 December 1890 to 22 January 1891, and though he lost the match, it was with the honourable score +4 -6 =9.

In the same autumn and winter (from 23 October 1890 to 28 April 1891) took place a telegraph match of two games between Chigorin and Steinitz (of course there was a break during the Steinitz-Gunsberg match).
It is interesting that before the telegraph match with Steinitz, Chigorin, for training and practical trial of his analysis, in August-September 1890 conducted a correspondence match with the first-category player A.A. Markov. He was a famous mathematician, one of the foremost Russian people of the age, and had a deeply respectful regard towards Chigorin. We also mention that in 1912, then a future academic, Markov sent a letter to the holy government of the synod, in which he wrote: 'I have the most obedient honour to ask the shining synod to excommunicate me from the church. I hope that there is sufficient basis for excommunication, for which would possibly serve my book Calculation of Probability, where I clearly express my attitude to legend, lying at the bases of the Jewish and Christian religions.'

Probably the same boldness and independent critical thought was shown by Markov in his chess analysis and this allowed him to finish the correspondence match of four games against Chigorin with the honourable score of +1 -2 =1.

One can be very sorry that Chigorin, both up to and after this match, did not utilise A.A. Markov as a trainer before his Cuban matches with Steinitz. Then again, Markov, busyng himself with important scientific work, could hardly have disengaged himself from it for a lengthy period.

Steinitz demanded that the telegraph match with Chigorin be played at a stake of a thousand dollars, but this sum was easily collected by subscription amongst members of the St. Petersburg Chess Club. They knew that true accommodation means guaranteed profit, since correspondence play was an area in which Chigorin had no equal.

Here, in full measure, Chigorin would show his concrete, deep, absolutely accurate and comprehensive analysis, passion, self-control in sharp positions, striving for opening experiments, but not his sporting deficiencies. And he was playing in his own habitual climate.

The match had great significance for opening theory — of which both opponents had an excellent knowledge. I have in mind the fact that the concrete opening variations, specifically chosen for the match, were refuted by Chigorin and thereafter permanently left the scene. With white, Chigorin played the Evans Gambit, with black — the Two Knights Defence. In both games play began from the opening positions which were recommended by Steinitz as favourable: for Black in the first game and for White in the second. But the essence of the theoretical arguments arose not only about these variations and openings. They revolved around whether the principles of evaluating a position were correct. Steinitz considered that having an extra pawn for himself in both games, with good defensive capabilities for his king, guaranteed victory and he was prepared to prove in practice the fundamental aims of the 'new school' which he had enunciated — the pre-eminence of defence over attack.

Chigorin, however, proceeded from the foremost principles which in our day are axioms for every qualified chess player: firm possession of the initiative and harmonious deployment of pieces, where reliable coordination of attacking forces more than compensates for a pawn deficit.

The Chigorin-Steinitz telegraph match aroused enormous interest in the chess world. The names of both opponents were passed by telegraph agencies to
newspapers, with lively comments in the Russian and foreign press, not to mention chess magazines from all over the world. Everywhere interviews were published with the local masters, together with their forecasts and analysis. The whole chess world followed this most interesting contest of two great chess players with bated breath.

And not only the chess world, but also... the American secret police showed an even more wretched spirit than those in Russia, and their ignorance. Steinitz making use of ciphers to transmit the moves by telegraph, one fine day was arrested on the charge of being a 'Russian spy'! Taking out of his pocket a few American newspapers and his own chess magazine, Steinitz, of course, would have easily proved the absurdity of the arrest even to the late Senator McCarthy, along with his other 'witch hunters'.

After nearly half a year of struggle, the telegraph match ended in a brilliant 2½ victory for Chigorin. Steinitz, in both games, generally distinguished himself in great nobility and adherence to principle and declared in his own chess magazine that 'Chigorin's play was in all respects wonderful' and that 'never has one chess contest aroused such widespread and literally universal interest.'

But the World Champion obviously could not make both ends meet and explain to his admirers why he, the World Champion and head of the 'new' chess school, lost to the king of the 'old' school. And Steinitz, not wanting to recognize the principal superiority of Chigorin's innovatory play, gave this curious explanation.

He wrote about the first game: 'This was a slow battle for position, and the Russian master advanced on the most approved principles of the contemporary struggle of chess art.'

It was being accepted that Chigorin defeated Steinitz by applying Steinitz's own methods.

It is interesting that the same explanation was given by the supporters of the Cuban genius as the reason for the defeat of Capablanca, 36 years later, in his World Championship match against Alekhine. They maintained that Alekhine played not in his own style, but that he had mastered Capablanca's style, and, in this way, though Capablanca was defeated, his style triumphed.

The result of the telegraph duel had important consequences. Even long before the end, it became clear to the whole chess world that there was a need for a new match encounter between the World Champion and the Russian genius pretender, the more so since Chigorin already had, in principle, Steinitz's agreement to a return match.

The Russian amateurs were taking into account also the need to hold the match in an ordinary, cool climate.

This time, without any difficulty, sufficient means were collected in St.Petersburg for paying Chigorin's stake of $2,000, Steinitz's expenses, and the living costs of the contestants in the match.

Only three days after the end of the telegraph match, 1 May 1891, the St.Petersburg Chess Society sent Steinitz a telegram with the suggestion of playing a match in St.Petersburg at any convenient time for him.
Chigorin was already so highly regarded in world chess opinion, that there appeared a powerful rival bid to his fellow countrymen. On the following day a telegram was received from New York: 'The Havana Chess Club wants you to arrange your match with Steinitz in December, to ten won games, for two thousand dollars. Do you accept the proposal?'

The unfavourable effect of the Cuban climate was obvious. To play in Havana meant for sure that Chigorin would play below his powers. But, in Cuba, it was not for the climate that was warm, in Cuba the admiring Cuban amateurs were also warm towards Chigorin, and not only as a genius master, but also as a charming man. And there was high regard for Chigorin not only in Cuba. This is how the conservative Lasker, usually restrained in his praise, recalled Chigorin:

'He was a lively, amiable man, open, sincere. He commanded respect also in his appearance. His eyes sparkled with life, he dressed with great care, his manner inspired all respect. In any society he at once attracted universal attention – above all by his warmth.

If, to try to describe him as a thinker, then above all it is necessary to mention that he was a greater artist than a philosopher. However, his judgement, based on feeling or instinct, was frequently more accurate than the opinion of many who stuck to strictly logical construction. As a consistent thinker, Steinitz was superior to him, however in understanding of correctness, strength and beauty in chess art, Chigorin far excelled Steinitz. One can understand why he lost to Steinitz, since in play over the board told the superiority of the economic strength of Steinitz's methods. On the other hand, when Chigorin had sufficient time at his disposal for analysis, for example in correspondence play, he had no equal...'

Interesting too is Lasker's description of Chigorin the man.

'Mikhail Ivanovich was always an excellent colleague/companion. He would never have a bad word to say about any contemporary masters. He would never get involved in any intrigue, nor would he look for a case to compromise any of them. There would also never be an occasion where he tried to prevent the participation of one of his rivals in a tournament. And he never showed even a hint of such motives; he always strived to raise chess to the level of an art.'

What did Chigorin look like in those years? A contemporary of the great Russian chess player, the Muscovite D.N.Pavlov, described him in this way: 'As then, I see entering the hall a thickset man, not tall in stature, with very black hair and a clipped beard, dressed in a uniformly black frock-coat. His matt, dark, healthy-shaded face was very pleasant and friendly, albeit without the least smile and invariably serious. But he was alive with some secret smile, his black eyes shined brightly, speaking of a stormy temperament hiding behind his self-possessed exterior.'

During his stay in Cuba, Chigorin gained the sympathy of not only the local chess players, because of his brilliant creative style of play, but also of the local population, seeing in the representative of the distant northern country, a simple, democratic and cultured man, with broad horizons, and without any sort of racial prejudice or arrogance.
In St.Petersburg, however, Chigorin, to express it in the words of Shakespeare, were 'cold northern friends' and this distinctly showed when an international contest with the participation of Chigorin was held in St.Petersburg, to which I will return later.

Intrigue, squabble, envy, petty money interests, absurd accusations levelled at Chigorin, reigned as before in the St.Petersburg Chess Club, where, at the head, Alapin made up a real 'anti-Chigorin game' and instead of backing the genius chess player, and providing creative and moral help for him in the struggle for the World Championship, he stirred up trouble by setting himself against the vital interests of the native chess movement.

It is significant, for example, that when Chigorin played a match against Steinitz in Cuba, Alapin exploited the absence of the Russian champion – the chairman of the club – in order to carry out an election for the government of the club, which in itself was both improper and formally incorrect. Indeed, even upon this 'sudden' election, Chigorin remained chairman of the chess club but received, in all, only a majority of three votes. And he might not have received even this! It is clear what a negative sporting effect this would have on his well-being, or even possibly the outcome of the match.

Chigorin's patience was exhausted! It is necessary to say that as well as correctness, politeness and sensitive regard to colleagues, Chigorin was a very principled, straightforward man, but, where necessary, could be sharp and intolerant. Altogether he passionately detested hypocrites, cheats, hack-workers, lovers of intrigue, ignorance concealed by flowery pseudo-scientific terminology, and lack of understanding of the creative aspect of the game.

Upon an urgent meeting of the members of the club, Chigorin sent in his resignation from the position of chairman of the board. Chess players supporting him ardently protested against the decision imposed on Chigorin. Alapin, on the other hand, 'went over to the attack'. Then there was the sound of mutual reproach and accusations. As a result, the 'St.Petersburg Society for Chess Amateurs' split into two different sections. Friends of Chigorin mostly stayed with him, after buying chess stock from the previous society, and in March 1891, in the same premises opened a new St.Petersburg Chess Society in which Chigorin became the Vice-President, while as President of the new club was selected an important diplomat and chess amateur, P.A.Saburov.

The remaining chess amateurs, however, full of squabble and intrigue, became members of a circle attached to the 'Economists Society'.

Without entering into detailed analysis of the mutual accusations, it has to be recognised that Alapin and his supporters were unjust if only because beginning everywhere – in St.Petersburg, Moscow and in the provinces – the stormy growth of the Russian chess movement was above all, if not exclusively, incumbent upon the international appearances of Chigorin, his diligent activities in chess clubs and literary work in \textit{Universal Illustrated} and \textit{New Times}, which had to be appreciated!

It is symptomatic that his opponents were not able to create a solid chess organisation without Chigorin. After several years the lack-lustre formation of the
Astarin circle disintegrated and Alapin himself took up residence abroad where he spent practically all his remaining life, only now and then visiting St.Petersburg.

Chigorin painfully endured all these squabbles and understood that in the event of Steinitz coming to St.Petersburg, the atmosphere of the match would be tense, inevitably a strain on his nerves. The most rational decision would be to hold a Chigorin-Steinitz match in Moscow. There the competent Chess Circle with the Society of Doctors' included enthusiasts of chess such as P.P.Bobrov, who (instead of D.Sargin) began to publish, in 1891, the journal Checkered Board, later named Chess Review. Bobrov was also an 'intellectual patron', like the Moscow millionaire Sokanzhoto, who did not spare many thousands of roubles to organise, five years later, a return match between Steinitz and Lasker in Moscow.

And even if the Moscow money bags were not providing help in organising a match, its financial side could have easily been secured by subscription amongst the usual chess amateurs to be found in St.Petersburg.

But Chigorin, apparently, lost sight of this possibility, while perhaps the suggestion of holding the match in Moscow carried the fear of evoking a new attack on himself from the side of the St.Petersburg 'patriots' – the Alapinists.

Undoubtedly, Chigorin was bitter at being denied the staging of the match in a neutral, but nevertheless he finally wrote to Steinitz stating that the decision is left to him whether to play in St.Petersburg or Havana.

Steinitz, of course, chose Havana, a climate with which he felt sufficiently comfortable. All the same, he understood very well that Chigorin could not play at that strength in Cuba.

Chigorin had burned his boats!

56. Ponziani Opening

Mikhail Chigorin

Isidor Gunsberg

Match, Havana 1890 (1)

Notes by: Chigorin, Steinitz and Bogoljubow

1.e4 e5 2.ﬁ3 d6 3.c3 d5 4.d4 exd4

Chigorin: It would be better for Black to continue 4...exf4 5.d5! 8b8 6.xe5 5.7.cxe5 cxd3 6..b8 7.cxd3+ etc.

Bogoljubow: This continuation is also nowadays considered to be one of the best.

5.e5 c5

Chigorin: If 5...dxe4, then 6.cxd6 (or 6.b4+ 7.c3) 7.h3 etc.

Bogoljubow: 5...dxe4 is too dangerous in view of 6.8e2.

6.8b5 a6 7.8a4 8e7

Bogoljubow: Here one should give serious attention to 7...8b6 8.cxd4 8a4 9.8xa4 8d6 10.0.8e7 etc.

8.8xd4 cxd4

Chigorin: If 8...exf5 9.8f5 8b6 10.8xg7+ 8f8 11.8h6.

Bogoljubow: Also here 8...8b6 merits consideration. On the other hand, he cannot play 8...exf5 in view of 9.8f5 8b6 10.8xg7+ 8f8 11.8h6 8g8 12.8h5! 8d6 13.h3! with a good attack.

9.8xd4 8b6 10.8c2 c5

Chigorin: On 10...0-0 would follow 11.8d3 g6 12.h4 d6 13.8g3 with a strong attack on the castled position.

11.8e4

Chigorin: Weaker would be 11.8g4 in view of 11...g6 12.8g3 d5; and then,
after the move ...\textit{\underline{\textbf{d}}e6}, preparing castling on the queen's side, White would lose his slight advantage in position. On \textit{11.\underline{\textbf{d}}d3} would follow \textit{11...d5}.

\textit{11...d5 12.exd6 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}xd6} 13.0-0 f5}

Bogoljubow: Simpler is \textit{13...\underline{\textbf{d}}e6}, but the move in the game is also good.

\textit{14.\underline{\textbf{w}}e2 0-0 15.\underline{\textbf{d}}a3 \textit{\underline{\textbf{d}}d7}}

Also the move \textit{15...f4} is sufficient for an equal game: \textit{16.\underline{\textbf{d}}d1 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}c7}} (or \textit{16...\underline{\textbf{w}}f6}) \textit{17.\underline{\textbf{w}}h5 g6} etc.

\textit{16.\underline{\textbf{f}}4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}xf4}}

Steinitz: Better was \textit{16...\underline{\textbf{w}}f6}, and if \textit{17.\underline{\textbf{d}}e5}, then \textit{17...\underline{\textbf{w}}g6 18.\underline{\textbf{c}}c7 \textit{\underline{\textbf{d}}c8}} etc.

\textit{17.\underline{\textbf{w}}xe7 \underline{\textbf{a}}c8 18.\underline{\textbf{d}}ad1 \underline{\textbf{c}}6}

Chigorin: If \textit{18...\underline{\textbf{d}}c8}, then \textit{19.\underline{\textbf{w}}d6 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}xd6} 20.\underline{\textbf{a}}xd6}, and Black is forced to defend the knight with his rook; then \textit{21.\underline{\textbf{b}}xc6 bxc6}, and Black has weak pawns on the queen's flank. If, however, \textit{21...\underline{\textbf{c}}xc6 22.\underline{\textbf{x}}xf5 \underline{\textbf{e}}e2 23.\underline{\textbf{b}}bl! \underline{\textbf{a}}a4 24.\underline{\textbf{a}}c4 b5 25.\underline{\textbf{d}}d3} etc.

\textit{19.f3}

Bogoljubow: Gunsberg defends very well. White cannot instead play \textit{19.\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}xc5}?} because of \textit{19...\underline{\textbf{g}}g4!} (Hoffer) \textit{20.f3 \underline{\textbf{x}}xf3 21.\underline{\textbf{w}}xf2 \underline{\textbf{x}}xd1 22.\underline{\textbf{a}}xd1 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}g6}} and wins. On the other hand, the move indicated by Chigorin, \textit{19...\underline{\textbf{a}}xg2?}, is not good: \textit{20.\underline{\textbf{w}}xb6! \textit{\underline{\textbf{g}}g4} (20...\underline{\textbf{f}}f3 21.\underline{\textbf{w}}d6!) 21.\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}e6+ \textit{\underline{\textbf{h}}h8} 22.\textit{\underline{\textbf{a}}xf5!} and White wins.}

\textit{19...c4}

Chigorin: The other way of defending the pawn was by \textit{19...\underline{\textbf{a}}a4}, on which White would reply \textit{20.\underline{\textbf{c}}c4}, with the threat of \textit{\underline{\textbf{d}}d6}, and obtain a strong attack.

\textit{20.\underline{\textbf{d}}d4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}h6} 21.\underline{\textbf{d}}d6}

Chigorin: Not so good would be \textit{21.\underline{\textbf{b}}h4} in view of \textit{21...\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}g6}; if then 22.\underline{\textbf{a}}xc4 \underline{\textbf{x}}xc4 23.\underline{\textbf{a}}xc4, then 23...\underline{\textbf{a}}c8, winning at least the exchange.

\textit{21...\underline{\textbf{d}}d5}

Greco: Gunsberg, and likewise Steinitz and other commentators, suggested here \textit{21...g6}, however even in this case White, of course, is significantly better.

Bogoljubow: The losing move. By means of \textit{21...g6!} Black could defend successfully. For example: \textit{22.\underline{\textbf{a}}xc4 \underline{\textbf{x}}xc4 23.\underline{\textbf{w}}e6+ (not possible is 23.\underline{\textbf{b}}b3? in view of 23...\underline{\textbf{b}}b5! 24.a4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{g}}h8} 25.\underline{\textbf{d}}d4 \underline{\textbf{e}}e8 26.\underline{\textbf{w}}xb7 \underline{\textbf{d}}d3 etc., Deutsche Schachzeitung) 23...\underline{\textbf{a}}h8 24.\underline{\textbf{w}}xc4 \underline{\textbf{w}}e4+ 25.\underline{\textbf{f}}2} (25.\underline{\textbf{h}}1? \underline{\textbf{a}}e4 26.\underline{\textbf{w}}b3 \underline{\textbf{w}}e2 27.\underline{\textbf{a}}c1 \underline{\textbf{a}}xf3!) \textit{25...\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}xf3}}.\footnote{In fact \textit{22.\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}e6+} is best because after 22.\underline{\textbf{a}}xc4 \underline{\textbf{e}}c8 23.\underline{\textbf{w}}c7 \underline{\textbf{a}}xc4 24.\underline{\textbf{b}}b3 \underline{\textbf{e}}c3–25.\underline{\textbf{h}}h1 \underline{\textbf{w}}e2 or 25.\underline{\textbf{f}}2 \underline{\textbf{w}}c5 Black gains a knight for a pawn. Also, in the bracketed line with 25.\underline{\textbf{h}}h1?, instead of 25...\underline{\textbf{d}}e4, which leads to a level position after 28.\underline{\textbf{g}}1, Black should play 25...\underline{\textbf{b}}5, winning, because any mirage of a mating attack by 26.\textit{\underline{\textbf{w}}h4 \underline{\textbf{a}}xf1 27.\underline{\textbf{d}}d7 is dispelled by the reply 27...\underline{\textbf{h}}5.}
Chapter 13 - Laurels and thorns

22. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{W}}}}xf8+! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{W}}}}xf8 23. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{B}}}}xh6 gxh6
24. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xc4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{B}}}}b5 25. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{B}}}}b3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}h8
Chigorin: 26. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e3 was threatened.
Steinitz: Correct was 25...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g7.
26. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xc4 27. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{B}}}}xc4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f4 28.g3
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g6 29.f4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d8 30.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g7 31.h4
b5
Chigorin: After 31...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d2+ 32.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe2+ White, obviously, would easily win the game.
32. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{B}}}}b3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f8

33. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e6

Bogoljubov: Chigorin conducts the endgame energetically.
33...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d2+ 34.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb2 35.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xa6
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g2 36.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d2 37.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f6+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e8
38.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xf5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d3+ 39.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xc3
40.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe7 41.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}h5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f8 42.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xh6
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xg3+ 43.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xg3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f5+ 44.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g4
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xh6+ 45.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g5
Black resigned.

57 Ponziani Opening
Mikhail Chigorin
Isidor Gunsberg
Match, Havana 1890 (11)
Notes by: Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c6 3.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c6 4.d4
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe4 5.d5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}b8
Bogoljubov: Also good is 5...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe7 6.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe5
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g6 7.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe5(?) = but not 7...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xf2??
8.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xg6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xd1 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xf7+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e7 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g5+
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d6 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c4+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c5 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}ba3 etc.

6.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}d3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f6 7.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xe5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c5
Chigorin: For defence of the king's flank, this bishop is more useful on e7.
8.0-0 0-0 9.b4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}b6
Chigorin: And now he should retreat the bishop to e7, but all the same I prefer White's game.
10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g5
Chigorin: Weaker would be 10.a4 a5 11.b5
d6 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c4 h6 and if 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb6, then 13...
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb6, and the knight on b8 will take up a good position on c5.
Bogoljubow: If 10.c4, then 10...d6 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f3
a5 etc.
10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}h6 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}h4 d6 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}bd7?
This is too passive. Now Black gets into difficulties. On the other hand, upon the continuation 12...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g5 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}g3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xd5 etc., it is not apparent what compensation
White would have for the pawn.
13.a4 a6 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}xb6 15.c4
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}bd7

16.f4! a5
Chigorin: Black's position is irreparable: he cannot prevent White's moves
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}b1-c3-e4.
17.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}c3! axb4 18.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}e8
Chigorin: Again not good. The only, but good, possibility of freeing himself was
18...c6! with a counter-attack on the d5-square, e.g. 19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}h1 cxd5 20.cxd5
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}a5 21.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f3 b6 etc.
19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f3 b6 20.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}ae1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textit{Q}}}}f8

485
Chigorin: If 20...Rxax4 then 21.Rxf6+ Rxf6 22.Nxe8+ Rxe8 23.Rel and 24.Rxf6 with a winning position.\textsuperscript{162}

21.Qc2 b7 22.Wd3 g6 23.Rxf6+ Qxf6

24.Re6!

Steinitz: In the art of playing this sort of position Chigorin hardly has an equal among contemporary masters.

24...b3 25.Qxf6 Wd7 26.c3!

Chigorin: Without any doubt White must win also after 26.b1, but the move in the game forces Black to resign sooner.


Black resigned.

58 Queen's Pawn Game
Isidor Gunsberg
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, Havana 1890 (16)

Notes by: Chigorin and Grekov
1.e3

Grekov: In accordance with one of the conditions of the match, proposed by the Havana Chess Club organisers, neither one of the opponents had the right to play in the match one and the same opening more than twice. However, Gunsberg got round this stipulation: two games he began with the move 1.d4, two - with the move 1.e3. In the first two, Chigorin played the Dutch, and the remaining four were conducted with similar variations of the Queen's Gambit.

1...d5 2.d4 Qf6 3.Qf3 c6 4.Qe2 g4 5.0-0 Qbd7 6.b3 e6 7.Qh2 Qd6 8.Qbd2 0-0 9.c4 Re8

Chigorin: Obtaining a formation characteristic of the Queen's Gambit.

Grekov: Already at this time, in the first period of his work on the question of finding a defence to the Queen's Gambit, Chigorin adopted in his practice the basic structure of the Slav Defence. However this was not yet in its purest form - he was distracted from the prospect of playing ...e6-e5, which at the time sometimes turned out well for him, for example in the 6th game of the match with Steinitz in 1889, in the game with Delmar from the New York tournament of 1889 etc. Of course, White has sufficient resources to prevent the move ...e6-e5. Later, as a
result of persistent analytical work and indefatigable confirmation in practice, Chigorin created healthy foundations for the system of the Slav which remains one of the most reliable defences even our day.

10.\(\text{c5}\) \(\text{f5}\) 11.\(\text{f3}\)

Ivkov: The pawn offensive on the king's flank begun with this move shows a lack of solidity.

Chigorin refutes it very skillfully, see 14th and 15th moves.

11...\(\text{h6}\) 12.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{h7}\) 13.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{c7}\) 14.\(\text{g5}\)

14...\(\text{cxe5}\) 15.\(\text{c5}\)

Ivkov: If 15.\(\text{dxe5}\), then 15...\(\text{cxe5}\)

\(\text{cxe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 17.\(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{g3+}\), and Black, by capturing the h-pawn, obtains a promising game.

15...\(\text{d3}\)!

Chigorin: On 15...\(\text{g6}\) White would reply 16.\(\text{cxd6}\) \(\text{xd6}\) 17.\(\text{f4}\).

16.\(\text{xd3}\) \(\text{xd3}\)

Chigorin: Here Black could play 16...\(\text{h2+}\) 17.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xd3}\) 18.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{g3}\)

19.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{h5}\) 20.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{g6}\) and White's attack is repelled.

17.\(\text{cxd6}\) \(\text{xd6}\) 18.\(\text{f2}\)

Ivkov: The continuation 18.\(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{g3+}\)

19.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xf1}\) 20.\(\text{xf1}\) \(\text{xh4+}\) would be in Black's favour. Now Gunsberg has for the pawn the more active game, and he quite skillfully creates an enduring attack on the king's flank.

18...\(\text{h5}\) 19.\(\text{h5}\) \(\text{c7}\) 20.\(\text{g2}\)

20...\(\text{g6}\)

Chigorin: There was hardly a better continuation. After 20...\(\text{f6}\) 21.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f5}\) 22.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{g6}\) White obtains diverse attacks, for example, 22...\(\text{f8}\) (White threatened \(\text{g5-g6}\)) 23.\(\text{w4}\) or \(\text{w3}\); apart from this, subsequently White might transfer the knight to e5 or play a2-a4, giving his bishop the opportunity to occupy the a3-f8 diagonal.

21.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f8}\)!

Chigorin: Black intends to play 22...\(\text{f6}\) 23.\(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{h6}\). If Black were to reply at once 21...\(\text{b4}\), then White could continue 22.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{b5}\) 23.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{d3}\)

24.\(\text{e1}\) and then 25.\(\text{xe5}\) with a strong position.\(\textsuperscript{163}\)

22.\(\text{w4}\) \(\text{d4}\)!

Chigorin: 22...\(\text{f6}\) 23.\(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) loses to 24.\(\text{wxf6}\).

23.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{w5}\) 24.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 25.\(\text{a3}\) \(\text{w5}\) 26.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{a4}\) 27.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{b6}\) 28.\(\text{e4}\)!

Chigorin: Without this move White cannot reinforce the attack.

28...\(\text{dxe4}\) 29.\(\text{d3}\)!

\(\textsuperscript{163}\) This is an optimistic view of White's prospects. Black has an extra pawn and most of White's pawns are on the same color square as his bishop. It seems that Black is in fact much better.
Chigorin: Black can win the exchange, by playing 29...\( \text{f5} \) 30.\( \text{Exh7} \) \( \text{xh7} \) 31.\( \text{Wh3} \) \( \text{gf8}! \), but White would obtain a strong attack, which would give him chances of a draw; 32.b5+ c6 33.dxc5 bxc5 34.\( \text{Wxh7} \) \( \text{xa3} \) 35.\( \text{Wxe4} \) etc; in general Black's position would be secure.\(^{4}\)

30.\( \text{Exe3} \) \( \text{Wc2} \) 31.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Wb1} \+ 32.\( \text{Be1} \) \( \text{Wf5} \) 33.\( \text{Wg3} \) \( \text{Wd3} \) 34.\( \text{Ab2} \) \( \text{Ae4} \)

35.\( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{We3+} \) 36.\( \text{Axf2} \) c5

Chigorin: The continuation 36...\( \text{xf3} \) 37.\( \text{Wxf3} \) \( \text{Wxf3} \) 38.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) would be unfavourable for Black: 39.\( \text{fh3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 40.\( \text{hh7} \) \( \text{Ed8} \) 41.d5!, threatening 42.\( \text{xg7}+ \) and \( \text{hh7} \).

37.bxc5 bxc5 38.\( \text{Ah3}! \)

Chigorin: If 38...\( \text{c4} \), then 39.\( \text{Qe5} \), with the threat of \( \text{g5-g6} \), and Black's chances of a win are illusory.

39.\( \text{Qxd4} \)

Gekov: But not 39.\( \text{Qxd4?} \) because of 39...\( \text{Cc1}+ 40.\text{h2} \) \( \text{xd4!} \) and Black wins.

39...\( \text{We1+} \) 40.\( \text{Ef1} \) \( \text{Wxg3+} \) 41.\( \text{Exg3} \) \( \text{Ed8} \)

Chigorin: On 41...\( \text{Ee7} \) White would reply 42.\( \text{Ee3} \) with a subsequent f4-f5.

42.\( \text{Ee5} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 43.\( \text{Aa3} \) \( \text{Ed7} \) 44.\( \text{Aa4} \)

45.\( \text{Ab7} \) 46.\( \text{Qg8} \)

Gekov: He should hardly have voluntarily rejected the drawing chances which remained present on the board with opposite-coloured bishops.

46...\( \text{xf8} \) 47.\( \text{Ee2} \) \( \text{Ec5} \) 48.\( \text{Af2} \) \( \text{Qg8} \)

Chigorin: White threatened 49.\( \text{Exe6} \), but better was 48...\( \text{Ee7} \).

49.\( \text{Ee5} \) \( \text{Ee5} \) 50.\( \text{fxe5} \)

50...\( \text{Qe4} \)

Chigorin: Stronger is 50...\( \text{Qh5!} \), after which the black king could without difficulty go to g6; giving up his a7-pawn to capture the one on g5 would be favourable for Black.

51.\( \text{Qxe6?} \)

Chigorin: A mistake. It cannot confidently be stated that Black would achieve victory upon the continuation 51.\( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) (or 51...\( \text{Qh1} \) 52.\( \text{Qe2} \) f6 53.\( \text{fxe6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 54.\( \text{gxh6} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) etc) 52.\( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 53.\( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 54.\( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \), but the extra pawn, of course, leaves him chances of a win.
51...\textit{b2+} 52.\textit{e3} \textit{c2} 53.\textit{xa7} fxe6 54.a4 \textit{h7} 55.a5 \textit{a2} 56.\textit{d4} \textit{b3} 57.\textit{c5} \textit{d5} 58.\textit{b6} \textit{g6} 59.\textit{d7} \textit{b2+} 60.\textit{c5} \textit{c2+} 61.\textit{b6} \textit{c6+} 62.\textit{a7} \textit{c8} 63.a6

63...\textit{g8} 64.\textit{b6} \textit{xg5} 65.\textit{c5} \textit{f5} 66.\textit{d6} g5 67.a7 g4 68.\textit{f7+} \textit{g5} 69.\textit{f1} g3 70.\textit{b1} \textit{a8} 71.\textit{a1} g2 72.\textit{c5} \textit{xa7} 73.\textit{xa7} g1\# 74.\textit{d6} \textit{b6+} 0-1

Chigorin: Of course not at once 73...\textit{xa7} = stalemate.

59 Two Knights Defence
Isidor Gunsberg
Mikhail Chigorin
Match, Havana 1890 (22)
Notes by: Chigorin
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f3} \textit{c6} 3.\textit{c4} \textit{f6} 4.\textit{g5}

Gunsberg risks this move, relying on his inventive new defence introduced his 8th move.
4...\textit{d5} 5.exd5 \textit{a5} 6.\textit{b5+} c6
7.\textit{xc6} \textit{bxc6} 8.\textit{d3}
The usual move now is 8.\textit{c2}.
8...\textit{c5}

Black prevents the move 9.\textit{c4} (9...\textit{xe4} 10.\textit{xe4} \textit{xf2+}).
9.0-0 0-0 10.\textit{c3} \textit{b6}

as after 11.\textit{ge4} \textit{xe4} 12.\textit{xe4} to continue the attack at once with 12...f5.
11.\textit{xe2} \textit{d5} 12.d3 \textit{b7}

This knight makes fifteen moves in the game and plays a very important role in the attack. Its last move actually forces White to resign.

13.\textit{f3} \textit{c7} 14.\textit{e1} f5 15.\textit{d2}

White wisely defends the h2-pawn from danger: after ...\textit{d6}, the knight on f3 could later come under threat from the advance of the pawn to e4, in which case White would have to make the move g2-g3, compromising his game. I would however prefer some other kind of defensive plan.

15...\textit{c5} 16.\textit{f1} \textit{b8} 17.\textit{f3} \textit{e6} 18.g3 \textit{d4} 19.\textit{xd5}

This exchange is virtually forced; after 19.\textit{g2} Black could steadily continue the attack by 19...f4, threatening 20...f3.

19...\textit{xd5} 20.\textit{g2} f4 21.\textit{c3} \textit{e6} 22.b3 \textit{g5} 23.\textit{h5}

White must prevent the knight check on h3, or the even stronger move ...\textit{h3} (in the event of \textit{h2}). But no matter how White defends, he cannot avoid the catastrophe on the king’s flank.

23...\textit{b6}! 24.c4 \textit{h6} 25.\textit{e2}
Perhaps White reckoned on the reply 25...f3, after which he could obtain three pawns for the piece after 26...xg5 fxe2 27.xd8 exf1+ 28.xf1 xd8 29.xd5+.

However, retreating to d1 would not have been better. If 25.xd5+ then 25...xd5 26.xh6 +f3+ 27.xh1 wb7 and Black wins.

25...d7 26.h1

If 26.xh3, then after 26...xh3 Black would win the game with no particular difficulty, in view of the threat 27.f3 followed by 28.d7.

26...d7 27.cxd5

27...xd5!

Here, I preferred a straightforward honest attack to guarantee the win of the game. The spectators – amongst whom were a number of strong Havana players – expected the move 27.f3, which would win a piece. In practical play it is difficult to see one’s way through the mass of complicated variations which would follow this continuation: 27...f3 28.xf3 xf3 29.xf3 xd5 30.e4 f6 31.g2! xf2+ 32.g1 xd3 33.e3. What

166 But then 34...a5 is the answer, attacking the defender of the e4-rook, after which White loses at least a piece with an exposed king to boot.

167 Instead Black has 34...e2 and if 35.xf2 then 35...xf2 and the bishops destroy White again.

168 Actually, on 38...h6 39.b2 h6, White would get a perpetual with 40.e8+. Correct is 38...h5+ 39.g2 f3+ 40.xf2 h4+, which either wins White’s queen or mates in a few moves, i.e. 41.g3 wh2+ or 41.g1 f2+ 42.g2 g4+ 43.h2 h3.
Black does not play the queen to e7, so as not to give White the opportunity of sacrificing the queen for two pieces, after which the game would be considerably strengthened; but now White is forced to sacrifice a piece.

33.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}e3}} fxe3 34.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}e3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e3}}
35.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}x}e3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}h2}} 36.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}d}a1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}h}4}
37.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g5}} 38.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}h}3+} 39.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}h1}}
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}xf3}} 40.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}e}e2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}8} 41.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}c1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}d}d6}
42.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}2} 43.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f2} h6

Black would only win a pawn after \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}x}xb3}; now, after \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}h}8}, he plans to take the e4-pawn. White obviously cannot capture the knight.

44.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}c7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f3}!
White resigned.

60 Two Knights Defence
Andrey Markov
Mikhail Chigorin
Correspondence game, Russia 1890

Notes by Romanov

In preparation for the telegraph match with Steinitz, Chigorin undertook great analytical work, and also played four games by correspondence with the special aim of becoming familiar practically, and not just analytically, with certain features of various attacks and defences in the stipulated openings. Precisely this – through the inseparably linked theoretical analysis and practice – was Chigorin’s method of opening research.

For his partner in the correspondence games Chigorin chose Andrey Andreievich Markov (1856-1922), an outstanding teacher-mathematician, future academic, great lover of chess, close to master strength. Chigorin valued highly Markov’s chess gifts and they were personal friends for many years.

1.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}e4}} e5 2.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c6} 3.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f6}
4.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g}g5} d5 5.exd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}a}a5} 6.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}b}b5+} c6
7.dxc6 bxc6 8.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}e}e2} h6 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}h}h3}
From this position began the struggle in the second game of the telegraph match.

9...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c5}
Apart from this continuation, which he employed against Steinitz, in the 4th game of the analytical contest against Markov, Chigorin chose the move 9...g5, 'which proved, as should be expected, unsatisfactory.'

10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c3}
Steinitz replied 10.d3.

10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}x}xh3}
'The game was played with the special aim of studying various ways of conducting the attack; this move was also made for the same purpose. However, I recognise that taking the knight is premature; the queen’s bishop is important for the attack.'

11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}x}xh3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}b}b6} 12.d3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}5} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}a}a4}
0-0 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}e}e3} f5 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}d2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c8} 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}a}a1}
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}d}d4} 17.dxe4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f2+} 18.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}a}a2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}x}x}e4+
19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}e}e1} e3 20.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}c}c1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f4} 21.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}c}c2}

21...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}h}h4+}?
Chigorin explained: 'This move was made hurriedly, 'without looking at the board'. It seems that 21...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f6} would have led to the win of the game; if 22.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}g}g6} then 22...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}f}f1+} 23.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}x}x}xf1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{w}w}f2+}.
24. $\text{d}1 \text{xc}3+ 25. \text{bxc}3 \text{d}8+ 26. \text{d}3 \text{e}2+ 27. \text{c}2 \text{e}1 ++ \text{w} and wins. 169
Or 22. $\text{g}6 \text{f}7, \text{then} ... \text{f}8, \text{threatening} \ldots \text{f}1++; \text{if White returns the rook to g1, then} \ldots \text{f}2.\textbf{'}

22. $\text{g}3 \text{f}2 23. $\text{g}6 \text{e}2+ 24. \text{d}1 \text{a}4+ 25. \text{c}2

169 In this line, instead of 26. $\text{d}3, \text{White should return some of his material advantage with} 26. \text{d}3 \text{e}3+ 27. \text{xe}3 \text{g}1+ 28. \text{e}2, \text{when Black is slightly better but has no forced win.}

25... $\text{c}7 26. $\text{e}8+ \text{h}7 27. \text{g}6+ \text{g}6 28. \text{e}8+ \text{l}2