



FIDE World Cup 2025 in Composing Chess Problems

— Definitive awards —



This PDF file contains the final awards of the **FIDE World Cup 2025** in composing. A total of 279 problems and studies have been received. The following table gives a break down of the numbers for the various sections together with the numbers of prizes, honourable mentions and commendations awarded:

section	received	awarded		
		Pr	HM	Comm
twomovers	25	4	3	4
threemovers	28	3	3	2
moremovers	27	3	5	5
eg studies	43	5	5+2	3
helpmates	50	5	7	6+1
selfmates	26	4	3+1	3+1
heterodox	20	2	2	3
fairies	39	3+1	3	4
retros + pg	21	2	2	4
Σ	279	31+1	33+3	34+2

During the **claims stage**, three problems were found to be unsound (one selfmate and two retros). In contrast, one study that was deemed to be unsound is now included in the award. One helpmate and one retro turned out to partially anticipated. The awards have been adjusted by the judges accordingly. Also, there have been objections regarding the originality of the winner of the moremover section which the judge rejected as unjustified.

Winners:

section	Gold medal	Silver medal	Bronze medal
twomovers	Gvozdják	Murashev	Vasylenko
threemovers	Shavyrin	Doukhan	Kusovkov
moremovers	Banaszek	Shavyrin	Gavrilovski
eg studies	Pasman	Minski	Arestov
helpmates	Klemanich	Gavryliv	Petković
selfmates	Gvozdják	Oganesjan	Richter
heterodox	Petković	Turevski	Linß
fairies	Tribowski	Shankar Ram	Dyachuk
retros + pg	Prentos	Hambros	Parrinello

Notes: Two awards have not been translated into English. Given the availability of tools like *DeepL* and *Google Translate*, I consider a translation unnecessary.

Some solutions in the studies section are very short. The full solutions provided by the authors can be found in the PGN-file distributed with this award.


Twomovers

— Award by Marco Guida —

I wish to thank Torsten Linß, the director of the FIDE World Cup 2025, for inviting me to judge the twomovers section of the competition, a task I have enjoyed a lot. I received 25 originals in anonymous form, finally deciding to award 11 of them, with the 4 Prizes in my opinion standing well above the crowd. Several entries were affected by some construction flaws, that I tried to weight against originality, complexity and construction challenges. Unfortunately, entry no. 21 (Kd2/Ke4) turned out to be anticipated by V. Dyachuk, Melnichenko-80 JT, 2019, 2nd-4th Prize (yacpdb-490379).

Peter Gvozdják

Gold medal



#2* C+ (9+12)

1st Prize: no. 19

A rare Burmistrov Combination with 4 thematic mates (3× le Grand with a multiple-threat introductory try) and a fourfold Mäkihovi: a crystal clear content in a very clean setting. I am aware of only a couple of examples of 4-phases Burmistrov Combination, that, however, exploit totally different mechanisms. Here the strategy underlying the King's le Grand is of striking consistency across all phases, exploiting the release of control by the keys of squares f5, f4, e6 and d6 respectively in the extended field of the black King to reduce to the unit the 4 set mates after kings' flight. All four thematic mates are battery mates by wQ-wR battery, further contributing to deliver an overall outstanding coherence. An additional Pseudo le Grand is the cherry on the pie. A defense dual in the solution is totally negligible.

1...Ke5 x 2.Tc4 A, T:e3 B, Td3 C, T:c5# D

1.L:f7? [2.Tc4 A, T:e3 B, Td3# C] Ke5 x 2.T:c5# D, but 1...Dd5!


1.Lf8? [2.T:c5# D] Ke5 x 2.Tc4# A, but 1...Se7!

1.Sb7? [2.T:c5# D] Ke5 x 2.T:e3# B, but 1...Se4!

1.Kb6! [2.T:c5# D] Ke5 x 2.Td3# C, 1...Se4/b:c3/T:c2/c4 2.S:c6/D:c3/T:c2/Td3#

Pavel Murashev

Silver medal



#2* C+ (10+10)

2nd Prize: no. 17

A modern problem, with a rich thematic content. At the core, a Zagoruiko 3×2 over 4 phases combined with the Barnes theme and a full defense-based Dombrovskis (double-threats/double-defenses). Ventura (with two thematic defenses on the same square e5) is the underlying and unifying strategic element that makes the difference. I valued 4 main phases: 1.L:g5? (introducing the thematic double-threat), 1.De8?, 1.Dd6? and 1.Ld4! The problem is enriched with Pseudo le Grand (BaA-AbB) and Kharkiv-2 (refutation/defense b) themes, an additional Dombrovskis paradox (threat/mate C and defense a) and other Hannelius-flavoured elements. A defense dual in the Solution is a negligible flaw.

1...S:f6 2.Se7# A; 1...Sf~ 2.Se3# B, but 1...Se5! b


1.L:g5? [2.Se7 A, Se3# B] e5 a 2.Dg6# C, 1...Se5 b 2.S:h4# D, but 1...S:f4! c

1.De8? [2.Dg6# C] 1...e5 a 2.D:c8# E, 1...S:f4 c 2.Se3# B, but 1...Se5! b

1.Dd6? [2.Se3# B] e5 a 2.Se7# A, 1...Se5 b 2.D:e5# F, 1...e3 2.Dd3#, but 1...g:f4!

1.Ld4! [2.Se7# A] e5 a 2.Dg6# C, 1...Se5 b, S:d4 2.Se3# B

Anatoly Vasylenko
Bronze medal



#2 C+ (12+8)


thematically more interesting than the play in the solution.

1.d8=D? [2.Dh4#] Le6 a 2.Df6# A, 1...Df2 b 2.Dg7# B, 1...Ld5/T:d8 2.Se2/Le5#, but 1...D:g1!
 1.Lc2? [2.Te4#] Ld5 2.Se2#, 1...Te6 2.Tc4#, but 1...Le6! a
 1.Tc5? [2.Se2#] Lc4 2.T:c4#, but 1...T:a2! c
 1.Le4! [2.Se2#] Le6 a 2.Dg7# B, 1...Lc4,Te6 2.T(:)c4#, 1...T:a2 c 2.Lb6#

3rd Prize: no. 18

A sophisticated problem with an old-style taste, but a modern and spicy twist. Across the main Try 1.d8=D? and the solution 1.Le4! three different forms of Gamage are combined: the “classical” form (1...Le6 2.Df6#) and the “Pelle” form (1...Df2 2.Dg7#) in the try; the “bi-color” form (1.Le4! Le6 2.Dg7#) in the solution. The author claims this is a novelty; whichever would be the case, this is a significant achievement: no blend of intricate letter-based patterns, but interesting strategy and high quality play. A mate change and a mate transfer involving thematic defenses and thematic mates provides a much welcomed modern touch. Two additional tries (1.Lc2?, 1.Tc5?) fit well in the global picture, with refutations changing functions into effective defenses in the solution. A pity the strong key and refutation of the main try, and that the variation play of the try is richer and

Anatoly Slesarenko




#2 C+ (14+7)

1.Sd4? [2.D:d5# B] K:e4 x 2.Te1# C, 1...Sf5 y,Se6 2.D(:)e6# E, but 1...e6!
 1.Te1? C [2.e:d5# G] S:f5 y 2.e:f5# F, 1...d:e4,d4 2.Sc4#, but 1...d2, L:c3!
 1.g5? [2.D:d5# B] e6 a 2.Ld6# A, but 1...Se6!
 1.e:d5! G [2.Te1# C] Ke4 x 2.Ld6# A, 1...S:f5 y 2.De6# E, 1...d2/L:c3 2.Sc4/L:c3#

4th Prize: no. 20

Ukrainian cycle (cyclic King's le Grand) that exploits a Rook-Bishop battery play and an unusual orthogonal flight of the black King. With the well integrated additional Try 1.Te1? d2,L:c3! (double refutation) the author has managed to expand the content with further thematic elements: the Kharkiv theme, a key-threat reversal, and, most significantly, a Zagoruiko 3×2 (across four phases) that makes the difference. The impact of the aggressive key 1.Te1? that takes a flight is smoothed by such flight being effectively non viable, since a mate is provided in the set play. The additional try 1.g5? triggers a Pseudo le Grand instance (AxB-BaA).

Vasyl Dyachuk




#2 C+ (14+11)

1.Lf5? [2.h8=D# A] L~ a 2.S:d7# B, 1...L:f5! b 2.Sg4# C,
 1...Sf7,S:h7Se4/D:d3+ 2.Te4/S:d3#, but 1...d:e3!
 1.d6! [2.S:d7# B] L~ a 2.S(:)g4# C, 1...Lf5! b 2.h8=D,L# A, 1...L:c4+/d:e3/D:d3+ 2.S:c4/Dc3/S:d3#

1st Honourable Mention: no. 24

Shedey cycle (or short-cut Lačný) with black correction thematic defenses. The idea in itself is not new, but the exploitation of a black Bishop as the thematic piece and of two white half-batteries have elements of originality. A heavy position, yet with all white pieces justified, notably those forming the half-battery that does not play as such in the solution, including the white Queen in a by-play variation. A defense dual in the try (both the thematic 1...L:f5 and the dualized defense 1...T:f5 enable the mate by self-blocking square f5) negatively affects the precision of the play and the quality of the rendering of the idea.

Luiz Gomez Palazon



#2

C+ (9+8)

2nd Honourable Mention: no. 6


A nice, classical Zagoruiko 3x2 in a light setting, with an option play by the white Queen searching for a successful route to reach the mating square e3. Most of the thematic mates exploit simple strategies, mainly through straight captures and re-captures. The refutation to the try 1.D:f3? D:c6! triggers an instance of the Kharkiv-2 theme, with an additional mate change that add some spice to the problem.

1.D:f3? [2.De3#] e:d5 **a** 2.D:d5# **A**, 1...D:c4 **b** 2.T:c4# **B**, but 1...D:c6! **c**

1.Dc1? [2.De3#] e:d5 **a** 2.c:b5# **C**, 1...D:c4 **b** 2.D:c4 # **D**, 1...D:c6 **c** 2.Da3# **G**, but 1...d2!

1.De1! [2.De3] e:d5 **a** 2.D:e7# **E**, 1...D:c4 **b** 2.S:e7# **F**, 1...D:c6 **c** 2.T:c6# **H**

Vladimir Sorochan



#2

C+ (11+6)

3rd Honourable Mention: no. 7

An incomplete block in the set position: 3 possible black moves, of which only the King's flight has a provided mate. Across the 4 phases, a 3x3 Zagoruiko unfolds through a cycle of defenses/refutation. A strong promotion key of the try 1.b8=D? and a rather brutal refutation of the try 1.Dh6? K:c3! (the king's flight provided in the set play!) penalize this entry. Additionally, the same logic underpins pairs of changed mates (e. g. 2.Dc2/Dc1, 2.Dc7/Dc6, 2.De6/Dg8) and that significantly reduces the appeal of the variation play.

1...K:c3 **a** 2.Dc2 **A**#


1.b8=D? [] K:c3 **a** 2.Dc2# **A**, 1...c:b4 **b** 2.Dc7# **B**, but 1...d:c3! **c**

1.Dh6? [] c:b4 **b** 2.Dc6# **E**, 1...d:c3 **c** 2.De6# **C**, but 1...K:c3! **a**

1.Tb1? [] d:c3 **c** 2.Da2# **F**, 1...K:c3 **a** 2.Sb2# **D**, 1...c:b4! **b**

1.Dg1! [] K:c3 **a** 2.Dc1# **G**, 1...c:b4 **b** 2.D:d4# **H**, 1...d:c3 **c** 2.Dg8# **I**

Miroslav Subotić



#2

C+ (7+7)

1st Commendation: no. 2

A nice le Grand (AaC-CaA), enriched with a good set of changed mates (three different mates after 1...D:b6, two different mates after 1...D:b5 and after 1...Ta4 respectively) and two instances of the Karkhiv-2 theme (refutations 1...Ta4 and 1...D:b5).


1...D:b6 **a** 2.Db4# **A**, 1...D:b5 **b** 2.S:b7# **B**

1.Lc6? [2.Db4# **A**] D:b6 **a**, Dc4 2.S(:)c4# **C**, 1...Db5 **b** 2.S:b7# **B**, but 1...Ta4! **c**

1.Sc8? [2.Db4# **A**] D:b6+ **a** 2.D:b6# **D**, 1...Ta4 **c** 2.D:a4# **E**, but 1...D:b5! **b**

1.Dc5! [2.Sc4# **C**] 1...D:b6 **a** 2.Db4# **A**, 1...D:b5 **b** 2.D:b5# **F**, 1...Ta4 **c** 2.L:a6# **G**

Ovidiu Crăciun



#2*

C+ (11+8)

2nd Commendation: no. 12

The thematic core of this problem is a 3×2 Zagoruiko. Through two additional tries, the author adds a $1 \times$ Dombrovskis (Db!-bD#) and two instances of the Kharkiv-2 theme (thematic refutations/defenses $1...K:e5$ b and $1...T:e5$ a). The price paid is however high: unpleasant double-threats in both additional tries and use of the provided flight as refutation (rather strong, even if somehow thematic).

1...T:e5 a 2.De3# A, 1...K:e5 b 2.Df6# B


1.Sf6? [2.De3# A, Sc6 D], but K:e5! b

1.Dc6? [2.D:c5, Dd5#] K:e5 b 2.Df6# B, but 1...T:e5! a

1.S:c3? [2.De3# A] T:e5 a, K:c3 2.Dd2# C, 1...K:e5 b 2.Sc6# D, but 1...S:f4!

1.S:c5! [2.De3# A] T:e5 a 2.Se6# E, 1...K:e5 b 2.Sd7# F, 1...Sf4 2.D:f4#

Leonid Yarosh



#2

C+ (10+10)

3rd Commendation: no. 16

Two pairs of changed mates across 4 thematic phases in the background of the WCCT11 theme. The 4 phases are strategically grouped in two pairs: the first with thematic defenses that interfere a white line on the same square d4 vacated by the key; the second pair with thematic defenses that interfere another white line on the same square g7, vacated by the key as well. The white Queen far away from the battlefield is a strong hint to the solution.


1.Sf3? [2.Lc4#] Sd4 a 2.Se7# A, 1...Ld4 b 2.S:b4# B, but 1...Sd6!

1.Sc2? [2.Lc4#] Sd4 a 2.S:e3# C, 1...Ld4 b 2.S2:b4# D, but 1...Tf4!

1.g8=D,L? [2.De5#] Tg7 c 2.D:e6# E, 1...Sg7 d 2.T:d7# F, 1...L:d4 2.S:b4#, but 1...Tf6!

1.g8=S! [2.De5#] Tg7c, Tf6 2.S(:)f6# G, 1...Sg7 d 2.Sge7# H, 1...L:d4 2.S:b4#

Miroslav Svítek



#2*

C+ (12+7)

4th Commendation: no. 13

A blend of King's le Grand (BaC-CaB) and Pseudo le Grand (AbC-CcA). The idea is not new, and this lack of originality penalizes this entry. On the positive side, all thematic tries and the solution have flight giving keys; yet it is a pity that in the first try the King's flight is not met by a new mate.

1.Tc4? [2.D:d3# A] K:c4 2.D:d3# A, 1...L:c4 b 2.T:d6# C, but 1...Td2!

1.Sc5? [2.Le4# B] Kc6 a 2.T:d6# C, 1...d:c5 2.T:c5#, but 1...f:e3!

1.Tc6! [2.Te:d6# C] K:c6 a 2.Le4# B, 1...L:c6 c 2.D:d3# A

Participants: Crăciun, Ovidiu: 12 (2nd comm.); Dimitrov, Ognian: 8; Dyachuk, Vasyl: 24 (1st hon. ment.); Gasparyan, Alexey: 25; Gatti, Daniele: 23; Gomez Palazon, Luis: 6 (2nd hon. ment.); Gvozdják, Peter: 19 (1st pr.); Labai, Zoltán: 15; Moen, Kabe: 9; Mosiashvili, Givi: 21; Murashev, Pavel: 17 (2nd pr.); Pankratiev, Aleksandr: 10; Radović, Srećko: 3; Samilo, Volodymyr: 1; Sayman, Umut: 22; Sergiienko, Andrii: 5; Skripnik, Anatoly: 11; Slesarenko, Anatoly: 20 (4th pr.); Sorochan, Vladimir: 7 (3rd hon. ment.); Subotić, Miroslav: 2 (1st comm.); Svítek, Miroslav: 13 (4th comm.); Vasylenko, Anatoly: 18 (3rd pr.); Velikhanov, Kenan: 14; Yarosh, Leonid: 16 (3rd comm.); Zamanov, Vidadi: 4;

Threemovers

— Award by Frank Reinhold —


Zur Beurteilung lagen mir 28 Aufgaben in neutralisierter Form vor. Auffällig war die relative hohe Anzahl von Aufgaben, bei denen Drohung und Varianten mehrere in sich geschlossene thematische Blöcke bildeten. Bei diesen Darstellungen war es mir wichtig, dass diese gut erkennbar sind und möglichst untereinander eine thematische Beziehung haben. Auf alle Fälle scheint sich das etwas als Trend im Dreizüger abzuzeichnen, während ich mir streng logische Darstellungen oder Probleme mit Verführungen öfters gewünscht hätte.

In der Spitze ging es sehr eng zu, so dass die Reihung auch anders hätte ausfallen können. Einige Bemerkungen zu letztendlich nicht ausgezeichneten Aufgaben. Nr. 14: Die vom Autor angegebene Adabashew-Synthese ist bei weitem nicht so klar herausgearbeitet wie bei in diesem Preisbericht ausgezeichneten Aufgaben zum selben Themenkomplex. Nr. 16: Diese Aufgabe hat mir sehr viel Kopfzerbrechen bereitet, ist doch das logische Schema auszeichnungswürdig. Während mich der Mattdual in der Drohung schon nicht begeistert hat, taucht dieser erneut in der Variante 1...Th3 2.D:g2+ K:f5 auf. Auch wenn der Dual nicht zerstörend ist, würde ich die Aufgabe in diesem starken Turnier deswegen weiter hinten platzieren und weiß nicht, ob ich damit dem Autor einen Gefallen tun würde. Statt Tb5/Bg4 könnte man den Dual auch mit sTa5, sSa2, sBc3, wBc2 beseitigen. Aber vielleicht fällt dem Autor sogar noch etwas Besseres ein. Nr. 17: In Satz und einer Verführung spielt Tf8 keine Rolle, wodurch der Schlüssel sehr zurechtstellend wirkt und wenig Harmonie – zumindest im Vergleich zur Spitze – zwischen Satz, Verführung und Lösung trotz vieler Buchstaben vorhanden ist. Nr. 26: die Rolle von wLd8 ist zu schwach, denn er verhindert nur 1...Te8 in der Lösung und spielt sonst in einer Nebenvariante der Verführung eine Rolle.

Ich bedanke mich für das Vertrauen von Torsten Linß, dass ich ein so hochrangiges Turnier richten durfte, und habe mich für folgende Reihung entschieden.

Valery Shavyrin

Gold medal



#3

(9+10)


1. Preis: Nr. 9

Ein umfangreiches Vorhaben wurde in recht luftiger Konstruktion umgesetzt: In der ersten Gruppe von Drohung und zwei Varianten wechseln die Felder d3, d5 und f7 durch unterschiedliche weiße Figuren zwischen Zweit- und Mattzug zyklisch, wobei der Zweitzug einheitlich durch den Lc4 mit stillen Zügen ausgeführt wird. In der zweiten Gruppe von drei Varianten werden die Mattzüge der ersten Gruppe zu Zweitzügen der Varianten. Die Schlagflucht der abseitsstehenden Dame im Schlüssel wird etwas durch die Verführung 1.Dh2? g3!, das Damenopfer und die stille Drohung kompensiert. Mit konstruktivem Geschick gelang es, dem abseitsstehenden Ta4 Aufgaben zu geben. Mich hat die Ausgewogenheit von Inhalt und Form tief beeindruckt.

1.Dh2? g3! 1.Dg3! [2.Ld3 A [3.S:f7# B]] Sc1 2.L:f7 B [3.Td5# C], 1...S:g3 2.Ld5 C [3.Sd3# A], 1...Sc3 2.Sd3+ A Ke4 3.D:f4#, 1...Sg6 2.S:f7+ B Kf5 3.Le6#, 1...b5 2.Td5+ C Ke6 3.Ta6#

Gérard Doukhan

Silver medal



#3

(15+10)

Darstellungen vermisst. Die Variantenpaare sind klar zu erkennen und umso mehr bedaure ich die verwässernde Variante 1...T:h7. Ein sBh7 würde das beseitigen, führt aber zu illegaler Stellung. Künstlerisch ist die Diagrammstellung kein Blickfang, aber der Inhalt kompensiert das weitestgehend.


1.L:b6? **A** [2.Sc7# **C**], but 1...e:d4! 2.f4 **E** [3.Sc7# **C**] L:d6 3.Sc3?
1.T:b6? **B** [2.Sc3# **D**] e:d4 2.f4 **E** [3.Sc7# **C**] L:d6 3.T:d6#, but 1...T:d3!
1.Sc7+? **C**, but 1...K:d4! 1.Sc3+? **D**, but 1...K:d6!
1.f4! **E** [2.L:b6 **A** [3.Sc7# **C**] L:d6 3.Sc3# **D**] Tg7 2.T:b6 **B** (2.Kd7?) [3.Sc3# **D**] e:d4 3.Sc7# **C**,
1...T:d3 2.Sc7+ **C** K:d4 3.L:b6#, 1...Le7 2.Sc3+ **D** K:d6 3.T:b6# **B**,
1...Te3 2.d:e3 [3.Sc7# **C**] L:d6 3.Sc3# **D**, 1...Tg8 2.Kd7 [3.Sc3# **D**] e:d4 3.Sc7# **C**
1...T:h7 2.T:b6 [3.Sc3,S:f6#]

2. Preis: Nr. 27

Diese gewaltige Aufgabe ist eine der wenigen in diesem Turnier mit logischer Struktur und zeigt Adabashev-Sythese in drei Variantenpaaren. Zwischen stiller Drohung und Variante 1...Tg7 ergibt sich ein Pseudo-leGrand mit Blockschädigungen nach weißen Zweitzügen auf b6. Im zweite Variantenpaar 1...T:d3/Le7 sehen wir Fernblocks, wobei die Zweitzüge des ersten Paares als Mattzüge wiederkehren und deren Drohzüge zu Zweitzügen werden. Das dritte Paar fügt sich harmonisch ein, indem wir erneut die Züge Sc7/Sc3 mit dem typischen Wechsel von Droh- und Spiel matt des Pseudo-leGrand-Themas sehen. Zusätzliche Feinheiten sind die Dualvermeidung zwischen 2.T:b6/Kd7 und der Wechsel von Zweitzug des Probespiels 1.L:b6? und dem Schlüssel. Dem Autor gelang es perfekt, die Variantenpaare untereinander zu verbinden, was man häufig bei anderen Adabashev-

Aleksandr Kusovkov

Bronze medal



#3


(9+11)

1.T:b7! [2.Tc7 [3.Le6# **A**] Kc4 3.D:d4# **B**] Sg2 2.Tb5 (2.Le5?) [3.D:d4# **B**] Kc4 3.Sb6# **C**,
1...Sf5 2.Le5 (2.Tb5?) [3.Sb6# **C**] Kc4 3.Le6# **A**, 2...c4 3.Tb5#, 1...Kc4 2.Le6+ **A** Sd5 3.Sd6#,
1...Sc4 2.D:d4+ **B** c:d4 3.Tb5#, 1...Sf7,Sg6 2.Sb6+ **C** Kd6 3.S:f7#

3. Preis: Nr. 12

Die Drohung und zwei Varianten bilden eine leGrand-Zyklus, wobei man in den Varianten noch Dualvermeidung sieht. Normalerweise ist das schon anspruchsvoll genug, auch wenn der Königsfluchtmechanismus mit Fesselungen thematisch gut bekannt ist. Dass es dazu jedoch gelang, in einem zweiten Variantenblock noch alle drei thematischen Züge als Zweitzüge zu zeigen, finde ich grandios. Jegliches Nebenspiel, das die Klarheit der Thematik verwässert hätte, wurde vermieden. Unzufrieden war ich einzig mit dem offensichtlichen Schlüssel des abseits stehenden Turmes – der einzigen Möglichkeit, etwas gegen die satzmattlose Königsflucht zu tun. So bleibt also – trotz großartigen Inhalts – noch Potential für die Zukunft.

Zoran Gavrilovski



#3


(13+11)

1. ehrende Erwähnung: Nr. 25

Adabashev-Synthese mit S/T-Batterie, wobei die Drohung und drei Varianten (1...L:c5/T:d2/Tc1) im ersten Block Abzüge des Batterievordersteines und gleich fünf unterschiedliche Fesselungsmatts zeigen. Die schwarzen Schädigungen sind zweimal Hinlenkung zum Schlag und einmal Weglenkung. Die Selbstfesselungen auf d4 mit stillen Zweitzügen der weißen Dame sind der Inhalt des zweiten Variantenpaares und zeigen weitere vier Fesselungsmatts. Beide Variantenblöcke vereint zudem das Babuschka-Thema. Das dritte Variantenpaar (1...Ld3/Sf3) ist in sich fast konsistent, hat aber nichts mit dem Hauptgeschehen gemeinsam. Der Schlüssel wirkt etwas behelfsmäßig, befreit er doch den thematischen weißen Springer von seiner Deckungsfunktion.

1.Tf6! [2.Sb5+ Dd4/Td4 xy 3.Sc3/Sd6#] L:c5 2.Se6+ Ld4,Lb4,Dd4 x,Td4 y 3.S(:)c5#,
1...T:d2 2.Sf3+ T2d4,Dd4 x, T7d4 y 3.S(:)d2#, 1...Tc1 2.Sc2+ Dd4 x, Td4 y 3.d3#,
1...D:d4 x 2.Dc3 [3.De3#] Ld3/Sg4,Sf1 3.D:d3/Df3#, 1...T:d4 y 2.Db5 [3.D:c6#] c:b5 3.Ld5#,
1...Ld3 2.e:d3+ K:d3 3.Lc2#, 1...Sf3 2.e:f3+ Kd3 3.Lc4#

Srećko Radović



#3

(11+13)


2. ehrende Erwähnung: Nr. 23

Gewaltiges Spiel der Springer/Turm-Batterie! Bei den beiden symmetrischen Variantenpaaren nach Entblockung von c3 und e3 besetzt der Springer gerade das von Schwarz verlassene Feld in der fortgesetzten Verteidigung unter Fernblocknutzung, während der beliebige Zug eine eher trivial anmutende Mattwendung erlaubt. In Summe ergeben sich auf 2...S:d7 fünf Mattwechsel. Der Schlüssel mit Schachprovokation scheint auf den ersten Blick gut zu sein, aber das in der Diagrammstellung starke 1...S:d7 mit Deckungsverlust von d5 erfordert entsprechendes Handeln. Die Konstruktion ist recht schwer und der rote Faden ist nicht ganz so gut herausgearbeitet wie bei den Preisträgern.

1.Ke6! [2.Sb4+ S:d7 3.Sc6#] Tc~ 2.Lb2+ Tc3 3.L:c3#, 1...Tc2 2.Sc3+ K:c3/S:d7 3.T:d3/S:b5#,
1...L~ 2.Dg1+ Le3 3.D:e3#, 1...Lf2 2.Se3+ S:d7/K:e3 3.Sf5/Dh6#, 1...T:b6+ 2.S:b6+ S:d7 3.Sc6#,
1...T:c7 2.S:c7+ S:d7 3.S:b5#, 1...S:d7 2.Sc6+ Kc4 3.S:e3#, 1...g:f3 2.Dh4+ Lf4 3.D:f4#

Participants: Abdullayev, Elmar: 21; Atayants, Grigory: 16; Dimitrov, Ognian: 3; Doronin, Timur: 13; Doukhan, Gérard: 27 (2nd pr.); Feoktistov, Aleksandr: 14; Garzón, José A.: 4; Gasparyan, Alexey: 18; Gatti, Daniele: 8; Gavrilovski, Zoran: 25 (1st hon. ment.); Kusovkov, Aleksandr: 12 (3rd pr.); Labai, Zoltán: 7 (2nd comm.); Matyushin, Gennady: 6; Murashov, Vasili: 20; Novitsky, Petro: 24; Pankratiev, Aleksandr: 15; Quintero Occhiuzzi, Pablo: 1; Radović, Srećko: 23 (2nd hon. ment.); Sayman, Umut: 5; Shavyrin, Valery: 9 (1st pr.); Slesarenko, Anatoly: 22 (1st comm.); Štastný, Juraj: 19; Svítek, Miroslav: 17; Sygurov, Aleksandr: 11; Tomeo Amigo, Ivan Vladimír: 2; Velikhanov, Kenan: 10 (3rd hon. ment.); Yarosh, Leonid: 26; Zamanov, Vidadi: 18.

Kenan Velikhanov



#3

(9+10)

3. ehrende Erwähnung: Nr. 10

Der Autor möchte uns ein neues Thema präsentieren, bei dem in drei Phasen drei unterschiedliche weiße Steine als Erst-, Droh- und Mattzug auf demselben Feld (e7) agieren. Außerdem sieht man Funktionswechsel der weißen Themasteine auf anderen Feldern (z.B. Sd5 als Erst- und Mattzug, Sf6 und Te7 jeweils als Droh- und Mattzug). Im gesamten Geschehen sind die schwarzen Züge K:f4, L:f4 und f5 als schwarze Erst- und Zweitzüge zu sehen.

Der Gib-Nimm-Schlüssel gefällt mir ausgezeichnet, zumal 1...K:f4 im Satz durch 2.Dd4+ Kg3 3.Dg5# abgedeckt ist. Ebenso finde ich die Verführung 1.Th7? durch den abseitsstehenden Turm hervorragend. So exzellent diese Verführung ist, so sehr fällt 1.De7+? dagegen ab. Ein Schachgebot als vollwertige Verführung wirkt auf mich

wenig plausibel, zumal die Widerlegung auch recht trivial ist. Konstruktiv hervorragend ist die Einbindung von Th8 in beiden Varianten der Lösung, aber auch hier hätte ich mir nach 1...Kf5 2.De3 analog zum ersten Abspiel noch eine Verteidigung gegen die Drohung 3.Se7# gewünscht. Trotzdem gebührt der innovativen Idee meine Hochachtung.


1.De7+? K:f4 a 2.Tg8 [3.Tg4#] f5 3.Sd5# A, 1...Kd4!

1.Th7? [2.Te7+ B K:f4 a 3.Dd6#] K:f4 a 2.Dd4+ Kg3 3.Dg4#, 1...L:f4 b 2.Dd5+ K:e3 3.Dd3#, 1...Td1!

1.Sd5! A [2.S:f6+ C K:f4 a 3.Dg5#] f5 c 2.Th7 [3.Te7# B] L:f4 b 3.Sf6# C,

1...Kf5 2.De3 [3.Se7#] Kg6 3.Se7#

Anatoly Slesarenko



#3

(9+15)

1. Lob: Nr. 22

Die Doppeldrohung 3.Se3, Sb6# in der Variante 1...e3 2.D:e6 tritt in der Drohung nach dem Schlüssel und der Variante 1...Le3 als Zweitzüge in Einzelung auf, während beide Züge in der Variante 1...T:g4 zu Mattzügen werden und auch bei D:e6 ergibt sich eine Verschiebung der Zählstelle zwischen Mattzug der Drohung und Zweitzug einer Variante. Tiefgründig sind die Verteidigungen auf dem Drohfeld e3 angelegt. Der Schlüssel ist gut und insbesondere die Variante 1...e3 2.D:e6 der Höhepunkt des Problems.


1.Dd7! [2.Se3+ A T:e3/L:e3 3.D:e6# C/Dd3#],

1...Le3 2.Sb6+ B S:b6 3.Dd3#,

1...e3 2.D:e6! C [3.S:e3# A, Sb6# B] D:d5/e4+ 3.D:a6/Sf6#

1...T:g4 2.T:c3+! L:c3 3.Se3# A, 2...S:c3 3.Sb6# B

Zoltán Labai



#3

(10+8)

2. Lob: Nr. 7

Verführung und Lösung zeigen jeweils Reziprokwechsel der zweiten und dritten weißen Züge, wobei dieser noch einmal zwischen den beiden Drohungen bzw. beiden Themavarianten zu finden ist. Außerdem wechselt der Zug Td5 seine Funktion als Mattzug zu Zweitzug. Zwei Fernblockschädigungen werden harmonisch mit weißen diagonal und horizontal wirkenden Batterien verbunden. Ein schöner Klassiker!

1.S:f7? [2.Lc5+ A K:c4 3.Ld5# B] K:c4 2.Ld5+ B Kd4 3.Lc5# A

1...Ld6 2.S:d6 ~ 3.Td5# C, 1...f:e4!

1.Ld6! [2.Ld5 B [3.Sc6#] L:e5 3.Lc5# A] L:e5 2.Lc5+ A K:c4

3.Ld5# B,

1...Lf4 2.Td5+ C K:e4 3.T:d3#, 1...T:f6 2.Lc5+ A K:e5 3.Le3#

Ich gratuliere den ausgezeichneten Autoren und bin mir sehr sicher, dass wir das eine oder andere nicht ausgezeichnete Problem in anderen Preisberichten wiederfinden werden.

Moremovers

— Award by Kjell Widlert —


I received 27 entries on anonymous diagrams, a slightly lower number than could have been hoped for in a prestigious tourney like this. Also, the average quality wasn't dramatically high: there are a number of good problems, but few works that could be characterized as masterpieces. At the low end, there were some entries where White just keeps chasing the black K with checks until there is mate, without any strategical depth.

Some other entries that don't appear in the award are these: No. 2: The variations are very loosely connected; the recurrence of R and S moves to e4 at W2 and W3 looks more like coincidence than plan. No. 8: I see no connecting theme between the variations (which do show lively play of the pieces). No. 10: Unclear theme and several duals. No. 13: A simple setting of the Meerane theme, not original enough for a distinction. No. 16: A clear idea in the wS tempo-gain, but not enough originality for a distinction. No. 19: Valladao theme, but the thematic promotion occurs only in a short line. No. 23: The logic is simple (switchback manoeuvres to remove two black pieces) and the mate is far from a model. No. 27: Some testing indicates that the long main line may actually be dual-free, which is surprising and might have been worth a commendation. But all the captures in the initial play bring nothing of beauty; I would have preferred to remove the 12 first moves, leaving a #46 which is essentially a duel wQ+wB against the bK. If that means there has to be two black Qs in the diagram, then so be it.

Here is my award:

Marcin Banaszek

Gold medal



#10

C+ (9+12)


1st Prize: no. 18

In the main plan, a white R/B pendulum annihilates Rb4 and Sa3, preparing a forced en-passant capture that opens for a mate from c3. But this plan also opens Qa5-c3, so the black Q needs to be decoyed in a foreplan. This foreplan starts with a discreet P move on the opposite edge of the board, threatening an echo of the main plan with a forced ep-capture by Pf4. After 1...Qa7 the main plan works as expected, delayed by one move as Black has gained the new (but weak) defence Qd7. The most remarkable thing happens after 1...Rb3. From a logical standpoint, this is just a by-variation, prolonging the threat to the full 10 moves. But from an artistic standpoint, this is the most memorable line: White starts on the left flank, uses the ep capture from the main plan to close the line b3-g3 again, and then switches to the right flank to mate using the ep capture of

the threat. The fact that the setup is largely symmetric doesn't bother me when the play on the two flanks is so different. A very impressive performance.

1.Ld6+? Kd5 2.L:b4+ Ke5 3.Ld6+ Kd5 4.L:a3+ Ke5 5.Ld6+ Kd5 6.c4+ d:c3 ep 7.Lb4+ Ke5 8.L:c3+ D:c3! 1.h3! [2.Lf6+ Kf5 3.g4+ f:g3 e.p. 4.Lh4+ Ke5 5.L:g3#] **Da7 2.Ld6+ Kd5 3.L:b4+ Ke5 4.Ld6+ Kd5 5.L:a3+ Ke5 6.Ld6+ Kd5 7.c4+ d:c3 ep 8.Lb4+ Dd7 9.T:d7+ Ke5 10.L:c3#, 1...Tb3 2.Ld6+ Kd5 3.L:a3+ Ke5 4.Ld6+ Kd5 5.c4+ d:c3 ep 6.Le7+ Ke5 7.Lf6+ Kf5 8.g4+ f:g3 ep 9.Lh4+ Ke5 10.L:g3#**

Valery Shavryin
Silver medal



#4* C+ (10+8)


2nd Prize: no. 3

The move pairs Rf5+ & Sf7+ and Sc4+ & Lb8+ occur at move 2 in two variations, and at move 3 in two other variations. In contrast to no. 2 mentioned above, these repetitions are clearly intentional. The 2+2 variations (Adabashev synthesis) are connected by the effect that W2 forces a black self-block that is later used in the mate. The economy is exemplary: all white officers are fully active. The key moves Be4 out of an en-prise position, but this is just a minimal flaw as there is a full-length variation for 1...d×e4. This is a great fourmover.

1...d:e4 2.Sc4+ Kd5 3.Td6+ K:c4 4.Tc7#

1.Lg2! [2.Sc4? d:c4!, 2.f4+? g:f3!, 2.d4+? T:d4!] ~ **2.Tf5+ A e:f5 3.Sf7+ B Kf4 4.Le3#** (4...Kf5?), **1...L:a6 2.Sc4+ C d:c4 3.Lb8+ D Kd4 4.Td7#** (4...Kc5?), **1...g3 2.f4+ g:f4 3.Tf5+ A e:f5 4.Sf7# B** (4...Kf4?), **1...Te1 2.d4+ L:d4 3.Sc4+ C d:c4 4.Lb8# D** (4...Kd4?)

Zoran Gavrilovski
Bronze medal



#4 C+ (14+11)

3rd Prize: no. 9


Another Adabashev synthesis in a matrix that looks both familiar and completely natural, with its combination of the Brazil motif from h#2 (with Maslar theme mates) and Siers play from three- and more-movers. I just hope that no one has hit on the same combination before; a quick search didn't bring anything to light. Ra1 is essential for soundness; without it we would have duals 2.Bc1/Rd1 Sd2 3.B:d2/R:d2. The two tries aren't thematic, but it's nice to have two plausible options beside the real key.

1.Se2? [2.f7 [3.f8=D [4.Df3#] Sd2 4.Sc3#] & 2.g7 [3.g8=D(L) ~ 4.D:h7#] & 2.g:h7 [3.h8=D ~ 4.Dh7#]] 1...h:g6! x, 1.S:e6? [] Sf2!

1.Sf7! [2.Td1 [3.Sd6#] Sd2 3.Sd6+ A Kd4,Kd5 4.T:d2#]

h:g6 x 2.Lc1 [3.Sg5#] Sd2 3.Sg5+ B Kf4,Ke3 4.L:d2#, 1...Sf2 y 2.Sd6+ A Kd4,Kd5 3.Sf5+ Ke4 4.S:g3#, 1...Sb~ 2.Sg5+ B Ke3,Kf4 3.Sf3+ Ke4 4.S(:)d2#

Ralf Krätschmer



#14 C+ (11+12)

1st Honourable Mention: no. 24


The main plan mate 1.Lf8 (2.L:g7#) Kf6 2.Se4+ Ke5 3.Sg5+ Kf6 4.Sh7+ Ke5 5.L:g7+ Ke4 6.Sg5+ Ke3 7.Ld4+ is unsuccessful due to 7...c:d4! White can remove this obstacle with a wS pendulum (as actually happens in the solution), but initially this is prevented by Bb6's guard of c5 (and indirectly also d4). So we need two foreplans, an indirect one decoying Bb6 away, followed by a direct one to annihilate Pc5. The first one isn't as easy as it sounds: after 1.d:c7?, Black doesn't oblige by playing B:c7, but instead defends the single threat Se4# by h1=Q! (4...g6 doesn't work due to 5.Kf8.)

The solution is to start with another direct foreplan moving Sf2 to g5, with the not-so-common effect of adding another threat Sh7# ("Droh-zuwachs" in German) to d:c7. This forces B:c7, and everything then

works as planned. The final attack ends in a pin model. The wS pendulum play is attractive with 8 moves in all, passing over e4 three times. There is interesting logic in an almost flawless setting; only the passive pinner Re1 is to be regretted.

1.Lf8! (2.L:g7#) **Kf6 2.Se4+ Ke5 3.Sg5 Kf6 4.Le7+ Ke5 5.d:c7** (6.Ld6+ Kf6 7.Se4,Sh7#) **L:c7 6.Lf8 Kf6 7.Se4+ Ke5 8.S:c5 Kf6 9.Se4+ Ke5 10.Sg5 Kf6 11.Sh7+ Ke5 12.L:g7+ Ke4 13.Sg5+ Ke3 14.Ld4#**

Michael Herzberg



#12

C- (9+13)

2nd Honourable Mention: no. 24

The composer gives a great number of tries (see the full solution), some of which seem to have only a loose connection to the logic of the problem. I see it like this:


White's target is to conquer the weak point of Black's position, which surprisingly turns out to be b4. The best defender of b4 is Pc5, which is in turn defended by Pd6. White can remove these, one after the other, with a wS pendulum h7-g5-e4:d6-e4 followed by Se4:c5-e4. (1.Sg5! may look weak, giving up f6, but is in fact a strong attack due to the guard of e4.) When this is done, the wS can return to h7 and R or B can go to b4. The question is: exactly when should White go to b4 (in which position of the wS?), and who goes there first?

The answer is that the wB must play to b4 first, and that must happen when the bK is at f6 so that the strong Be7+ threatens. The final mate then comes with wRb4, bBd4 and wSh7-f6#. The composer claims this as a model, but that is a mistake: d4 is guarded also by Sc6. This is a pity, but no great flaw.

The pendulum logic isn't very complex, but the play around square b4 seems original.

1.Lg4+? Ke4 2.Sf6+ L:f6!; 1.Tb4? [2.Le4#,Lg4#] Ld4? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sf6#, 1...a:b4? 2.Sg5 and #12; 1...c4? 2.T:c4 and #4), but 1...c:b4! 1.Lb4? [2.Sg5 and #10] is too slow;
1.Tc3? [2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sf6#] L:c3? 2.L:c3 and #4, 1...S:c3? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sf6#, 1...S:d5? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sg5#, 1...Se8? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sg5+ K:d5 4.Lf3#, but 1...g:f2!
1.Lc3? [2.Se7#] S:c3? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sf6#, 1...S:d5? 2.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sg5#, but 1...L:c3!
1.Sg5! (2.Le4+/Lg4+ Kf6 3.S#) **Kf6 2.Se4+ Kf5** (2.Lc3+? S:c3? 3.Sh7+ Kf5 3.Lg4+ Ke4 3.Sf6#, but 2...L:c3!; 2.Tc3? (3.Sh7+ Kf5 4.Lg4+ Ke4 5.Sf6#) ... too slow!) **3.S:d6+ Kf6 4.Se4+ Kf5 5.S:c5** (6.Lg4+ Kf6 7.Se4#) **Kf6** (5...Sc3 6.Lg4+,L:c3 and #8) **6.Se4+ Kf5 7.Sg5 Kf6 8.Lb4!** (11.Le7+ Kf5 12.Le4,Lg4#) **a:b4** (8...S:d5 9.Lf8! and #11); 8.Tb4? (9.Se4+,Sh7+ Kf5 10.L#) 8...a:b4? 9.L:b4 S:d5 10.Lf8! and #12, but 8...S:d5!,Lf5!) **9.Sh7+ Kf5** (9.T:b4? S:d5!,Lf5!) **10.T:b4 Ld4** (12...Sd4) **11.Lg4+ Ke4 12.Sf6#**

Srećko Radović



#5


C+ (10+9)

3rd Honourable Mention: no. 11

In the two thematic variations, we see annihilation of the wB by sacrifices to the black K, so that the wQ can take over. The somewhat unusual full-length threat (with a wB/wQ Bristol manoeuvre that fits well with the annihilation manoeuvres) is a plus, the by-variation 1...d2 with another wB/wQ Bristol and a switchback mate is another plus, but the fact that the two thematic variations are very similar and end with the same mate is a minus.

1.Sc6! [2.Sg2 [3.Se3+ Kb3 4.Ld1#] d2 3.Se3+ Kd3 4.Le2+ Ke4,K:e3 5.Df3#, 2...Kd5 3.Lf3+ Kc4 4.Se3+ Kb3 5.Ld1#] **Kd5 2.Lf3+ Kc4 3.Ld5+ K:d5 4.Df3+ Kc4 5.D:d3#, 1...Kb3 2.Ld1+ Kc4 3.Lb3+ K:b3 4.Dd1+ Kc4 5.D:d3#, 1...d2 2.Le2+ Kb3 3.Ld1+ Kc4 4.De2+ Kd5 5.Se7#**

Aleksandr Kusovkov



#4


C+ (11+12)

4th Honourable Mention: no. 6

Threat and another two variations with a discovered check by the wK followed by a R/Q Bristol – a natural motif when the wK battery is doubled as is the case here. Another related variation 1...Sf7 involves a wK capture and lacks the Bristol motif, but is in other respects equally good as the thematic ones, with impressive activity by the wQ. However, a disadvantage of the matrix is that wSa1 is needed only in the variation K:e3.

1.Td2! [2.Kd6+ (2.Kf6+?) Kf5 3.Te5+ Kf6 4.De6#] **d:e3**
2.Kf6+ (2.Kd6+?) **K:f4 3.Te4+ Kg3 4.De5#, 1...K:e3 2.Kf5+**
 (2.Kf6+/Kd6+?) **K:d2 3.Te1 ~ /d3 4.De2/De3#, 1...Sf7 2.K:f7+ Kd5**
3.Tc7 [4.De6#] Kd6/Kc4 4.De5/T:d4#

Grigory Popov



#26

C- (7+10)


5th Honourable Mention: no. 26

To defend against a short threat, the bR can only try for perpetual check. The wK cannot capture the bR on the g file (as g:h1=Q+ would be devastating), but the wK can find shelter on h3 as g3 is defended by wRf3. In that position, Black has gained the defence 5...Ka5 (6.Ta3+ Ra4), so that White must renew the attack from above by 6.Rf8. This allows another almost-perpetual check in the opposite direction, where the wK finds shelter on h8 (due to the possibility R:g8) but which allows the new defence 11...Ka6 (12.Ra8+ Ra7). This far, the play is very clear and elegant, reminiscent of a number of Moritz Henneberger moremovers from the 1950s (where the checking bR cannot be captured for reasons of stalemate).

But the rest of the solution, with the bK being forced to the h file, is rather messy. I assume the composer built this finish in order to give wSh1 something active to do besides being a passive victim of a bP capture, which is indeed a nice and unexpected detail, but having more than half of the solution without any real thematic interest is too much.

1.Tf3! [2.Ta3#] **T:g7+ 2.Kh6 Tg6+ 3.Kh5 Tg5+ 4.Kh4 Tg4+ 5.Kh3 Ka5 6.Tf8 [7.Ta8#] Tg3+ 7.Kh4**
Tg4+ 8.Kh5 Tg5+ 9.Kh6 Tg6+ 10.Kh7 Tg7+ 11.Kh8 Ka6 12.Ta8+ Ta7 13.Tb8 [14.Ta2#] Tb7
14.Sb4+ Kb5 15.T:b7+ Kc4 16.Tc7+ Kd4 17.Td2+ Ke3 18.Td3+ Ke4 19.Sg3+ Kf4 20.Sh5+ Ke4
21.Th3+ T:b1 22.Sf6+ Kf4 23.Sd3+ Kf5 24.Tf3+ Kg5, Kg6 25.Tg7+ Kh6/Kh4 26.Th3/Tg4#

Ognian Dimitrov



#12

C- (9+11)

1st Commendation: no. 21


1.S:c7? e4! but not 1...f1=S 2.Se8 S:h2 3.Re4 4.Sg7#. The foreplan 1.Rg3 2.Rc3 cuts the line of bBa1 so that S:c7 can no longer be met by e4, but now 3...f1=S works as White has lost the possibility Re4. An experienced solver of pendulum problems might now expect a reverse manoeuvre to regain that move (4.Rg3 Kf4 5.Re3+), but that's an illusion as Sf1 guards g3. So what to do instead?

It turns out that 1...f1=S isn't a very strong defence, delaying but not stopping the white attack. White can allow 4.Se8 S:h2 as Se8 can take over the guard of f4 from h5. After 7.Rg3 Sf3, everything is ready for 8.Sg3+ Kf4 9.Sfh5# – if you ignore the tiny detail that the wR blocks g3. Luckily, its guard of g4 can be replaced with a second black selfblock if the bK is temporarily forced back to f4.

The logical structure is very simple: a two-move direct foreplan bringing Re3 to c3 prepares a long mainplan. But the activity of the white and black knights is elegant to see, ending in a nice 4-knights model mate.

1.Tg3! [2.Tg5#] **Kf4 2.Tc3+ Kf5 3.S:c7 [4.Se8 ~ 5.Sd6, Sg7#] f1=S 4.Se8 [5.Sd6, Sg7#] S:h2 5.Sg7+**
Kf4 6.S:h5+ Kf5 7.Tg3 [8.Tg5#] Sf3 8.Sg7+ Kf4 9.Tg4+ S:g4 10.Sh5+ Kf5 11.Sg3+ Kf4 12.Sh5#

Sven Trommler



#4

C+ (12+11)

2nd Commendation: no. 7

The essence of the construction is the focal position of Rd4, controlling d3 and f4 (and also g4, but that is outside of the focal matrix). When Black gives up the guard of c5 or f5 in order to open a line of defence for a black R, White can mate on that square after the bR has been forced away and the bK has been forced to d4. There is a non-systematic dual avoidance between the variations: 1...g:h5 2.f4+? T:f4 3.Sd3+ Kd4 4.Sf5+ T:f5! and 1...b5 2.Sd3+? T:d3 3.f4+ Kd4 4.Lc5+ K:c5! There is also good differentiation of three threatened mates after 1.d7 2.Sg4+ R:g4 3.d8=Q.

All this is very respectable. But how do we evaluate the three black rooks? They are all active in the thematic play; theoretically, Ra6 or Rh6 could be replaced by a bQ but that would most likely cause unsolvability.

1.Sg4+? T:g4! 1.Sd3+? T:d3!


1.d7! [2.Sg4+ T:g4 3.d8=D [4.Dd5# X, 4.Dd6# Y, 4.Lf6# Z]

3...b5 a,g:h5 b 4.Dd5# X; 3...T:g3 4.Dd6# Y; 3...Td4 4.Lf6# Z]

1...b5 a 2.f4+ A (2.Sd3+?) **T:f4 3.Sd3+ B Kd4 x 4.Lc5#**

1...g:h5 b 2.Sd3+ B (2.f4+?) **T:d3 3.f4+ A Kd4 x 4.Sf5#**

Aleksandr Feoktistov



#10

C- (7+10)

3rd Commendation: no. 17

The composer mentions “logical structure” and “Dresdner”, but I see none of that. Instead I see a subtle struggle between White and Black, where Black’s defending resources are overcome step by step (albeit without the New German kind of logic).

1.Sc2! opens the first rank for the wR. The best defence is 1...d5, preparing an escape via d7 for the bK. So instead of prematurely playing 2.Ra1 d6 3.Rh1 B:g4!, White must take the time to save the wS and guard d7 by 3.Sf6. This opens for a subtle defence by Black: 3...Bh3! and now neither 4.Rh1? Rd3! nor 4.Rg1? R:f2! Instead the bR must be decoyed by the unexpected 4.Sd4! R:d4, weakening the black control of the g and h files and allowing 5.Rg1 g4 6.Ra1 g3 7.Rh1 – decisive, as the bB can no longer be defended. Or 5...Bd7

6.R:g5 etc. The fact that the wR visits all four corners adds some value, but is really a simple effect.

1.Ta1? [2.Sc2,Sd3 ...] Tb2!

1.Sf6? T:f2! 2.Sg8 Th2! 3.Se7 Th7+!, 1...d5? 2.Ta1! Tb2 3.c5! ... #10

1.Sh6? [2.Kf8 ...] d5! 2.Sf5 d:c4! 3.Se7 d5!, 3.Sd6 T:d6


1.Sc2! [2.Ta1] **d5!** (1...T:c2? 2.Sh6! ... #9) **2.Ta1!** [3.Th1] **d6** (2.Sf6? d:c4! 3.Ta1 Td6! 4.Th1 T:f6!,

2.Sd4? T:d4!) **3.Sf6** [4.Th1] **Lh3!** (3.Th1? L:g4!) **4.Sd4** [5.Ta8+] **T:d4** (4.Th1? Td3, 4.Tg1? T:f2!

5.T:g5 Tg2!, 4.Sb4? Tb2!) **5.Tg1** [6.T:g5] **g4!** **6.Ta1 g3 7.Th1! Td1 8.T:h3 Th1 9.T:h1 Kc8 10.Th8#**

5...Ld7 6.T:g5 Le8+ (6.Th1? Le8+! 7.S:e8 Td1! 8.Th8 Th1!) **7.S:e8 Td1! 8.Sf6! Tg1** (8.Tg8? Tg1!)

9.T:g1 Kc8 10.Tg8#

Vidadi Zamadov

#5

C+ (12+10)


4th Commendation: no. 12

The point is in the unexpected castling mate, underlined by the thematic try (only 1.Bf3! allows that mate, not 1.Bh1?) and hidden first by the fact that Ra1 is active in the variation 1...Kf6, second by the presence of Pe2. Apart from this, I see no dramatic points in the play.

1.T1a4? [2.L:g5 ~ 3.Sd3#] Le7 2.T:d5+ e:d5 3.Sd3+ Ke6 4.Lf5+ Kf6 5.Ld4#, 3...Kf6 4.Ld4+ Ke6 5.Lf5#, but 1...Kf6!, 1.Lh1? f5!

1.Lf3! [2.Se4 ~ 3.Sd3#] Kf6 2.Se4+ Ke7 3.Ta7+ Sc7 4.T:c7+ Kd8 5.T1a8#, 3...Kd8 4.Td7+ Kc8 5.T1a8#,

1...f5 2.L:g5 Le7 3.Sd3+ Kd4 4.S:e2+ Kd3 5.0-0-0#

Boško Milošeski

#19

C- (7+9)

5th Commendation: no. 25

A repeated tempo-gaining manoeuvre: White has a free move every time the bK is at g7. Of course, White must use the opportunity to annihilate blocking black Ps. It's not entirely clear which passed white P then must play, but the clever little manoeuvre 9.Be4 10.Bd5+ opens all the gates for Pc3. The ensuing ending is trivial.

One has the feeling that there could be an anticipation of this matrix, but I haven't found anything. The wB roundtrips from f5, e6, d5, e4 don't impress me very much, and neither does the slow excelsior by Pc2 as the quick path 1.c2-c4?? isn't even playable.

1.c3! Kg8 2.Le6+ Kg7 3.L:d5 Kg6 4.Le4+ Kg7 5.Lf5 Kg8 6.Le6+ Kg7 7.L:c4 Kg6 8.Ld3+ Kg7 9.Le4 Kg8 10.Ld5+ Kg7 11.c4 Kg6

12.Le4+ Kg7 13.c5 Kg8 14.Ld5+ Kg7 15.c6 Kg6 16.Le4+ Kg7 17.c7 Kg8 18.c8=D+ Kg7 19.Df8#

Participants: Aunver, Indrek: 13; Banaszek, Marcin: 18 (1st pr.); Dimitrov, Ognian: 21 (1st comm.); Feoktistov, Aleksandr: 17 (3rd comm.); Gatti, Daniele: 1; Gavrilovski, Zoran: 9 (3rd pr.); Herzberg, Michael: 22 (2nd hon. ment.); Karmil, Ferhat: 20; Krätschmer, Ralf: 24 (1st hon. ment.); Kusovkov, Aleksandr: 6 (4th hon. ment.); Lybashevsky, Leonid: 8; Matyushin, Gennady: 19; Milošeski, Boško: 25 (5th comm.); Muljadi, Paul: 15; Murashov, Vasili: 5; Pankratiev, Aleksandr: 23; Popov, Grigory: 26 (5th hon. ment.); Quintero Occhiuzzi, Pablo: 14; Radović, Srećko: 11 (3rd hon. ment.); Samilo, Volodymyr: 10; Sayman, Umut: 4; Shavyrin, Valery: 3 (2nd pr.); Sygurov, Aleksandr: 2; Tang, Xyan: 27; Trommler, Sven: 7 (2nd comm.); Velikhanov, Kenan: 16; Zamadov, Vidadi: 12 (4th comm.).

Studies

— Preliminary award by Michal Hlinka —

Riaditeľ turnaja Torsten Linss mi na rozhodnutie v anonymnej forme poslal 43 štúdií. Zásielka bola v priemere na kvalitnej úrovni, avšak našli sa aj slabšie, respektíve nekorektné skladby.

Niektorí autori pracovali na vylepšení starších, už známych ideí. Sú to skladby (pozri súbor PGN):

Č. 7: napr. V. Kirilov, Badalov 55 – MT, 2017, alebo H. Lomer, National Zeitung 1935

Č. 12: L. Zoltán, Magyar Sakkélet 1958 alebo E. Pogosianc, Šachmaty v ZSSR. 1978

Č. 14: S. Rumjancev, Magyar Sakkélet 1980

Č. 21: V. Kondratiev, Československý šach 1989

Aj keď niektoré z týchto skladieb vylepšujú pôvodné myšlienky, v hodnotení som uprednostnil originálne myšlienky.

Nekorektné resp. málo kvalitné sú štúdie:

Č. 10: po prvom ťahu 1.e4 čierny nehrá autorom zamýšľané 1...J:e4??, ale má až 7 možností, ako vyhrať (napríklad 1...Vd3!, 1...Vd1!

Č. 28: slabá štúdia

Č. 39: slabá a viacnásobne nekorektná štúdia

Č. 40: biely vyhrá okrem 3.Sf6+! aj po 3.Sf4! čo autor uvádza ako pokus s tým, že po 3...K:f4 ... 6.Kh1! je to remíza. Určitý problém s touto pozíciou má počítač. Potrebuje dlhší čas, aby zistil, že po 7.D:g1+! to biely vyhrá.


Zároveň chcem poďakovať svojmu priateľovi Ľubošovi Kekelymu za pomoc pri overovaní pôvodnosti a korektnosti štúdií a za preklad predbežného výsledku do anglického jazyka.

Neľahko sa hodnotí turnaj, v ktorom je viac dobrých štúdií, ktoré by si zaslúžili získať vyznamenanie. Ja som uprednostnil štúdie podľa svojho vkusu, avšak niektoré mnou nevyznamenané sa môžu uplatniť aj v iných turnajoch.

Svoje hodnotenie predkladám nasledovne:

Michael Pasman

Gold medal



draw


(6+6)

1. cena: no. č. 23

Je to elegantná štúdia s jasným víťazstvom v súťaži. V schéme mereditky sa autorovi podaril husársky kúsok s nečakane bohatým obsahom. Autor skombinoval tri paty s väzbou kameňa s témou Nowotny, ktorá sa objavuje 3× v hlavnom riešení a 2× v tematických pokusoch. Spomenul som si na svoju štúdiu (pozri v súbore PGN), v ktorej sa určité fragmenty zhodujú. Samozrejme to nemá vplyv na originalitu novej štúdie.

1.e6! Sc4! 2.S:c4 c2+! 3.Kc1 g2! 4.Sd2+! Kc3 5.e7!! (Nowotny) 5...R:e7 6.Se4+! Kb3 7.Sc5+! Ka2 8.Tg1 Te2! 9.T:g2! Lh6+! 10.Ld2 (Nowotny decoyed) T:d2 11.Se4! Te2+ 12.Sd2! T:d2 13.f4! L:f4 14.T:d2 Kb3

Martin Minski
Silver medal




win (6+6)

2. cena: no. č. 24

Úvod začína pekne, biely „podloží“ jazdca, ktorý je nepriamo pokrytý. V ďalšej hre po 2...Kg8 biely môže pomstiť jazdca a po 3.Dd8+? získať vežu. Avšak k výhre to nestačí. Lebo v závere logického pokusu vzniká pozícia X - s bielym pešiakom na h6, ktorý prekáža ťahu Dh5+?? Je zrejme, že biely sa pešiaka musí zbaviť a pred vyšachovaním veže najskôr hrá silné 3.h7+!! Po 5.D:g5 sa zdá, že súper musí kapitulovať, ale ten ešte disponuje krásnou kombináciou s obeťou dámy a jazdca v nádeji zachrániť sa patom. Ale biely jeho pokus odrazí a čierny si musí nechať ukázať druhú pozíciu X po 9...Dd7 - bez pešiaka h6 a prehrá – už ide 10.Dh5+! Logická štúdia so živou hrou na oboch stranách.

1.Sg5+! T:g5 2.Dc7+ Kg8 3.h7+!! Kh8 4.Dd8+ K:h7 5.D:g5 D:d1+! 6.K:d1 Nc3+! 7.L:c3 e2+ 8.Kc2!! d1D+ 9.Kb2 Dd7 10.Dh5+! Kg8 11.Dg6+ Kf8 12.Lb4+

Pavel Arestov
Bronze medal




draw (3+5)

3. cena: no. č. 6

Materiálna prevaha čierneho je fiktívna, lebo prevaha dvoch jazdcov bez ďalšieho materiálu k výhre nestačí. A na to sa v obrane spolieha biely. V úvode vynúti presun čiernych jazdcov, ktorí v ďalšom budú umožňovať obrany patom. Taká situácia vzniká po 3...Jed5!, v ktorej začína sólová spanilá jazda bielej dámy. Všetky pokusy čierneho o výhru končia patom (po mnohých obetiach bielej dámy), respektíve pozičnou remízou. Darmo sa čierny kráľ snaží presúvať na rôzne polia, rozbiť pevnosť bieleho sa nepodarí.

1.e7! (1.D:b5? Sc4(Sd5)! 2.D:c4(D:d5) Sb6+ -+.) **1...Sb6+** (1...Dg7 2.D:b5=.) **2.Kd8 Dg5 3.D:b5! Sed5!** (3...D:b5 4.e8=D+ =; 3...Sbd5 4.De8+! Kf6 (4...Kf5 5.Df7+ Kg4 6.Kd7 Sf6+ 7.D:f6! D:f6 8.e8=D =) 5.Df8+ Ke6 6.Dg8+!! D:g8+ 7.e8=D+ =) **4.Db1+!** (4.De8+? Kf5! 5.Df7+ Kg4 -+; 4.Dd3+? Kh6! 5.Dh3+ Kg7 -+) **4...Kh6 5.Dh1+ Kg7 6.Da1+ Kf7 7.Df1+ Ke6 8.Df7+!!** (8.De2(De1)+? Kd6 -+.) **8...Kd6!** (8...K:f7=; 8...Ke5 9.Dh5!! D:h5 10.e8=D+ =.) **9.Dg7!!** (9.Dg6+? D:g6 10.e8=D Df6+ -+.) **9...Df4!** (9...D:g7 10.e8=S+! =; 9...Dh4 10.Dg6+ Ke5 11.Dh5+!! D:h5 12.e8=D+ =.) **10.Dg1!** (10.Dg6+? Kc5 11.Dc2+ Sc4 -+.) **10...Dh4** (10...S:e7 11.D:b6+ =; 10...Df6 11.Dg7! Df4 12.Dg1 – positional draw.) **11.Dg6+ Kc5 12.Dg1+ Kc4** (12...Kc6(Kb5) 13.De1!) **13.Df1+!** (13.Dc1+? Sc3! -+.) **13...Kb4 14.Db1+ Ka5 15.Da1+!** (15.Da2+? Kb5 -+.) **15...Kb5** (15...Kb4 16.Db1+ Kc4 17.Df1+ - positional draw.) **16.De1!! 16...Dg5** (16...D:e1 17.e8=D+ =; 16...Df6 17.De5(De6) D:D 18.e8=D+ =.) **17.De5!! D:e5** (17...Dh4 18.De1(De4)! =.) **18.e8=D+ D:e8+ 19.K:e8**, draw.

Volodymyr Samilo



win


(4+3)

4. cena: no. č. 3

Vežová štúdia a miniatúra. Uplatniť slabého a-pešiaka nie je jednoduché, ale podarí sa to po presnej hre s niekoľkými pokusmi, ktorým sa treba vyhnúť. Pekne je vyvrátený pokus po 4.Ve7? a štúdia v štúdiu vznikne po 9...Kf1 10.Ve4!, ale nie 10.Vh2?! a čierny sa zaujímavým spôsobom zachráni. Skladba zrejme má aj teoretickú hodnotu pre vežové koncovky.

1.Tb7! (try 1.g6?! e5 2.Tb5! Te8 3.g7 e4 4.Te5! T:e5 5.g8=D+.-, but 1...Tg8! 2.Tg2 e5 3.Kb2 e4=) **1...Te8 2.g6** (2.Kb2? e5! 3.g6 e4 4.g7 e3 5.Te7 Tb8+ 6.Kc3 e2! (6...Tc8+? 7. Kd3!+.-) 7.Kd3 Td8+=) **2...e5 3.g7 Tg8!** (3...e4 4.Te7!+.-, not 4.Tb4? e3! 5.Te4 T:e4! 6.g8=D e2 7.Dg2 Tf4! 8.Dg3+ Kd1!= (8...Tf2? 9.Dh4! zz 9...Kf1 10.Dh1#) **4.Kb2!** (try 4.Te7? Kd2! 5.Kb2 e4 6.Td7+ Ke1! 7.Te7 Kd2= positional draw) **4...e4 5.Kc3!** (5.Te7? Kd2! 6.T:e4 T:g7=) **5...e3 6.Kd3 e2! 7.Tb2!** – return, **7...T:g7** (7...Td8+ 8.Ke3 Te8+ 9.Kf3+.-) **8.T:e2+ Kd1** (9...Kf1 10.Te4!+.-, try 10.Th2? Ta7! 11.Kc4 Ta8! 12.Kb5 Tb8+ 13.Ka5 Ta8+ 14.Kb6!? Kg1! 15.Tc2 Kf1! 16.Th2 Kg1= positional draw) **9.Te4!! Kc1 10.Kc3** (10.a4? Kb2 11.Kc4 Ka3=) **10...Kb1 11.a4!** (11.a3? Ka2=) **11...Ka2 12.Kb4! Tb7+ 13.Kc5** (13.Ka5? Kb3=) **13... Kb3 14.a5 +.-**

Jan Timman



win


(9+7)

5. cena: no. č. 37

Po úvode a 5.V5g2 čierny má peknú obranu 5...Vg3! a čo ďalej? Nájsť správnu cestu k výhre nie je jednoduché, nasleduje ďaleko predvídavý ťah! Jeho úmyslom je uvoľniť pole c4 pre šach na tomto poli bielou dámou – 6.d6! Do slepej uličky dovedie 6.Dh3?, respektíve aj 7.Dh3? pre Vf7! 6...c:d6 7.a4! Nešlo prehodiť ťahy 6.a4? pre 6...Vh7!. Ale nie 6...b:a4? 7.d7! Teraz po 7...b:a4 už vychádza 8.Dh3+! Určite sa tu zapáčia krížové väzby v boji všetkých ťažkých figúr s pútavým obsahom. Hoci nájsť ideu, že ide o pole c4, bez pomoci počítača nie je jednoduché.

1.f6! [1.Lh5 D:b2= (or 1...Te7=)] **1...De4+ 2.Lf3! D:f3+ 3.Tbg2 Df1+ 4.Tg1 Df3+ 5.T5g2 Tg3!** [5...Tg4 6.Dh5+–] **6.d6!** [Try: 6.Dh3 Tf7! 7.f7+ K:f7 8.D:d7+ Kf8 9.Dd8+ Kf7 10.Dd7+ Kf8 11.Dc8+ Kf7 12.D:c7+ Kf8= (or 12...Kg8=) ; 6.a4 Th7 7.De3 D:e3 8.T:g3+ D:g3 9.T:g3+ Kf7 10.a:b5 K:f6 11.d6 c6= (or 11...c5=) ; 6.h:g3 Th7=] **6...c:d6** [6...c5 7.Dh3! Tf7! 8.f7+ K:f7 9.D:d7+ Kf6 10.Dd8+ Ke5 11.Te1+ Kd4 12.h:g3+–] **7.a4!** [Try: 7.Dh3 Tf7! 8.f7+ K:f7 9.D:d7+ Kf8 10.D:d6+ Kf7 11.Dc7+ Kf8 12.Dc8+ Kf7=] **7...b:a4** [Main- 7...Th7 8.De3! D:e3 9.T:g3+ D:g3 10.T:g3+ Kf7 11.a:b5 Th4 12.Tb3+–; 7...T:f6 8.D:f6 D:f6 9.T:g3+ Kf7 10.Tg7+ D:g7 11.T:g7+ K:g7 12.a:b5+–] **8.Dh3! Tf7! 9.f7+! K:f7 10.D:d7+ Kf8** [10...Kg8 11.De8+ Kh7 12.h:g3+–] **11.D:d6+ Kf7 12.Dc7+** [or- 12.Dd7+] **12...Kf8** [12...Kf6 13.Db6+ Kf7 14.Df2!+–] **13.Dc8+ Kf7 14.Dc4+** [The point of the 7th move: the square c4 has become available.] **14...Kf8 15.Tf1**

Jan Sprenger



win


(5+5)

1. čestné uznanie: no. č. 15

Čierny hrozí postupom c-pešiaka, preto biely obetuje strelca 1.Sa4+!, aby dostal kráľa na okraj šachovnice, čo umožní vytvárať matové hrozby. Avšak čierny hrá silné 2...d5+!, čo mu umožní aktívnu obranu. Potom biely pokračuje 4.g5!, ale nie 4.g:f5?, čo k výhre nestačí. Po ďalšej zaujímavej hre a 7...Ka3 stojí biely pred dôležitým rozhodnutím. K výhre nestačí pokus 8.Vg1? alebo 8.Vf1? – matový útok zmarí prítomnosť čierneho f-pešiaka. Avšak po presnom ťahu 8.Vh1!! obrana čierneho zaniká a biely už svoju misiu úspešne dokončí po 9.Vh3+! (ale nie 9.Vh6?), respektíve po 12.Vh4!! (ale nie Vc6?), kde súboj končí po 14.Db3+.

1.La4+! K:a4 2.Tb7 d5+! 3.Ka7 Da2 4.g5! d4! 5.g6 c2 6.Tc1! d3 7.g7 Ka3 8.Th1!! d2 9.Th3+! d2 9.Th3+! Dc4 11.g8D c1D 12.Th4!! f4 13.T:f4 D:f4 14.Qb3+

Sergei Migunov



win


(5+4)

2. čestné uznanie: no. č. 13

Biely má pešiaka viac, ale jeho šance na výhru bude ohrozovať čierneho voľný pešiak. Už prvý ťah je rozhodujúci. Ľahko sa dá pomýliť a hrať zdanlivo rovnocenné 1.Ke3?, ale tu sa čierny zachráni. V ďalšej hre biely (prirodzene) postupuje pešiakmi, o postup sa snaží aj čierny a-pešiak. Po 4...a3, čo je najlepšia šanca na záchranu, biely pokračuje presne 5.Sa1!, po 5.Sc3? biely stráca tempo a nevyhrá. V ďalšej presnej a zaujímavej hre po 8.h5 čierny hrá vynaliezavo 8...Sf8! Biely má na výber, avšak len jeden ťah je správny. Výhra uniká po 9.Ke4?, 9.Kf4? alebo 9.g5? Situáciu rieši ťah 9.Ke3!, ktorý len remizoval v úvode 1.Ke3? Poslednú šancu čierneho biely zlomí po 11.g5!, lebo už má pripravené 15.Sd4! a 18.De7 mat. Zaujímavý, ale analyticky pomerne zložitý súboj S+3P proti S+2P.

1.Kf3! Kd5 2.g4 a4! 3.h4 4.Lb2 a3 5.La1! Ke6! 6.f5+! Kd5! 7.f6! Ke6 8.h5 Lf8! 9.Ke3! Kf7 10.Ke4 Lc5 11.g5! h:g5 12.Kf5 g4 13.h6 g3 14.h7 g2 15.Ld4! L:d4 16.h8=D g1=D 17.Dh7+ Ke8 18.De7#

Sergey Osintsev



win


(8+6)

3. čestné uznanie: no. č. 34

Po 1.d:e7 si biely ešte navýši materiálnu prevahu, ale čierny sa chopí iniciatívy a hrá najsilnejší ťah 1...Sc7+! (slabšie je 1...Vb4+, lebo strelec ostane napadnutý, aby po 2.Ka7 obetoval strelca 2...Sb8+! s úmyslom vytlačiť bieleho kráľa na okraj šachovnice a po 4...Kc7 pohroziť matom. Materiálna prevaha bieleho je už značná a je zrejmé, že ak mat odrazí, vyhrá. Nasleduje 5.c6! Hrozilo 5...Va2 alebo Vb7+. Po 5...S:c6 6.e8=J+! inak by dostal mat. Po ďalších samozrejmych ťahoch a 8...Sd7 čierny znovu hrozí matom, ktorý súper musí odraziť obeťou veže, iba tak nepríde o výhru. Hra pokračuje ťahmi 9.Vc8+! K:c8. Tu len zdanlivo biely prišiel o materiálnu výhodu – všetko je už pripravené. Biely preberá iniciatívu a vyhrá dvomi vidličkami v závere 11.Jc6+ a 15.Jc6+.

1.d:e7 Lc7+! 2.Ka7 Lb8+! 3.K:b8 Tb4+! 4.Ka7 Kc7 5.c6! L:c6 6.e8=S+! L:e8 7.Tc1+ Kd8 8.Td3+ Ld7 9.Tc8+!! K:c8 10.Se7+ Kd8 11.Sc6+ Kc8 12.S:b4 Tf4 13.Sg6! T:b4 14.Se7+ Kd8 15.Sc6+ Kc7 16.S:b4

Ivan Bondar



win


(4+4)

4. čestné uznanie: no. č. 9

Zábavná štúdia, ktorá by sa určite zapáčila aj riešiteľovi. Čierny sa bráni obeťou oboch strelcov, aby si vytvoril šance na pat. Ale biely je obozretný a odrazí všetky nástrahy a v závere aj on nezostane čiernemu nič dlžný a rovnako obetuje dve figúry (6.Vb3+! a 7.Se4!), ktoré mu nechutia a neprijme ich. A nakoniec biely pridá ešte jednu obeť 10.Va3+! a súboj ukončí echovou vidličkou.

1.Tf2! Ld1+! (1...b1=D 2.Tf8+! Kb7 3.Tb8+ Kc7 4.T:b1 L:c6 5.L:c6 K:c6 6.Tc1+; 1...Kb7 2.Se7+! Ka6 3.Le4!+-) **2.Kg5!** (2.Kh6? Lf3! 3.T:f3 Lg7+! 4.K:g7 b1=D 5.Ta3+ Kb7 6.Tb3+ Ka8 7.Le4 Dg1+!=) **2...Lf3! 3.T:f3 Lf6+ 4.K:f6!** (4.T:f6? b1=D 5.Tf8+ Kb7 6.Tb8+ Ka6 7.T:b1=) **4...b1=D 5.Ta3+ Kb7 6.Tb3+! Ka8! 7.Le4! Df1+ 8.Lf3! Da1+ 9.Sd4+!** (9.Ke6? Df6+! 10.K:f6=) **9...Ka7 10.Ta3+! D:a3 11.Sb5+!+-**

Gennady Matyushin



draw

(6+6)

5. čestné uznanie: no. č. 22


Pozícia bieleho sa zdá byť stratená, hrozí Va5+ a b:a3). Napriek tomu existuje záchrana v podobe peknej vstupnej hry na oboch stranách. Čierny príleje olej do ohňa ťahom 2...Dh1+! a po 3.V:h1! b:a3 skúša šance na výhru vo dvoch variantoch. A) Pokus o výhru po 5...Va4! zmarí silné 9.Ka3! a 11.De5+!, čo by po 11...D:e5 viedlo k patu. Čierny sa patu môže vyhnúť, ale už nezabrání večnému šachu. Zaujme aj variant B) 5...Kf8!, v ktorom je použitý Rétiho manéver po 12.Ke5! Slogan Všetky vežové koncovky sú remízové sa tu naplnil.

1.Sd4! T:d4+ 2.Kh2 Dh1+! Sacrifice in the corner to distract White as much as possible. **3.T:h1! b:a3 4.h5** (4.Tg1? Ta4! 5.h5 Ta5) **4...a2 5. Tg1!**

Main line 1: **5...Ta4! 6.h6 Ta6 7.h7 Th6+ 8.Kg2 Tg6+ 9.Kf3! T:g1 10.h8=D a1=D 11.De5+! Kf7** (11...D:e5 – stalemate) **12.Dd5+! Kg6 13.De4+!** (13. De6+? Df6!) **13...Kh6 14.De6+!** (14.D:f4+? Tg5) **14...Tg6 15.Dh3+ Kg7 16.Dd7+ Kf6 17.Dd6+ Kf5 18.D:f4+ Ke6 19.Dc4+!** (Diagonal checks from white squares don't allow the help of the 'black-squared' Queen.) **19...Kf6 20.Df4+ Kg7 21.Dc7+ Kh6 22.Dh2+ Kg7 23.Dc7+!=**

Main line 2: **5... Kf8!** To prevent the white rook from being activated. **6.h6 Td7! 7.Kh3! Tb7 8.Ta1** (8.f3? Tb1) **8...Tb2 9.f3!** (the bypass maneuver 7.Kh3 saved a pawn.) **9...Kf7 10.Kg4 Kg6 11.K:f4 a5 12.Ke5** (Reti) **12...a4** (12...K:h6 13.Kf6) **13.f4!** Now the pawn saves the King. **13...Te2+ 14.Kd4 K:h6 15.Kc3!=**

Serhiy Didukh




draw

(11+12)

Zvláštne čestné uznanie: no. č. 43

Romantická štúdia s kráľom v šachu, ktorý je z časti ospravedlnený tým, že je tam pokus 1.Kh4!?, ktorý autor neuvádza. Po zaujímavej hre čierny chytí a dobyje bielu vežu, avšak aby to dosiahol musí si zamurovať strelca. Podobné zamurovanie vykoná aj biely (počas hry, kde je čierny zaneprázdnený odchytom veže) a na šachovnici sa objaví pat ešte aj so zamurovaním kráľa.

1.Kg4! Kf7 2.Sf8 c:b4 3.Ld2! L:a5 4.T:d6 Kxe7 5.Td5! b6 6.S:h7 Ke6! 7.Tb5 a6 8.Sf8+! T:f8 9.Le1! a:b5 10.Lh4! Td8 11.h3! Td3 12.g3 Td4 13.e:d4 Kd5 14.d:e5 K:e5

Bogusz Piliczewski


win

(4+3)

Zvláštne čestné uznanie: no. č. 5

Niektoré fragmenty štúdie sú už dávno známe, napríklad E. Cook 1927, P. Henacker 1942. V minulosti bez existencie databáz nebolo možné analyticky zvládnuť náročnosť analýz, ktoré predstavuje táto štúdia, v ktorej sa podarilo spracovať až niekoľko vzájomných zugzwangov.

1.Kg3! Nc3 2.Ng5! Kg1 3.Sf3+ Kh1 4.Kg1 5.Lh3! Se2+ 6.S:e2+ L:e2 7.Lg2 Ld1 8.Se4! Le2 9.Sf2! Lg4! 10.Sd3! Lh5! 11. Sf4! Lg4 12.K:g4

M. Pastalaka


win

(4+4)

Pochvalná zmienka: no. č. 8

Príčinou prehry čierneho je zatúlaný jazdec, ktorý sa neskoro dostane do hry. Biely stavia na vzdialeného h-pešiaka, ale musí hrať presne 2.h5, nestačí pokus 2.Vf3+? pre nečakané vyvrátenie 2...Kc2!!, lebo čierny včas dostane jazdca do hry. Ďalej zaujme 4.Vg6!, ale nie Vg7? len s remízou, ale tento ťah sa uplatní po 4...Kb4 namiesto 4...Kd4. Po 5.Va6 čierny stráca figúru a biely presadí voľného pešiaka a vyhrá.

1.f5! g:f5 2.h5 f4! 3.Tg2! Lh7 4.Tg6! Kd4 5.Ta6 Sc7 6.Ta7 Sd5 7.T:h7 Sf6 8.Th8 Ke4! 9.h6 Kf5 10.Tg8! S:g8 11.h7

Anatoly Skripnik

draw

(7+5)


Pochvalná zmienka: no. č. 27

Po úvode sa biely spolieha na premenu posledného pešiaka a hrá 3.a:b7, čierny reaguje nepríjemným ťahom 3...Sd8+! a v ďalšom si biely nesmie hneď premeniť pešiaka na dámu, ale najskôr hrá 5.Vb3+!, aby sa čierna dáma dostala do väzby. V ďalšom už biely pokračuje podľa plánu 8.Je7!, ale nie 8.Ka8?, lebo po 9...Ve8! vo vzájomnom zugzwangu by sa ocitol biely a prehral by. Ale teraz po 9...Ve8 10.Db6! ťahať musí čierny. Po a) 10...D:b6 je pat s väzbou jazdca, alebo b) 10...Ka3! 11.Df6! – tu síce čierny môže získať jazdca, ale večnému šachu sa nevyhne.

1.Lf8+ Kb2 2.Tb4+ (2.a:b7? D:c4 3.b8=D T:c3+) 2...K:c3 3.a:b7 Ld8+! (3...Ld4+ 4.T:d4 K:d4 5.Lc5+ Kd5 6.Se7+=, 3...Le5 4.Ld6 Df2+ 5.Kc6 Df3+ 6.Kb6 L:d6 7.S:d6 T:g8 8.Tc4+ Kd3 9.Tc8=)

4.S:d8 D:f8 5.Tb3+ K:b3 6.b8=D Db4+ 7.Ka7 Tg7+ 8.Se7! (thematic try: 8.Ka8? T:g8 9.Db6 Te8 zz 10.Dc7 Th8 11.Df7+ Dc4 12.Df3+ Kb4 13.Db7+ Ka3 14.De7+ Db4 15.Dc7 Dd4+) 8...T:e7+ 9.Ka8 Te8 10.Db6 ZZ a) D:b6 stalemate with pin=, 10...Ka3! 11.Df6! Da5+ 12.Kb7 a1) T:d8 13.Da1+ Kb4 14.De1+ Kb5 15.De5+ Ka4 16.Da1+ pos. draw=, a2) 12...D:d8 13.Dc3+ Ka4 14.Dc4+ Ka5 15.Dc5+ pos. draw =)

Andrzej Jasik



win

(8+4)

Pochvalná zmienka: no. č. 29

Pekný úvod a silná trojka ľahkých figúr zaútočí na kráľa v rohu. Po 3.e6! už je čierny v agónii a musí si bez odporu nechať ukázať mat s aktívnym blokováním troch polí.

1.e7! (1.e:d7? Db8+ 2.Kc2 Db4=) **1...Lb4!** **2.e8=D+!** (2.c7+? Da3+ 3.Kc2 Dc3+ 4.Kb1 Db3+ =; 2.Kb1? L:e7 3.S:e7 Da4 4.c7 Db4+ 5.Kc2 Dc4+ 6.Kd1 Df1+ 7.Kc2 Db4+ =) **2...D:e8** **3.e6!** (3.c7? Da8 4.e6 Da3+ 5.Kc2 Dc3+ 6.Kb1 Db3+ =) **3...d:e6** (3...Da8 4.Le5+ Kg8 5.Sh6+ Kf8 6.Sh7+Ke7 7.Sf5+ Kd8 8.Lf6+ Kc7 9.c:d7 Da3+ 10.Kc2 Da2+ 11.Kd3 Db3+ 12.Ke4 Dc2+ 13.Kf4 Ld2+ 14.Se3 +-, 3...Kg8 4.Le5 Lf8 5.Se4 Da8 6.Sf6+Kh8 7.S:d7+ +-) **4.Le5+** (4.S:e6 Da8 =) **4...Kg8** **5.Sh6+ Kf8** **6.Sh7+** (6.Sxr6+? Ke7 7.Sf5+ Kf7 8.c7 Da8 9.Sd6+ L:d6 10.L:d6 D:d5 11.c8=D D:d6 =) **6...Ke7** **7.d6+!** **L:d6**

(7...Kd8 8.Lf6+ Kc8 9.d7+ +-) **8.Lf6#**

Participants: Abad González, José Miguel: 28; Afek, Yochanan: 21; Aliev, Ilham: 31; Arestov, Pavel: 6 (3rd pr.); Avedisian, Alexander: 18; Avni, Amatazia: 11; Baslov, Yuri: 14; Bondar, Ivan: 9 (4th hon. ment.); Didukh, Serhiy: 43 (spec. hon. ment.); Dimitrov, Ognian: 20; Eilazyan, Eduard: 26; Gasparyan, Alexey: 36; Gatti, Daniele: 33; González, Luis Miguel: 30; Hlebec, Darko: 32; Jasik, Andrzej: 29 (comm.); Karmil, Ferhat: 1; Kuzmichev, Vladimir: 40; Matyushin, Gennady: 22 (5th hon. ment.); Migunov, Sergei: 13 (2nd hon. ment.); Minski, Martin: 24 (2nd pr.); Muljadi, Paul: 39; Murashov, Vasili: 4; Nielsen, Steffen: 42; Nosek, Stanislav: 7; Occhiuzzi Quintero, Pablo: 38; Osintsev, Sergey: 34 (3rd hon. ment.); Pallier, Alain: 17; Pasman, Michael: 23 (1st pr.); Pastalaka, M.: 8 (comm.); Pervakov, Oleg: 35; Piliczewski, Bogusz: 5 (spec. hon. ment.); Samilo, Volodymir: 3 (4th pr.); Sayman, Umut: 2; Skripnik, Anatoly: 27 (comm.); Sprenger, Jan: 15 (1st hon. men.); Tarasiuk, Vladislav: 25; Timman, Jan: 37 (5th pr.); Tomeo Amigo, Ivan Vladimir: 16; Valitov, Ilshat: 12; Velikhanov, Kenan: 10; Vorovich, Arkadyj: 41; Zamanov, Vidadi: 19.

Helpmates

— Award by Dmitri Turevski —

I received 50 anonymized and neatly presented helpmates from the tournament director, Torsten Linß, arranged first by the number of moves and then by the number of pieces. I later had the pleasure of meeting Torsten in London this summer. Thank you again, Torsten – well done, and thank you for inviting me to judge this prestigious competition, it was much appreciated.


As expected, the overall standard of the entries was very high, setting the bar from the outset. For the final award, I selected 19 problems. I am confident, however, that many of the others fully deserve publication and would fare well in other tournaments. Analyzing all of the submissions was a truly enjoyable experience.

Ranking the very best proved more challenging – not only because I had to compare helpmates of different lengths, but also because the selected problems were all of excellent quality, demonstrating superb technical skill and tackling some of the most demanding ideas. The difficulty lay in the fact that many of these ideas, while brilliantly executed, are already known in some form. In the end, I chose to give extra weight to originality. After the claims stage, entry 18 – initially the 3rd Prize – was downgraded to Special Commendation because of the predecessor (Annex K); entries 34, 4 and 39 were upgraded accordingly.

But let the readers judge for themselves.

Emil Klemanič

Gold medal



h#2.5 4;1.1;1.1 (10+14)

1st Prize: no. 13

The lucky number thirteen. I do not recall seeing anything quite like this before. Could this be the “Helpmate of the Future” as originally envisioned? Here, the pairs of solutions are not merely loosely related – they form an inseparable whole with two cyclic shifts of the white moves. Hats off to the composer, this is a helpmate to remember.

1...D:c5+ A 2.K:c5 L:c1 B 3.D:a3+ a L:a3# C


1...D:d5+ D 2.K:d5 T:a2 E 3.L:d2+ b T:d2# F

1...L:c1 B 2.D:a3+ a L:a3 C 3.Td7 D:c5# A

1...T:a2 E 2.L:d2+ b T:d2 F 3.Tee7 D:d5# D

Evgeny Gavryliv

Silver medal



h#2 4.1;1.1 (8+13)

2nd Prize: no. 9

The best twomover of the tournament. A magnificent HOTF with both pairs saturated with rich helpmate strategy: line/gate openings, hideaways, Bristols, Pelle moves, switchbacks, and an obligatory Zilahi – all with very strong white force.


1.e:f5 De7 2.D:f3 (2.D~?) T:d4#,

1.c:d6 D:a7 2.Td5 (2.T~?) L:e4#,

1.D:f5 D:g6 2.De4 D:e4#,

1.T:d6 Dd7 2.Td4 D:d4#

Nikola Petković
Bronze medal




h#4 2.1;... (4+12)

3rd Prize: no. 34

An excellent matrix with two bicolour Bristols in each solution and model mates. Strict and beautiful, like Salisbury Cathedral, and essentially flawless. I can easily imagine this problem winning 1st Prize in another tournament.

1.Sd3 c3 2.Tf5 T:f5+ 3.Ke3 T:f2 4.Ld4 L:d4#
 1.Se6 c4 2.Le3 L:e3+ 3.Ke5 L:g5 4.Td5 T:d5#

Fadil Abdurahmanović




h#2 5.1;1.1 (4+10)

4th Prize: no. 4

Double white AUV without twins and without move repetition – a solid improvement on the famous Annex A – and there is also a pawn Zilahi, a combination that naturally calls for five solutions! A pity that the white play in the B/S pair is symmetrical.

1.Sfd6 f8=T 2.Ke7 d:e8=D#
 1.Lh4 d:e8=L 2.Lf6 f8=S#
 1.g5 f:e8=L 2.Tf6 d8=S#
 1.K:f7 d:e8=T 2.Le6 Tf8#
 1.K:d7 Ld6 2.Kc8 f:e8=D#

Oleksandr Semenenko




h#5 (3+6)

5th Prize: no. 39

Reciprocal Maslar is known from Annex B. Here, with three fewer pieces and 4.B:f4+ as a real check – a very nice touch – the result is excellent, complete with a model mate (in a corner, but still). Undoubtedly a prize-worthy composition.

1.Lg5 Le4 2.Lg2 f4 3.Kh1 Ke3 4.L:f4+ Kf2 5.Lh2 L:g2#

Viktoras Paliulionis




h#5 b) ♖e4→g2 (3+11)

1st Honourable Mention: no. 41

A brilliant hideaway sacrifice, Ba1-h8. The unique try shows that sacrificing the offending bishop on c3 falls short by just one white tempo. The twin features a somewhat paradoxical return of the wK to e4, which must be delayed until the black pieces are rearranged – although, as the author notes, it is not strictly necessary.

a) 1.Db5 Kf5! 2.Kb4 Kg6! 3.Ta3 Kh7! 4.Lh8 K:h8 5.Sb3 c3#,
 try: 1.Db3? c:b3 2.Kb4 b:c4 3.Ta3 ... 4.Sb3 Kd3 5.Lc3 d:c3#,
 b) 1.Tb3 c:b3 2.c3 b:a4 3.Kb3 Kf3 4.Kc4 Ke4 5.Sb3 d3#

Jorge Joaquin Lois




h#3 3.1;... (7+11)

- 1.Kd4 Sc1 **A** (Sb4?, Sc3?) 2.K:d5 Sa2 3.Td4 Sb4# **B**
 1.Ke2 Sb4 **B** (Sc3?, Sc1?) 2.Sd3 Sa2 3.Le1 Sc3# **C**
 1.L:f3 Sc3 **C** (Sc1?, Sb4?) 2.Ld1 Sa2 3.Ke2 Sc1# **A**

2nd Honourable Mention: no. 19

White must lose two tempi while Black constructs the cage. Each of the three possible wS moves invalidates two of Black's possible plans in slightly different ways, resulting in a nice cyclic dual avoidance (a similar mechanism can be seen in Annex C). It is then intriguing to observe why only the switchback route works for the wS: Sc1-d4 closes bR, Sc3-e2 doesn't work because e2 is needed for the bK and Sb4-d6 is simply blocked by the wP. These subtle differences in motivation, together with the repetition of Ke2 position, prevent a higher placing for this very fine problem, which also displays solid formal content – a cycle of white moves and a cyclic form of the Zalokotsky theme.

Valery Gurov




h#3 2.1;1.1;1.1 (9+11)

3rd Honourable Mention: no. 25

Individually, all the ideas (hideaway, Kniest, Zilahi) are well known, but the blend here feels original and is very well executed.

- 1.Db8 T:d5+ (L:c5+?) 2.K:d5 b3 3.T:c6 L:c6#,
 1.Tb8 L:c5+ (T:d5+?) 2.K:c5 b:a3 3.L:c6 T:c6#

Daniel Novomesky




h#8 (2+6)

4th Honourable Mention: no. 48

An excellent subtly motivated four-move manoeuvre by the wB, reminiscent of many fine classic problems.

- 1.Lh4 (1.Tf7?) Lg3 2.Tf7 Lf4 3.Tg8 (3.Lf6?) Ke2 (Lg5?) 4.Lf6 Lg5
 5.Kd6 Kf3 6.Ke7 Kg4 7.Kf8 Kh5 8.Kg7 Lh6#

Anatoly Skripnik




h#3 b) –♙d1 (10+11)
c) ♖a2 → b4, d) ♖a2 → e5

5th Honourable Mention: no. 28

very good HOTF with clever strategy, showing the Brasil motif in one pair of twins and a closely related idea of the wS travelling to e1 in the other. Depending on the chosen strategy, the order of the black moves is reversed – a very neat effect. The heavy setting and somewhat clumsy twin (-bRd1) are probably unavoidable.

- a) 1.Td1-d2 A Sc6-e5+ 2.Kd3:e3 B Se5-f3+ 3.Ke3-d3 C Sf3-e1#
- b) 1.Lf1-e2 D Sc6-b4+ 2.Kd3:c3 E Sb4:c2+ 3.Kc3-d3 F Sc2-e1#
- c) 1.Kd3:c3 E b4-b5+ 2.Kc3-d3 F La5-e1 3.Lf1-e2 D Sc6-b4#
- d) 1.Kd3:e3 B e5:d6+ 2.Ke3-d3 C Te7-e1 3.Td1-d2 A Sc6-e5#

Valery Semenenko




h#4 3.1;... (7+10)

6th Honourable Mention: no. 35

An impressive Zilahi cycle in an h#4. The white rook, bishop, and knight are arranged in an instantly recognisable circular guarding pattern. Indeed, Black captures the wB and wS to clear the way for their defenders, however, the wR sacrifice is motivated differently – the wS does not need to visit h3. Still, a fine achievement.

- 1.e:f2 L:f2 2.e3 T:e3+ 3.Kd6 Te7 4.Sc6 Lc5#,
- 1.Tg1 S:g4 2.T:g3 Se5 3.Tg7 Tg3 4.Te7 Tg6#,
- 1.d4 Lh2 2.Kd5 Tf3 3.e:f3 S:g4 4.Ke4 Sf6#

Zoran Gavrilovski




h#2.5 4;1.1;1.1 (6+15)

7th Honourable Mention: no. 12

This is probably another echo of the Brasil TT run in May 2025. One pair shows anticritical-like moves by white pieces in the spirit of the Brasil motif, the other exploits the same interference to permit bK passage. A wholesome idea.

- 1...Ld5 2.T:e6 Lc6 3.Lf6 Sc4# A,
- 1...Tf4 2.Se4 Tg4 3.Sf6 Sf3# B,
- 1...Sc4+ A 2.Kd5 Tc1 3.Kc6 Sa5#,
- 1...Sf3+ B 2.Kf4 Ld1 3.Kg4 Se5#

S. Manikumar†




h#3 2.1;1.1;1.1 (5+7)
b) ♜d5→e8

1st Commendation: no. 15

An ambitious concept, with White playing on b6/c5 in a pleasing pattern that shows the Kozhakin and Meerane themes in a light setting (the mechanism is reminiscent of Annex D). On the other hand, the solutions are serial, with little black-white interplay (partly due to the chosen theme), and the motivations are fairly straightforward.

- a) 1.Tc5 Tb6 2.Kd5 Tf6 3.Le4 Sb6#
- 1.Kf5 Sb6 2.Kf6 Sc8 3.Tf5 Tb6#
- b) 1.Le2 Tc5 2.Kd3 Tc1 3.Te3 Sc5#
- 1.b3 Sc5+ 2.Kd5 Sa6+ 3.Kc4 Tc5#

Torsten Linß

h#8 try


(2+5)

2nd Commendation: no. 47

It is remarkable that in a position like this Black could lack a waiting move – yet, if one attempts to construct a mate with bKb8, that is exactly the case. Instead, only bKd8 works. These are not fully independent and equal phases, as shown by the repetition of the brutal 5...Kc4:d5, but it remains an excellent find.

1.Sf5 Lb6 2.Da4+ Kb2 3.Kb8 Kc3 4.Da8 Kc4 5.Sd6+ K:d5 6.Ta7+ Ke6 7.Sb7 Kd7 8.... Lc7#,

1.Dc8 Ka2 2.Sc4 Lc5 3.Sb6 Kb3 4.Sd7+ Kc4 5.Kb8 K:d5 6.Kc7 Ke6 7.Kd8 Kf7 8.Tc7 Le7#

Vitaly Medintsev


h#6

(2+13)

3rd Commendation: no. 44

White must lose five (!) tempi with precision while Black builds the cage. There is interplay: Black's move order depends on the wB's position. The idea was originally presented as an h#4 in Annex E by Norman McLeod, later extended to h#5 by Chris Feather in Annex F.

1.Db5 (1.Ka4,b5,La5#?) Ld7! (tempo, L:b7,L:e6?) 2.Ka4 Lc8 (2.L:e6) 3.Db3 Ld7+ (tempo) 4.b5 Lc8 (4.L:e6?) 5.b4 Lb7! (tempo) 6.La5 Lc6#

Galyaviev Samat

h#2 4.1;1.1

(5+7)

4th Commendation: no. 3


Fourfold cyclic Zilahi in a beautiful Meredith setting without white pawns. There are very similar problems by A. Skripnik (Annex G, Annex H). The improved form is commendable, and the different checkmates make it original.

1.f:g5 T:e4+ 2.Kf6 Te6#,

1.T:f4 Sf7+ 2.Kf5 Le6#,

1.S:d5 T:f3 2.Ld4 Sf7#,

1.S:d6 Td4 2.Sf5 S:f3#

Volodymyr Lastivka

h#3.5 2;1.1;...


(5+12)

5th Commendation: no. 31

A very clean execution of the Maslar theme. The white play is known from Annex I. The novelty that merits distinction lies in the bQ Pelle moves.

1...Td8 2.Dd5 Lf5+ 3.Kd4 Ld3 4.Dd7 T:d7#,

1...Lc8 2.De6 Td4+ 3.Kf5 Tg4 4.Dd7 L:d7#

Aleksandr Pankratiev

h#2 6.1;1.1 (9+14)

6th Commendation: no. 10

Three pairs of R/B solutions, though the play is not very complex and not entirely uniform within the pairs. 1.b:c5 T:a5 2.c:d4 Te5#


1.Df3 e3 2.T:d4+ T:d4#

1.Sd3 Ld2 2.Sf2 d5 #

1.Dg4 h:g4 2.S:f5+ L:f5#

1.Dg6+ f:g6 2.Sg4 g7#

1.L:h3 L:g8 2.L:f5 Ld5#

Mykola Kolesnyk

h#3 2.1;1.1;1.1 (7+8)

Special Commendation: no. 18

An ingenious ortho-diagonal mechanism, featuring indirect batteries set up on lines masked no fewer than three times. Special praise is due for the construction – the cookstoppers are placed most unobtrusively.


1.Dc7 Lc5 2.T:b3 L:b3 3.Kc6 La4#

1.De7 Tc5 2.L:b3 T:b3 3.Kd6 Td3#

In closing, I would like to congratulate all participants for their creativity, craftsmanship, and dedication to the art of the helpmate. The diversity of themes, the technical mastery, and the inventive details I encountered made this judging both a privilege and a challenge. Even where ideas were familiar, they were often presented with fresh nuances or impeccable execution. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to study these works in depth, and I hope that readers will take as much pleasure in exploring them as I did.


Participants: Abdurahmanović, Fadil: 4 (4th pr.); Aunver, Indrek: 2; Bašić, Bojan: 7; Bilokon, Yuri: 40; Cioflâncă, Mihaiu: 26; Crăciun, Ovidiu: 42; Danstrup, Niels: 33; de Mattos Vieira, Ricardo: 8; Dimitrov, Ognian: 23; Feoktistov, Aleksandr: 37; Galyaviev, Samat: 3 (4th comm.); Gasparyan, Alexey: 50; Gatti, Daniele: 24; Gavrilovski, Zoran: 12 (7th hon. ment.); Gavryliv, Evgeny: 9 (2nd pr.); Gurov, Valery: 25 (3rd hon. ment.); Hudák, Stanislav: 14; Klasinc, Marko: 5; Klemanić, Emil: 13 (1st pr.); Kolesnyk, Mykola: 18 (spec. comm.); Krätschmer, Ralf: 22; Labai, Zoltán: 11; Lastivka, Volodymir: 31 (5th comm.); Linß, Torsten: 47 (2nd comm.); Lois, Jorge Joaquin: 19 (2nd hon. ment.); Lütt, Michael: 43; Manikumar, S.: 15 (1st comm.); Medintsev, Vitaly: 44 (3rd comm.); Mihajlovski, Zlatko: 30; Murashov, Pavel: 20; Murashov, Vasili: 38; Nefyodov, Vladislav: 36; Nifdaliyev, Jahangir: 17; Novomesky, Daniel: 48 (4th hon. ment.); Paliulionis, Viktoras: 41 (1st hon. ment.); Pankratiev, Aleksandr: 10 (6th comm.); Parrinello, Mario: 49; Petković, Nikola: 34 (3th pr.); Semenenko, Oleksandr: 39 (5th pr.); Semenenko, Valery: 35 (6th hon. ment.); Skripnik, Anatoly: 28 (5th hon. ment.); Solja, Kenneth: 6; Svítek, Miroslav: 46; Trommler, Sven: 29; Vasylenko, Anatoly: 16; Velikhanov, Kenan: 32; Vilkauskas, Antanas: 21; Witztum, Menachem: 27; Zamanov, Vidadi: 1; Zimm, Justus: 45.

Annex A
Fadil Abdurahmanović
Phénix 1990
1st Prize




h#2 4 Sol. (5+9)

Annex B
Hans Peter Rehm
Die Schwalbe 2000
Commendation



h#5 (3+9)


Annex C
György Bakcsi
György Páros
Probleemblad 1962
2nd Prize



h#2 3 Sol. (5+8)

A: 1.Dd8 d:e8=T 2.Kd7 c:d8=D#, 1.Te5 d8=L 2.Sc5 c8=S#, 1.Sg5 c:b8=T 2.Kc7 d8=D#, 1.Sd8 c8=L 2.Kc7 d:e8=S#; **B:** 1.Lc4 Lh6 2.Sg5 d3 3.Kd2 Kf1 4.Ke3 Ke1 5.L:d3 L:g5#; **C:** 1.Tf3 Sc3 2.Sg7 Se4#, 1.f3 Sf4 2.Sd6 Sh5#, 1.Sf3 Se3 2.S:f6 Sf5#


Annex D
Valery Gurov
Aleksandr Feoktistov
Vladislav Nefyodov
8th WCCT 2008
5th Place



h#3 (5+6)


b) ♖g8→g6, c) ♜f8→g5

Annex E
Norman Macleod
The Problemist 1973
6th Commendation



h#4 (2+9)


Annex F
Norman Macleod
version C. Feather
Broodings 2009



h#5 (2+11)


D: a) 1.De8 Le5 2.Lc5 Lh8 3.Le7 Se5#, b) 1.Dg7 Se5+ 2.Kf6 Sf3 3.Tf7 e5#, c) 1.De7 e5 2.T8g6 e6+ 3.Kf6 Le5#; **E:** 1.Tb3 Tb1 2.Tb4 Tb3 3.Db5 Tb2 4.Sb3 Ta2#; **F:** 1.Db3 Tb1 2.Db5 Tb2 3.Tb3 Tb1 4.Tb4 Tb2 5.Sb3 Ta2#

Annex G
Anatoly Skripnik
Československo 100 2018
5th Prize




h#2 4 Sol. (7+9)

Annex H
Anatoly Skripnik
SuperProblem 2020
7th Prize




h#2 4 Sol. (7+6)

Annex I
Oleksandr Semenenko
Gravure 2017
Special Prize



h#3.5 2 Sol. (3+7)


Annex K
Vitaly Medintsev
Albino 2021
E. Bogdanov MT 70
1st Prize



h#3 2 Sol. (9+10)

G: 1.D:d4 Tc6+ 2.Ke5 Sg6#, 1.K:c5 Se6+ 2.K:c4 Lb5#, 1.K:e7 Sc6+ 2.Kf6 Tf5#, 1.T:d7 Sec6 2.Kc7 Sb5#; **H:** 1.L:f5 Td4+ 2.Ke6 Sd8#, 1.K:e4 Sg3+ 2.K:f4 Le3#, 1.K:c5 Tc4+ 2.Kb5 Sd6#, 1.T:c6 Sd6 2.f5 Te5#; **I:** 1...La7 2.Tb6 Te5+ 3.Kd4 Te3 4.Ld5 L:b6#, 1...Ta5 2.Tb5 Ld4 3.Kd5 Le5 4.De4 T:b5#; **K:** 1.T:b5 T:b5 2.D:d4 T:d4 3.Ke3 Tb3#, 1.L:b5 L:b5 2.T:d4 L:d4 3.Ke4 Lc6#

Jorge Joaquin Lois
no. 19, version



h#3 3.1;1.1;1.1 (7+11)

Responding to the judge's comment, the author of no. 19 has composed a version that addresses the judge's criticism.

1.S:f4 Se2 2.K:g5 Sg1 3.Kh4 Sf3#

1.K:f4 Sf3 2.De4 Sg1 3.Tf5 Sh3#

1.Ke4 Sh3 2.K:d4 Sg1 3.Se4 Se2#

Selfmates

— Award by Ivan Soroka —


From the World Cup director, I received 26 selfmates in anonymous form. The level of the competition was rather high, despite a shortage of large-scale strategic style problems.

The following problems could not be included in the award: No. 4 (Ka5-Kc5): Ž. Janevski's mechanism featuring a fourfold cycle of white moves has been used dozens (!) of times. The author failed to add anything new to the cyclic thematic domain. No. 7 (Kh4-Kf5): Two significant anticipations: s#5, A. Azhusin & A. Selivanov, [P1421391](#) and s#6, A. Selivanov, [P1101451](#). No. 10 (Kf4-Ke6): A good idea, but it surely needs further improvement. No. 11 (Ka8-Ke4): The 3rd and 4th moves in both variants are the same; what is worse, the problem is seriously anticipated: s#5, O. Efrosinin, [P1366080](#), s#5, A. Selivanov, [P1393012](#). No. 22 (Ke4-Kg4): cook 1.Sf7 Lc1 2.Df1 [3.Sf6+ Kg3 (3...K:h4 4.De1+ f2 5.T:h3+ K:h3 6.Dh1+ Kg3 7.S:h5+ Kg4 8.S:e5+ D:e5#) 4.Dg1+ K:h4 etc. 5.De1+ f2 6.T:h3+ K:h3 7.Dh1+ Kg3 8.S:h5+ Kg4 9.S:e5+ D:e5#] Ld2 3.Sh6+ Kg3 4.T:f3+ etc.

The proposed award is as follows.

Peter Gvozdják

Gold medal



s#3

(14+7)

1st Prize: no. 3

A fantastic problem; in a rather light construction, the author presented a grandiose concept: Shedey theme in 4 variants. The mechanism is highly refined; its implementation complies with “the self-mate spirit”. The white king has two flights: c4 and d3, so in the threat, White blocks one of these squares, while in the checkmate pattern the other one is controlled by the black king. The two defences 1...Sf2, 1...Se3 involve a subtle differentiation of White's responses. The first moves in both phases are nice, ambushing behind own knights; the white-black half-battery is transformed into a black royal battery. An unforgettable and beautiful modern style problem. My respect and congratulations to the author.


I would like to note that a similar matrix was used in a well-known problem by P. Gvozdják, [P1196881](#), see Annex A1. The author of F3 changed the pattern of P1196881 so skilfully that the output was an absolutely new creation with a concept much superior to that of A1. The scheme seems to be the same, but the thematic content is drastically different due to replacement of the defences 1...d1=T(S)/d1=D(L) with 1...Se3/Sf2. Instead of reciprocally changed continuations and le Grand theme, we see the Shedey theme in 4 variants.

1.Tg4? [2.Sc4+ A Ke4+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#] Se3 a 2.Sd3+ B Kd5+ 3.Td4+ L:d4#,
1...La6 b 2.Sf7+ C Ke4+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#, 1...Sf2 c 2.Sg6+ D Kd5+ 3.Td4+ L:d4#, but 1...Le6!
1.Td7! [2.Sd3+ B Kd5+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#] Se3 a 2.Sf7+ C Ke4+ 3.Td4+ L:d4#,
1...La6 b 2.Sg6+ D Kd5+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#, 1...Sf2 c 2.Sc4+ A Ke4+ 3.Td4+ L:d4#

The author indicates an extra try with Rudenko, Barnes and Mäkihovi themes involving all of White's thematic moves, but in my opinion this does not enhance the value of the problem, since it is very high anyway. It looks like the try 1.Tg5? would like to “share the glory” of the two Shedey theme phases.

1.Tg5? [2.Sc4+ A Ke4+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#, 2.Sd3+ B Kd5+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#]
1...La6 2.Sf7+ C Ke4+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#, 2.Sg6+ D Kd5+ 3.Dd4+ L:d4#, but 1...Se3! a and 1...Sf2! c

Aleksey Oganessian
Silver medal



s#9 (16+5)

works: **6.Lf4 h2 7.Lh6 h1=D 8.Lf8 D~ 9.Dc7+ S:c7#**.

An interesting multi-faceted logical problem in which the white Lh2 tries to break through to the f8 square and block it. A systematic movement of white pawns on the e-file and of the black d-pawn, with White refusing to capture the black pawn. Premature attempts to implement the main plan 1.Lf4 are invariably refuted by Black in various ways. A well-deserved prize-winner of the competition.


2nd Prize: no. 18

The main plan 1.Dc7+ S:c7# fails because the white king's f8-flight is not blocked: 2.Kf8. The straightforward attempt to block that square with the bishop is also unsuccessful: 1.Lf4? 2.Lh6 3.Lf8 4.Dc7+ S:c7#, but 1...h2 2.Lh6 hg=D 3.Lf8 D:d1! The try 1.b3? also fails: 1...g3! (But not 1...d5? 2.Sf3! g:f3 3.ef3 d4 4.Lf4 h2 5.Lh6 h1D 6.Lf8 Dh2 7.f4! D:f4 8.ef4 d3 9.Dc7+ S:c7#)

Therefore, White plays in a radical way, getting rid of the main opponent: **1.S:h3! g:h3** (Not 1...g3 in view of 2.L:g3 d5 3.Lf4 d:e4 4.Tb3! Ka4 5.Lh6 Ka5 6.Lf8 Ka4 7.Tb8+ Ka5 8.Dc7+ S:c7#, 3...d4 4.Lh6 d:e3 5.Sf2! e:f2 6.Lf8 f1=D 7.Dc7+ S:c7#)

Second foreplan: **2.b3! d5 3.e5! d4** (3.Lf4? h2 4.Lh6 h1=D 5.Lf8 Dh2!) **4.e4! d3** (4.Lf4? h2 5.Lh6 h1=D 6.Lf8 D:c6!) **5.e3! d2** (5.Lf4? h2 6.Lh6 h1=D 7.Lf8 Dg1!) and only now the main plan

Frank Richter
Bronze medal



s#16 (8+10)


3rd Prize: no. 23

1...d:e3 2.D:g4+ L:g4#
1.Sf1? Le8 2.Le4?? no threats.
1.Sf1? Le8 2.Sg3 Ld7 3.Dc4??

1.Sc2! [2.D:g4+ L:g4#] **Le8 2.S:d4** [3.Sge6+ fe6#] **Ld7 3.Sc2 Le8 4.Se3 Ld7** (switchback) **5.Sf1! Le8 6.Sg3 Ld7 7.Dc4+ Ke3 8.D:c3+ Kf4 9.Dc4+ Ke3 10.De2+ Kf4**. The two black pawns c3 and d4 are no longer on the chessboard. **11.Sf1 Le8 12.Le4! ~ 13.Dd2+ K:e4 14.Sg3+** (switchback) **Kf3 15.De2+ Kf4 16.Se6+ fe6#** (8...Kf2 9.Dd2+ Kg1 10.Ld4+ K:h2 11.Lf1+ K:g3 12.Dg2+ Kf4 13.D:g4+ L:g4#)

A problem with classical pendulum manoeuvres and switchbacks. It is a pity that Black has no defence against the threat arising after 12.Le4. C. f. F. Richter, 19792, Die Schwalbe 327, 6/2024, [P1422520](#).

Mikhail Khramtsevich



s#4 (7+10)


4th Prize: no. 6

An economical setting devoid of white pawns; in the threat and two variants, there is a cyclic interchange of white pieces' moves ABC-BCA-CAB. Quite a few similar problems have been composed in the past 20 years; M. Khramtsevich is particularly active in developing this thematic domain. In the problem under review, an extra feature is Black Correction in black rook's play 1...Te5!; unfortunately, however, the bundle of variants 1...D~ with play identical to that appearing in the variant 1...Te5 detracts from the impression.

1.Sb3! [2.Sb4+ A T:b4+ 3.Lb7+ B S:b7 4.Sc5+ C S:c5#]
1...Te~ 2.Lb7+ B S:b7 3.Sc5+ C S:c5 4.Sb4+ A D:b4#
1...Te5! 2.S:c5+ C T:c5 3.Sb4+ A D:b4+ 4.Lb7+ B D:b7#

Byplay: 1...Dc1,e3,g5,d6,e5,f8,f5 2.S:c5+ D:c5 3.Sb4+ T:b4 + 4.Lb7+ T:b7#

Waldemar Tura



s#2

(10+14)

1st Honourable mention: no. 1

1.Lh2! [2.Sd6+ T:d6#]

1...e2 2.S:d2+ T:d2#

Play of the black battery Td5+Lg8.

1...Ld~ 2.Dd4+ T:d4#

1...Lc3! 2.Dd3+ T:d3#

White queen's play in response to play by the black Ld2.


1...f4 2.Te5+ T:e5#

1...d6 2.L:f5+ T:f5#

Black pawns opening lines for white pieces.

SOTF 3×2 theme. One of the few methods to invigorate the s#2 genre.

Anatoli Stopotschkin



s#12

(12+11)


2nd Honourable Mention: no. 19

The focal point for the forthcoming encounter is the d2-square. Main plan: 1.Tff2? ~ 2.T:d2+ T:d2 3.T:d2+ D:d2#, but 1...T:b5! Therefore, **1.Sc4+! Ta:b4!** (1...Tb:b4? 2.T:d2+ D:d2#) **2.Tff2** [3.T:d2+ T:d2+ 4.T:d2+ D:d2#] **T2b3** 3.**T:f6!** [4.T:d2+ D:d2#] **Tb2**. White opens the way for his Qf7. **4.Tff2** [5.T:d2+ T:d2+ 6.T:d2+ D:d2#] **T2b3** 5.**Tf1** [6.T:d2+ D:d2#] (switchback) **Tb2** 6.**Df2** **T2b3** 7.**Dg1** **Tb2** 8.**Dg2** **T2b3**. Now the white queen guards the e4-square, so that she can be sacrificed at the right moment, giving up the excessive control of d2. **9.g8=S!** ~ **10.D:e4+! K:e4** 11.**Sg6+ Kd3** 12.**T:d2+ D:d2#**

A classical problem with pendulum maneuvers by white line-pieces.

The idea is not new and has been implemented more than once by German problemists as well as by I. Soroka, this tourney's judge. Such content is not enough to justify a prize for this problem, but in general it is a good composition deserving a distinction. To the pendulum maneuvers, the author added a knight underpromotion as well as a Bristol (Tf1, Df2). It seems to me that the Bristol could have been made as long as possible by shifting the queen to f8. A plus for the problem is a second preliminary plan 1.Sc4+; a minus is the white Lb5's pitiful role, as it must keep the Bc4 pinned.

Indrek Aunver



s#4

(10+9)

3rd Honourable mention: no. 8


1.K:d2? d3 2.e4 L:b4#, but 1...L:b4+!

1.f7? L:b4 2.Df6+ Ke3 3.L:d2+ L:d2#, but 1...d3!

1.Tg2! L:b4 (1...d3 2.e3+ Kf3 3.K:d2 L:b4#) **2.Dg4+**

(2...Ke3 3.L:d2+ L:d2#) **2...Ke5** 3.**Dg5+ Ke4** 4.**T:f2+ Sf3#**

A small spectacular problem with an unexpected finale.

Aleksandr Feoktistov

s#7

(7+5)


Commendation: no. 12

1.h7! g4 2.Dd6+ Kg7 3.f8=L+ Kh8 4.Lg7+ K:h7 5.Dh2+ Kg6 6.Dc2+ Kh5 7.Dh7+ L:h7#

1...L:h7 2.Tb8+ Kf8-e7 3.f8=D+ Kd7 4.De8+ Kc7 5.Dc6+ K:b8 6.Db6+ Kc8 7.Df5+ L:f5#, 6...Ka8 7.De4+ L:e4#

1...L:f7 2.h8=D+ Lg8 3.Df6+ Lf7 4.S:g5 Ke8 5.Se6 L:g6+ 6.Df5 Lg~ 7.Dg6+ L:g6#

The duel between the white queen and the black bishop ends in four trivial model mates.

José A. Garzón

s#2

(10+14)

Commendation: no. 2

1.e4! [2.e:f5+ S:f5#]


1...d:e3 ep. 2.Td6+ S:d6#

1...f:e3 ep. 2.D:f5+ S:f5#

1...f:e4 2.Dg4+ Sf5#

1...D:e4 2.Sc7+ S:c7#

Two pairs of variants in which the key-making white pawn is taken, with two variants featuring its e.p. capture on the e3-square.

Mark Erenburg

s#7

(9+13)

Commendation: no. 13

1.a5! [] L~ 2.Sc7+ Kc5 3.Se6+ Kd5 4.S:f4+ Kc5 5.Se6+ Kd5 6.f4 ~ 7.De4+ D:e4#

1...Sf1 2.Sb8 Kc5! 3.Tc6+ Kd5 4.Td6+ Kc5 5.Dc8+ K:d6 6.Dd7+ Kc5 7.D:d4+ D:d4#


1...f:g5 2.Th6 ~ 3.Dd7+ Dd6 4.D:b5+ Dc5 5.Dc4+ Ke5 6.D:d4+ Kf5 7.Dd5+ D:d5# (change of places of Df5 and Kd5)

Three variants with quiet (checkless and non-capturing) moves; unfortunately, they are not united by a common idea.

Participants: Aunver, Indrek: 8 (3rd hon. ment.); Banszek, Marcin: 25 (sp. hon. ment.); Borodavkin, Sergiy: 22 (cooked); Dimitrov, Ognian: 11; Erenburg, Mark: 13 (comm.); Feoktistov, Aleksandr: 12 (comm.); Garzón, José A.: 2 (comm.); Gasparyan, Alexey: 26; Gatti, Daniele: 21; Gvozdják, Peter: 3 (1st pr.); Holubec, Jozef: 15; Jordan, Gunter: 16; Khramtsevich, Mikhail: 6 (4th pr.); Labai, Zoltán: 9; Libiš, Zdeněk: 7; Linß, Torsten: 14 (sp. comm.); Novomesky, Daniel: 20; Oganeshjan, Aleksey: 18 (2nd pr.); Pankratiev, Aleksandr: 4; Raican, Paul: 24; Richter, Frank: 23 (3rd pr.); Shalygin, Oleg: 10; Stopochkin, Anatoli: 19 (2nd hon. ment.); Trommler, Sven: 17; Tura, Waldemar: 1 (1st hon. ment.); Yuzyuk, Viktor: 5.

Special distinctions for miniatures

Marcin Banaszek



s#25

(4+3)

Special Honourable Mention: no. 25


Main plan: 1.D:e6+? D:e6+! 2.Kd4,Kf4! The white king has two unguarded squares: d4 and f4. The black queen enjoys full freedom and can endlessly pursue the white king by checks; so it is clear that forced play will follow.

1.Dh4+! Kd7! 2.Dd8+ Kc6 3.Db6+ Kd7 4.Tb7+ Ke8 5.Dc6+ Kf8 6.Df3+ Ke8 7.Df7+ Kd8 8.Dc7+ Ke8 9.Dd7+ Kf8 10.De7+ Kg8 11.Df7+ Kh8 12.Df6+ Kg8 13.Tg7+ Kh8 14.Tg4+ Kh7 15.Th4+ Kg8 16.Dg5+ Kf8,Kf7 17.Tf4+ Ke8 The f4-square is blocked. 18.Tb8+ Kd7 19.Dd8+ Kc6 20.Db6+ Kd7 21.Tb7+ Ke8,Kc8 22.Dc6+ Kd8 23.Td7+ Ke8 24.Td4+ Ke7 The d4-square is also blocked. Time has come for the main plan: 25.D:e6+ D:e6# with epaulette mate.

Byplay: 1...Kf7 2.T5b7+ → s#16, 4...Kc8 5.Tc7+ → s#20, 5...Kd8 6.Td7+ → s#21, 6...Kg8 7.Df7+ → s#20)

A logical problem in miniature form; systematic movement of the white queen and the black king, creation and play of white batteries, the black king's return to the initial position at the end of the solution.

Torsten Linß



s#8 b) ♕e1

(5+2)

Special Commendation: no. 14

a) 1.c8=S! Kc1 2.Sb6 Kd1 3.Sa4 Kc1 4.Df4+ Kd1 5.Td2+ Kc1 6.Td3+ Kb1 7.Tb3+ Ka1 8.Sc2+ S:c2#

b) 1.c8=L! Kc1 2.Ld7 Kd1 3.La4+ Kc1 4.Dc4+ Lc3 5.Tb4 Kd2 6.De2+ Kc1 7.Sb3+ Kb1 8.Db2+ L:b2#


Forsberg theme on the e1-square. An interesting nuance: White promotes his pawn to the same type of piece as the one occupying the e1-square in the diagram position.

Annex

Peter Gvozdják

13911 Die Schwalbe 12/2008

2nd Prize (s#2-3)



s#3

(11+8)

1.Te4? [2.Sb3+ A Kb5+ 3.Tb4+ L:b4#, 1...d1=T,S 2.Sa4+ B Kc4+ 3.Db4+ L:b4#, 1...d1=D,L 2.Sd7+ C Kc4+ 3.Db4+ L:b4#, 1...Ld1 2.Se6+ D Kb5+ 3.Tb4+ L:b4#, but 1...Th4! 1.Tb8! [2.Sa4+ B Kc4+ 3.Tb4+ L:b4#, 1...d1=T,S 2.Sb3+ A Kb5+ 3.Db4+ L:b4#, 1...d1=D,L 2.Se6+ D Kb5+ 3.Db4+ L:b4#, 1...Ld1 2.Sd7+ C Kc4+ 3.Tb4+ L:b4#

Heterodox problems

— Award by Vlaicu Crişan —

I received from the FIDE World Cup Director a file containing 20 entries presented in an anonymous format. I expected to see a variety exploring many underused heterodox stipulations in the competition. However, it turned out that 90% of entries were helpselfmates.


Being the first person to judge this newly created section, I think it is important to begin with some theoretical remarks about heterodox problems. The announcement stipulates that in this group are accepted all compositions adhering to standard chess rules: no fairy pieces and/or conditions, with Black and White moving alternately on a standard 8x8 chessboard, with any stipulations that don't fall in other established categories.

I strongly believe that all A→B compositions, including Shortest Proof Games and ortho-reconstructions, must be also treated as heterodox compositions. These are currently included in the Retros section, although they don't respect the main character of genuine retro compositions. A genuine retro composition is characterized by a known diagram [initial] position, an unknown final position and a backwards direction of play. Although I am aware this view might not be shared by many retro aficionados, it should at least give them some food for thought.

Within the heterodox category we can also encounter several unusual aims: stalemate, check, capture, field occupation and even giving mate with a certain piece. All these stipulations deserve to be explored, as they give an opportunity to unleash composers' creativity. My hope is that composers reading the present award will get stimulated to get away from the well-trodden paths when participating in the heterodox section in the next edition of the FIDE World Cup.

After this short theoretical digression, let's turn our attention to the competition. The overall quality was below my expectations, compared to the high standards set by the previous editions of this prestigious tournament. I decided to discard the entries which fail to make usage of all figures in all phases or show some already known patterns and those which don't have a strategic content good enough to retain in the award. For the remaining entries, I propose the following classification.

Nikola Petković
Gold medal



hs#4.5 b) –♘g5 (9+8)

1st Prize: no. 10

The most ambitious composition from the tournament, scoring high marks for both technical merit and artistic impression. There are three pairs of pieces mutually exchanging their roles – the theme of the [9th Romanian Tzuica tournament](#) – in diagonal-orthogonal correspondence:

1st pair wRd6–wBe4:

Guard of g6 / Passive annihilation in B1 by the black mating piece.

2nd pair wRe8–wBh2:

Active sacrifice in W5 after occupying the vacated square in B2 / Play on e5 in W4 to guard black King flight(s).

3rd pair bRe7–bBf4:


Front piece of the fully constructed black battery / Rear piece of the fully constructed black battery.

The play has many subtle points, with genuine interplay dictating the order of moves by both sides. The twinning and the overall construction are also good.

a) 1...T:e4+ (Tb7+?) 2.Ka3 Tb4 (Le3?) 3.Te4 Le3 (L:d6?) 4.Le5 Lc5 5.Th4+ T:h4#

b) 1...L:d6+ (Ld2+?) 2.Ka4 Lb4 (Tc7?) 3.Ld6 Tc7 (T:e4?) 4.Te5 Tc4 5.Lf8+ L:f8#

Dmitri Turevski
Silver medal



hs#4 2.1;... (3+3)


2nd Prize: no. 4

In an aristocratic miniature, all pieces move in both solutions. The play is well unified, with a pregnant diagonal-orthogonal correspondence: after the initial black battery fires, the black Queen actively selfblocks and launches a cross-checks ending – the theme of the [15th Romanian Tzuica tournament](#).

This superb composition, which surely deserves to be included in any anthology, did not receive the top place just because it received a slightly inferior score at the technical merit. Nevertheless, the play is subtle – please check why W1 and W2 can't be exchanged – and the construction is flawless.

1.Le7! (Tf6?) Ka5 2.Tf6! (Kc4?) Sf4+ 3.Kc4 Da4+ 4.Lb4+ D:b4#
1.Tb2+! (Ld2?) Ka6 2.Ld2! (Kc5?) Se3+ 3.Kc5 Da7+ 4.Tb6+ D:b6#

Torsten Linß
Bronze medal




hs#9.5 (2+4)

1st Honourable Mention: no. 19

Among the many single-line compositions, I liked this miniature setting for its solving appeal and logic. All black moves are visible, so White must waste one tempo to get the pieces back to the same positions. As the wS can't lose a tempo in 9 moves, the wK must triangulate. Due to these constraints, the order of Black moves is uniquely determined. Like in the 2nd Prize, all pieces move in the solution. For those who raise their eyebrows in disbelief when seeing the successful place of this composition, I would like to remind them that the main aim of the chess composition is to produce pleasure to solvers. The only reason for which this wonderful composition doesn't get a Prize is the very strong similarity of the idea with [another single-line helpselfmate](#) but using an entirely different matrix.

1...a5 2.Kb7 a4 3.Ka6 a3 4.Sa4 (4.S~?) Kc8 5.Kb5 Sd8 6.Ka5 a2
7.Ka6 a1=T 8.Ka7 Tc1 9.Ka8 Tc7 10.Sb6+ S:b6#

Mario Parrinello




hs#4.5 (3+7)

b) ♠g3→g4

2nd Honourable Mention: no. 7

A lovely conception: one of the set black batteries is dismantled to allow the promotion of the wPg5, while the remaining one delivers the mate after capturing the promoted wQ. Although the arrangement of the black batteries is known from the [21st Romanian Tzuica tournament](#) (see Commendations – Anirudh Daga & S. K. Balasubramanian and Kostas Prentos), the motivation for black battery dismantling seems to be original. Although the superb economy is a plus, the absence of white strategy slightly mars the overall impression. Nevertheless, a solid and convincing piece of work.

a) 1...Lf6 2.g:f6 Td8 3.f7 Te8+ 4.f:e8=D Se4 5.Db5+ L:b5#
b) 1...Th6 2.g:h6 Lc4 3.h7 Lg8 4.h:g8=D Se3 5.Da2+ T:a2#

Hiroaki Maeshima

hs#3.5 2;1.1;... (6+9)

Commendation: no. 3

Two pairs of pieces exchange functions:


1st pair wBb1–wRc2: Mutual Grimshaw on wK initial square.

2nd pair bBc4–bRd4: Peri-critical maneuver / Guard of wK flight(s).

Compared to the first prize, the content looks less impressive, and the interplay is quite limited. Moreover, both exchanges are half-active.

Purists may rightly criticize the fictitious strategy and claim wBb1 is useless in the second solution, because there is no equivalent of the thematic try 3.Ka2? from the first solution to justify the need of wBb1 obstruction. Although this flaw might be avoided, there is another one: wBb1 guards a flight in the first solution, while wRc1 doesn't do the same in the second solution.

1...La6 2.Kb3 Lc8 3.Lc2 Le6 4.Dc7+ S:c7#, 1...Th4 2.Kd2 Th8 3.Tc2 Td8 4.De7+ S:e7#

Niels Danstrup


hs#4 2.1;... (3+3)

Commendation: no. 5

Another aristocratic miniature in which all pieces move in both solutions ending in two echo mates. However, the not perfectly matching play and the rather simple strategic effects reduce the artistic impression, hence the lower ranking.

1.Ld7 Kd5+ 2.Kf5 Tg4 3.Tc4 Dd6 4.Le6+ D:e6#

1.Tb3 Tc3 2.Kf4 Kc4 3.Ke4 Tf3 4.Ld5+ D:d5#

Sven Trommler

hs#4.5 b) ♖c8→f8 (5+11)

Commendation: no. 9

The ambition is quite high: to show the dismantling of an existing battery and its complete rebuilding on two distinct lines with the exchange of front and rear pieces. But there is also a price to pay: the mating move is played by the bB to the same square and the wRs play is reduced to clear the path of the bR.

a) 1...Lg8 2.T:g7 Lh7 3.Te7 Tg8 4.Te2 Th8 5.Tc1+ Lb1#

b) 1...Le6 2.T:f6 Lf5 3.T:d6 Te6 4.Td2 Te5 5.Tc1+ Lb1#

Congratulations to the authors of the awarded compositions and many thanks to the director and all participants for the entertaining hours I spent studying their works.

Participants: Borodavkin, Sergiy: 8; Cioflâncă, Mihaiu: 15; Danstrup, Niels: 5 (comm.); Dimitrov, Ognian: 13; Evseev, Georgy: 2; Gasparyan, Alexey: 20; Gatti, Daniele: 12; Kirtley, Mark: 11; Linß, Torsten: 19 (1st hon. ment.); Maeshima, Hiroaki: 3 (comm.); Medintsev, Vitaly: 16; Novomesky, Daniel: 17; Oganessian, Aleksey: 14; Parrinello, Mario: 7 (2nd hon. ment.); Petković, Nikola: 10 (1st pr.); rgirakopoulos, Themis: 1; Semenenko, Olexandr: 6; Semenenko, Valery: 18; Trommler, Sven: 9 (comm.); Turevski, Dmitri: 4 (2nd pr.).

Fairies

— Award by Thomas Maeder —

From tourney director Torsten Linß, I received 39 anonymous entries on uniform diagrams and with more or less homogenized notation of the solutions.

Among them were a number of top problems, but I was astonished by how many entries there are that would have difficulties making their mark in a mediocre tourney; I don't quite understand why the authors decided to submit these problems to a global competition.


I have also found some entries with very interesting ideas, but flaws in their realization. In an informal tourney, entries like this might land in the lower ranks, but this being a formal tourney where non-awarded entries remain unpublished, I generally decided not to include them in the award to give the authors the chance of success in a different tourney with an improved setting.

Fairy chess has been quantitatively dominated by problems with help-play stipulations in recent years, and this tourney is no exception: two thirds of the entries have a non-antagonistic stipulation. I am certainly not the only one to have recognized that composers have had a lot of success with such problems in many recent tourneys. So readers may be surprised that the top places of this tourney all have antagonistic stipulations. The reason for this phenomenon is two-fold: on the one hand, I have the impression that many judges are a bit too impressed – more than me anyway – by the harmony of play that can be achieved much more easily in help play than in, say, direct play; and on the other hand, almost all of the problems that I have mentioned in the second paragraph above are help-play problems.

But now to the awarded entries:

Marcel Tribowski

Gold medal



s#14 Isardam (14+10)


1st prize: no. 36

Pendulums with alternating guards and unguards are known from the orthodox selfmate field. But here, the motivations for both parts are very specific to Isardam, which seems highly original. Once one has discovered this mechanism, the foreplan almost plays itself. But what progress have we made? In the ensuing main plan, White uses a different sequence of alternating guards and unguards to improve the position of its Bg3 while keeping Black busy! Finally, the hR completes his roundtrip to deliver the decisive check; Black is forced to observe its own king while at the same mating the white king. A fantastic battle!

1.e8=L! [2.Td3+ K:e4 3.Lg6+ L:c6#] **Tb7** (i) **2.Lg6** (ii) [3.Td3+ Tb4#] **Ta7** **3.Lf7** [4.Td3+ ...] **Tb7** **4.Ld5** [5.Td3+] **Ta7** **5.Lg8** [6.Td3+ ...] **Tb7** **6.Th4** [7.Td3+] **Ta7** **7.Lf4** [8.Td3+ ...] **Tb7** (iii) **8.Lh6** [9.Td3+] **Ta7** **9.Th3** [10.Td3+ ...] **Tb7** (iv) **10.Td3+ K:e4** **11.Ld5+ Kf5** **12.Thf3+ Kg4** **13.Tf2+ Kh4** **14.Th2+ Tb4#**

- i: 1...Tf1 2.L:f1 Tb7 3.Ld7 Ta7 4.Tf2 ~/Tb7 5.Td3+ K:e4 6.Lf5+/Tf4+ L:c6#/Tb4#
- ii: 2.Th4? Ta7 3.Lf4 Tg1!
- iii: 7...Tf1 8.L:f1 Tb7 9.Lh2(Lg5,Lh6) Ta7 10.Thh3 Tb7 11.Le6 ~/Ta7 12.Td3+ K:e4 13.Th4+/Lg2+ Tb4#/L:c6#, 7...Tg1 8.Td3+ K:e4 9.Lh7+ Tg6 10.L:g6+ L:c6#
- iv: 9...Tf1 10.L:f1 Tb7 11.Thf3 ~/Ta7 12.Td3+ K:e4 13.Tf4+/Lh7+ Tb4#/L:c6#

N. Shankar Ram
Silver medal



#4 (7+11)
3D-Chess
♣=Unicorn=(1:1:1)-Rider

2nd prize: no. 27


Problems on the $5 \times 5 \times 5$ "board" are so few and far between that they are almost automatically original. And here, we have an example that even realizes an ambitious theme: the Jacobs cycle with 4 thematic squares and 4 defenders!

On the 2d board, this idea seems to require the usage of fairy force (I know of a realization with Zebras), while the added dimension provides enough lines to get by without – I don't consider the Unicorn a fairy piece. The key move creates a Zugzwang position; this means that every first black move has to be looked at, and it's no wonder that a few of them have dualistic continuations. Luckily, play is unique after the vast majority of moves by each of the defenders, though.

- 1.Sa3A:c2A+? Sc4B/Sb2C/Sc3C:c2A!
1.Ue1C-d2B+? Sc4B/Sb2C/Sd3D:d2B!
1.Se5C-e3B+? Sc4B/Sc3C/Sd3D:e3B!
1.Sc1E-d1C+? Sb2C/Sc3C/Sd3D:d1C!
1.Ue1C-c3A! []
1...Sc4B~ 2.Sc1E-d1C+
2...Sb2C:d1C 3.Se5C-e3B+ Sc3C/Sd3D:e3B
4.Sa3A:c2A/Uc3A-d2B#
2...Sc3C:d1C 3.Uc3A-d2B+ Sb2C/Sd3D:d2B
4.Sa3A:c2A/Se5C-e3B#
2...Sd3D:d1C 3.Sa3A:c2A+ Sb2C/Sc3C:c2A
4.Uc3A-d2B/Se5C-e3B#
1...Sb2C~ 2.Se5C-e3B+
2...Sc4B:e3B 3.Sc1E-d1C+ Sc3C/Sd3D:d1C
4.Sa3A:c2A/Uc3A-d2B#
2...Sc3C:e3B 3.Uc3A-d2B+ Sc4B/Sd3D:d2B
4.Sa3A:c2A/Sc1E-d1C#
2...Sd3D:e3B 3.Sa3A:c2A+ Sc4B/Sc3C:c2A
4.Uc3A-d2B/Sc1E-d1C#
1...Sc3C~ 2.Uc3A-d2B+
2...Sc4B:d2B 3.Sc1E-d1C+ Sb2C/Sd3D:d1C
4.Sa3A:c2A/Se5C-e3B#
2...Sb2C:d2B 3.Se5C-e3B+ Sc4B/Sd3D:e3B
4.Sa3A:c2A/Sc1E-d1C#
2...Sd3D:d2B 3.Sa3A:c2A+ Sc4B/Sb2C:c2A
4.Se5C-e3B/Sc1E-d1C#
1...Sd3D~ 2.Sa3A:c2A+
2...Sc4B:c2A 3.Sc1E-d1C+ Sb2C/Sc3C:d1C
4.Uc3A-d2B/Se5C-e3B#
2...Sb2C:c2A 3.Se5C-e3B+ Sc4B/Sc3C:e3B
4.Uc3A-d2B/Sc1E-d1C#
2...Sc3C:c2A 3.Uc3A-d2B+ Sc4B/Sb2C:d2B
4.Se5C-e3B/Sc1E-d1C#

Vasyl Dyachuk

Bronze medal



#2 4 solutions (12+6)

♙=Vao, ♘=Lion, ♖=Rook-,

♗=Bishop-, ♝=Rose-,

♞=Nightrider-Lion

3rd prize: no. 28

4 white lions each guard a square allowing a mate when provided with a hurdle. Their move lines intersect on $3+2+1=6$ squares. In the set play, moves by black pieces to these 6 squares lead to all 6 combinations of dual mates, as each black piece serves as hurdle for two white lions. With the key moves, White provides hurdles himself to threaten one of the mates. The same black moves now intercept one of the lion lines, so that the ensuing mates are now unique. When the dust settles, we count a le Grand theme on each of the intersection points and a plethora of cyclic shifts. Following traditional views of fairy economy, it would be better if all pieces were orthodox or lions. After toying a bit with the position, I am convinced that it would indeed be possible to eliminate the alien Vaos, but only at significant material cost. Similar traditional views would ask for 3 refutations, leaving only one real solution, but this again would be expensive to achieve (if at all). The composer opted for a light setting and astonishingly reached a position with only one cook-

stopper. I can very well respect this decision.

1.Kg2! [2.TLa2# A] VAf2/LLc2/NLd2 **abc** 2.TLf1/RNa3/LIc1# **BCD**


1.Kf3! [2.TLf1# B] LLf5/VAf4/VAf2 **dea** 2.RNa3/LIc1/TLa2# **CDA**

1.e7! [2.RNa3# C] VAe3/LLc2/LLf5 **fbd** 2.LIc1/TLa2/2.TLf1# **DAB**

1.g5! [2.LIc1# D] NLd2/VAf4/VAe3 **cef** 2.TLa2/TLf1/RNa3# **ABC**

Participants: Balasubramanian, S. K.: 24 (2nd comm.); Braun, Paul: 8; Brull Mayol, Cosme: 1; Courthiau, Bernard: 23 (1st hon. ment.); Crişan, Vlaicu: 15 (1st comm.); Danstrup, Niels: 4; Dimitrov, Ognian: 16; Dyachuk, Vasyl: 28 (3rd pr.); Eilazyan, Eduard: 7; Feoktistov, Aleksandr: 38; Gasparyan, Alexey: 39; Gatti, Daniele: 14; Giakatis, Theodoros: 32; Golha, Ján: 3; Gvozdják, Peter: 37 (sp. pr.); Huber, Eric: 2; Klemenić, Emil: 35 (2nd hon. ment.); Kochulov, Igor: 34; Kotěšovec, Václav: 10 (4th comm.); Krätschmer, Ralf: 6; Linß, Torsten: 9 (3rd comm.); Lörinc, Juraj: 21; Nefyodov, Vladislav: 29; Novomesky, Daniel: 17; Pachl, Franz: 11; Parrinello, Mario: 33 (3rd hon. ment.); Rittirsch, Manfred: 31; Răican, Paul: 13; Semenenko, Valery: 12; Shankar Ram, N.: 27 (2nd pr.); Solja, Kenneth: 19; Stopochkin, Anatoli: 26; Tarasiuk, Vladislav: 30; Tar, Gábor: 22; Tribowski, Marcel: 36 (1st pr.); Tritten, Pierre: 25; Trommler, Sven: 5; Vieira, Ricardo de Mattos: 20; Vilkauskas, Antanas: 18.

Peter Gvozdjak



r#2 (16+14)

♖♗=Rook-, ♘♙=Bishop-,

♚♛=Nightrider-Lion

paralysing pieces

after the hurdles on both paralysis lines have been removed can the black rook-lion deliver mate. Speaking of lions: White makes the thematic flights inaccessible either by 3 orthodox blocks or by 3 moves providing hurdles to a phalanx of black nightrider-lions. White can start with each of these 6 moves, forcing the black queen to attack one of the flights because of Zugzwang – the clumsy lions hardly have any moves. If White starts with providing a hurdle, we get a Lačný cycle of the blocking moves, and if White starts with a blocking move, the result is a Lačný cycle of the moves providing hurdles. Getting all this sound must have been extremely hard, and the position tells... 30 pieces were necessary, including a number of non-thematical paralyzing pieces, among them both lions and (otherwise) orthodox officers.

Three white pieces stand out negatively: apart from BLd1g8 also Bg3 even if this piece both prevents the unwanted queen mate on e5 and keeps the Rg4 on the 4th rank, forcing it to sacrifice itself rather than unguarding the thematic squares. I have therefore decided to give this problem a special treatment from those which obey to more traditional rules of economy.

1.TLb6? **A** [] D:c1 **a** 2.Tc4 **D** D:c4#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.Td4 **E** TLf5#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.Te4 **F** TLf5#, 1...NLc4!

1.TLc6? **B** [] D:c1 **a** 2.Te4 **F** TLf5#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.Tc4 **D** TLf5#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.Td4 **E** D:d4#,

1...NLd2 2.Kc4 D:c1#, 1...NLd4!


1.TLd6? **C** [] D:c1 **a** 2.Td4 **E** TLf5#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.Te4 **F** D:e4#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.Tc4 **D** TLf5#, 1...NLd4!

1.Tc4? **D** [] D:c1 **a** 2.TLb6 **A** D:c4#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.TLc6 **B** TLf5#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.TLd6 **C** TLf5#, 1...pLLb5!

1.Td4? **E** [] D:c1 **a** 2.TLd6 **C** TLf5#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.TLb6 **A** TLf5#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.TLc6 **B** D:d4#, 1...NLd2!

1.Te4! **F** [] D:c1 **a** 2.TLc6 **B** TLf5#, 1...Db1 **b** 2.TLd6 **C** D:e4#, 1...D:b2 **c** 2.TLb6 **A** TLf5#

Bernard Courthiau



s#9 Circe

(9+6)

Spezial prize: no. 37

In 1974, Milan Velimirović realized his famous 3×3 Lačný cycle in an orthodox threemover. The problem relied on 3 flights of the black king: one of them needs to be attacked twice, by the white queen and another white piece, allowing the queen to deliver mate from that square; or all 3 squares have to be guarded for a mate, let's call it X, by a different piece. Some years later, young Miodrag Mladenović used the same mechanism in a reflexmate twomover with swapped colors; the fairy stipulation allowed for a much more elegant setting. Who would have thought that 50 years after Milan's pioneering work, the same mechanism would be used to show two 3×3 Lačnýs in one problem?? There is also a 6×3 Zagorujko, which would normally be a feat in itself, but looks like a simple addendum here. In r#2 settings, Black has to be prevented from playing the move X early as a disturbing check; Miodrag did this elegantly by unblocking a black pawn. In entry 37, the author(s) resort(s) to paralyzing lions: only

1st honorable mention: no. 23


I am not quite sure about the purpose of the thematic tries given with the solution; it seems to me that Black doesn't have enough choice for making them interesting. Also, the key is rather strong as it has to establish the white rook's self-guard. But the white bishop has plenty of choice; as the climax of the problem, the key turns out to be a clearance of the long diagonal for the very specific play of the black bishop. All in all, an extremely entertaining composition with many surprising moves and good Circe-specific play!

1.Tc4? b5?, 1...Kb5!, 1.Sc1? b5?, 1...b:c5!

1.Lg7! b5 2.Tc4 b:c4[+wTh1] 3.Sc1 c3 4.Tf1 c2 5.Le6 g4 6.Tf6 Lg5

7.La2+ L:f6[+wTa1] 8.Lg8+ L:a1 9.Lb2 L:b2#

Emil Klemenčič



h#2.5 4;1.1;1.1 (12+12)

♖♗=Lion

2nd honorable mention: no. 35

An interesting “helpmate of the future?” problem showing two Zilahis. A different judge might have placed this among the prizes, but to me, everything about this composition makes a very static impression, from the many blocked pawns to the clumsy fairy pieces used.


1...LI:e3 2.K:e3 a LIh4 3.Kf4 LIh6#

1...LI:f3 2.K:f3 b LIhh4 3.Kf4 LIh6#

1...LIh7 2.LI:h6 LI:h5+ 3.Ke3 a LI:h6#

1...LIb7 2.LI:f6 LIe4+ 3.Kf3 b LI:f6#

Mario Parrinello



hs#3 Super Guards (10+10)

b) ♖c2→b2 c) ♖c2→g6

♖=Lion

♖=Rook-Lion

♖=Bishop-Lion

3rd honorable mention: no. 33


As far as I can tell, this is an original cycle of eliminations of Super Guards. The twinning changes give away a lot. Also, the mates to the white king are very orthodox.

a) 1.Tc1 LIb4 2.S:b4 TL:c1 3.S:a6+ TLc5#

b) 1.Td1 LLd3 2.S:d3 LI:d1 3.S:c5+ LIg4#

c) 1.Tf1 TLe5 2.S:e5 LL:f1 3.S:g4+ LLa6#

Vlaicu Crișan



hs#3 2.1;1.1;1.1 (6+3+2)

Anda


1st commendation: no. 15

Perfect orthogonal-diagonal echo with good usage of the entire board. I would like to see more Anda-specific choices in the play; e. g. that the black king would only have to wait on f5 to allow the white pieces to become neutral; but in this problem, the order of the black moves is also (and more prominently) determined by the very orthodox need to evacuate d7 and f2 early.

1.L:f8 nL:g3 2.Tf2[=n]+ Ke6 3.nTd6[=w]+ nL:d6[=s]#

1.T:h3 nT:e7 2.Ld7[=n]+ Kf4 3.nLe3[=w]+ nT:e3[=s]#

S. K. Balasubramanian



h#2 (7+9)


♙=Leo, ♚♛=Pao, ♖♗=Vao
BUL-pieces c2 f2 g3 c4 g5

2nd commendation: no. 24

Rich play with lots of Bul effects. I have never used Bul pieces in my compositions, but I imagine that it is very difficult to compose something satisfactory, mainly because most moves will end up having multiple purposes, which runs totally against the economy of aims that I usually attempt to achieve; this composition is certainly no exception here. Also, there is more static force on each side of the board than I would like to see.

1.bVA:g6[sK→f5] bPA:b5[sK→h5] 2.bLE:h4[sbPA→g4]
bVA:f7[sB→f5]# (2...bVA:f7[sB→d5]? 3.bVaf5!)
1.bPA:a3[sK→d5] bVA:e6[sK→a2] 2.bLE:b2[sbVA→b1]
bPA:a5[sB→b3]# (2...bPA:a5[sB→d5]? 3.bPAb3!)

Torsten Linß



s#13* (4+2)


♙♛=Cardinal

3rd commendation: no. 9

Almost-echo in two corners. This wouldn't impress me a lot in a help-play problem; but we have antagonistic play here, and the Cardinals are adequately used.

1...Kc2 2.Dc6+ Kb3 3.Kd5 Kb4 4.Dc4+ Ka5 5.CLd2+ Kb6 6.Da6+ Kc7 7.Db7+ Kd8 8.Th8+ CLe8 9.Ke5 CLf8 10.CLg5+ Ke8 11.Dd5 CLg8 12.De6+ Kf8 13.Kf6 CL:h8#,
1.Kd5 Kc2 2.Db1+ Kc3 3.De4 Kb3 4.Kc5 Kc3 5.Kc6 Kb3 6.Dd3+ Kb4 7.CLa3+ Ka5 8.Dd5+ Ka6 9.Db5+ Ka7 10.Da5+ Kb8 11.CLb5+ Kc8 12.Da8+ CLb8! 13.Td3 CL:a8#

Václav Kotěšovec



ser-!=9 4 solutions (6+0)

Grid chess

♙=Sparrow

4th commendation: no. 10

Echos in help (or series) play are a dime a dozen. Luckily, this entry uses a very original combination of fairy elements, though, and with one exception, all pieces move in each solution.

1.SPd4 2.Ke4 3.Kd3 4.Kd2 5.Ke1 6.SPd2 7.SPfe2 8.SP4e3 9.SPcd3!=
1.Kd4 2.Ke3 3.SPd4 4.Kf2 5.SPfg3 6.SPdf3 7.Kg1 8.SPf1 9.SPdf2!=
1.SPe5 2.Ke6 3.Kd7 4.SPdc6 5.Ke8 6.SPd8 7.SPcd7 8.SP5d6 9.SPfe6!=
1.Ke4 2.Kf5 3.Kg4 4.Kh5 5.SPg5 6.SPh4 7.SPfg4 8.SPcf4 9.SPef5!=

Retros and proof games

— Award by Richard Dunn —

I must start by expressing my thanks to the tournament director, Torsten Linß, for entrusting me with the task of judging this section of such a prestigious competition. Twenty originals of all types, but predominantly proof games, were submitted. Eight of the problems incorporated fairy conditions, most of which are well-known although some may be quite new to problemists. Originality and retro content have been the main criteria in my decisions although I have taken aesthetics and economy into account where relevant. Note that most of the problems are not fully computer-tested.

Two problems have been found to contain cooks: *No. 15 (PG 29.5 Knightmate)*: Shorter solutions have been found, with the shortest as follows – 1.a4 g5 2.a5 Bg7 3.a6 Bxb2 4.a:b7 Bd4 5.Ba3 Bb6 6.Bd6 c:d6 7.b:c8=R Kg7 8.R:b8 Kf6 9.Rxd8+ Sg7 10.Rb8 Rc8 11.e4 Bd8 12.Rb6 a:b6 13.Qh5 Rc3 14.g4 Rg3 15.Bh3 Rb8 16.c4 R:g1+ 17.Sc2 Re1 18.Ra8 R:e4 19.Kb2 Re5 20.Rha1 Rb5 21.R1a7 Ra5 22.Rc7 Ra7 23.Kb3 Rab7 24.Bf1. *No. 16 (-28 & #1 Proca Retractor, Circe Assassin)*: back 13.Kb2-c1! Ra1(a3)-a2+ 14.Bg5-f6 & fwd 1.e8=Q#


Here are my thoughts on the originals not selected for an award:

No. 2 (PG 9.5 Take&Make Vertical Cylinder): Another short proof game, demonstrating interchange of 1 st and 2 nd black moves in the two solutions, White homebase, return of the pawn to its home square, and black sacrifices. *No. 3 (PG 15.0)*: The wQ acts as a shield to her lord, enabling exchange of places. Promotion of (Pa2) to S and its subsequent capture, allowing the bQ to get to b8, is a nice touch. *No. 4 (PG 15.0)*: The wK makes a perilous journey, including a surprising switchback (f7xf8-f7), with the help of (Sb8). *No. 8 (PG 18.5)*: It appears that two moves can be saved by each side if the Knights on the d and e files come directly from the b and g files, respectively, but this is impossible – (Sg8) has to come out quickly to allow 3.Bg8, while (Rh1) has to exit the back rank via e1 and e3, preventing 5.Se2? *No. 9 (PG 20.0)*: Everything revolves around the capture of (Bc8) – the most likely piece to do this is (Ra1) and this is indeed the case. Unique move order governed largely by the need to avoid checks of both Kings. *No. 11 (PG 22.0)*: White's move 5.f:g7 and the subsequent move 6.B:a7 create a situation whereby Black requires waiting moves; thus we have a cleverly hidden four-fold oscillation (pendulum) of the bRh8 (Rh8 ↔ g8). The wP on g7 holds its position until the bK emerges, whereupon it captures the bB, promoting to a Rook. There are insufficient moves available for [Ra1] to be released from its cage and move to the squares occupied by the visible Rooks (a3 or f5). Unfortunately, this problem is largely anticipated; the first 14 moves are identical to those of [P1004212](#). *No. 13 (PG 25.0)*: Enjoyable game of 'ships passing in the night'. *No. 17 (Add a piece to make the position legal (keeping white King in check), pointing the exact last move, and permitting at least 42 legal White replies to Black's check)*: Fine task which is certainly enjoyable and easy to solve. *No. 19 (Release the position!)*: A classical retro employing familiar strategy and incorporating a double repeated Pronkin (by wR on a1 and bS on b8). *No. 20 (Last move? a) Anticirce Cheylan; b) Mirror Anticirce Cheylan; c) Vertical Mirror Anticirce Cheylan; d) Couscous Anticirce Cheylan)*: Wenigsteiner (defined as total force of 3-4 men) with quadruplet of positions. It's unfortunate that Type Cheylan is used only in d).

Here is my award:

Kostas Prentos

Gold medal



PG 20.5

(14+15)

c1, Bc8-h3-c8 and Bf8-a3-f8. The promoted bishops are captured (Ceriani-Frolkin). The motivation for each line-clearance is pure; there are no extraneous elements which might lead to confusion. The added move 21.a4 provides an alternative route for the bQa1, and the close try illustrates this path. In this try, the bBc8 impedes the most direct route for the promoted wQ, which can only get to g4 via e8 and h5, leaving White with insufficient moves to play Pa3-a4. This problem should be compared with [P1004377](#), a similar idea showing line-clearances and switchbacks by the wBs as well as a switchback by the wK. While not entirely a novel idea, it is technically brilliant and a worthy winner.

1st Prize: no. 10


Try: 1.a3 Sh6 2.d4 a5 3.Sd2 a4 4.e4 e5 5.Qg4 f5 6.f4 f:g4 7.f5 Bb4 8.f6 g3 9.f7+ Ke7 10.Rb1 Qg8 11.f8=R Qa2 12.Rf3 Qa1 13.Rb3 Kf6 14.d5 Bf8 15.d6 a:b3 16.d:c7 d5 17.Sc4 Bd7 18.c8=Q Ra4 19.Qe8 Rb4 20.Qh5 Bc8 21.Qg4 (leaves the wP on a3 instead of a4)

Solution: 1.d4 e5 2.d5 Ba3 3.d6 a5 4.d:c7 d5 5.Bh6 Bh3 6.c8=B Qg5 7.Bg4 f5 8.f4 f:g4 9.f5 g3 10.f6 Bc8 11.f7+ Ke7 12.f8=B+ Kf6 13.Bb4 a:b4 14.e4 b3 15.Qg4 Bf8 16.Sa3 Ra4 17.Rd1 Qc1 18.Sc4 Qa1 19.Rb1 Rb4 20.Bc1 Sh6 21.a4

This problem contains no less than four line-clearance manoeuvres: a). bBc8 → h3, wBc8 → g4, bBh3 → c8; b). bBf8 → a3, wBf8 → b4, bBa3 → f8; c). wBc1 → h6, bQg5 → c1, wBh6 → c1; and d). wRa1 → d1, bQc1 → a1, wRd1 → b1. Of these four, the first two are Bristol-clearances while three involve switchbacks: Bc1-h6-

Joachim Hambros

Silver medal



PG 16.5

#color

(16+16)

mates are used to allow White to make two of Black's moves (Sc6-b8 and Qd6-d8). In addition, Qd1 and Qd8 swap places (and colours), and (Ke1) and (Bf1) return home after their trip. Any traces of the mating moves are entirely removed. A really delightful problem showing deep strategy.

2nd Prize: no. 7

1.e3 d5 2.Ke2 Bh3 3.Kd3 e6 4.Kd4 Bb4 5.Bd3 Qf6[f6=w] 6.Qh5 Sc6[c6=w] 7.Bf1 Kd7 8.Kd3 d4 9.Qc5 h5 10.Ke2 Sh6 11.Ke1 Rag8 12.Qf8 h4 13.Sb8[b8=b] c6 14.Qd6+ Ke8 15.Qdd8[d8=b] Bf8 16.Qf3 f6 17.Qd1


#colour (#c): A game does not end with mate. Instead, the colour of the mating piece (defined as the piece or pieces giving check in the mating position) is changed, and (unless illegal self-check results, in which case the mate is a 'final' one) play continues with the mated side moving next.

To get (Ra8) to g8, Black needs to do a switchback with (Sb8), (Qd8), (Ke8) and (Bf8). Alternative routes with fewer switchbacks are possible but require more Rook moves. In any case, there are 18 visible Black moves. To cut this number down by two, a total of four check-

Participants: Bašić, Bojan: 18 (comm.); Crişan, Vlaicu: 16 (cooked); Donati, Gianni: 4; Fieberg, Christoph: 11; Frolkin, Andriy: 19; Gasparyan, Alexey: 21; Gatti, Daniele: 17; Hambros, Joachim: 7 (1st hon. ment.); Kirtley, Mark: 8; Koch, Jean-René: 9; Lörinc, Juraj: 20; Michielsen, Joost: 5 (3rd hon. ment.); Nallusamy, Velmurugan: 12 (comm.); Novomesky, Daniel: 2; Olin, Per: 13; Parrinello, Mario: 6 (2nd hon. ment.); Prentos, Kostas: 10 (1st pr.); Răican, Paul: 15 (cooked); Sergiienko, Andrii: 3; Tritten, Pierre: 1 (comm.); Ubaidullaev, Rustam: 14 (comm.).

Mario Parrinello

Bronze medal



PG 16

(14+14)

Memory Circe


1st Honourable Mention: no. 6

1.h4 Sh6 2.h5 Sf5 3.h6 Sh4 4.h:g7 f5 5.g:f8=B[+bPg7] R:f8 6.c3 Rf6 7.Qa4 Ra6 8.Qc6 d:c6[+wBf8] 9.a4 Be6 10.Sa3 Ba2 11.b3 Sd7 12.Bb2 Sf6 13.0-0-0 Kd7 14.Ba1 Q:f8 15.Kb2 Qh8 16.K:a2[+wBf8] R:f8

Memory Circe: Any capture triggers the rebirth of the piece previously captured, on the same square where its capture occurred (if it is not occupied), regardless of the colour or type of unit just captured. The reborn piece resumes its normal course. If the square where the capture occurred is occupied, then the captured unit is annihilated. A unit can exist in memory before the actual play starts.

There are three Schnoebelen promotions by the same piece, namely a wB on f8: 5.g:f8=B[+bPg7]; 8...d:c6[+wBf8]; and 16.K:a2[+wBf8]. This piece, the star of the show, is finally removed (16...R:f8).

Joost Michielsen



PG 16


(14+14)

2nd Honourable Mention: no. 5

1.f4 e6 2.f5 Ke7 3.f6+ Kd6 4.f:g7 Sf6 5.g8=R (g8=Q?) Sa6 6.Rg3 Rg8 7.c4 Rg4 8.c5+ Kd5 9.c6 Bc5 10.c:b7 Qh8 11.b8=R (b8=Q?) Se8 12.Rbb3 Rb4 13.Rg6 Rbb8 14.Rb6 c:b6 15.Qa4 Sac7 16.Qa6 f:g6

Nice clearances by the promoted wRs on the b and g files making way for (Rh8), and their subsequent capture (Ceriani-Frolkin). This is a doubling of the theme of the Ben-Zvi Memorial Tourney held in 2022 (proof games showing clearance manoeuvres with pure motivation).

Pierre Tritten



PG 7

(12+13)

Face-2-Face


Commendation: no. 1

1.e3 d5 2.Qh5 Bg4 3.Qg6 g:b2 4.Qxg8 bd1:S 5.Q:g4 S:e3 6.Qd4 d:d4 7.d:e3 d:e3

Face-2-Face: When a white piece is one rank below a black piece on the same file, they exchange their powers.

A problem with an unusual condition and featuring Ceriani-Frolkin/Phoenix themes: capture of (Sg8), rebirth of S on d1 and its subsequent capture on e3. It also features the Kozhakin theme: first and last moves made on the same square (e3). An impressive amount crammed into just 7 moves.

Velmurugan Nallusamy



PG 24


(15+14)

Commendation: no. 12

1.b4 Sa6 2.b5 Rb8 3.bxa6 b5 4.f4 Rb6 5.f5 Rh6 6.f6 exf6 7.Sa3 Se7 8.Rb1 Sc6 9.Rb4 Sb8 10.Rh4 Bb4 11.g4 Qe7 12.Bg2 Kd8 13.Bc6 Re8 14.Sf3 Qf8 15.0-0 Re3 16.dxe3 Be1 17.Qd6 b4 18.Bd2 b3 19.Bb4 b2 20.Sd2 b1=S 21.Rf5 Sc3 22.Sdb1 Sd5 23.c3 Se7 24.Rd5 Sg8

The three Knights on home squares (Sb1, Sb8, Sg8) are impostors: Sb1 is the original Knight from Sg1, Sb8 is the original Knight from Sg8, and Sg8 is a promoted piece (Phoenix/Pronkin theme).

Rustam Ubaidullaev



PG 26


(14+13)

Commendation: no. 14

1.h4 e5 2.h5 Be7 3.h6 Bg5 4.h:g7 Se7 5.Rh6 Rf8 6.Rb6 a:b6 7.g8=R Ra3 8.Rh8 Rf3 9.a4 h5 10.a5 h4 11.a6 h3 12.a7 h2 13.a8=Q h1=R 14.Qa4 Rh4 15.Qc6 Ra4 16.e:f3 Ra8 17.Ba6 e4 18.Ke2 e3 19.Kd3 e2 20.Rh1 e1=Q 21.Qe2 Rh8 22.Qee6 Qe5 23.Qh3 Qc3+ 24.b:c3 Sg8 25.Ba3 d:c6+ 26.Bd6 Bg4

Plenty of content in this problem: double Ceriani-Frolkin (wQ, bQ), double Pronkin (bR, wR) and two switchbacks (bR, bS).

Bojan Bašić



Add wK, a black piece (1+1) and 9 Ps (of either color) on the marked squares for -1w & #1

Circe Parrain

Commendation: no. 18

Add white: Kg1, Pa1b4c1c2d1d2; black: Rb1, Pb3b5c5. -1.0-0(+Pb4) & 1.Rh1-h4[+Sb6,+Pb7]#

As a pawn appeared on b4 after 0-0, it had to be captured en passant. After -1.a4:Pb3 e.p. -2.b2-b4, White is in danger of a retro-stalemate, and thus Black must immediately move Rb1 out of the way. However, the only possibility is -2...Kd5-c4[+Rb1], and then nevertheless, after -3.b1:Rc2 (or possibly -3.b1:Pc2), although Black has many possible retractions, he does not have any way to prevent White's retro-stalemate on the next move. The only way to explain the legality of the retraction -1.0-0[+Pb4] is as follows: -1...a4:[Sb3&Pb3 e.p.] (i. e. bPa4 captures wSb3 and, at the same time, captures wPb4 e.p.) -2.b2-b4[+Sb3] a2:Sb1=R -3.S~- b1 and the risk of retro-stalemate is gone. Therefore, besides wPb4, there also had to be a wSb3 captured prior to White's forward move, validating the forward move from the solution. It should be noted that bRb1 cannot be any other piece, as this would allow the possibility of -1...a4:Pb3 e.p. (without a double capture) -2.b2-b4 X~-b1 -3.b1-b2 Kd5:~c4 and no retro-stalemate (hence there is no proof that a wS will be reborn on b6 in the forward move). This may well be the first realisation of an en passant move with double capture in Circe Parrain in a retro problem where retroanalysis is required to prove that such a move had to occur.