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Following the success of my previous book *Grandmaster Repertoire – The Nimzo-Indian Defence*, I was delighted when Jacob Aagaard and John Shaw offered me the opportunity to write a companion volume covering the Queen’s Indian and Catalan from Black’s perspective, making for a complete repertoire after 1.d4 ¤f6 2.c4 e6. As a long-time 1.d4 player, I have used a variety of weapons against the Queen’s Indian and have also incorporated it into my Black repertoire. Despite all this experience in my playing career, I could never have imagined how strategically rich this opening is, until I analysed it for this book. Even though the Queen’s Indian has a reputation for solidity, certain variations can lead to extremely sharp, double-edged play.

I believe the Queen’s Indian and Nimzo-Indian combine perfectly, since Black’s strategic goals are similar in both openings: he develops quickly and aims to control the centre with pieces initially, while keeping a flexible pawn structure. In this book we will encounter a few lines where an early ¤c3 allows Black to transpose to a pleasant version of a Nimzo-Indian with ...¥b4. Moreover, I have endeavoured to make our complete repertoire as compact as possible, which is one reason why I opted to meet 3.g3 with 3...¥b4†, after which 4.¤c3 would lead straight to Chapter 7 of my Nimzo-Indian book.

Apart from making the repertoire theoretically robust and sharing numerous theoretical novelties, one of my main goals in this book has been to share my knowledge of certain thematic pawn structures such as hanging pawns, isolated d5-pawn, Hedgehog structure and more. It is worth mentioning that it is mostly Black who gets to choose which structure to enter, and the correct decision will depend on how well his pieces will coordinate in the resultant positions, as well as taking into account the opponent’s set-up. For instance, after 4.g3 ¥a6 5.¤bd2 White’s ability to exert pressure on the centre is limited, so 5...d5 becomes more appealing. If, on the other hand, White goes for some other 5th-move option which enables his knight to go to the more active c3-square, then I would refrain from fixing Black’s central structure so soon.

The Queen’s Indian is justifiably popular at all levels and has proven its reliability even in World Championship matches. I hope the readers will enjoy this book and find many useful things for their chess education.

Michael Roiz
Rishon LeZion, October 2018
Petrosian System

6.cxd5

Variation Index

1.d4 ♙f6 2.c4 e6 3.♗f3 b6 4.a3 ♙b7 5.♕c3 d5 6.cxd5

6...♕xd5

A) 7.e4?! 104
B) 7.♕a4† 106
C) 7.♕xd5 ♕xd5!
   C1) 8.g3 110
   C2) 8.e3 112

B) note to 8.♕xd5

10...♕h4!!N

B) note to 9.♕c2

13...♕f8!!N

C1) note to 9.♕e3

14...♕c8!!N
1.d4 d6 2.c4 e6 3.d3 b6 4.a3 b7 5.c3 d5 6.cxd5
This is White's most popular choice by a considerable margin.

6...exd5
As usual, we avoid the more rigid ...exd5 pawn structure where possible.

This chapter will deal with some minor options: A) 7.e4?!, B) 7.a4† and C) 7.dxe5.

7.d2 and 7.e3 are analysed in the next chapter, while the big main line of 7.c2 can be found in Chapter 8.

7.g5 c6 leads back to variation D1 of the previous chapter.

7.g3
The fianchetto set-up is playable but it contains no real venom here, as Black is well placed to contest the light squares.

This occurred in Loureiro – Sunye Neto, Sao Jose de Rio Preto 1995. The simplest continuation is:
14...f6N=
Black has no problems.

A) 7.e4?! dxe4

11...cxd4
11...d7?! allows a thematic trick: 12.g5! xg5 13.xb7 b8 14.g2 White had a small edge with virtually no risk in Vi. Kovalev – Avdeenko, Tomsk 2008.

12.cxd4
12.g5? d3! 13.xd3 xxd3 14.exd3 xg2 15.xg2 d8† leaves White in a depressing endgame due to his pawn weaknesses.

12.c6 13.d1 c8 14.d3

This pawn sac has been tried by several strong players but White's compensation is questionable.
9.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textsigma e5 \textwhe d4}}}!

This move may appear artificial but it serves an important purpose in limiting White's activity on the kingside – especially with regard to the queen.

9...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textc c6}}}? cannot be recommended. True, after 10.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe e2 \texth h6}}} 11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texth h4}}} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe d5}}} Black went on to win in Piket – Korchnoi, Roquebrune 1992, although White certainly has compensation at this stage. However, 10.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe h5}}}! is a finesse which puts Black's 9th move out of business. The point is revealed after 10...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe c7}}}N (10...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg g6}}} 11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe e2 \texth h5}}} 12.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg g4 \textwhe d5}}}} 13.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg xf5! \textwhe xh1}}} 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texth h5!!}}} was devastating in Hart – B. Watson, Auckland 2010) 11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe e2 \textg g6}}} 12.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texth h4}}} when Black is in trouble.

10.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg g3}}}

10...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe d8}}}!

The queen is not really wasting time, as White's development has been disrupted and he now has to spend another tempo safeguarding his rook.

10...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe f6}}} is less accurate; after 11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe b5}}} c6 12.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textf f3}}} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe d5}}} 13.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg g2}}} b5 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texta a4}}} White has promising play for the pawn.

11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe g1}}}

11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe b5}}} c6 12.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textf f3}}} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textcxb5}}} 13.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textf xe4 \textwhe d7}}} was poor for White in A. Mikhalevski – A. Sokolov, Biel 1992.

11.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\texta a4}}}! is not much better. Play continues 11...c6 12.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textf f3 \textwhe d5}}} 13.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textc c4}}} and now a serious improvement is:

\begin{center}
\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe e2}} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textwhe c7}}}N (in the game Black tried to get too clever with 13...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textf f4}}}, after which 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textg g3}}} left White with a strong initiative for the pawn in Kopasov – M. Kaufmann, email 2003) 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textcxb5 \textwhe d6}}} Black has returned the extra material to reach an excellent position where White suffers from serious weaknesses.}
\end{center}

We have been following the game Aoiz Linares – Veingold, Barcelona 1992. Black has a few good options but the most promising seems to be:
11...d5!N 12.b5†
Black would be happy to provoke 12.c4, when 12...b7 leaves the light-squared bishop restricted, thus limiting White’s active possibilities. Play might continue 13.a4† c6 14.c3 c7 15.g2 0–0† when, aside from being a pawn down, White’s king faces an uncertain future.

12...c6 13.d3 b5!
Securing the future of the excellent bishop on d5.

14.a4 a6 15.axb5 cxb5
My analysis continues:

We have, in the previous chapter, already seen a few incarnations of this queen check, which White hopes will disrupt our development and provoke a concession of some kind. This approach was employed by Garry Kasparov back in 1983, and has been used by many other GMs.

7...d7
I favour this natural developing move.

7...d7 8.c2 xc3 9.bxc3 leaves Black with a less harmonious set-up compared with variation B of Chapter 8.

7...c6 is playable and has scored well for Black; nevertheless, I regard this move as a slight concession.

8.d5
8.e5?! xc3 9.bxc3 d6 gives White absolutely nothing, for instance:
10...\textit{xd7} (10...\textit{c6}?? could have led to disaster for White in Petronic – Ostojic, Belgrade 1989, if Black had only found 10...\textit{h4}!N with the deadly threat of ...\textit{c5}. White has no real choice but to retreat with 11.\textit{b4}, when 11...\textit{c5} leaves him hopelessly uncoordinated and behind in development.) 10...\textit{xd7} 11.\textit{xd7}† \textit{xd7} 12.f3 \textit{f5} 13.e3 \textit{c5} Black had the more pleasant game in Dzagnidze – A. Muzychuk, Khanty-Mansiysk 2014.

8...\textit{xd5}

8...\textit{exd5} was Korchnoi’s choice, which brought him a draw against Kasparov in Game 3 of their 1983 Candidates match. However, blocking the diagonal of the b7-bishop is an indisputable achievement for White, so most strong players have preferred the bishop recapture.

9.\textit{c2}

This is the most ambitious try; White wants to establish a strong pawn centre.

9.\textit{g5}

This move is popular yet harmless. Azmaiparashvili has played it three times; strangely, his opening play became worse each time, as shown in the examples below.

9...\textit{e7} 10.\textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 11.\textit{c1}?! This is the most interesting move to analyse, as long as it’s from Black’s side of the board! White is playing with fire, attacking a pawn at the expense of his development.

11.\textit{e5} is safer, when 11...\textit{a6} 12.\textit{xd7}† \textit{xd7} 13.\textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 14.f3 \textit{f5} gave Black comfortable equality in Azmaiparashvili – Grischuk, Moscow (rapid) 2002, which was the first of the aforementioned games of the Georgian GM.

11...0–0!

Naturally we can sacrifice the c-pawn.

12.\textit{xc7}

Obviously this is the critical move to consider. It’s extremely risky though: White not only expends another tempo, but also opens the c-file which Black can now use to invade. I checked two other ideas:

a) 12.e3 is safer but Black is at least equal after: 12...\textit{c5} 13.\textit{b5} \textit{f6} 14.dxc5 bxc5 15.0–0 \textit{ab8} 16.\textit{a5} This was Buhmann – Cvitan, Pula 2003, and now 16...\textit{ab6}!N

11...\textit{f3}
would have caused White some problems, with \( \text{...b8} \) or perhaps \( \text{xf3} \) followed by \( \text{b7} \) coming soon.
b) 12.e4? was Azmaiparashvili’s bizarre attempt to improve, but it can be refuted by: 13...\( \text{xe4} \) 13.\( \text{xc7} \)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard1}
\end{center}

13...\( \text{fc8}!! \)N (13...\( \text{c5} \)? 14.dxc5 \( \text{xc7} \) 15.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xc5} \) gave Black a good position with rook against two minor pieces in Azmaiparashvili – Macieja, Erioni Argolidas 2006, but the text move is even better) 14.\( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{f6} \) Threatening to win the rook with ...\( \text{c6} \), while also setting up attacking ideas against White’s king. 15.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f4} \) 16.\( \text{c4} \) (16.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c6} \) traps the rook) 16...\( \text{xf3} \) 17.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{c1} \)† 18.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xc4} \)† 19.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f8} \)† White will be hard pressed to keep his position together with his king placed in such a way.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard2}
\end{center}

Conveniently escaping the pin while activating the knight.

13.\( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xa4} \) 14.\( \text{d2} \)

14.b3 \( \text{xb3} \) 15.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a2} \) 16.e4 \( \text{fc8} \) was horrible for White in Bonin – Adorjan, New York 1986.

14...\( \text{fc8} \) 15.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{b3} \)

Black had a dangerous initiative in Azmaiparashvili – Kramnik, Cap D’Agde (rapid) 2003.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard3}
\end{center}

9.\( \text{e7} \)

The other natural continuation 9...c5 10.e4 \( \text{b7} \) 11.\( \text{f4} \) offers White some more activity.

10.e4

10.\( \text{f4} \)N \( \text{c8} \) 11.e4 \( \text{b7} \) transposes to the main line.

10...\( \text{b7} \) 11.\( \text{f4} \)

11.\( \text{b5} \) has achieved a plus score for White but 11...0–0 12.\( \text{c6} \) \( \text{c5} \)! is a nice resource which enables Black to unblock the c-pawn at once. 13.\( \text{xb7} \) (after 13.dxc5N \( \text{xc6} \) 14.cx\( \text{b6} \) \( \text{d6} \) 15.bxc7 \( \text{ac8} \) 16.0–0 \( \text{xc7} \) 17.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{b7} \) Black’s excellent bishops provide full compensation for the pawn) 13...\( \text{xb7} \) 14.0–0 \( \text{c5} \) 15.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c7} \) 16.dxc5 Here I found a slight improvement over Mchedlishvili – Werle, Emsdetten 2010:

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard4}
\end{center}

12...\( \text{c5} \)!
109

Chapter 6 – 6.cxd5

16...exd5 17...exf8= Black has no problems.

12...0–0 13...d3

13...b5!? c6 14...e2 occurred in Sanikidze – Matlakov, Gjakova 2016. My new idea is 14...f6N 15.0–0 c5! when any problems along the d-file are illusory, for instance:

16.dxc5 exd5 17...a4...a8 18.e5...c6 19...b3...d5 Black has a comfortable game and the e5-pawn might become weak in the long run.

12...c5N 13...xc5 14...e2 occurred in Sanikidze – Matlakov, Gjakova 2016. My new idea is 14...f6N 15.0–0 c5! when any problems along the d-file are illusory, for instance:

16.dxc5 exd5 17...a4...a8 18.e5...c6 19...b3...d5 Black has a comfortable game and the e5-pawn might become weak in the long run.

12...c5N is possible although 12.dxc5 gives Black something to think about, since 12...exd5 13...b5† forces the king to move. The text move is a simpler solution.

13...c5 14.d5

White relies on the power of the passed pawn. Keeping the c-file closed is also desirable for him.

14...c4!

Fortunately, the rook still has some value on c8.

15...e2...xd5 16...xd5...f6 17.0–0N
White should not keep his king in the centre any longer.

The over-aggressive 17.h4 \=e8 18.\=g5 \=f8\# led White nowhere in Kincs – Amstadt, Zalakarosi 2008.

17...\=e8 18.\=c3 a6 19.a4 h6
White’s pieces are rather ineffective and don’t support the passer, so Black is at least not worse.

C) 7.\=xd5 \=xd5!

White’s opening play would be fully justified after 7...\=xd5 8.\=c2, when the position is the same as variation B except that Black’s knight is on b8 instead of d7. Play may continue 8...\=c7 9.e4 \=b7 10.\=f4\# and White is doing well.

The text move is clearly best: the queen is active yet not vulnerable to attack, and Black has good control over the central light squares.

We will consider C1) 8.\=g3 and C2) 8.\=e3.

8.\=f4 has been played several times but it proves harmless after 8...\=d6, for instance: 9.\=xd6 \=xd6 10.e3 0–0 11.\=d3 \=d7= Nutiu – Parligras, Baile Tusnad 1999.

C1) 8.\=g3

This has been quite a popular choice; apparently the centralized queen is an inviting target. However, White comes under pressure in the centre after the following strong reply.

8...\=c6!

Another attractive option is:

8...c5?! 9.\=e3
9.\=g2? \=c6 10.\=a4 was seen in Mietner – Wegener, Recklinghausen 1999, when Black should have played 10...0–0–0!N 11.dxc5 b5!, punishing White for keeping the king in the centre for too long. For instance: 12.\=c2 \=d4 13.\=d3 \=b3 14.\=b1 \=xd3 15.exd3 \=xd3\#

9...\=c6 10.dxc5 \=xd1\# 11.\=xd1 \=xc5 12.\=xc5 bxc5
13.\textit{c}1 \\
13.\textit{g}2 \textit{d}4 14.\textit{x}d4 \textit{x}g2 15.\textit{g}1 \textit{c}xd4 16.\textit{x}g2 0–0–0 is equal. \\
13...\textit{e}7 14.\textit{xc}5 \textit{ac}8 \\
Black’s development advantage fully compensated for the pawn in Salvatore – Wassilieff, corr. 2007.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

9.\textit{e}3 \\
This is White’s only way to maintain the balance.

9.\textit{g}2?!
This is the move White would like to play, but the following complications favour Black. \\
9...\textit{x}d4! 10.\textit{h}4 \textit{a}5† 11.\textit{b}4 \textit{xb}4† 12.\textit{ax}b4 \textit{xa}1 13.\textit{xb}7 \textit{d}8 14.\textit{f}1 \\
This position was reached in S. Ivanov – Anastasian, St Petersburg 1994, and a couple

of subsequent games. Black can obtain a clear advantage with the following improvement:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

14...\textit{c}3!N 15.\textit{d}2 \\
15.\textit{f}4 0–0† \\
15...\textit{xd}2 16.\textit{xd}2 \textit{b}3 17.\textit{c}6† \textit{e}7 \\
18.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}1† 19.\textit{g}2 \textit{hx}h1 20.\textit{hx}h1 \textit{d}8† \\
Black has excellent winning chances due to his extra queenside pawns, which will soon become passers.

9...0–0–0 10.\textit{g}2 \textit{e}5 11.\textit{dxe}5

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

11...\textit{xe}5N \\
This simple innovation is a safe equalizer, which sees Black regain the pawn in a comfortable situation.

The more complicated alternative is: \\
11...\textit{xd}1†? 12.\textit{xd}1 \textit{xd}1† 13.\textit{xd}1 \textit{xe}5
14.\texttt{h}3†! (after 14.\texttt{g}1 \texttt{xf}3 15.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{xf}3 16.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{e}7\texttt{f} The position is unclear and holds mutual chances, and a draw ensued in Uberos Fernandez – I. Jones, corr. 2016.

12.\texttt{e}2

In the event of 12.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{xd}5 (but not 12...\texttt{xd}5? 13.\texttt{h}3\texttt{d}7 14.0–0–0†) 13.0–0 \texttt{xf}3† 14.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}8= Black has nothing to worry about.

I also checked 12.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{b}8 13.0–0 \texttt{xf}3† 14.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}7 15.\texttt{c}2 (15.\texttt{xd}7 \texttt{xd}7=) 15...\texttt{xf}3 16.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}7= when the activity of White’s pieces can be neutralized, while Black’s pawn structure is preferable in the long run.

12...\texttt{a}5† 13.\texttt{f}1

13.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{xf}3† 14.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{c}5 is also level.

13...\texttt{g}4 14.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{xf}3 15.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{xd}4 16.\texttt{xf}4 \texttt{c}5=

Black has no problems and the opposite-coloured bishops make a draw a likely outcome.

8...\texttt{e}7\texttt{N} 9.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{c}5 10.\texttt{e}4 \texttt{d}6 11.0–0 0–0

11...\texttt{xd}4 is also good enough, for instance: 12.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{d}7 13.\texttt{xd}4 0–0 14.\texttt{c}3 \texttt{c}6=

12.\texttt{e}5

12.\texttt{xc}5 can be met by 12...\texttt{bxc}5?!, in the style of some other lines we have seen, such as D41 from the previous chapter. Here too, after 13.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{c}6= Black’s control over the d4-square and future play along the b-file compensates for the structural drawbacks.
12...\textit{$\text{d}7$} 13.\textit{$\text{e}2$} $\text{c}6$ 14.\textit{$\text{dxc5}$} $\text{bxc5}$!
   By now you should be expecting this choice of recapture!

15.\textit{$\text{d}1$} $\text{c}7$ 16.\textit{$\text{e}4$} $\text{g}6$
   Black is not worse at all. Before completing development, White has to move his queen to avoid a nasty discovered attack.

Other pawn moves on the kingside should be met in the same way.

22...\textit{$\text{d}4$}$^2$
   White can exchange the knight with either his knight or his bishop; either way, Black gets a passed pawn and a full share of the chances.

\textbf{Conclusion}

This short chapter has dealt with a few sidelines after 6.\textit{$\text{cxd5}$} $\text{cxd5}$, beginning with the pawn sacrifice 7.\textit{$\text{e}4$}?!. There is no doubt that White’s gambit is objectively unsound, so all you have to do is remember some key lines and remain vigilant at the board.

7.\textit{$\text{a}4$}$^\dagger$ is not too challenging although please remember that, unlike the previous chapter where we blocked this check with ...\textit{$\text{d}7$}, here we should prefer 7...\textit{$\text{d}7$} and recapture on $\text{d}5$ with the bishop.

Finally we considered 7.\textit{$\text{d}5$} $\text{xd5}$! when Black’s queen is rather well placed in the centre, as evidenced by the lines after 8.\textit{$\text{g}3$} \textit{$\text{c}6$}! when White must play accurately to maintain the balance. 8.\textit{$\text{e}3$} is safer but this is clearly not an opening variation which will cause Queen’s Indian players to lose sleep.
Abridged Variation Index

The Variation Index in the book is 9 pages long. Below is an abridged version giving just the main variations, not the sub-variations.

Chapter 1
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6

A) 4.♘g5 ♘b7 8
B) 4.♗f4 ♘b4†!! 16

Chapter 2
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.e3 ♘b7

A) 5.a3 24
B) 5.♗c2 26
C) 5.♗bd2 29
D) 5.♗c3 32

Chapter 3
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.e3 ♘b7

5.♗d3 d5

A) 6.cxd5 40
B) 6.0–0 41

Chapter 4
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.♗c3 ♘b7

A) 5.♗d3 57
B) 5.♗f4 58
C) 5.♗c2 61
D) 5.g3 68

Chapter 5
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.a3 ♘b7

5.♗c3 d5

A) 6.♗a4† 75
B) 6.♗f4 77
C) 6.♗c2 79
D) 6.♗g5 87

Chapter 6
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.a3 ♘b7

5.♗c3 d5 6.cxd5 ♘xd5

A) 7.e4?! 104
B) 7.♗a4† 106
C) 7.♘xd5 110

Chapter 7
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.a3 ♘b7

5.♗c3 d5 6.cxd5 ♘xd5

A) 7.♗d2 115
B) 7.e3 118

Chapter 8
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.a3 ♘b7

5.♗c3 d5 6.cxd5 ♘xd5 7.♗c2 ♘xc3

A) 8.♗xc3 139
B) 8.bxc3 145

Chapter 9
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.g3 ♘a6

5.♗bd2 d5

A) 6.cxd5 160
B) 6.♗g2 164

Chapter 10
1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘f3 b6 4.g3 ♘a6

5.♗a4 ♘b7 6.♗g2 c5

A) 7.d5?! 180
B) 7.0–0 182
C) 7.cxc5 186
Chapter 11
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²f3 b6 4.g3 ¾a6 5.²b3 c6? 

A) 6.¾g2 204 
B) 6.¾f4 205 
C) 6.¾g5 209 
D) 6.²c3 213 

Chapter 12
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²f3 b6 4.g3 ¾a6 5.²c2 c5 

A) 6.¾g2 ²c6 221 
B) 6.d5 exd5 7.cxd5 ¾b7 224 

Chapter 13
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²f3 b6 4.g3 ¾a6 5.²c2 e5 

A) 6.¾g2 ²c6 221 
B) 6.d5 exd5 7.cxd5 ¾b7 224 

Chapter 14
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²f3 b6 4.g3 ¾a6 5.b3 ¾b4† 6.²d2 ¾e7 

A) 7.²c3 266 
B) 7.²c3 267 
C) 7.¾g2 0–0 8.0–0 d5 271 

Chapter 15
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²f3 b6 4.g3 ¾a6 5.b3 ¾b4† 6.²d2 ¾e7 7.²g2 0–0 8.0–0 d5 9.cxd5 exd5 10.²c3 ¾e8! 

A) 11.²f4 287 
B) 11.a3 288 
C) 11.²b1 290 
D) 11.²c1 292 
E) 11.²e1 293 
F) 11.²c2 295 
G) 11.²e5 300 

Chapter 16
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 

A) 3.a3 315 
B) 3.e3 316 
C) 3.²g5 318 
D) 3.g3 ¾b4† 4.²d2 321 

Chapter 17
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.g3 ¾b4† 4.²d2 ¾e7 5.²g2 d5 6.²f3 0–0 7.0–0 c6 

A) 8.²a3† 335 
B) 8.b3 336 
C) 8.²c3 338 
D) 8.²f4 343 
E) 8.²b3 347 

Chapter 18
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.g3 ¾b4† 4.²d2 ¾e7 5.²g2 d5 6.²f3 0–0 7.0–0 c6 8.²c2 ²bd7 

A) 9.²g5 359 
B) 9.²c1 361 
C) 9.a4? 363 
D) 9.²d1 369 

Chapter 19
1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.g3 ¾b4† 4.²d2 ¾e7 5.²g2 d5 6.²f3 0–0 7.0–0 c6 8.²c2 ²bd7 9.²f4 b6 

A) 10.²bd2 382 
B) 10.cxd5 384 
C) 10.²c3 385 
D) 10.²d1 391