## To err is human, but not for long - Gady Costeff



Note: data from HHDBV through 2015. Faults include cooks, duals, and minor faults.
The power and availability of chess engines and databases is dramatically reducing the analytical error rate in studies, to the point that cooked studies may soon become extinct. It is interesting that despite the high historical error rate, study composition has flourished, perhaps because the cycle of creation, destruction, and correction, operates successfully in all fields of life. However, before studies become analytically perfect, let's revel in our imperfection through the stories of three cooked studies.
E. Zepler, $1^{\text {st }}$ Prize 1.p Morgenzeitung (c) 1928


The judge, Richard Reti, commented on 3.Rh1!! "When I saw the solution's third move I thought at first it had to be a wrong transcription!". The study was submitted originally with Kb8. Shortly thereafter the study was cooked and Zepler corrected it by moving the king to a8, as above. Unfortunately, a second cook was discovered after 1..d4! and for some time the study was under a cloud. Only the efforts of Wieland Bruch in 2007 uncovered the spectacular computer move 2.Re5!! not only saving the study, but adding a chameleon echo variation to what was already a magnificent, and still unsurpassed logical study. For the extraordinary story behind this study see: http://arves.org/arves/images/PDF/EG_PDF/eg171-supplement.pdf\#page $=33$

Z．Cahane，corr．H．Aloni $1^{\text {st }}$ Prize，IRT 1965


There is special pleasure when one can help correct studies by composers no longer with us．In 2005 Hillel Aloni asked me to test his correction of the 1965 Israel Ring Tourney winner．Six－piece databases had been solved that year，but were not yet available online，so testing was limited to an engine，which happily coped well with the task．Hillel was very pleased，primarily because he felt the historical responsibility of saving the study．Aloni＇s correction is exemplary，having moved the entire position one rank south．It reduces white＇s advantage to the minimum while retaining everything by the original composer．
I conclude with a new correction．In 1990 I published a study in the since discontinued Shahmat magazine．A few years later it was cooked and in 2005 I published a correction in the Dutch EBUR， another since discontinued magazine．In early 2020 I cooked that study too．Hopefully this study is correct，otherwise this magazine may too be in danger．
G．Costeff EBUR 2005 correction


Thematic＂fairy＂try：
1． 0 xd 5 甾xh5 2 ． $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{f} 2$ 气e5（or



Now the only way to win is the illegal
5．d8＝black ©！！


Solution：
1．d8씁！气xd8



3．tede e2！！tempo．
3．g8＝씁씁xf3＋4．붑 e 1
気c6！5．a8＝莫！
（5．a8＝씁 씁xe3＋！）
5．．．回d4！6． a a © $\mathrm{c} 2+$ ！





mzz－black to move．
Nd8 interferes five times with the queen：
4．．．${ }^{\mu} \mathrm{d} 8$ is blocked
4．．畑a8 $5 . \mathrm{g} 8$ 甾
4．．甾g8 5．a8씁
4．．官e6 5．g8皆
4．．．气c6！

When correcting prior work by other composers one must be sensitive and respectful to their intentions, as Aloni demonstrated above. Such "conservation" is not necessary when correcting our own studies, and in fact one can try to improve them even at the cost of significant changes. When I composed this study in 1990, I was fascinated by the position in which white wins only if he can promote a black knight. I could not manage it in the original version, nor in the correction. Hopefully this third time is the charm.

