

A first survey of Losing Chess endgame literature to the end of 1999 : notes and corrections

John Beasley, 21 August 2018

Vladica Andrejić has sent me some notes on “A first survey of Losing Chess endgame material published up to the end of 1999”, and has drawn my attention to some errors. While writing them up, I noticed the need for one other correction.

Pages 25-29, “Liardet 1999/10-13”: although I received these from Liardet, they should have been attributed to Angrim. My apologies to both gentlemen.

Page 2, Roese 1923: White can also win, albeit less crisply, by 1 c4 bxc3 2 Nf1, or even by 1 c3 Bxc3 2 Nf1.

-- Watney 1923: the composer’s initials should be “C. G.”

Page 3, Torngren 1929: the original stipulation read “White to play and win *as soon as possible*” (emphasis added). There was also a companion piece with White Qe8 (1), Black Kc3 (1), and the same stipulation. In the latter, the intention was presumably 1 Qh5 giving the move to Black, but I do not see why 1 Qa8 does not win just as quickly.

Page 6, Schmidt and Kniest 1948: the given line 2 Kg7 fails, 4...Na6 drawing for Black, but 2 Kh7 wins easily.

Page 7, Mortensen 1960: in line 2, “3 Nxa8” should be “3 Kxa8”.

Page 9, Kuhlmann 1980: the note “4 Bh7 Kd8 5 Bb1 Kc8 6 Ba2 is slower” in line 8 of the text is faulty, since 5...Ke8 draws for Black. 5 Bf5 would give a slower win. In the main line, 8...Kh3 allows 9 Qc5 Kh4 10 Qc6 winning more quickly, but 8...Kh1 forces the main line as given (9 Bd3 Kh2 10 Be2 etc).

Page 11, Dittmann 1987: in line 2, “5 Bb1” should be “5 Ba2”.

Page 12, Liardet 1991, R v 2N: my conjectural reconstruction “3 Rh1 Na6” was quite misguided. I no longer have convenient access to the source, but I suspect that we merely have a misnumbering of moves, and that the line intended was 1 Rg1 Nd5 2 Ra1 Nd6. In fact 2 Rg4 wins for White, but playing ...Nd6 first holds the draw.

-- Evseev 1992/2: in line 5, “5 Nd6” should be “8 Nd6”.

Page 13, Byway 1995: in the line 2 a8N Qe1, a crisper refutation of 3 Kb7 is 3...Qd1 4 Ka7 Qg4 5 Ka6 Qe6 and wins. In the line 2 a8K, White can play 4 Kcb6 (instead of 4 Kbb6) and the queen is dominated at once.

Page 14, van der Bilt 1997/c: the given solution is by far the simplest, but White can also play 1 c7 Rxh2 2 Kc6 Re2 3 a7 Re4 4 c8K Re2 5 K8b7 Re4 6 a8K or 1 a7 Rxh2 2 a8K Re2 3 Kb7 Re3 4 c7 Re2 5 c8K, in each case reaching the book win with three kings against rook.

Page 15, Beasley 1998/1: in line 3, “3 Nge5” should be “3 Ne5”.

Page 16, Beasley 1998/4: in line 9, “1...Nd3 by 2 Nc7” should be “1 Nd3 by 1...Nc7”.

-- Beasley 1998/5: in line 4, “Bd1 v Qd6/Na8” should be “Bd1 v Qd6/Nh8”, and in line 5, “Bh6/Bc1 v Kc6” should be “Bh6/Bc1 v Nc6”. The index needs alteration to reflect the latter correction.

Page 18, Angrim 1999/1: in the last line, the 66-ply win with PP v P should have been given as Pc2/Pd4 v Pa6.

Page 23, Liardet 1999/7, 3K v K: in line 11, “25 Kee5” should be “25 K5e5”.

Page 25, “Exercice inédit” (Ka3/Ra8/Rh7 v Kd4, Black to move): computer analysis has now shown this to be a win for White.

Page 27, Pc7 v Rc2/Nc4: the answer to 1 c8K is not 1...Rf2 2 Kd8 Rf6 (3 Ke8 wins) but 1...Re2 2 Kb8 Rd2 3 Ka8 Nb6.

Page 30, Piece v piece: “Beasley 1996” should be “Beasley 1996/1”.

-- entry K v RP: “Busing 1983/a” should be “Busing 1983/2a”.