

COUNTING UNREACHABLE SINGLE-SIDE PAWN DIAGRAMS WITH LIMITLESS CAPTURES

COLIN MCDONAGH
CMCDONAGH@CS.NUIM.IE

Epiphainein counts unreachable single-side pawn diagrams (in chess) where pawns can move forward or diagonally-forward without limit whilst remaining on the board. Epiphainein is a serial calculation and takes a few seconds to calculate the number of unreachable diagrams on a regular 8×8 board. With a decent machine it should take roughly 4 hours to calculate the same on a 10×10 board.

1. INTRODUCTION

We count unreachable single-side pawn diagrams (in chess) found by attempting to match pawns to starting files, where a single side is either exclusively white or exclusively black, and a diagram [1] is the contents of a board's squares as opposed to a position which also accounts for side to move, castling rights and en-passant. Pawns can move forward or diagonally-forward without limit whilst remaining on the board, the latter of which can be seen as pawns capturing empty squares. The motivation for this project is Shirish Chinchalkar's "An Upper Bound for the number of reachable positions" [2]. Finally the code is available at [3].

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. An Example. Certain pawn diagrams are unreachable as pawns may only move forward or diagonally forward. Consider "Fig. 1". In order for a pawn to be on $a3$, it must have come from $b2$. However, since there's a pawn on $b2$, this diagram is unreachable.




FIGURE 1. The simplest unreachable diagram

We allow pawns to move diagonally forward without limit. In reality pawns can only move diagonally by capturing opposing chessmen, apart from the King.

2.2. Naive Approach. A pawn-square $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is a square which maps to files μ from which a pawn on s could have started the game on, as shown in “Fig. 2”. A set of pawn-squares $\nu \in 2^{\mathcal{S}}$ and the union of their potential starting files M therefore form a bipartite graph $G = (\cup M, \nu, E)$.




FIGURE 2. $\mu_{d4} = [b, f]$

Theorem 2.1. *A diagram is reachable iff its G has a $|\nu|$ -perfect matching.*

Every pawn-square in ν must be mapped to a starting square to be reachable, which is a $|\nu|$ -perfect matching in G . This matching can be found in $\mathcal{O}(|\nu|)$ via Horn’s greedy *EDF* scheduling algorithm [4]¹. However, there are $\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n(n-2)}{i}$ distinct diagrams on an $n \times n$ board, so an *EDF* based serial computation for $n = 8$ would take in the order of days or maybe weeks.

3. A BOTTOM-UP ATTEMPT AT COUNTING UNREACHABLE DIAGRAMS

3.1. Overview. For a range of starting files u , there is a maximally large set of pawn-squares v whose potential starting files are a subset of u :

$$\forall u \exists v \ni \forall s \in v, u_s \subseteq u \wedge \forall s \notin v, u_s \not\subseteq u$$

“Fig. 3” shows an example of v on a board.




FIGURE 3. $v_{[b,f]}$

¹For ordered input, i.e. pawns ordered by rank then file (row then column respectively)

Due to theorem 2.1, $u \in \mathcal{U}$ produce unreachable diagrams in which there are $>|u|$ pawns within v_u . More generally, every unreachable diagram is produced by at least some $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}$ and its equivalent pawn-squares $V_U = (v_u; u \in U)$ where $\forall u \in U, v_u$ contains more than $|u|$ pawns. Once we have the number of unreachable diagrams produced by each $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}$, we use the principle of inclusion-exclusion to determine the total number of unreachable diagrams.

3.2. High-level Enumeration. We order $u \in \mathcal{U}$ by (u_0, u_1) . We look to enumerate the satisfiable subset of $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}$ as efficiently as possible, where U is satisfiable if it produces unreachable diagrams. The following explain how we achieve this efficiency.

Theorem 3.1. *Let “edge” be a quality of U whose $(\cup U)_l = 1 = a$, and “non_edge” a quality of U whose $(\cup U)_l = 2 = b$ and $(\cup U)_r < n$. Then U whose $(\cup U)_l > 2$ are either a displacement of some $U \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{non_edge}$ within $[[2, n-1]]$ or a reversal of some $U \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{edge}$ displaced such that the rightmost file of the reversal is the n^{th} file.²*

It’s intuitive to just compute U anchored on the a file and produce $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}$ by considering images of anchored U . However it’s necessary to have *edge* and *non_edge* categories because they have different $|V|$ as shown in “Fig. 4”.




FIGURE 4. $V_1 = (v_{[a,d]})$ is filled with a black background. V_2 is equal to $(v_{[b,e]})$ left-shifted one square and is marked with gray Xs. Although $U_1 = U_2 = ([a, d])$, $|\cup V_1| \neq |\cup V_2|$

Theorem 3.2. *Let a continuous U have the property that $|\cup U| = (\cup U)_r - (\cup U)_l + 1$. Then non-continuous U are multisets of continuous U .*

Naturally, U which are non-continuous can be split into continuous subsets which we only have to consider once, and then use to produce every $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let any unsatisfiable U which we’ve had to enumerate be an “unsat core”. Then a U which contains a file-reflection and/or displacement of a core is also unsatisfiable.*

²It’s also true that we only need compute one member of a file-reflected pair $(\exists, E), \exists, E \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{non_edge}$. However, due to an implementation detail and because computing $U \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{edge}$ dominates $U \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{non_edge}$ we haven’t implemented it

We check if U contains a core by iterating over a copy of U ; M . On each iteration check if M displaced s.t. $(\cup M)_i = 1$ is in an entry in our *cores* dictionary; if so, U is unsatisfiable, otherwise pop M_1 and continue until finding a core or $|M| = 0$. This routine is preferable to checking satisfiability.

Lemma 3.4. *Any U which contains a u for which $|u| = |v|$ or $|u| = n$ is unsatisfiable.*

Assume that references to U hereon are to a U which don't contain always unsat u to avoid introducing unnecessary notation.

Lemma 3.5. *If U is unsatisfiable then $\forall P, n < \sum_{v \in V} |p_v|$ where $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|V|}\}$ are the pawns in V and $p_i > |U_i|$.*

Proof. $\forall u$, u is potentially satisfiable as assumed from lemma 3.4 onwards. If there are unlimited pawns available, then we can always produce unreachable diagrams by placing a pawn in every square $s \in \cup V$. Therefore any unsatisfiability must be caused by our limited pawn supply of n pawns. \square

Theorem 3.6. *If some $U \in (2^U)_{non_edge}$ is unsatisfiable and U' is the “non-edge equivalent” of U , i.e. U right-shifted one file, then U' is also unsatisfiable.*

$v \in V'$ are either the same size as or smaller than their counterparts whereas $u \in U'$ are identical to their counterparts s.t. U' also requires $> n$ pawns. Therefore we first enumerate the entirety of $(2^U)_{edge}$ and feed the collected *unsat cores* into a separate enumeration of $(2^U)_{non_edge}$.

Theorem 3.7. *If $U + u$ is unsatisfiable and μ is u right-lengthened and/or right-shifted then $U + \mu$ is also unsatisfiable.*

Right-lengthening u increases its pawn requirement above what was already unsatisfiably high. Right-shifting u reduces already insufficient overlaps between v and previous $\nu \in V$.

In light of the above, our enumeration is defined in “Fig. 5”.

3.3. Diagrams contained within V . For a given U we catalogue all unreachable diagrams contained within the corresponding V , i.e. where every pawn in the unreachable diagram is within V . To make this cataloging easier we first create a partition λ , $\lambda \vdash V$, with as few possible parts s.t. $\forall \rho \in \lambda$ every square $s \in \rho$ is contained by the same subset of U . And we achieve this with a partition refinement strategy.

3.3.1. Partition Refinement. A partition refinement [5] incrementally partitions a family of sets V into disjoint sets which collectively are λ . When adding v to λ , we check $\forall \rho \in \lambda$ which $|\rho \cap v| > 0$ and split those ρ into ρ_v and $\rho_{v'}$. In order to remove v from λ it's normal to keep a union-find data structure [6], however, we instead incrementally store λ , $\lambda \vdash M$, $M \in \{(U_i; 1 \leq i \leq j); 1 < j < |U|\}$ which collectively form Λ . This approach scales well because of some domain specific simplifications we can make to Λ . The following characterise our partitioning.

Lemma 3.8. *Given $\rho = I = v_a \cap v_b \cap \dots \cap v_w$, ρ can be simplified to $v_{[I_{maxl}, I_{minr}]}$, where I_{maxl} is the rightmost left-file of any u in I and I_{minr} the leftmost right-file of the same.*

FIGURE 5. High-level Enumeration

```

 $unsat\_cores \leftarrow enumerate(true, \emptyset)$ 
 $enumerate(false, unsat\_cores)$ 
function  $enumerate(edge, unsat\_cores)$ 
   $unsat\_cores \leftarrow unsat\_cores \text{ or } dict()$ 
   $u \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
   $U \leftarrow (u)$ 
   $sat \leftarrow true$   $\triangleright$  We consider  $\emptyset$  initially pseudo-satisfiable
   $max\_uLen \leftarrow initMax\_uLen$   $\triangleright n - 1 ? edge : n - 2$ 
   $\triangleright max\_uLen$  tracks the longest  $u$  which could potentially be added to  $U$ 
  while  $U \notin END\_Us$   $\triangleright |END\_Us| = 2$ 
    if  $sat$  then
       $append(U, lexicographicallyNext\_u(U_{-1}, max\_uLen))$ 
    else
       $toPop \leftarrow num\_uToBacktrack(U)$ 
       $\mu \leftarrow popNReturnLastPopped\_u(U, toPop)$ 
       $\triangleright$  If one item is popped we return  $U_{-1}$ , if two then  $U_{-2}$ 
       $max\_uLen \leftarrow (U_{-1_r} - U_{-1_l})$  if  $toPop = 1$  else  $initMax\_uLen$ 
       $append(U, lexicographicallyNext\_u(\mu, max\_uLen))$ 
    if any unsat core  $\in U$  then  $\triangleright$  Theorem 3.3
       $sat \leftarrow false$ 
    continue
     $sat \leftarrow countAndRecord(U)$ 
    if  $!sat$  then
       $unsat\_cores[U] = true$ 
       $unsat\_cores[reverse(U)] = true$ 
  return  $unsat\_cores$ 

function  $lexicographicallyNextCandidate\_u(u, max\_uLen)$ 
  if  $u_{new} = (u_l, u_r + 1)$  isn't longer than  $max\_uLen$  and  $u_r + 1 < max\_uLen$ 
  then return  $u_{new}$   $\triangleright$  Theorem 3.7.  $maxULen = n ? edge : n - 2$ 
  else
    return  $(u_l + 1, min(u_l + 1 + minNonEdge\_uLen, maxULen))$ 
     $\triangleright minNonEdge\_uLen = 3$ 

function  $num\_uToBacktrack(U)$ 
  if the lexicographically last  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is already in  $U$  or replacing  $U_{-1}$  with  $u$ ,
   $U_{-1} \prec_{lex} u$ , would result in unsatisfiability or discontinuity then return 2
   $\triangleright$  Theorem 3.2
  else return 1

```

An intuition for this is, given that a number of similarly orientated congruent triangles are placed on top of a horizon intersect, the intersection is another smaller congruent triangle.

Lemma 3.9. *Given $\rho = I$, if $|v \cap \rho| > 0$, then $|v \cap \rho| = v_{[u_l, \min(I_{minr}, u_r)]}$.*

$I_{maxl} \leq u_l$ but u_r can of course be to the left of I_{minr} .

Lemma 3.10. *Given $\rho = I \setminus D$, $D = v_\alpha \cup v_\beta \dots \cup v_\omega$, if $|v \cap \rho| > 0$, then $|v \cap \rho| = v_{[u_l, \min(I_{minr}, u_r)]} \setminus v_{[u_l, D_r]}$ where D_r is the file of the rightmost square $s \in D$.*

$v_{[u_l, D_r]}$ can't be intersected by v because whatever elements contributed the D_r starting-square to D have left-files to the left of u_l and therefore cover v . Therefore the intersectable squares are those of I , given in lemma 3.9, less the excluded $v_{[u_l, D_r]}$ region.

Theorem 3.11. *Given $\rho \in \lambda$ are enumerated in the order they're added, $|v \cap \rho| = 0$ and $I_{minr} < u_l$, then ρ won't intersect any subsequent v .*

Proof. $|v \cap \rho| = 0$ because $I_{minr} < u_l$. Given μ is the corresponding range of starting files of the subsequent v , then $u_l \leq \mu_l$, $I_{minr} < \mu_l$, and therefore $|v \cap \rho| = 0$. \square

As no subsequent v can intersect ρ we don't add it to λ .

Theorem 3.12. *Given $|v \cap \rho| > 0$, if $u_r <$ the file of the rightmost square in ρ , ρ_r , then $\rho_{v'}$ is intersectable by a subsequent v . Conversely, if $\rho_r \leq u_r$, then $\rho_{v'}$ isn't subsequently intersectable.*

This is a purely geometric observation. See "Fig. 6". As a result we don't add any subsequently non-intersectable $\rho_{v'}$ to λ .




FIGURE 6. $v_1 = v_{[a,e]}$ is filled with a black background. $\rho = v_1$. $V_1 = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$. $v_2 = v_{[b,e]}$ is marked with gray Xs and $v_3 = v_{[c,f]}$ is marked by white circles. As $u_{2r} = \rho_r = "e"$, the squares in ρ that v_3 would have intersected had it been added before v_2 , namely $c2$, $d2$, $d3$ and $e3$, belong to ρ_v . $\rho_{v'}$ is not subsequently intersectable.

3.3.2. *Enumerating λ Solutions.* Having partitioned V , we enumerate every solution $P \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda$. Consider the following.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $v = V_{-1}$. Every solution to V must also satisfy $V \setminus v$.*

As a result we can produce every solution to V from solutions to $V \setminus v$.

Lemma 3.14. *Let P be a solution to V and P' be a solution to $V \setminus v$. Let $l \vdash V \setminus v$, and $l_v = \{\rho; \rho \in l \wedge |\rho \cap v| > 0\}$. If $\forall \rho \in l_v, P'_\rho = P_{\rho_v} + P_{\rho_{v'}}$, then we say P is produced from P' .*

We produce P from P' by (1) $\forall \rho \in l_v$, splitting pawns in P'_ρ into P_{ρ_v} and $P_{\rho_{v'}}$ (2) $\forall \rho, |\rho \cap v| = 0$ which remain subsequently intersectable, copying over P'_ρ to P_ρ (3) for an orphan partition $\alpha = v \setminus \cup(V \setminus v)$, $\alpha \neq \{\emptyset\}$, placing up to whatever number of pawns haven't already been placed in P in α all s.t. V is satisfied. Our general approach to splitting P'_ρ and placing pawns in α is recursive.

Theorem 3.15. *Let P be a solution for Λ_V produced from P' which is a solution for $\Lambda_{V \setminus v}$. Let $C(X)$ be the number of unreachable diagrams which a solution X represents. Let $l = \{\rho; \rho \in \Lambda_{V \setminus v} \wedge |\rho \cap v| > 0\}$. Let α be an orphan part in Λ_V . Finally, let $N(\rho) = \binom{|\rho_v|}{P_{\rho_v}} \binom{|\rho_{v'}|}{P_{\rho_{v'}}}$ and $D(\rho) = \binom{|\rho|}{P'_\rho}$. Then*

$$C(P) = C(P') \binom{|\alpha|}{P_\alpha} \prod_{\rho \in l} \frac{N(\rho)}{D(\rho)}$$

We can count $C(P_{\Lambda_V})$ by continuously computing $C(P_{\Lambda_V})$ from $C(P_{\Lambda_{V \setminus v}})$, where the initial value $C(P_{\Lambda_\emptyset})$ is of course 0.

3.4. Counting All Unreachable Diagrams. We now consider how to generate all unreachable diagrams from the satisfiable subset of $U \in 2^{\mathcal{U}}_{edge} \cup 2^{\mathcal{U}}_{non_edge}$.

3.4.1. Disjoint Combinations of U . $\forall P_V$, extract the unique tuples $(e, w, |p|, z, |q|)$ into \mathcal{S} where $e \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether $U \in (2^{\mathcal{U}})_{edge}$, $w = (\cup U)_r - (\cup U)_l + 1$, $|p| = \sum_{p \in P} p$, $z = |U|$ and $|q| = |\cup_{v \in V} v|$. We enumerate

$$((\mathcal{S}))_{\mathfrak{R}} = \left\{ S; S \in ((\mathcal{S})) \wedge \sum_{s \in S} s_w \leq n - E(S) \wedge \sum_{s \in S} s_{|p|} \leq n \wedge \sum_{s \in S} s_e \leq 2 \right\}$$

where $((\mathcal{S}))$ is the infinite multiset of $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $E(S)$ is the number of covered edge squares.³

Every unreachable diagram is counted via some $S \in ((\mathcal{S}))_{\mathfrak{R}}$ if we consider two additional factors:

- (1) Let $F(S)$ be the number of ways to uniquely and disjointly displace $s \in S_{non_edge} = \{s; s \in S \wedge s_e = 0\}$ s.t. s doesn't cover an edge file, and/or move to the opposing edge and reverse $s \in S_{edge}$.
- (2) Let $R(S)$ be the number of ways to place between $0 \leq r \leq n - |\sum_{s \in S} s_{|p|}|$ remaining pawns in $n(n-2) - \sum_{s \in S} s_{|q|}$ squares.

Given $C(s)$ is the number of diagrams produced by s , then the number of diagrams produced by S is $C(S) = \prod_{s \in S} C(s)F(S)R(S)$.

3.4.2. Diagram Duplicity. Diagrams aren't necessarily unique to some S . For e.g. in "Fig. 7".

³The number of covered edge squares isn't $\sum_{s \in S} s_e$ because one edge U can cover both edge squares




FIGURE 7. The above diagram may be produced by $\{\{[a, b]\}\}$, $\{\{[a, c]\}\}$ and $\{\{[a, b], [a, c]\}\}$ when we consider the factor R .

To count each diagram only once we use the inclusion-exclusion sieve:

Theorem 3.16. *The # of unreachable diagrams is $\sum_{S \in (\mathcal{S})_{\text{sr}}} (-1)^{(\sum_{s \in S} s_z) + 1} C(S)$*

4. SANITY CHECK

We sanity check our method on boards of width $3 \leq n \leq 7$. For a given n , we enumerate all pawn diagrams in the $n(n-2)$ grid, and for each attempt to place pawns on starting squares using OR-Tools [7]. We compute for $n = 7$ in about 2 hours because of a few observations: (1) the horizontal reflection of an unsat diagram across the center of the board is unsat (2) the row-displacement of an unsat diagram towards the starting files is unsat (3) the horizontal displacement of an unsat diagram likely may also be unsat (see code at [3]) .

5. RESULTS

The results obtained are shown in “Table. 1”.

TABLE 1. Unreachable Diagrams

n	$\#Unreachable$	$\%Unreachable$	<i>Approx. Time</i>
3	0	0	<1s
4	18	11.04	<1s
5	550	11.12	<1s
6	16398	08.63	<1s
7	541782	06.20	<1s
8	20217623	04.35	3s
9	851074312	03.02	3m
10	40168190051	02.10	4h

REFERENCES

- [1] Wismuth.com. Statistics on chess positions. [online] Available at: <<http://wismuth.com/chess/statistics-positions.html>> [Accessed 31 January 2022].
- [2] Chinchalkar, S., 1996. An Upper Bound for the Number of Reachable Positions. ICGA Journal, 19(3), pp.181-183.
- [3] epiphainein. 2022. [online] Available at: <<https://github.com/ctmcd/epiphainein>> [Accessed 31 January 2022].

- [4] Horn, W., 1974. Some simple scheduling algorithms. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 21(1), pp.177-185.
- [5] Paige, R. and Tarjan, R., 1987. Three Partition Refinement Algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(6), pp.973-989.
- [6] Simsiri, N., Tangwongsan, K., Tirthapura, S. and Wu, K., 2017. Work-efficient parallel union-find. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 30(4), p.e4333.
- [7] Google Developers. 2022. OR-Tools | Google Developers. [online] Available at: <<https://developers.google.com/optimization>> [Accessed 31 January 2022].