

The 11th FIDE World Cup in Composing

${\bf Section} \; {\bf A-Two movers}$

Final award by

Gerard Doukhan

MMXXIII

A01 Slesarenko A. A02 Labai Z. (SVK) A03 Gasparyan A. (ARM) A04 Feoktistov A. A05 Delobel B. (FRA) A06 Guida M. (ITA) A07 Alekseev Y. A08 Murashev P. A09 Moen K. (USA) A10 Abad J. M. (ESP) A11 Syzonenko V. (UKR) A12 Markovcij V. (UKR) A13 Yarosh L. A14 Kuzovkov A. A15 Vokál S. (SVK) A16 Dimitrov O. (BUL) A17 Atavants G. A18 Gomez Palazon L. (ESP) A19 Mosiashvili G. (GEO) A20 Svítek M. (CZE) A21 Kuzmichev V. A22 Pankratiev A. A23 Gvozdják P. (SVK) A24 Shead A. (AUS) A25 Uris M. (ESP) A26 Subotić M. (SRB) A27 Kovačević M. (SRB) A28 Majoros B. (HUN) A29 Stojnic M. (SRB) A30 Zamanov V. (AZE) A31 Paslack R. (GER) A32 Galvaviev S. A33 Murashov V. A34 Dyachuk V. (UKR) A35 Almammadov A. (AZE) A36 Gavrilovski Z. (MKD)

t is a great honour to judge the 11th FIDE World Cup in Composing section A.

My sincere thanks go to the tournament organizer for the invitation. There were 36 original anonymous form. Studying in these gave me great pleasure. A judge still wants to be surprised by robust themes, artistic impression, and impeccable construction. A great key and set of tries are welcomed. Naturally each judgement is specific to the person who does it, to his tastes, to his Personally, I like culture. ล problem telling a story and I apologize to composers if I did not understand the one, they were proposing. This plays some role in ranking problems.

The level of the first 6 problems is excellent. We have some gems. On the other hand, the level is much lower than in previous years.

I did not retain problems:

- with insufficient content;

- that contained significant flaws

- with highly known patterns or clear anticipations.

My remarks after the claims on award: in my judgment, I had already eliminated several problems that included important anticipations. Readers reported to the tournament director two new anticipations for the **A20** (yacpdb/16206) and the **A31** (yacpdb/295606). I therefore must eliminate them and modify the classification as follows:

A23 – 1st Prize, Gold medal PETER GVOZDJÁK *Slovakia*



#2

11+11

1. 邑 g4? (A) - 2. 邑 xe6# (B) 1... 堂 f6 (a) 2. 鬯 xf5# (C) 1...fxg4 2. ② xg4# 1... 邑 xc5!

1. ②xe6? (B) - 2. 堂xf5# (C) 1... 堂f6 (a) 2. ②g4# (A) 1... 堂e4 2. 堂f4# 1... 逸c2!

1. & xf5! (C) - 2. @g4# (A) 1... 堂f6 (a) 2. 單 xe6# (B) 1...exf5 2. 營 xf5# (C) 1....& xd6 2. & g7# 1....& d1 2. @d7#

This problem could be almost banal since it presents a Cyclic Le Grand on the Black King flight. It is not the first and it will not be the last. The author of this lines even tried it in the 1970s. The composer of the A23 had to add another idea and that is another cycle!! That of arrival squares of key, threat and mate. A complete 3x3 cycle after constant defence in all phases: A(B)C/B(C)A/C(A)B. Thematic squares are g4-e6-f5. I am not a big fan of formal themes. If we draw a parallel with literature, there is a genre called the tautogram where all words in a sentence must begin with the same letter example with a T: The teacher took the troublemakers' toys. It's a technical achievement, but is it literature?

Here, with the association of the 2 themes, we must admit that the prowess forces admiration. Finally, the keys are not trivial either giving a flight either sacrificing the piece that performs it. Note the move 1...exf5 which, after the key, allows getting the 3rd thematic mates.

A1 – 2nd Prize, Silver medal ANATOLY SLESARENKO



#2 11+7 Dedicated to the memory of Eugene Fomichev, my old friend and teacher in the Bohemian kingdom. (Author.) *1... \Beta xc5 (a) 2.\Beta e4# (A) *1... \Delta e6 (d) 2. \Delta xf3# 1.\Delta d6? - 2.\Beta e4# (A) 1... \Beta xd4 (b) 2.\Beta f5# (B) 1... \Delta xc5! (a) 1... \Delta xc5! (a) 1... \Delta xd4 (b) 2.\Beta f5# (B) 1... \Delta xd4 (c) 2.\Beta e1# 1... \Delta xd4 (c) 2.\Beta e1# 1... \Delta kd4 (c) 2.\Beta e1#

1.營xf3! - 2.營f4# 1...章xd4 (b) 2.營f6# 1...查xd4 (c) 2.營f5# (B) 1...查xd4 2.泰c3# (C) 1...查e6 (d) 2.營xd5# (1...▲xg3/&e3 2.營e3#)

The two tries 1.2d6? and 1.&c3? illustrate the Le Grand theme with the defence 1... \argue xd4. In one case. the key controls the square e4, the defence blocks the case d4. In the other case, the key guards square d4 and takes the control of the square e4. Note that in the second try, the defence 1... &xd4, a selfpinned effect, brings a nice 2. \medselete1# legitimizing the WEfl. Good but The key 1.\"xf3! is a not new. thunderbolt. It brings two changed mates thanks to the WEf1 which is in ambush. Its change of function is interesting. The author evokes the theme Shedey. It is better to take pleasure with the flight-giving key and the role of the W¤f1 which are for a lot in the quality of the problem.

A4 – 3rd Prize, Bronze medal ALEKSANDR FEOKTISTOV



#2

 13 ± 10

1.2f6? - 2.27xg6# (A) / ≌g4# (B) 1...&e6 (a) 2.∃xe4# 1... ≌e6 (b) 2.26xd5# 1... ≌d7! (c)

```
1. 急h6? - 2. 營g4# (B)
1... 急e6 (a) / 邕d7 (c) 2. 急7xg6# (A)
1... 邕e6 (b) 2. 急7xd5#
1...gxh5 2.營f5#
1... 急f2!
```

1. 2xe3? - 2. 2g2# 1... 2xe3 (d) 2. ≌c1# 1... ≣xe3 (e) 2. ≌g4# (B) 1... &d4!

1. 2xe5! - 2. 25xg6# 1... 2xe5 (f) 2. 27xg6# (A) 1... 2xe5 (g) 2. 2g4# (B)

Picture at an exhibition. No Mussorgsky did not go through this. It was the examination of the A4 problem which made me think to this musical work: Four moves of the same Knight propose four different situations. After 1.266? we have a double threat and two defences trying to annihilate it. After the second moved 1.266? we find, on the same defences two changed mates with the reappearance of the other threat. The next two moves 1.2x63? and 1.2x65! are flight-giving keys that contain the initial threats.

Note the system of two threat corrections: (1.2h6, 1.2xe3) and (1.2h6, 1.2xe5). A very interesting problem which has a flaw: the White Rook f8 is useful only to prevent refutation 1...2xf7. Annoying.

A8 - 1st Honorable mention PAVEL MURASHEV



#2

11 + 10

*1...&~ 2.\Bg3# (A) *1...&xg4! (a) 2.\Bxe4#

1. &xe6? (B) – 2. ≌g5# (C) 1... &xg4 (a) 2. ≌g3# (A) 1... ≌xg6 (b) 2. ≥d7# 1... ≥xd5! (c)

```
1.&xe4? (D) - 2.Bxf3# (2.營g5? 營xe4!)

1...&xg4 (a) 2.Bxd3# (E)

1...&xd5 (c) 2.營g5# (C)

1...&xe4 2.營g3# (A)

1...&d1(c4) 2.&c4#

1...e1營(邕)!

1.營g5! (C) - 2.&xe6# (B)

(2.&xe4? 營xe4!)
```

1...\$\overline{2}xg4 (a) 2.\$\overline{x}xg4# 1...\$\overline{x}xg6 (b) 2.\$\overline{x}xg6# 1...\$\overline{x}xd5 (c) 2.\$\overline{x}xe4# (D) 1...e3 2.\$\overline{x}xd3# (E) 1...exd5 2.\$\overline{x}d7# 1...exf5 2.\$\overline{x}xf5#

Salazar and Urania themes. changed and transferred mates. We will stop there for the technical presentation of this problem. It is best to examine the WAf5 play trying to surrender the Black King with the help of the White Queen, unfortunately without success. But it is the White Queen who takes over and highlights the Bishop by making him mates 5 times (to be noticed a White Bishop star). A good team these two.

A12 - 2nd Honorable mention VASIL MARKOVCIJ Ukraine



#2

11 + 7

1. ≅ h4? - 2. ≥ e7# (A) / ≥ b4# (B) /
 ≅ d6# (C)
 1... ≌ xd4 (a) 2. ≅ xd4#
 1... ≅ xc6 (b) 2. ≅ e5# (D)
 1... ≅ xc6 (b) 2. ≅ e5# (D)
 1... ≅ xc6 (b) 2. ≅ e5# (D)
 1... ≅ xd4! (a)
 1. ≅ c7? ~ 2. ≅ e5# (D)
 1... ≅ xc6! (b)
 1... ≅ xc6! (b)
 1... ≅ xc6 (b) 2. ≅ e5# (D)
 1... ≅ xc6! (b)
 1... ≅ xc6 (b) 2. ≅ d6# (C)
 (1... ≥ g4 2.e4#, 1... ≥ d7 2. ≅ xd7#)

Here, we think outside the box. When we look at this problem, we feel that W²^h7, far from everything, has a role to play. The composer does not disappoint us. Its arrival on h4, threatening three mates is not just a wet firecracker, an appetizer to get us into appetites. We discover that Black intervene through the two thematic defences 1... mxd4 and 1... mxc6.

Then 1.e3? narrows the threat field, but this time 1... add 4! refutes the move. Note that 1... add 4: refutes always punctuated by 2. ad 6:because case d4 is under control.

The W^{Bh7} tries once again to act. This time, by skilfully lurking behind the W²c6 to threaten, here 2.^{Be5#}. Now 1...^Bxd6 refutes.

After the key 1. $\pounds b7!$ with the same threat, on the thematic defences we find two of the threats of the first try.

It is Mochalkin theme which is a combination of Rudenko and Le Grand

Mochalkin					
1	-	а	b		
Х	AB	С	С		
Y	С	А	В		

This theme is associated, here, with Dombrowskis theme. A problem that should have had the 1st Prize. Unfortunately, widely anticipated by the following work yacpdb/429154 that will be found in the album FIDE 2016-2018 (A52).

The author asks to remind that in his problem there is pseudoform of Burmistrov combination:

1.X?-2.A,B#, 1...b 2.D#, 1...a!

1.Y?-2.D#, 1...a 2.A#, 1...b!

1.Z! – 2.D#, 1...a 2.B#

In my opinion it does not have a significant contribution to the composition but if he wishes!

A2 – Commendation ZOLTAN LABAI *Slovakia*



#2

9+12

1. 2 xf4? – 2. ≌ d5# (A) / ≌ e6# (B) 1... 2 xf4 2. ≌ xd4# (C) 1... 2 xf4 2. ≌ xh2# (D) 1... 2 c7!

1. ② xe3? - 2. 營 xd4# (C) 1... ② e6 2. 邕 d5# (A) 1...fxe3 2. 營 xh2# (D) 1...c5!

1.월c7! – 2.빨xd4# (C) 1...일e6 2.필xe6# (B) 1...c5 2.필d5# (A) 1...堂xd6 2.빨xd4#

We feel that the Knight d5 is the main actor. We have three moves by the same white Knight that bring transfers of mates and threats. Note that we have two threat corrections: $1.2 \times 3?$ and 1.2×7 are the primaries of $1.2 \times 4?$ Even if the purists will scream, we can even mention the Rudenko theme in 3 phases?

A14 - Commendation ALEKSANDR KUZOVKOV



#2

10 + 8

1. ≌ h3? – 2. ≌xf3# (A) 1...fxg4! (a)

- 1. 邑 a3? 2. &xd3# (B) 1...d4 2. &b7# 1...fxe3! (b)
- 1. 邕 xf5? 2. 邕 xf4# 1...fxe3 (b) 2. 鬯 xf3# (A) 1...堂 xf5 2. 逸 xd3# (B) 1... 逸 c7!
- 1. 昌xd5! 2. 昌d4# 1...fxg4 (a) 2. এxd3# (B) 1... 堂xd5 2. 豐xf3# (A) 1.... 息b6 2. 魚hxf6#

Threat Correction and not White Correction, as the Autor mentions, combined with the Hannelius theme. It is not rare but this one has 2 qualities, its lightness and elegance even if the matrix has an obvious symmetry.

A29 – Commendation MIHAILO STOJNIC Serbia



#2

13 + 12

*1...2c~(e) 2.2xf3#(B) / Qxf5#(C) / タxc4#(D) *1... 2 cxe3 (c) 2. 2 xf3# (B) *1... 2xb4 (a) 2. 2xf5# (C) *1... 2 d4 (d) 2. 2 xc4# (D) *1... 2 gf6(e3) 2. 2 f6# (2. 4 f6#?) 1.gxf3? - 2.Sc4 (D) / f4# 1...b5 2.f4# 1... \Bxd2 (b) / \Bd4 (g) 2. \2c6# (A) 1... 2xb4 (a) 2.Qxf5# (C) 1... 2 cxe3! (c) (2. 2 xf3#?? (B)) 1.\$g5?~2.\$f4#(E) 1... \arrow xd2 (b) 2. \arrow e8# (F) 1...2 cxe3 (c) 2.2 xf3# (B) 1... 2xb4! (a) (2. 2xf5#?? (C)) 1... 包xb4 (a) 2. 營xf5# (C) 1... \alpha xd2 (b) 2. \alpha c6# (A) 1... \Bd4 (g) 2. \alpha c6# (A)

1... 包e1 (h) 2.營xf5# (C)

1... 2d4! (d) (2.2xc4#?? (D))

```
1.e4? ~ 2. ②c6# (A)

1... ③xb4 (a) 2. ③xf3# (B)

1... ⑤xd2 (b) 2. 營xf5# (C)

1...fxe4 2. 營xe4#

1... ②d4 (d) 2. ③xc4# (D)

1... ⑤d4 2. ②c6# (A)

1... 爲d6!
```

```
1. 空g5! - 2. 堂xf5# (C)
1... 空d4 (d) 2. 空xc4# (D)
1... 空cxe3 (c) 2. 空xf3# (B)
1... 空gxh6(e3) 2. 堂f6#
```

The Set Play presents a B2c2 antitriple whose mates will reappear in the next phases of the problem. The 2 tries 1.Exc4? and 1.e4? shows Dombro-Lacny theme for the two defences 1...2xb4 and 1...Exd2

1	-	а	b
Х	А	В	С
Y	В	С	Α

In the first try the W \blacksquare c3 blocks case c4 and takes control of cases d4 and e4. In the second try the W \triangle d3 gives the flight d4 and takes control of cases d5 and f5.

Finally, between the two tries and the Real Play, we have a pseudo-Le Grand Cyclic. Unfortunately, the Wac3 is useless in Real Play. If 1.e4 had been the key of Real Play the problem would have had a much higher ranking.

Gerard Doukhan,

August 26, 2023