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Перıфќряıа Notíou Aıpaíou



WFCC
$63^{\text {rd }}$ World Congress of Chess Composition $44^{\text {th }}$ World Chess Solving Championship Rhodes, Greece, 16-23 October 2021

Congress Programme

|  | Sat 16.10 | Sun 17.10 | Mon 18.10 | Tue 19.10 | Wed 20.10 | Thu 21.10 | Fri 22.10 | Sat 23.10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morning | Arrival | Opening <br> Ceremony <br> 14:30 <br> WFCC <br> Opening <br> Session <br> 16:30 | Open <br> Solving <br> 10:00 | WCSC <br> 1st day <br> 10:00 | wCSC 2nd day 10:00 | Excursion and free time | WFCC <br> Closing Session 10:00 | Departure |
| Afternoon |  |  | Committees | Committees | WFCC Session 15:00 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prize Giving } \\ & \mathbf{1 4 : 0 0} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Evening |  | Captains' meeting 19:00 <br> Quick Composing 20:00 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lectures } \\ & \mathbf{2 0 : 0 0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Open Quick } \\ & \text { Solving } \\ & \mathbf{2 0 : 0 0} \end{aligned}$ | Open <br> Fairy <br> Solving $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0}$ <br> 20:00 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Solving } \\ \text { Show } \\ \text { 20:00 } \end{gathered}$ | Closing Banquet 19:30 |  |

WCCC 2021 website: https:/ / wccc2021.wfcc.ch/
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## Open Solving Tourney - 63 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ WCCC, Rhodes, Greece 18 October 2021

ROUND 1 - PROBLEMS Time 2 hours


2\#: Give the key.
3\# and n-\#: give key, possible threat and all variations until and including white's last but one move.
EG: give all moves up to an obvious win.
$\mathrm{H} \#$ : give the complete solution ( 1 solution $=2.5$ points).
S\#: key, possible threat and all variations until (and including) white's last move.

## From the WCSC rules:

The solutions are to be written in the following way:

1) in direct mate problems: all moves in all variations of full length including the threat if it is of full length too except the last move of Black and the mating move, i.e. in twomovers only the key; in threemovers all three move variations, including the threat, up to the second white move, etc.
2) in helpmate problems: all moves.
3) in selfmate problems: all moves except the mating move in all variations of full length, including the threat if it is of full length too.
4) in endgames: all moves up to an obvious win or draw.
5) if a threat is not written all required variations (according to a,c,d) are to be given.

6 ) in problems for which more than one solution is indicated the solver has to give the requested solutions. In all other problems and endgames only one solution is to be given.
7) if a solver believes he has found a cook, he may give it instead of the solution. In this case, he has to give the complete moves of the cook according to point 8 .
$8)$ the correct and complete solution or cook of a problem scores 5 points. An incomplete solution scores fewer points.

# Open Solving Tourney - $63^{\text {rd }}$ WCCC, Rhodes, Greece 18 October 2021 

## ROUND 2 - PROBLEMS Time 2 hours



## 2\#: Give the key

3\# and n-\#: give key, possible threat and all variations till and including white's last but one move.
EG: give all moves up to an obvious win.
$\mathrm{H} \#$ : give the complete solution ( 1 solution $=2.5$ points).
S\#: key, possible threat and all variations until (and including) white's last move.

## From the WCSC rules:

The solutions are to be written in the following way:
1 ) in direct mate problems: all moves in all variations of full length including the threat if it is of full length too except the last move of Black and the mating move, i.e. in twomovers only the key; in threemovers all three move variations, including the threat, up to the second white move, etc.
2) in helpmate problems: all moves.
3) in selfmate problems: all moves except the mating move in all variations of full length, including the threat if it is of full length too.
4) in endgames: all moves up to an obvious win or draw.
5) if a threat is not written all required variations (according to a,c,d) are to be given.

6 ) in problems for which more than one solution is indicated the solver has to give the requested solutions. In all other problems and endgames only one solution is to be given.
7) if a solver believes he has found a cook, he may give it instead of the solution. In this case, he has to give the complete moves of the cook according to point 8 .
$8)$ the correct and complete solution or cook of a problem scores 5 points. An incomplete solution scores fewer points.

# Open Solving Tourney－ $63^{\text {rd }}$ WCCC，Rhodes，Greece <br> 18 October 2021 <br> ROUND 1 －SOLUTIONS 



Touw Hian Bwee， $2^{\text {nd }} \mathbf{H M}$ Main Post 1973
1．留f8？［2．©e～\＃］but 1．．． C h2 ！
1．©xf5？［2．M Mf8\＃］but 1．．．bxa5！
1．©d5 ？［2．留f8\＃］but $1 . . . \mathrm{g} \mathrm{c} 4$ ！
1．©xf5 ？［2．씁d6\＃］but 1 ．．．峉d2 ！
1．d5 ！（5 points）［2．M M m （6\＃］
1．．．县h2 2．巛e3\＃1．．．马c4 2．घxc4\＃1．．．fxg4＋2．（f3\＃

William A．Whyatt， $1^{\text {st }}$ Prize The Tablet 1959




1．．．gg4 2．是xg4（0．5 point）～3．©d7\＃


## Leonid Lyubashevsky \＆Leonid Makaronez，Sachmatija 2011



1．．．c5 2．cxd3［3．dxc4～4．©d7\＃］



## Amatzia Avni，Original


 have the same position as two moves ago，without the c7－pawn．But now the $7^{\text {th }}$ rank is open for the rook，and this makes a difference．


7．Ih1（ 1.5 points）domination of the black queen

Unto Heinonen，Com．Suomen Tehtäväniekat 2008－10



György Bakcsi， $5^{\text {th }} \mathbf{H M}$ Europa Rochade 1990






7


12


# Open Solving Tourney－ $63^{\text {rd }}$ WCCC，Rhodes，Greece <br> 18 October 2021 <br> ROUND 2 －SOLUTIONS 

Franz Pachl， $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ HM Mansfield MT，The Problemist 1985－87



1．씁c8！（5 points）［2．씁f8\＃］
1．．．吕xe6 2．씁xe6\＃1．．．コxg4 2．घg6\＃

## Valentin Marin Y Llovet， $2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize TT Tidsskrift for Skak 1896－97




1．．．헙d6 2．0b5＋（1 point）웁xe7 3．Mff


## Leonid I．Kubbel，3rd Prize 64 1935－36







1．．．c5 2． $\mathrm{mf} 5+$ 学d6 3． B d5＋（1 point）exd5 4．e5\＃

## Jan Rusinek， $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Prize Suomen Shakki 1987






8．2f2＋Gh2 9．Hih8＋
9．．．${ }^{6}$ g3 10． 4 h3 ${ }^{2}$（ 0.5 point）

Jorge J．Lois \＆Jorge M．Kapros，5th Prize F．Abdurahmanovic－60 JT StrateGems 2000



Friedrich Chlubna，Schach－Echo 1974 （v）

1．씀g1！zugzwang．



Open Solving Tournament of WCCC 2021 (Greece, Rhodes 18.10.2021) - Final Individual Results

| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Round 2-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total - 240 |  | Perf. Rat. | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#2 | \#3 | \#5 | + | H\#3 | S\#3 | (1) | \#2 | \#3 | \#4 | + | H\#4 | S\#5 | (1) | Points | (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. |  | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Van Beers, Eddy |  | BEL | 2580.08 | 9 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 94 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 115 | 60 | 209 | 2654.94 | 8.08 |
| 2 | Khasanov, Ural | j | RUS | 2470.95 | 28 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 60 | 240 | 2654.94 | 19.84 |
| 3 | Murdzia, Piotr |  | POL | 2654.94 | 3 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 53 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 109 | 59 | 162 | 2636.40 | -2.00 |
| 4 | Pavlov, Danila | j | RUS | 2647.44 | 4 | IM | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 59 | 240 | 2636.40 | -1.20 |
| 5 | Sidiropoulos, Nikos |  | GRE | 2410.96 | 45 | FM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 57 | 220 | 2599.32 | 20.32 |
| 6 | Limontas, Martynas |  | LTU | 2495.14 | 20 | GM | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 105 | 57 | 225 | 2599.32 | 11.24 |
| 7 | Erenburg, Mark | s | ISR | 2361.89 | 56 | IM | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 57 | 240 | 2599.32 | 25.62 |
| 8 | Moiseev, Danila | j | RUS | 2489.95 | 21 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 3.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 56 | 240 | 2580.78 | 9.80 |
| 9 | Caillaud, Michel | s | FRA | 2487.88 | 23 | GM | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 118 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 115 | 55.5 | 233 | 2571.51 | 9.02 |
| 10 | Satkus, Vidmantas |  | LTU | 2474.51 | 27 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 94 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 55 | 214 | 2562.24 | 9.46 |
| 11 | Popov, Aleksey | j | RUS | 2504.35 | 17 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 105 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 54 | 225 | 2543.70 | 4.24 |
| 12 | Comay, Ofer | s | ISR | 2499.38 | 19 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 95 | 52 | 215 | 2506.61 | 0.78 |
| 13 | Kovačević, Marjan | s | SRB | 2475.03 | 25 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | 5 | 117 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 109 | 52 | 226 | 2506.61 | 3.40 |
| 14 | Hodge, David |  | GBR | 2323.29 | 72 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 118 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 51.5 | 238 | 2497.34 | 18.78 |
| 15 | Serafimović, Ilija | j | SRB | 2332.35 | 68 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 119 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 119 | 50 | 238 | 2469.53 | 14.80 |
| 16 | Richter, Frank |  | GER | 2366.89 | 54 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 118 | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 116 | 49.5 | 234 | 2460.26 | 10.08 |
| 17 | Górski, Piotr |  | POL | 2465.90 | 29 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 47.5 | 240 | 2423.18 | -4.60 |
| 18 | Sumiya, Bilguun |  | MGL | 2452.63 | 32 | FM | 5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 46 | 240 | 2395.37 | -6.18 |
| 19 | Uitenbroek, Hans |  | NED | 2264.14 | 94 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 117 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 45 | 237 | 2376.83 | 12.16 |
| 20 | Wege, Jochen |  | GER | - | - | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 96 | 44.5 | 216 | 2367.56 | - |
| 21 | Onkoud, Abdelaziz |  | FRA | 2424.90 | 38 | FM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 118 | 5 | 0 | 4.5 | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 44.5 | 238 | 2367.56 | -6.18 |
| 22 | Mendrinos, Nikos |  | GRE | 2265.82 | 93 | FM | 5 | 5 | 3.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 44 | 240 | 2358.29 | 9.98 |
| 23-25 | Chocenka, Dmitrijus |  | LTU | 2186.75 | 139 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 42.5 | 240 | 2330.48 | 15.50 |


| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Round 2-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total - 240 |  | Perf. Rat. | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H\#3 | S\#3 | (1) | \#2 | \#3 | \#4 | + | H\#4 | S\#5 | (1) |  | (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. |  | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| 23-25 | Crișan, Vlaicu |  | ROU | 2296.38 | 84 | IM | 5 | 0 | 1.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 42.5 | 240 | 2330.48 | 3.68 |
| 23-25 | Heuvel, Peter van den |  | NED | 2347.05 | 62 | IM | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | - | 5 | 120 | 42.5 | 240 | 2330.48 | -1.78 |
| 26 | Paavilainen, Jorma | s | FIN | 2448.29 | 33 | GM | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | - | 3 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 41.5 | 240 | 2311.94 | -14.70 |
| 27 | Maeder, Thomas |  | SUI | 2209.81 | 120 | IM | 5 | 5 | 0 | - | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 3.5 | - | 5 | 5 | 100 | 41 | 220 | 2302.67 | 10.02 |
| 28 | Rotenberg, Jacques | S | ISR | 2353.49 | 58 | IM | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 41 | 240 | 2302.67 | -5.48 |
| 29 | Selivanov, Andrey |  | RUS | 2343.85 | 64 | GM | 5 | - | 3 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 118 | 40 | 238 | 2284.12 | -6.44 |
| 30 | Aridov, Vladimir |  | UKR | 2330.73 | 70 | FM | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | - | - | 120 | 40 | 240 | 2284.12 | -5.02 |
| 31 | Kolčák, Marek | s | SVK | 2257.65 | 97 | IM | 0 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 38.5 | 240 | 2256.31 | -0.14 |
| 32-33 | Paliulionis, Viktoras |  | LTU | 2099.19 | 180 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | - | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 37.5 | 240 | 2237.77 | 14.94 |
| 32-33 | Sergiienko, Andrii | j | UKR | 1880.78 | 356 | - | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4.5 | 0 | - | - | 120 | 37.5 | 240 | 2237.77 | 38.50 |
| 34 | Steponavičius, Stasys |  | LTU | 2191.43 | 131 | - | 5 | 5 | 3 | - | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 37 | 240 | 2228.50 | 4.00 |
| 35 | Chovnik, Mordechay | s | ISR | 2347.36 | 61 | FM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2.5 | - | 120 | 36.5 | 240 | 2219.23 | -13.82 |
| 36 | Kopyl, Valery | S | UKR | 2210.30 | 119 | IM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 4.5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 34.5 | 240 | 2182.15 | -3.04 |
| 37 | Mihalčo, Oto | s | SVK | 2129.21 | 159 | - | 5 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 119 | 34 | 239 | 2172.88 | 4.72 |
| 38 | Satkus, Vilimantas | s | LTU | 2007.71 | 236 | - | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 4.5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 117 | 33.5 | 237 | 2163.61 | 16.82 |
| 39 | Boer, Johan de |  | NED | 2250.26 | 102 | FM | 5 | 5 | - | 2.5 | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 31.5 | 240 | 2126.53 | -13.34 |
| 40 | Nicula, Dinu-Ioan |  | ROU | 2230.08 | 110 | FM | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | - | - | 120 | 31 | 240 | 2117.26 | -12.18 |
| 41 | Konidaris, Panagiotis |  | GRE | 2113.88 | 170 | - | 0 | 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 29.5 | 240 | 2089.45 | -2.64 |
| 42 | Putintseva, Marina | jw | RUS | 2163.21 | 148 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 118 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | - | 115 | 28 | 233 | 2061.64 | -10.96 |
| 43 | Sokolov, Egor | j | RUS | 2099.28 | 179 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | - | 5 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 28 | 240 | 2061.64 | -4.06 |
| 44 | Ott, Roland | s | SUI | 2232.31 | 108 | - | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 120 | 27 | 240 | 2043.09 | -20.42 |
| 45 | Wissmann, Dolf |  | NED | 2306.22 | 82 | GM | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 25 | 220 | 2006.01 | -32.38 |
| 46 | Ooms, Andy |  | BEL | 2271.13 | 91 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 25 | 240 | 2006.01 | -28.60 |
| 47 | Libiš, Zdeněk | s | CZE | 2034.60 | 218 | - | 0 | 5 | - | 2.5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 120 | 24.5 | 240 | 1996.74 | -4.08 |


| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Round 2-120' |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total - 240 |  | Perf. Rat. | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#2 | \#3 | \#5 | + | H\#3 | S\#3 | (1) | \#2 | \#3 | \#4 | + | H\#4 | S\#5 | (1) | Points | (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. |  | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| 48-49 | Sihnevich, Mikalai | s | BLR | 2096.88 | 182 | - | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | 5 | 120 | 24 | 240 | 1987.47 | -11.80 |
| 48-49 | Van Herck, Marcel | s | BEL | 2053.60 | 207 | - | 5 | 4 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | - | - | 120 | 24 | 240 | 1987.47 | -7.14 |
| 50 | Versmissen, Koen |  | NED | 2040.40 | 215 | - | 5 | - | 3 | 5 | - | - | 120 | 5 | 5 | 0 | - | - | - | 120 | 23 | 240 | 1968.93 | -7.70 |
| 51 | Ushakov, Nikita | j | RUS | 2063.08 | 202 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | - | 5 | 119 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | - | 120 | 22.5 | 239 | 1959.66 | -11.16 |
| 52 | Kopylov, Evgeny |  | RUS | 1837.62 | 394 | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 120 | 22.5 | 240 | 1959.66 | 13.16 |
| 53 | Spiliadis, Athanasios |  | GRE | 1930.44 | 303 | - | 5 | 1.5 | - | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 4 | - | 0 | - | - | 119 | 20.5 | 239 | 1922.58 | -0.84 |
| 54-55 | Gilbert, Axel |  | FRA | 2075.64 | 193 | - | 5 | 5 | - | 5 | - | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 120 | 20 | 240 | 1913.31 | -17.52 |
| 54-55 | Harkola, Hannu | s | FIN | 1887.25 | 352 | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | - | - | 120 | 5 | - | - | 0 | 5 | - | 120 | 20 | 240 | 1913.31 | 2.82 |
| 56 | Nielsen, Steffen Slumstrup |  | DEN | 2103.14 | 176 | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | 2.5 | 2 | 120 | 5 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 120 | 19.5 | 240 | 1904.04 | -21.48 |
| 57 | Skyrianoglou, Dimitris |  | GRE | 1920.55 | 313 | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | - | 2 | 120 | 5 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 120 | 17 | 240 | 1857.69 | -6.78 |
| 58 | Šušulić, Živan | s | SRB | 1748.64 | 477 | - | 5 | - | - | - | 2.5 | 2 | 120 | 5 | 0 | - | 1 | - | - | 120 | 15.5 | 240 | 1829.88 | 8.76 |
| 59 | Hryshchenko, Kamila | jw | UKR | - | - | - | 5 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 120 | 5 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 72 | 10 | 192 | 1727.90 | - |
| 60 | Petras, Milan | S | CZE | 2023.03 | 224 | - | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 116 | 9 | 236 | 1709.36 | -33.84 |
| 61 | Enemark, Bjorn | s | DEN | 1662.91 | 572 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 120 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 118 | 5 | 238 | 1635.20 | -2.98 |
| 62 | Kovalskyi, Roman | j | UKR | - | - | - | 5 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 120 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 120 | 5 | 240 | 1635.20 | - |
| 63-64 | Fishchuk, Vladislav | j | UKR | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 120 | 0 | 240 | 1542.49 | - |
| 63-64 | Soerjadi, Ajuna | jw | NED | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 120 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 120 | 0 | 240 | 1542.49 | - |
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Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021 - Round 1. (20')

| Name |
| :--- | :--- |
| Country |




3.



| 4. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 里 | $\pm$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\pm$ | (2) | $\pm$ |
|  | $0{ }^{0}$ |  | $\pm$ |
|  | $\pm$ |  | ) |
|  | 0 |  |  |

5. 


6.


Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021 - Round 3. (100')

7.

8.

9.


Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021 - Round 4. (50')

10.


| $\mathrm{H} \# 2$ | 3111 | $6+8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(2 / 3,5 / 5)$ |  |

11. 


12.


Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021 - Round 5. (80')

14.

15.


16.

17.

18.

| 曾目 |  | \％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ） 1 | 既 | $\pm$ |
| $\pm$ |  |  |
| E |  | 쥰 쥰 |
| $\pm$ |  | $\pm$ |
|  | $\pm$ | 軮 |
|  | （1） | $)$ |
| 说会 | \％${ }^{\text {B }}$ |  |

44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021
Rhodes, 19-20 October 2021 - Round 1, \#2, 20'


44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021
Rhodes，19－20 October 2021 －Round 2，\＃3，60＇

| － $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 4$－ | Pavel Miltner |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 3rd honourable mention K．Sobek 50 JT， 1998 <br> 1．置a5！ <br> $>2.0 \mathrm{f} 2+$ $\qquad$ 1，25 <br> 1．．． 0 g 4 2．．${ }^{4} \mathrm{fl} 1+$ $\qquad$ 1，25 <br> 1．．．d5 2．起b4 $\qquad$ 1，25 <br> 1．．．思f5 2．挈xd2＋ $\qquad$ 1，25 |
| \＃3 5＋9 |  |
| $-\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 5-$ | Michael Keller \＆Thorsten Zirkwitz 2nd honourable mention The Problemist， 2000 |
|  |  |
|  | 1．悤h2！ |
|  |  |
| $\Sigma \text { BIIII }$ |  |
|  | 1．．axb5 2．4rxb5 ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．＠ |
|  | 1．．．䓢xd6 2．思xe5＋ $\qquad$ （a） <br> 1．daf5 2 易 8 |
|  | $@=1,0 / 2,0 / 2,5 / 3,0 / 4,0 / 5,0$ |
| \＃3 12＋10 |  |
| $-\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 6-$ | Frederick Gamage 2nd prize Natal Mercury， 1911 |
|  |  |
|  | 1．4c5！ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 1．．0xc5 2．${ }^{\text {ur c } 4 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . @ ~}$ |
|  | 1．．．$勹 \mathrm{~b} 62$ 2． $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{xb} 5+$ $\qquad$ （a） <br> 1．．．悤xc5 2．䠦d3 |
|  |  |
|  | $@=1,0 / 2,0 / 2,5 / 3,0 / 4,0 / 5,0$ |
|  |  |
| \＃3 11＋11 |  |

## 44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021

Rhodes, 19-20 October 2021 - Round 3, eg, 100'


44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021 Rhodes, 19-20 October 2021 - Round 4, H\#, 50'


44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021
Rhodes, 19-20 October 2021 - Round 5, \#n, 80'


44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021
Rhodes, 19-20 October 2021 - Round 6, S\#, 50'


44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021 (Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021) - Final Individual Results

| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-20' |  |  |  | Round 2-60' |  |  |  | Round 3-100' |  |  |  | Round 4-50' |  |  |  | Round 5-80' |  |  |  | Round 6-50' |  |  |  | Total - 360 |  | Perf. Rat. | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \# 2 \\ \hline 1 . \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \#2 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \# 2 \\ \hline 3 . \\ \hline \end{array}$ | (1) | $\frac{\# 3}{4 .}$ | \#3 | \#3 | (1) | + + |  | 9. | (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{H} \# 2 \\ \hline \mathbf{1 0 .} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | H\#3 | H\#6 12. | (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \# 4 \\ \hline 13 . \end{array}$ | \#6 | \#9 15. | (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { S\#2 } \\ \hline 16 . \\ \hline \end{array}$ | S\#3 | S\#4 18. | (1) | Points <br> 90 | (1) |  |  |
| 1 | Pavlov, Danila | j | RUS | 2647.44 | 4 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 90 | 360 | 2777.47 | 36.56 |
| 2 | Piorun, Kacper |  | POL | 2620.41 | 6 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 43 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 46 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 81 | 339 | 2649.49 | 8.20 |
| 3 | Khasanov, Ural | j | RUS | 2470.95 | 28 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 81 | 360 | 2649.49 | 50.24 |
| 4 | Van Beers, Eddy |  | BEL | 2580.08 | 9 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 48 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 80 | 358 | 2635.27 | 15.52 |
| 5 | Murdzia, Piotr |  | POL | 2654.94 | 3 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 39 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 48 | 79.5 | 307 | 2628.16 | -7.52 |
| 6 | Górski, Piotr |  | POL | 2465.90 | 29 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 43 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 69 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 78.5 | 342 | 2613.94 | 41.64 |
| 7 | Hodge, |  | GBR | 2323.29 | 72 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 59 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 48 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 77.5 | 347 | 2599.72 | 77.76 |
| 8 | Moiseev, Danila | j | RUS | 2489.95 | 21 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 52 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 50 | 76.75 | 332 | 2589.06 | 27.88 |
| 9 | Serafimović, Ilija | j | SRB | 2332.35 | 68 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 3 | 50 | 75.75 | 360 | 2574.84 | 68.20 |
| 10 | Kovačević, Marjan | s | SRB | 2475.03 | 25 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 49 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 76 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 50 | 72.5 | 355 | 2528.62 | 15.08 |
| 11 | Sidiropoulos, Nikos |  | GRE | 2410.96 | 45 | FM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 53 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 43 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 47 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 70 | 313 | 2493.07 | 23.08 |
| 12 | Caillaud, Michel | s | FRA | 2487.88 | 23 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 22 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 77 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 50 | 70 | 328 | 2493.07 | 1.48 |
| 13 | Wissmann, Dolf |  | NED | 2306.22 | 82 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 97 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 65 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 50 | 68.5 | 342 | 2471.74 | 46.56 |
| 14 | Popov, Aleksey | j | RUS | 2504.35 | 17 | IM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 66.5 | 360 | 2443.30 | -17.16 |
| 15 | Richter, Frank |  | GER | 2366.89 | 54 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 3.75 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 66 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 47 | 66.25 | 343 | 2439.75 | 20.48 |
| 16 | Paavilainen, Jorma | s | FIN | 2448.29 | 33 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 80 | 3.75 | 5 | 3 | 50 | 66.25 | 360 | 2439.75 | -2.40 |
| 17 | Limontas, Martynas |  | LTU | 2495.14 | 20 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 5 | - | 60 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 65 | 360 | 2421.97 | -20.60 |
| 18 | Heuvel, Peter van den |  | NED | 2347.05 | 62 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 63.25 | 360 | 2397.09 | 14.08 |
| 19 | Rotenberg, Jacques | s | ISR | 2353.49 | 58 | IM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 68 | 2.5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 62 | 348 | 2379.31 | 7.28 |
| 20 | Sokolov, Egor | j | RUS | 2099.28 | 179 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 80 | 3.75 | 5 | - | 50 | 61.25 | 360 | 2368.64 | 75.76 |
| 21 | Onkoud, Abdelaziz |  | FRA | 2424.90 | 38 | FM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 5 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 60.75 | 360 | 2361.53 | -17.84 |
| 22 | Satkus, Vidmantas |  | LTU | 2474.51 | 27 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 5 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 60.5 | 339 | 2357.98 | -32.76 |
| 23 | Sumiya, Bilguun |  | MGL | 2452.63 | 32 | FM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 54 | 1.25 | 3.75 | 1 | 50 | 59.25 | 334 | 2340.20 | -31.64 |
| 24 | Comay, Ofer | s | ISR | 2499.38 | 19 | GM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 3.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 59 | 330 | 2336.65 | -45.76 |
| 25 | Uitenbroek, Hans |  | NED | 2264.14 | 94 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 5 | 4 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 44 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 3.75 | 0 | - | 50 | 57.5 | 349 | 2315.32 | 14.40 |
| 26 | Nicula, Dinu-Ioan |  | ROU | 2230.08 | 110 | FM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 1.25 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 56.75 | 360 | 2304.65 | 20.96 |
| 27 | Pervakov, Oleg | s | RUS | 2275.51 | 89 | FM | 5 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 1.25 | 5 | 2.5 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 99 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 74 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 54.75 | 353 | 2276.21 | 0.20 |
| 28 | Erenburg, Mark | s | ISR | 2361.89 | 56 | IM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | - | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 53.75 | 360 | 2261.99 | -28.08 |
| 29 | Ushakov, Nikita | j | RUS | 2063.08 | 202 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 53.5 | 360 | 2258.44 | 54.96 |
| 30 | Linß, Torsten |  | GER | 2099.14 | 181 | - | 5 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 5 | - | 0 | 60 | 3 | - | - | 87 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 31 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 77 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 53 | 325 | 2251.33 | 42.80 |
| 31 | Ott, Roland | s | SUI | 2232.31 | 108 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | $3.75 \mid$ | 0 | 4 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 52.75 | 360 | 2247.77 | 4.36 |


| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-20' |  |  |  | Round 2-60' |  |  |  | Round 3-100' |  |  |  | Round 4-50' |  |  |  | Round 5-80' |  |  |  | Round 6-50' |  |  |  | Total - 360 |  | Perf. Rat. | +/- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#2 ${ }^{\text {\# }}$ | \#2 \#2 | \#2 | (1) | \#3 | \#3 | \#3 | (1) |  | $=$ | $=$ | (1) | H\#2 | H\#3 | H\#6 | (1) | \#4 | \#6 | \#9 | (1) | S\#2 | S\#3 | S\#4 | (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Points } \\ \hline 90 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | (1) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. 2 | 2. 3 | 3. |  | 4. | 5. | 6. |  | 7. | 8. | 9. |  | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 13. | 14. | 15. |  | 16. | 17. | 18. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Selivanov, Andrey |  | RUS | 2343.85 | 64 | GM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 55 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 52 | 335 | 2237.11 | -30.04 |
| 33 | Konidaris, Panagiotis |  | GRE | 2113.88 | 170 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 3.5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 72 | 5 | 5 | - | 50 | 51.5 | 352 | 2230.00 | 32.68 |
| 34 | Maeder, Thomas |  | SUI | 2209.81 | 120 | IM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 51.25 | 349 | 2226.44 | 4.68 |
| 35 | Steponavičius, Stasy |  | LTU | 2191.43 | 131 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 2.5 | 0 | - | 50 | 51 | 360 | 2222.89 | 8.84 |
| 36 | Chovnik, Mordechay | s | ISR | 2347.36 | 61 | FM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 3.75 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 50.75 | 360 | 2219.33 | -36.00 |
| 37 | Crişan, Vlaicu |  | ROU | 2296.38 | 84 | IM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 50 | 350 | 2208.67 | -24.68 |
| 38 | Ooms, Andy |  | BEL | 2271.13 | 91 | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 3.75 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 360 | 2208.67 | -17.56 |
| 39 | Kopyl, Valery | s | UKR | 2210.30 | 119 | IM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 52 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 49.5 | 352 | 2201.56 | -2.44 |
| 40 | Mendrinos, Nikos |  | GRE | 2265.82 | 93 | FM | 0 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 5 | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 49 | 360 | 2194.45 | -20.08 |
| 41 | Mihalčo, Oto | s | SVK | 2129.21 | 159 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 2.5 | 4 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 3.75 | 5 | - | 74 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 48.75 | 346 | 2190.89 | 17.36 |
| 42 | Sergiienko, Andrii | j | UKR | 1880.78 | 356 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 98 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 47.75 | 358 | 2176.67 | 83.24 |
| 43-44 | Kolčák, Marek | s | SVK | 2257.65 | 97 | IM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 47.75 | 360 | 2176.67 | -22.76 |
| 43-44 | Vasyliv, Stanislav | j | UKR | 2157.24 | 154 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 3 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | - | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | - | 50 | 47.75 | 360 | 2176.67 | 5.48 |
| 45-46 | Paliulionis, Viktoras |  | LTU | 2099.19 | 180 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | - | 5 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | 5 | 50 | 5 | - | 5 | 80 | 5 | 5 | - | 50 | 47 | 360 | 2166.01 | 18.80 |
| 45-46 | Wege, Jochen |  | GER | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 100 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 3.75 | 3.75 | - | 50 | 47 | 360 | 2166.01 | - |
| 47 | Sihnevich, Mikalai | s | BLR | 2096.88 | 182 | - | 5 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 98 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 46.5 | 358 | 2158.90 | 17.44 |
| 48 | Putintseva, Marina | jw | RUS | 2163.21 | 148 | - | 0 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 3.75 | 2 | 1 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 | 50 | 45.75 | 360 | 2148.23 | -4.20 |
| 49 | Gilbert, Axel |  | FRA | 2075.64 | 193 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 3 | - | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | 5 | 50 | 5 | - | 5 | 77 | 5 | 3.75 | - | 50 | 42.75 | 357 | 2105.57 | 8.40 |
| 50 | Chocenka, Dmitrijus |  | LTU | 2186.75 | 139 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 38.75 | 360 | 2048.69 | -38.84 |
| 51 | Boer, Johan de |  | NED | 2250.26 | 102 | FM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | - | 5 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 97 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 42 | 5 | - | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 38 | 349 | 2038.03 | -59.68 |
| 52 | Aridov, Vladimir |  | UKR | 2330.73 | 70 | FM | 0 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 3.75 | 0 | 50 | 36.75 | 360 | 2020.25 | -87.32 |
| 53 | Satkus, Vilimantas | s | LTU | 2007.71 | 236 | - | 0 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 0 | - | 0 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 31 | 360 | 1938.49 | -19.48 |
| 54-55 | Kopylov, Evgeny |  | RUS | 1837.62 | 394 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 2.5 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 28.5 | 360 | 1902.94 | 18.36 |
| 54-55 | Šušulić, Živan | s | SRB | 1748.64 | 477 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 2.5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 28.5 | 360 | 1902.94 | 43.40 |
| 56 | Spiliadis, Athanasios |  | GRE | 1930.44 | 303 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 27.5 | 360 | 1888.72 | -11.72 |
| 57 | Nielsen, Steffen Slumstrup |  | DEN | 2103.14 | 176 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | - | - | 4 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 3.75 | - | - | 80 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 26.75 | 360 | 1878.05 | -63.32 |
| 58 | Prenzler, Daniel |  | GER | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1.25 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 5 | - | - | 50 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 22.25 | 345 | 1814.06 | - |
| 59 | Libiš, Zdeněk | s | CZE | 2034.60 | 218 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.5 | 2 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 3.75 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 21.75 | 360 | 1806.95 | -64.04 |
| 60 | Van Herck, Marcel | s | BEL | 2053.60 | 207 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 1.25 | 1 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 3.5 | - | - | 50 | 3.75 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 3.75 | 0 | - | 50 | 19.25 | 360 | 1771.40 | -79.40 |
| 61 | Skyrianoglou, Dimitris |  | GRE | 1920.55 | 313 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | - | 0 | - | 60 | 1 | 0 | - | 100 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 50 | 2.5 | 0 | - | 80 | 5 | 0 | - | 50 | 16 | 360 | 1725.18 | -54.96 |
| 62 | Petras, Milan | s | CZE | 2023.03 | 224 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 2 | - | - | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 15.5 | 359 | 1718.07 | -85.80 |


| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-20' |  |  |  | Round 2-60' |  |  |  | Round 3-100 |  |  |  | Round 4-50' |  |  |  | Round 5-80' |  |  |  | Round 6-50' |  |  |  | Total - 360 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#2 | \#2 | \#2 | (1) | \#3 | \#3 | \#3 | (1) | + | = | $=$ | (1) | H\#2 | H\#3 | H\#6 | (1) | \#4 | \#6 | \#9 | (1) | S\#2 | S\#3 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. | 2. | 3. |  | 4. | 5. | 6. |  | 7. | 8. | 9. |  | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 13. | 14. | 15. |  | 16. | 17. |  |  |  |
| 63 | Kovalskyi, Roman | j | UKR | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.5 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 2 | 2.5 | 0 | 100 | - | - | - | 50 | 2.5 | - | - | 80 | 2.5 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 64 | Hryshchenko, Kamila | jw | UKR | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | - | 50 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 3.75 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 65 | Soerjadi, Ajuna | jw | NED | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | - | - | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | - | - | - | 50 | - | 0 | 0 | 80 | 2.5 | - |  |  |  |

## Created by WFCC Solving Tournament Manager

44th World Chess Solving Championship 2021 (Greece, Rhodes 19.10.2021-20.10.2021) - Final Team Results


| Rank | Name | Country | Round 1 |  | Round 2 |  | Round 3 |  | Round 4 |  | Round 5 |  | Round 6 |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ | Points | $\square$ |
|  |  |  | 30 | 40 | 30 | 120 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 160 | 30 | 100 | 180 | 720 |
|  | Ooms, Andy | BEL | 10 | 20 | 5.75 | 60 | 8 | 100 | 12.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 80 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 360 |
|  | Van Herck, Marcel | BEL | 5 | 20 | 2.25 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 3.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 80 | 3.75 | 50 | 19.25 | 360 |
| 9 | Germany | GER | 20 | 40 | 17.75 | 120 | 12 | 187 | 27.5 | 81 | 30 | 143 | 22.5 | 97 | 129.75 | 668 |
|  | Richter, Frank | GER | 10 | 20 | 12.75 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 12.5 | 50 | 15 | 66 | 15 | 47 | 66.25 | 343 |
|  | Linß, Torsten | GER | 10 | 20 | 5 | 60 | 3 | 87 | 15 | 31 | 15 | 77 | 5 | 50 | 53 | 325 |
|  | Wege, Jochen | GER | 10 | 20 | 3 | 60 | 9 | 100 | 7.5 | 50 | 10 | 80 | 7.5 | 50 | 47 | 360 |
| 10 | Israel | ISR | 25 | 40 | 19 | 120 | 13 | 200 | 18.5 | 100 | 25 | 130 | 20 | 100 | 120.5 | 690 |
|  | Comay, Ofer | ISR | 10 | 20 | 9 | 60 | 4 | 100 | 11 | 50 | 15 | 50 | 10 | 50 | 59 | 330 |
|  | Erenburg, Mark | ISR | 15 | 20 | 10 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 50 | 10 | 80 | 8.75 | 50 | 53.75 | 360 |
|  | Chovnik, Mordechay | ISR | 10 | 20 | 7.75 | 60 | 8 | 100 | 7.5 | 50 | 7.5 | 80 | 10 | 50 | 50.75 | 360 |
| 11 | Romania | ROU | 25 | 40 | 14.25 | 120 | 10 | 200 | 27.5 | 90 | 15 | 160 | 15 | 100 | 106.75 | 710 |
|  | Nicula, DinuIoan | ROU | 15 | 20 | 9.25 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 12.5 | 50 | 5 | 80 | 10 | 50 | 56.75 | 360 |
|  | Crișan, Vlaicu | ROU | 10 | 20 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 15 | 40 | 10 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 50 | 350 |
| 12 | Switzerland | SUI | 25 | 40 | 21.75 | 120 | 6 | 189 | 25 | 100 | 11.25 | 160 | 15 | 100 | 104 | 709 |
|  | Ott, Roland | SUI | 15 | 20 | 7.75 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 12.5 | 50 | 7.5 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 52.75 | 360 |
|  | Maeder, Thomas | SUI | 10 | 20 | 14 | 60 | 1 | 89 | 12.5 | 50 | 3.75 | 80 | 10 | 50 | 51.25 | 349 |
| 13 | Ukraine | UKR | 25 | 40 | 20.75 | 112 | 7 | 198 | 20 | 100 | 13.75 | 160 | 17.5 | 100 | 104 | 710 |
|  | Kopyl, Valery | UKR | 5 | 20 | 14 | 52 | 3 | 100 | 12.5 | 50 | 6.25 | 80 | 8.75 | 50 | 49.5 | 352 |
|  | Sergiienko, Andrii | UKR | 15 | 20 | 6.75 | 60 | 3 | 98 | 7.5 | 50 | 7.5 | 80 | 8 | 50 | 47.75 | 358 |
|  | Aridov, Vladimir | UKR | 10 | 20 | 4 | 60 | 4 | 100 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 80 | 8.75 | 50 | 36.75 | 360 |
| 14 | Slovakia | SVK | 25 | 40 | 20.5 | 120 | 6 | 192 | 17.5 | 100 | 12.5 | 154 | 15 | 100 | 96.5 | 706 |
|  | Mihalčo, Oto | SVK | 15 | 20 | 11.5 | 60 | 1 | 92 | 7.5 | 50 | 8.75 | 74 | 5 | 50 | 48.75 | 346 |
|  | Kolčák, Marek | SVK | 10 | 20 | 9 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 10 | 50 | 3.75 | 80 | 10 | 50 | 47.75 | 360 |
| 15 | Greece 2 | GRE | 0 | 40 | 9 | 120 | 2 | 200 | 12.5 | 100 | 10 | 160 | 10 | 100 | 43.5 | 720 |
|  | Spiliadis, Athanasios | GRE | 0 | 20 | 9 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 5 | 50 | 7.5 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 27.5 | 360 |
|  | Skyrianoglou, Dimitris | GRE | 0 | 20 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 7.5 | 50 | 2.5 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 16 | 360 |
| 16 | Czech Republic | CZE | 5 | 40 | 7 | 120 | 2 | 199 | 9.5 | 100 | 5 | 160 | 8.75 | 100 | 37.25 | 719 |
|  | Libiš, Zdeněk | CZE | 0 | 20 | 4.5 | 60 | 1 | 100 | 7.5 | 50 | 5 | 80 | 3.75 | 50 | 21.75 | 360 |
|  | Petras, Milan | CZE | 5 | 20 | 2.5 | 60 | 1 | 99 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 50 | 15.5 | 359 |

Problems Selected by: Palmans, Luc
Created by WFCC Solving Tournament Manager


b) $=$ m $e 5 \rightarrow a 2$
c) ${ }^{n} 2 \rightarrow a 2$

Take \& Make
需 = grasshopper
(1,5/3,5/5)
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3.1.1.1.1.1
(1,5/3,5/5)

11

b) $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{a} \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 2$

Patrol chess


10

2.1.1.1...

## Fairy definitions

Circe: when captured, a piece (other than king) is reborn on its game-array square: rook, bishop and knight are reborn on the square that is the same colour as the square of the capture, pawns on the file of the capture. If the game-array square is occupied, the captured piece disappears, as in a normal capture. Castling is permitted with a reborn rook. Fairy pieces are regarded as being the result of promotion and so are reborn on the promotion-square on the file of the capture.

Grasshopper: moves along queen-lines over another unit of either colour to the square immediately beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.

Neutral unit: belongs to whichever side chooses to uses it. It can therefore be moved or captured by White or Black, and in Circe it is reborn according to the capture. A king may not be moved on to a square controlled by a neutral piece, because of self-check.

Nightrider: a rider along a straight line on squares lying a knight's move away from each other.

Patrol chess: a unit may capture or give check only if it is observed by another unit of the same side.

Take \& Make: having captured, a unit must immediately, as part of its move, make a non-capturing step in imitation of the captured unit from the capture-square. If no such step is available, the capture is illegal. A pawn cannot be placed on its 1 st rank either in the diagram or as the result of a take\&make step after capture. Promotion by capture occurs only when a pawn arrives on the promotion rank as the result of a take\&make move. Checks are as in normal chess: after the notional capture of the checked king, the checking unit does not have to step away from the king's square.

OPEN FAIRY SOLVING TOURNAMENT
RHODES, 20.10.2021 (150 minutes)


= nightrider

b) 析h $2 \rightarrow f 1$

Take \& Make
= nightrider

## Marcel Tribowski

3rd Place Berlin - München 1988
1.Sc6? [2.S×d7+ B×d7 3.Be5\#]
1...Qg3!
1.f4! [2.f×95\#]
1...g×f4 2.Sc6 [3.S×d7+ Bxd7 4.Be5\#]
2...g1=N 3.c3 [4.Be7\#, S×e4\#]
3...Ng $\times$ c3 4.Sxd7+ @ Bxd7 5.Be5\#
3...Nbxc3 4.Sxe4+ @ N×e4 5.Be7\#
3...Naxc3 4.Be7+ @ N×e7 5.S×e4\#
@ = 1.5 / $3.5 / 5$

## Petko Petkov

dedicated to Julia's Fairies for its 1 year 4th-11th Commendation ex aequo Julia's Fairies 2013-I
a) $\mathbf{1 . n N} \times \mathrm{h} 5(\mathrm{nNh} 6)+\mathrm{nRf} 42 . \mathrm{nNb} 3 \mathrm{nB} \times 44(\mathrm{nBf} 1) \#$ @
b) $\mathbf{1 . n N} \times \mathrm{g} 2(\mathrm{nNg} 4)+\mathrm{nBf} 42 . \mathrm{nNe8} \mathbf{n R \times f 4 ( n R e 5 )}$ \# @
@ $=2.5 / 5$


## Imrich Bandžuch

Šachová skladba 2017
a) $1 \ldots \mathrm{Bf} 4$ 2.Kb1 Bg5 3.Gh5 Bc1 4.Gf3 $\mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{f} 3(\mathrm{~h} 5)$ 5.K×c1(Kh6) g5\# @
b) 1...B×d6(Bd5) 2.Ge6 Kh7 3.Gh3 g×h3(Qh8)+
4.Kb1 Qc8 5.Ka1 Qc1\# @
c) 1 ... Kg 7 2.Gh8 Bf 4 3.Gf6 $\mathrm{Kxf6(Kc6)} \mathrm{4.Kb2} \mathrm{Kb5}$ 5.Ka3 Bc1\# @
@ = 1.5 / $3.5 / 5$
b) . $\mathrm{e} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 2$
c) $\mathrm{g} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 2$

Take \& Make
胥 = grasshopper


8


Horst Backer
Problemkiste 2006
1.Qf4! [2.Gg1 b2\#]
$1 . . . g 1=G 2 . h 8=S$ Gg6 3.S×g6 @ b2\#
1...g1=Q 2.Gge3+ Q×e3 3.Gc3+ @ Q×c3\#
1...g1=R 2.Qh4+ Rg3 3.Gg2 @ b2\#
1...g1=B 2.Ge5+ Be3 3.Rd4 @ b2\#
$1 . . . g 1=S$ 2.h8=R Sf3 3.Q×f3 @ b2\#
2...Sxe2 3.Re8 @ b2\#
2...Sh3 3.Rxh3 @ b2\#
$@=1 / 1.5 / 2 / 3 / 3.5 / 4 / 5$

Jean Morice
dedicated to C. Sénéca-70
Thèmes-64 1973
1.Rh8? Re8! 2.f×e8=Q\#, 1.Rh7? Rg8! $2 . f \times g 8=Q \#$
1.Rh6? Rd8! 2.R×c7\#, 1.Rh5? Bc2!
1.Rh4? B×d3!, 1.Rh1? Bh2!
1.Rh2! [2.B×b1 @ a×b1=Q\#]
1...f1=~2.Ra4 @ Q×b6\#
1...B×d32.Ra5 @ Q×c4\#
1...Bc2 2.Ra6 @ Qc5\#
@ = $1 / 2.5 / 4 / 5$

Viktor Syzonenko
Phénix 2018
1.g×f6 Re5 2.Bd2 B×f6 3.Kc3+ @ R×c5\#
1.R×h4 Sg4 2.b5 R×h4 3.Kc4+ @ Se3\#
1.e8=R B×g5 2.R8e6 Se8 3.Ke5+ @ Be3\#
@ = 1.5 / $3.5 / 5$
3.1.1.1.1.1


Selection of problems: Juraj Lörinc
Controllers: Harry Fougiaxis \& Themis Argirakopoulos

Open Fairy Solving Tournament 2021 (Greece, Rhodes 20.10.2021) - Final Individual Results

| Rank | Name | Cat. | Country | Rating | \# | Title | Round 1-150' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total - 150 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#2 | \#2 | \#3 | \#5 | h\#2 | h\#4,5 | s\#3 | r\#2 | hs\#3 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { ser- } \\ \text { h\#7 } \end{array}\right\|$ | $h=4$ | PG6,0 | (4) | Points | (1) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. |  | 60 |  |
| 1 | Caillaud, Michel | s | FRA | 2488 | 23 | GM | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | 5 | 150 | 45 | 150 |
| 2 | Crişan, Vlaicu |  | ROU | 2296 | 84 | IM | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 150 | 42.5 | 150 |
| 3 | Uitenbroek, Hans |  | NED | 2264 | 94 | IM | 5 | 0 | - | - | 5 | - | 5 | 5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | - | 5 | 150 | 31 | 150 |
| 4 | Maeder, Thomas |  | SUI | 2210 | 120 | IM | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | 3.5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 28.5 | 150 |
| 5 | Huber, Eric |  | ROU | 2471 na | - | IM | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 2.5 | - | 5 | 132 | 27.5 | 132 |
| 6 | Van Beers, Eddy |  | BEL | 2580 | 9 | GM | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3.5 | - | - | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 27.5 | 150 |
| 7-8 | Comay, Ofer | s | ISR | 2499 | 19 | GM | 5 | 0 | - | - | 5 | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 25 | 150 |
| 7-8 | Satkus, Vidmantas |  | LTU | 2475 | 27 | IM | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 150 | 25 | 150 |
| 9-10 | Heuvel, Peter van den |  | NED | 2347 | 62 | IM | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 5 | 150 | 22.5 | 150 |
| 9-10 | Widlert, Kjell | s | SWE | 2553 na | - | IM | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 | - | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | - | 2.5 | 150 | 22.5 | 150 |
| 11 | Rotenberg, Jacques | S | ISR | 2353 | 58 | IM | 5 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 5 | 1.5 | 5 | - | 5 | 150 | 21.5 | 150 |
| 12 | Hodge, David |  | GBR | 2323 | 72 | - | 0 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 20 | 150 |
| 13 | Nicula, Dinu-Ioan |  | ROU | 2230 | 110 | FM | 0 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 19 | 150 |
| 14 | Wissmann, Dolf |  | NED | 2306 | 82 | GM | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | 2.5 | 5 | 118 | 17.5 | 118 |
| 15 | Onkoud, Abdelaziz |  | FRA | 2425 | 38 | FM | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 49 | 15 | 49 |
| 16 | Linß, Torsten |  | GER | 2099 | 181 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 1.5 | - | - | 5 | 77 | 11.5 | 77 |
| 17 | Sergiienko, Andrii | j | UKR | 1881 | 356 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 1.5 | 0 | - | 5 | 149 | 11.5 | 149 |
| 18-20 | Limontas, Martynas |  | LTU | 2495 | 20 | GM | 0 | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.5 | 5 | 150 | 11.5 | 150 |
| 18-20 | Ooms, Andy |  | BEL | 2271 | 91 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 5 | 1.5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 11.5 | 150 |
| 18-20 | Versmissen, Koen |  | NED | 2040 | 215 | - | 5 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 1.5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 11.5 | 150 |
| 21 | Gilbert, Axel |  | FRA | 2076 | 193 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | 5 | 150 | 10 | 150 |
| 22 | Satkus, Vilimantas | s | LTU | 2008 | 236 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 1.5 | - | - | 2.5 | 150 | 9 | 150 |
| 23 | Boer, Johan de |  | NED | 2250 | 102 | FM | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 3.5 | - | - | 5 | 150 | 8.5 | 150 |
| 24 | Kolčák, Marek | S | SVK | 2258 | 97 | IM | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 5 | - | - | 2.5 | 150 | 7.5 | 150 |
| 25 | Aridov, Vladimir |  | UKR | 2331 | 70 | FM | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 5 | 127 | 5 | 127 |
| 26 | Putintseva, Marina | jw | RUS | 2163 | 148 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.5 | 111 | 2.5 | 111 |
| 27 | Enemark, Bjorn | S | DEN | 1663 | 572 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.5 | 150 | 2.5 | 150 |

Main Judge: Fougiaxis, Harry Assistant: Argirakopoulos, Themis Problems Selected by: Lörinc, Juraj
Created by WFCC Solving Tournament Manager

Machine Gun Results

| $\#$ | Name | Country | $\# 2$ |  | $s \# 2$ |  | $h \# 2$ |  | Total | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1 | Kacper Piorun | POL | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 41 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Danila Pavlov | RUS | 9 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 40 |
| 3 | Marjan Kovacevic | SRB | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 40 |
| 4 | Mark Erenburg | ISR | 7 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 31 |
| 5 | Peter van den Heuvel | NED | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 30 |
| - | Frank Richter | GER | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 30 |
| 7 | Ilija Serafimovic | SRB | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 29 |
| - | Danila Moiseev | RUS | 7 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 29 |
| - | Andrey Selivanov | RUS | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 29 |
| 10 | Ofer Comay | ISR | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 27 |
| 11 | Martynas Limontas | LTU | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 26 |
| - | Nikos Sidiropoulos | GRE | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 26 |
| - | Vladimir Aridov | UKR | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 26 |
| 14 | Eddy Van Beers | BEL | 7 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 25 |
| - | Jorma Paavilainen | FIN | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 25 |
| - | Nikos Mendrinos | GRE | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 25 |
| 17 | Michel Caillaud | FRA | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 24 |
| 18 | Piotr Gorski | POL | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 23 |
| 19 | Mordechay Chovnik | ISR | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 22 |
| - | David Hodge | GBR | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 22 |
| 21 | Dinu-Ioan Nicula | ROU | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 21 |
| - | Hans Uitenbroek | NED | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 21 |
| 23 | Dolf Wissmann | NED | 5 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 19 |
| - | Abdelaziz Onkoud | FRA | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 19 |
| 25 | Koen Versmissen | NED | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| - | Panagiotis Konidaris | GRE | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| 27 | Valery Kopyl | UKR | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 13 |
| 28 | Thomas Maeder | SUI | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 12 |
| - | Stanislav Vasyliv | UKR | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 |
| 30 | Andy Ooms | BEL | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| - | Mikalai Sihnevich | BLR | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 11 |
| 32 | Vilimantas Satkus | $L T U$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| 33 | Andrii Sergiienko | UKR | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 34 | Zivan Susulic | SRB | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 35 | Milan Petras | CZE | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 36 | Dimitris Skyrianoglou | GRE | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | -2 |
| 37 | Bader Al-Hajiri | KWT | 3 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | -5 |
| 38 | Kamila Hryshchenko | UKR | 1 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | -12 |
| 39 | Ajuna Soerjadi | $N E D$ | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | -14 |




Jacques SAVOURNIN
Schweizerische ArbeiterSchachzeitung 1982

$\ddagger 2$
1.Qf6? [2.Qe7 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Se5 2.Q×e5 $\ddagger$
but 1...R×f7!
1.c7? [2.c8=S $\ddagger$ ]
1...S×e6 2.Qb6 $\ddagger$
but 1...Sc6!
1.Qb6! [2.Qc7ł]
1...Se5 2.Qc5 $\ddagger$
1...S×e6 2.c7 $\ddagger$
1...S×b4 2.Q×b4 $\ddagger$
$(10+5)$

Cornelis GROENEVELD Freie Presse 1987

$\ddagger 2$
1.Sc2? [2.Qf5 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Re3 2.Q×e3 $\ddagger$
but 1...Re4!
1.g×f3? [2.Q×h6 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Re4 2.Q×e4 $\ddagger$
but 1...Re3!
1.Be7! [2.B×d6 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Re4 2.Q×h6 $\ddagger$
1...Re3 2.Qf5 $\ddagger$
1...Bg7,Bf8 2.Bg5 $\ddagger$
1...Rb6 2.Sd3 $\ddagger$

Rainer PASLACK
Schweizerische ArbeiterSchachzeitung 1982

1.Sd2? [2.Bc4 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Sb5 2.Qf6 $\ddagger$
but 1...Rh5!
1.Sd6? [2.Bc4 $\ddagger]$
1...Sb5 2.Qf7 $\ddagger$
but 1...Rh5!
1.Sd5! [2.Sc7 $\ddagger]$
1...Sb5 2.Qe7 $\ddagger$
1...Bf4 2.S×f4 $\ddagger$
1...K×d5 2.Qe5 $\ddagger$

| Jac HARING Ceskoslovensky Šach 1967 | John M．RICE <br> $2^{\circ}$ Match de l＇Amitié 1967－70 $^{\circ}$ $2^{\circ}$ Place | Eugeniusz IWANOW <br> Buletin Problemistic 1992－93 $1^{\circ}$ Prix |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 负 <br> 㐱 烸 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | VIIII 5 UMIII |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\ddagger 2 \quad(10+9)$ | $s \neq 2 \quad(7+11)$ | $s \ddagger 2 \quad(10+10)$ |
| 1．Qc6？［2．Rd4†］ | 1．Sd～？［2．Qc2＋b×c2ł］ | 1．Qc1？［2．S×d4＋R×d4†］ |
| 1．．．Qa8＋2．Rd8 $\ddagger$ | but 1．．．Bg3！ | 1．．．Sc2 2．B×c6＋B×c6 $\ddagger$ |
| but 1．．．g×f5！ |  | 1．．．R×e8 $2 . Q \times c 6+B \times c 6 \ddagger$ |
|  | 1．Sf4？［2．Qc2＋b×c2ł］ | but 1．．．Sf3！ |
| 1．Q×g6？［2．Rf6\＃］ | but 1．．．g×f5！ |  |
| 1．．．Qa8＋2．Rf8 $\ddagger$ |  | 1．Qa1！［2．B×c6＋B $\times$ c6\＃］ |
| but 1．．．Sh4！ | 1．Se5？［2．Qc2＋b×c2 $\ddagger$ ］ | 1．．．Rc3 2．S×d4＋Q xd4 $\ddagger$ |
|  | but 1．．．Rf7！ | 1．．．R×e8 2．Ra5＋S×a5 $\ddagger$ |
| 1．Bb2？［2．Rde5才］ |  |  |
| 1．．．Qb5 2．Qxe7¥ | 1．S×b4！［2．Sa2＋bxa2ł］B×b4 |  |
| but 1．．．g×f5！ | 2．Qc2＋b×c2 $\ddagger$ |  |
| 1．Q×e7？［2．Bd6ł］ |  |  |
| 1．．．Sd4 2．R×d4 $\ddagger$ |  |  |
| 1．．．Qa8＋ $2 . \mathrm{Bb} 8 \ddagger$ |  |  |
| but 1．．．S×f4！ |  |  |
| 1．Bd6！［2．Q×e7 $\ddagger$ ］ |  |  |
| 1．．．Sd4 2．Rde5 $\ddagger$ |  |  |
| 1．．．Qa8，Q×d6，Q×b7 2．Bd3 $\ddagger$ |  |  |
| 1．．．S×f4 2．Rfe5 $\ddagger$ |  |  |
| 1．．．e6 2．Qxe6ł |  |  |
| 1．．．e5 2．Qxe5 $\ddagger$ |  |  |





Arpád MOLNAR
après Fadil
ABDURAHMANOVIC \&
Albertus WIJKER Elk Wat Wils 1949

$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2$
(6+5)
1.Qe6 Sd3 2.K×d5 Sf6ł

Zvonimir HERNITZ
StrateGems 2003

h $2^{*}$
1...Kf3 2.K×e5 Bb8 $\ddagger$
1.Rb6 a4 2.K×c5 Qa3 $\ddagger$

Valentin F. RUDENKO Shakhova kompozitsiya Ukraini 2003

$h \neq 2$
(4+9)
1.Qg5 Qb1 2.Kf6+ Qf5 $\ddagger$


| Yuri G. FOKIN | Theodor STEUDEL <br> Hamburger | Florian J. KOVACS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shakhmatnaya Poeziya 1991 | Problemnachrichten 1951 | Schach 1953 |



## 63rd WCCC - Rhodes, Greece SOLVING SHOW RESULTS

| Satkus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ooms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1-3 |
| Hodge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Selivanov |
|  | Hodge |  |  |  |  |  |  | Selivanov |  |
|  | 3-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-3 |  |
|  | Moiseev |  |  |  |  |  |  | Van Beers |  |
| Erenburg $0-3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Khasanov 0-3 |
| Moiseev |  | Hodge 0-4 | Serafimović | 5 | 4 | Pavlov | Pavlov 4-1 |  | Van Beers |
| Caillaud |  | Serafimović |  |  |  |  | Van Beers |  | Wissmann |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-3 } \\ & \text { Gorski } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Hodge | 5 | 0 | Van Beers |  |  | 3-1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Kopil |
|  | Gorski |  |  |  |  |  |  | Wissmann |  |
|  | 2-3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-3 |  |
|  | Pavlov |  |  |  |  |  |  | Serafimović |  |
| Pavlov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Serafimović |
| 3-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3-0 |
| Chovnik |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nicula |

# Serafimović Pavlov Hodge 

## World Congress for Chess Composition 2021 Internet tourney announcement

Helpmates in 2 to 3 moves are required with neutral units (pawns included, kings not allowed). In each phase a neutral unit plays when it is Black's turn to move and later when it is White's turn to move or vice versa. The thematic moves could be played immediately (one right after the other) or with a delay. Fairy pieces are allowed, but fairy conditions are not. Set play, twins and multiple solutions are allowed, but not duplex or zero-positions. Composers may participate with two entries as a maximum.

Closing date: 25 September 2021
Controller: Themis Argirakopoulos, themis.argirakopoulos@gmail.com
Judge: Kostas Prentos
Solutions are in French notation.

Georgy EVSEEV
Lev GROLMAN
The Problemist 1999

$h \neq 2$
2.1.1.1
$(6+9+2)$
$h \ddagger 3$

b) 霝 h 2

Kjell WIDLERT
Michel OLAUSSON Phénix 1992

Juraj LORINC
Michal DRAGOUN
Jubilé H. Fougiaxis-40 2006 $8^{\circ}$ Prix

$h \neq 2$
b) $d 2 \rightarrow a 4 \quad(2+9+7)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\text { Rose } \\
& \text { ELéo }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Georgy EVSEEV, Lev GROLM AN, The Problemist 1999:

1.Tnd5 Fnf7 2.g6 Tnxb5 $\ddagger$
1.Fnge4 Tng4 2.g5 Fnxc6 $\ddagger$

Kjell WIDLERT, Michel OLAUSSON, Phénix 1992:
a) 1.Ce4 e8=Fn 2.Fnc6 Fna8 3.Cf2+Rxf2 $\ddagger$
b) $1 . \mathrm{Dg} 1$ e8=Tn 2.Df1 Rg3 3.Tne1 Tnxf1 $\ddagger$

Juraj LORINC, Michal DRAGOUN, Jubilé H. Fougiaxis-40 2006, $8^{\circ}$ Prix:
a) 1.LEnee5 LEnh4+2.ROnhg4 LEnxb2 $\ddagger$
b) 1.LEnge5 LEng8+2.ROnhf7 LEnxa5キ


## Petko A. PETKOV, feenschach 2001:

1.Fnh1 Cnd8+2.Cndc6 Cnxb8 $\ddagger$
1.Tnh8 Cnc6+2.Cncd8 Cnxb7 $\ddagger$

Krasimir GANDEV, $1^{\circ}$ Coupe du monde FIDE 2010, $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}$ Recommandé:
1.Ta2 ROnxc3 2.ROncg3 ROnxf5 $\ddagger$
1.Ta3 ROnxc2 2.ROncf5 ROnxg3 $\ddagger$

M arkus MANHART, Franz PACHL, Pat a Mat 2008, $\mathbf{2}^{\circ}$ Prix:
a) 1...Dng7 2.c3 Snh7+3.Dngg6 Dnxe6ł
b) 1...Dnb5 2.f4 Sna4+3.Dnb4 Dnxb6 $\ddagger$


[^0]Julia VYSOTSKA, Probleemblad 2012, $3^{\circ}$ M ention d'Honneur:
1.Cf5 PAne7+2.Sf7 PAne1 3.PAnd1 PAnxd1才
1.Ce4 PAnc5+2.Sc4 PAnf5 3.PAnf1 PAnxf1 $\ddagger$

Sven TROM MLER, M ichael BARTH, harmonie-aktiv 2016, $5^{\circ}$ Prix:
a) 1.Fnb8 Fnxg3 2.Sa1 Fnxel $\ddagger$
b) 1.Sna1 Snxe1 2.Sd2 Snxe3 $\ddagger$
c) 1. Tnd3 Tnxe3 2.Sb8 Tnxg3 $\ddagger$

$63^{\text {rd }}$ WCCC, Rhodes 2021 Internet Tourney Award<br>Judge: Kostas Prentos

Merely hours after the closing date of the tourney, I received an electronic package from the tourney director, Themis Argirakopoulos, with all the problems in anonymous form, full solutions, authors' comments when applicable, definitions of the fairy pieces used - you name it! I am grateful to him for fulfilling his role so efficiently, making my own task easier. In total, 43 problems by 31 composers from 15 countries were received.
List of participants: Themis Argirakopoulos: *09, 10; Michel Caillaud: 37, 38; Ofer Comay: 06, 07; Vlaicu Crișan: 15, 16; Ricardo De Mattos Vieira: 39, 40; Stephan Dietrich: 03; Paz Einat: 28, **29; Bjørn Enemark: 31, 32; Theodoros Giakatis: *09; Mikael Grönroos: 36; Éric Huber: 19; Rolf Kohring: 26, 27; Marek Kolčák: 41; Rainer Kuhn: 05; Dimitris Liakos: 13, 42; Juraj Lörinc: 43; Solaiappan Manikumar: 33, *34; Velmurugan Nallusamy: *24, 25; Emanuel Navon: **29; Andy Ooms: 20; Jorma Paavilainen: 30; Franz Pachl: 01, 02; Mario Parrinello: 17, 18; Petko A. Petkov: 22; Pietro Pitton: 11, 12; James Quah: 14; Jacques Rotenberg: 21; Misha Shapiro: 04, 08; Kalyan Seetharaman: *24, *34; Hans Uitenbroek: 23; Menachem Witztum: **29, 35.
The tourney asked for helpmates in 2 to 3 moves, with a neutral piece being moved by both sides. Such a generic theme sets only minimal requirements, bringing the composer's creativity and imagination to the forefront. As expected, this resulted in a wide variety of featured ideas that on several occasions exceeded my expectations. Normally, the density of the thematic play would be very important in a thematic tourney, but in this case, I treated this tourney almost as if it had a free theme. Problems with very intensive thematic content were often placed lower than problems with other qualities, even if the theme was less predominant. I am convinced this is the right approach for this type of broad and easy to achieve theme. Of course, when the presence of the theme was strong, it would advocate in favor of the problem, everything else being equal.

Before moving on to the award, let me offer brief comments about most of the unsuccessful entries, either because of construction flaws, or other reasons. It might be useful for the composers to know my perspective about their problem, even if they disagree with my decision:

- 03: Nice miniature with Argentinian pieces, but the white Loco b4 has no role in one solution.
- 04: Mirrored mates by a promoted neutral Knight
in a cage. Simple content.
- 05: Neutral AUW in Tanagra, but the mates are unrelated. I expect this problem to be published elsewhere.
- 10: The author found a way to give a secondary role to the $w B$ and $w R$, when one of them is not used directly for the mate, but in my view, this role is not fully satisfactory.
- 13: Nice ODT solutions, with fully thematic play, but simple content.
- 14: Unusual and interesting reciprocal doubling between two different neutral pieces. The mates against the immobile bK are rather static and almost indistinguishable.
- 18: A nN forms a neutral battery and later selfpins by capturing the other nN. Despite some differentiation, the presentation is inherently symmetrical.
- 20: Vertical and horizontal transference of the same mate by doubled neutral Rooks. There are nice elements and uniform play. This problem came just short of a commendation.
- 21: Two en passant captures, with essentially repeated solutions.
- 23: Good analogy, with rather straightforward play.
- 24: AUW with nice elements, but not enough for a distinction.
- 25: Economical AUW in 3 twins. Rather uneven.
- 27: The promoted $n R$ or $n B$ can be restricted easier than a nQ. Nice analogy, but rather simple and straightforward play.
- 29: Very similar to the $4^{\text {th }}$ example from the announcement. The dance of the two Knights is extended by two half-moves, alas, thanks to suboptimal twinning.
- 32: Twin $b$ starts with the wK being in check.
- 33: Thematic AUW, but the mates are almost identical between the two solutions.
- 39: The same mate is arranged with line closing in both solutions, but without adequate variety.
- 40: The wBh2 is superfluous in one solution. It is easy to achieve an acceptable setting and publish this problem elsewhere.
- 41: My first thought was that with 14 neutral pieces there was no way all of them would be useful in each phase. Indeed, at least two pieces are redundant in each solution.
- 42: The nRh1 has no role in one solution.

1.d1=nN Gf5 2.nNf2 nNh6 3.CRg4 Gf3\#
1.d1=nCR Ge4 2.nCRb7 nCRh5 3.ZRe6 Gc6\#
1.d1=nZR Ge5 2.nZRxf4 nZRh7 3.Nf4 Gc5\#

Battery creation: The rear piece is the neutral fairy piece that promotes on d 1 and takes exactly two moves to reach its destination. The front piece is the white Grasshopper that, on W1, closes the line of the battery in anticipation of the arrival of the rear piece. On B3, a different black fairy piece cyclically closes the escape route of the rear piece of the battery. Finally, White fires the battery with a switchback move of the wG. Black is unable to move the neutral piece away from the mate, because its cage comprises exclusively black pieces that cannot be captured by Black.
Three perfectly matched solutions with cyclical play, battery creation, switchbacks and even model mates. There are several examples in the databases, mainly by Franz Pachl, with this combination of fairy riders and cyclical play, but I could not find an anticipation.

> 1...nRf1 2.exd1=nPA nPAe1 3.d1=nPA nPAxf1\#
> 1...nRb3 2.exd1=nVA nVAc2 3.d1=nVA nVAxb3\#
> 1...nRh3 2.exd1=nNA nNAf2
> 3.d1=nNA nNAxh3\#

The same strategy is applied in each solution: On W1, the nRf3 moves to the square on which it will be captured on the mating move. Black promotes the nPe 2 to a Chinese piece and moves it where it will be used as a hurdle on the mating move. Finally, the nPd2 promotes on the same square, to the same type of Chinese piece and gives mate by capturing the nR with the use of the hurdle created in the preceding play. It is worth noting the additional role of the "hurdle" piece: It also prevents the neutral piece that gives mate from moving away.

Excellent homogeneity, executed with precision. Changed promotions and Kozhakin in each solution. This problem shows a $3 \times 2$ change ( 3 solutions, 2 promotions). Compare with the $5^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention that shows a $2 \times 3$ change.


Two neutral batteries point at the bK. In the course of the solution, one battery is rearranged, so that its front piece comes within range to capture the front piece of the other battery. This leads to a double-check mate, with the last move being irreversible due to the doubling (pin) of the front piece of the battery.
Exquisitely analogous ODT, with Zilahi, distant model mates, reciprocal captures, pins, unpins. Made to satisfy the senses and impress. However, there is an objection: The author's choice to use the black Rook and Bishop is aesthetically pleasing, but lacks substance: It is possible to improve the economy by replacing both black pieces with one pawn: bRf2=bP, -bBd1, $\mathrm{wKe} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 2$, $\mathrm{nRb} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{~b} 2$. My guess is that he liked the aesthetics of 3 nR on the b1-h7 diagonal and 3 nB on the $4^{\text {th }}$ rank. Regardless, the solution is so beautiful that I deliberately chose to ignore this blemish.

1...d3 2.nGxe6 nGh3 3.nGh8 Gdf6\# 1...Rg5 2.nGxd4 nGdg1 3.nGe3 G6e4\#

An appealing construction of a column of Grasshoppers in one solution and a diagonal in the other, aiming at the black King. The wG is the nearest to the bK and serves as the hurdle that cannot be moved away by Black; one nG gives mate; the second nG pins its counterpart and also guards the hurdle, so that the bK cannot take it. The role of the thematic nG is slightly unbalanced between the two phases: In the orthogonal setting it gives mate, while in the diagonal setting it pins and guards a flight.
It seems illogical that a neutral Grasshopper must waste a move to capture a white Grasshopper, instead of letting the white Grasshopper do the same job. The reason is the timing. A white Grasshopper would need two moves to reach its destination, but only W2 is available for White. Some moves must be played by Black. The neutral Grasshoppers can do what the white Grasshoppers cannot: Be moved by both sides. Impeccable logic! Among all the entries, this one puts the theme of the tourney in the spotlight, in the most original way. This paradox influenced my decision very positively.

a) 1.nLIc2 nLIh7 2.nBg6 nBxe4+ 3.nRf3+nRxh3\#
b) 1.nLIf8+ nLIa8 2.nRc6 nRxh6+3.nBh5 nBxf3\#

Creation of neutral batteries with exchange of roles for the $n \mathrm{R}$ and nB as front and rear pieces and anticipatory doubling by the neutral Lion. Upon firing the battery, the front piece is selfpinned by the neutral Lion, annihilating the reversible defensive move. Nice ODT and good unity of moves. Every move shows the theme of the tourney and in this particular case, it makes a strong impression.

a) 1.nROe7 nRxh6 $2 . \mathrm{nRh} 3 \mathrm{nRxe} 3 \#$ 1. $\mathrm{nROg} 3 \mathrm{nBxh6} 2 . \mathrm{nBf} 8 \mathrm{nBxd6} \#$
b) 1.nROf1 nRg6+ $2 . n R g 3 n R x e 3 \#$
1.nROc8 nBg5+ 2.nBe7 nBxd6\#

Two pairs of similar looking solutions, but with enough differentiation to justify having both of them: In twin a, the nRd6 and nBe3 are pinned by both Roses. The neutral Rose unpins one, while maintaining the pin of the other. The unpinned piece captures the black Rose that was pinning it and ends up capturing the other pinned neutral piece on the last move. The mate works, because of the pin by the neutral Rose. In twin b, with the black Rose gone, the neutral Rose plays a critical move to allow the transfer of the pinned nRd6/nBe3 on a different pin square, from which it can capture the other neutral piece, giving a battery double-check mate.
It is unfortunate that the matrix requires the use of both the bPe5 and bROh6 in twin a, and neither of them in $b$. The author was able to link the twins in an acceptable, albeit crude way.

a) 1. $\mathrm{nCBd} 6=\mathrm{CR} \mathrm{nNg} 72 . \mathrm{nNe} 8 \mathrm{nCRd} 4=\mathrm{CQ} \#$
b) $1 . \mathrm{nCBb} 6=\mathrm{CR}$ nNe6 $2 . \mathrm{nNa} 8 \mathrm{nCRc} 6=\mathrm{CQ} \#$
c) $1 . \mathrm{nCBe} 3=\mathrm{CR} \mathrm{nNe} 12 . \mathrm{nNg} 2 \mathrm{nCRe} 6=\mathrm{CQ} \#$

The neutral Chameleon Bishop opens the line of the neutral Nightrider and closes a future line between the same Nightrider and the black King, starting the creation of a neutral battery. As soon as the battery is completed, the neutral Chameleon Rook fires, transforming into a Queen, with double-check mate. Black is unable to take back the last move, because of the self-check that would occur due to the transformation into a Chameleon Knight. Three equivalent solutions, with fully thematic play.

1.nRxc4 nRc2 2.Ke4 nRb4+ 3.Sc4 nRcxc4\# 1.nBxf5 nBg4 2.Ke4 nBg6+ 3.Sdf5 nB4xf5\#

Reciprocal batteries between the nBb 1 and the nRh4. On the last move, the battery is activated giving a double-check mate. Black cannot take back the mating move, because the front piece of the battery is pinned.
Good ODT, with switchback and exchange of functions between $n R h 4 / n B b 1$, $n R b 3 / n B f 7$ and $\mathrm{nSf5} / \mathrm{nPc} 4$.

a) $1 . \mathrm{nNa} 4 \mathrm{nNxb} 22 . \mathrm{Re} 8 \mathrm{nNxe} 8 \#$
b) 1.nCRh4 nCRxb2 2.Rd8 nCRxd8\#
c) $1 . \mathrm{nZRe} 4 \mathrm{nZRxb} 22 . \operatorname{Rf} 8 \mathrm{nZRxf} 8 \#$

The neutral fairy piece captures on b2 and becomes the front piece of a vertical battery. Then, it gives mate by pinning itself on the eighth rank, so that it is unable to return to its departure square b2. In order for the pin to work, the bR must be captured to clear the line. This works nicely, thanks to the Pelle move of the bR on the eighth rank. The geometrical correspondence between the type of the fairy piece on b2 and the square the bR must reach is vital for the solutions to work. Also notable is the link between g 1 and b 2 : There is a unique way to move three different riders from g 1 to b2 with exactly two steps. Excellent geometry and economy, even if the strategy is not very deep.

a) $1 . \mathrm{h} 1=\mathrm{nNA}$ dxe $8=\mathrm{nNA} 2 . \mathrm{nNAb} 2 \mathrm{e} 8=\mathrm{nNA}$ 3.nNAec4 nNAxd3\#
b) $1 . \mathrm{h} 1=\mathrm{nVA}$ dxe $8=n$ VA $2 . n V A g 6$ e $8=n \mathrm{nA}$ 3.nVAef7 nVAxe4\#

Three thematic cases in each solution, with each neutral pawn promoting and moving away exactly once. All three promotions to Vao in one phase are replaced by promotions to Nao in the other. Bristol clearances.

This problem has many similarities and some differences from WID 559168 (also available online at https://juliasfairies.com/problems/no700/). For example, here we have two promotions by White and one by Black and also different mates, with doubling of the pieces, instead of a cage. However, the existence of a predecessor, combined with a radical twin and heavy construction, prevented a higher ranking.

1.nGc3 nGxf5 2.nGd7 nG3f3\# [3.nGfd3??, nGfd5??]
1...nGxb5? 2.nGd7 nG3f3+ 3.nGff6!
1.nGh3 nGxb5 2.nGd7 nGhd3\#
[3.nGdf3??, nG3d5??]
1...nGxf5? 2.nGd7 nGhd3+ 3.nGa6!

Prevention of a neutral Grasshopper's escape, by removing a hurdle or becoming a hurdle itself for illegal self-check, if Black tries to move it away from mate. The passive neutral Nightrider-hopper is a necessary evil. It has the same role as the nGd1: It gives mate in one solution and prevents the removal of a hurdle in the other. Convincing dual avoidance.

1.nQf3+nQxg2+2.Kxg2 c8=nB 3.nBb7nBxd5\# 1.nQh5+nQxh2+2.Kxh2 c8=nR 3.nRh8 nRxh7\#

The sacrifice of the neutral Queen opens the black King's fortress. The pawn promotes to a $n B$ or $n R$, rather than a $n Q$, because a weaker neutral piece is easier to constrain, when it attempts to mate. Kniest, ODT.


## 1.nCGxe2 LIxg2+ 2.nCGxe5 nCGh2\# 1.nCGxc3 LIxb4+ 2.nCGxe5 nCGa5\#

A neutral Contra-Grasshopper captures the wPe5 in order to activate the wNf7 for control of c 1 and then returns to its initial square performing a triangular Rundlauf. In the meantime, the Lion positions itself on the mating line and assumes the role of the hurdle, instead of the unruly bP. In the final position, if Black tries to move the nCG along the mating line, it will expose the bK to selfcheck from the Lion.
Although two of the three moves of the Rundlauf are captures and despite the heavy construction, I appreciate the perfect analogy between the two solutions and certain strategic elements, like the relation between the Contra-Grasshopper and the Lion.


Two analogous ODT mates following promotions to linear neutral pieces. The final mates with the Knight and doubled line pieces ( $\mathrm{nQ} / \mathrm{nB}$ or $\mathrm{nQ} / \mathrm{nR}$ ) are very familiar in problems with neutral pieces, but the presentation in this problem is adequately original.


> 1.f1=nQ Rf8 2.nQa6 nQxf6\#
> 1.f1=nR exd4 2.e3 nRxf3\#
> 1.f1=nB nBd3 2.Sd5 nBxe4\#
> 1.f1=nS nSh2 2.nSg4 hxg4\#

Although there are hundreds of helpmates with neutral pieces and AUW, achieving the theme in four distinct lines without fairy conditions is not common, especially when complying with the requirements of this tourney. The disparity in the solution with the Knight promotion (the only one in which the promoted pawn does not mate) is inevitable.

35 - Menachem Witztum Israel
Dedicated to Ofer Comay
$5^{\text {th }}$ Commendation

c) $=$ b) 新 $\mathrm{a} 8 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 2$
$\mathrm{d})=\mathrm{c})$ 名 $\mathrm{f} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 5$
a) $1 . \mathrm{nRd} 4 \mathrm{nRd} 5+2 . \mathrm{Ke} 6 \mathrm{nQxd} 5 \#$
b) $1 . \mathrm{nBd} 5 \mathrm{nBe} 4+2 . \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{nQxe} 4 \#$
c) $1 . \mathrm{nBg} 5 \mathrm{nRxh} 42 . \mathrm{nRh} 5 \mathrm{nQxg} 5 \#$
d) $1 . \mathrm{nRf} 4 \mathrm{nBxh} 42 . \mathrm{nBg} 3 \mathrm{nQxf} 4 \#$

Two diagonal echo mates by $\mathrm{nQ} / \mathrm{nB}$ and two similar mates transferred horizontally by $\mathrm{nQ} / \mathrm{nR}$. The twinning mechanism is lacking and the mates are typical. A solid accomplishment, nevertheless.

a) $1 . \mathrm{nSxe} 4 \mathrm{~b} 42 . \mathrm{bxc} 3 \mathrm{nS} 4 \mathrm{xc} 3 \#$
b) 1.nSxc3 f5 2.fxe4 nScxe4\#

A neutral pawn spends two moves to replace its white counterpart. This seemingly insignificant change allows the neutral Knight to capture the pawn on the last move, when moved by White. The wRc6 and wBh7 are integrated nicely in both phases: One is giving mate and the other pins the neutral Knight. Good analogy between the two solutions.

1.b1=nN nNbxd5 2.nNe3 nN3xf5\# 1.b1=nCR nCRxa4 2.nCRd3 nCRdxg4\#

The neutral pawn promotes to a fairy piece and plays all the moves of both sides. On the way, it makes sure to capture the Rook that controls the mating square. The mate is given by doubling two neutral pieces of the same type. The bP cannot capture or interfere with the mating piece, because it is pinned by the third fairy piece. Simple strategy in light setting, with crystal clear content.

## DEFINITIONS OF FAIRY PIECES:

Hopper is a piece that moves by jumping over another piece (called a hurdle)
Leaper is a piece that moves directly to a square a fixed distance away
Rider is a piece that moves an unlimited distance in one direction, provided there are no pieces in the way

Camelrider CR: (1,3)-rider.
Chameleon unit: This may be any unit except a King. After each of its moves, a chameleon piece transforms into another piece in the sequence Knight > Bishop > Rook > Queen > Knight>... A chameleon pawn does not transform, but promotes to a chameleon piece in any phase. In the presence of chameleon units, normal pawns may promote to either normal or chameleon pieces.
Contra-Grasshopper CG: Moves on queen lines by a single step to reach a hurdle and then any distance beyond it [i.e. as a Grasshopper with the relative lengths of the parts of its move reversed.]
Grasshopper G: Moves on queen lines any distance to reach a hurdle and then a single step beyond it. The archetypal fairy hopper could be described as a combined $(0,1)+(1,1)$-riderhopper.
Lion LI: Moves on queen lines any distance to reach a hurdle and then any further distance beyond it.

Nao NA: (1,2)-Chinese rider or 'Chinese Nightrider'; moves on straight lines made up of $(1,2)$ knight steps [i.e. nightrider lines], but when capturing, moves any distance to reach a hurdle and then any further distance beyond it.
Nightrider N: (1,2)-rider, i.e. a piece whose moves consist of a number of knight steps in the same direction.
Nightriderhopper NH: Moves on straight lines consisting of a number of $(1,2)$ knight steps [i.e. nightrider lines], making any number of steps to reach a hurdle and a single step beyond it. Could be described as a ( 1,2 )-riderhopper.
Pao PA: ( 0,1 )-Chinese rider or 'Chinese Rook'; moves and captures on rook lines, but when capturing, moves any distance to reach a hurdle and then any further distance beyond it.

Rookhopper RH: Moves on rook lines any distance to reach a hurdle and then a single step beyond it. Could be described as a $(0,1)$ riderhopper.
Rose RO: (1,2)-rider moving on octagonal paths made up of knight steps changing direction by approximately $45^{\circ}$, e.g. d1-f2-g4-f6-d7-b6... From some squares it may make a complete circuit amounting to a null move, e.g. d1-d1.
Vao VA: (1,1)-Chinese rider or 'Chinese Bishop'; moves and captures on bishop lines, but when capturing, moves any distance to reach a hurdle and then any further distance beyond it.
Zebrarider ZR: (2,3)-rider.

## World Congress for Chess Composition 2021 Week-long thematic composing tourney

Helpmates in 2,5 or 3 moves are required with at least two phases (set play, twins, multiple solutions are allowed, but not duplex.) In each phase the W1 move unpins a white unit, which moves in the W2 and/or W3 move.

Harry Fougiaxis
4. WCCT 1990-92
15. Place

1.Kc4 g4 2.Sb4 Ra5 3.Sd3 Bd5 $\ddagger$
1.Kd6 g3 2.Sc7 B×b7 3.Se6 Rd5 $\ddagger$

Torsten Linß Harald Grubert
Die Schwalbe 1989

1. Hon. Mention

1.Sd3 Kb8 2.Be3 Rb5 3.S5f4 Sg5ł
1.Se3 Ka7 2.Re5 Rf7 3.Sfd5 Sc5 $\ddagger$

Jorge Kapros
Jorge Lois
Boletim da UBP 1990-91

1. Prize

1.B×b7+K×b7 2.b3 Bd4+3.Kb4 Sc6 $\ddagger$
1.R×a7+K×a7 2.Kb3 Sc6 3.Ka4 R×b4 $\ddagger$
1.R×b8+K×b8 2.Kb2 R×b4+3.Ka1 Bd4 $\ddagger$

The tourney is open to all composers worldwide.
M aximum 2 entries per composer (joint compositions count for 1 full entry).
Closing date: Saturday 16 October 2021, 14:00 hrs.
Controller: Themis Argirakopoulos, themis.argirakopoulos@gmail.com
Judge: Christopher Jones

## RHODES WEEK-LONG H\# TOURNEY

It was an honour to be asked to judge this tourney. I am most grateful to Themis Argirakopoulos, who as controller made everything so straightforward for me, and to Harry Fougiaxis, who kindly looked into some questions of originality of entries.

There were 42 anonymized diagrams for me to consider. The set theme was not very restrictive and had been interpreted in a number of interesting ways. Since this was a thematic tourney I tried to consider carefully the ways in which the theme was presented. In particular, it seemed to me that the thematic effect was diminished when a white move was one that had another purpose (for instance, guarding a flight square) as well as thematically freeing another white piece. Would a solver be drawn to the need for a white freeing move as part of the process of finding the solutions? I liked a number of entries where the answer to this question would be "yes", and where the theme was embellished by logical tries and/or dual avoidances. At the same time, there were entries that skillfully showed other interesting themes introduced by the thematically required freeing white move. Some of these, too, deserved a place in the award. I tried to find a balance between the problems that appealed to me in different ways. I hope that I hit that balance in a way that was fair, but as always there is bound to be some subjectivity and as usual I must apologize to composers who have grounds for feeling that another judge would have given their entry a higher placing.


## 1st Prize, Michel CAILLAUD:

1.Bb3 Se3 2.Sc2 f5 3.Rf4 Sd1 $\ddagger$
1...Sb2? 2.Sc2?? 3.Rf~ Sd1\#
1.b3 Sb6 2.b4 e7 3.Se6 Sa4 $\ddagger$
1...Sb2? 2.b4?? 3.Sc~ Sa4\#

On the face of it, it seems that after 1.Bb3 White could play 1...Sb2, and then, after $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 2$ and a move by the f1R off the first rank, $3 \ldots$...Sd1\#. However, there is no possible W2 move. This determines the route of the wS to d1 via e3. The unpinning of the wPf4 is pivotal in the solution. The solver would have to realize that he needs to free this Pawn to play move W 2 to solve the problem. The same logic is seen as in the second solution, in which the attempt to get the wS to a4 via b2 fails for want of a W2 move and this time it is the c5S that must choose e6 for the arrival square for its move unguarding a4, a follow-my-leader effect after the wP has vacated that square. This problem seemed to me to present the tourney theme in the most memorable way.

## 2nd Prize, Emanuel NAVON, Menachem WITZTUM:

1...Bg7 2.R×e5 (Rh2?) Be8 3.Re2 Rc3 $\ddagger$
1...Se2 2.Be7 (Bxe5?) Rb3 3.Bg5 Bf7 $\ddagger$

A rich mix, showing good move-by-move correspondence both in terms of geometry and of strategy (in which the unpinning on move W1 is prominent). The especially distinguishing embellishment, it seems to me, is the fine dual avoidance on the first black move - in one solution it is imperative that the $b R$, en route from h5 to e2 (for the strategically very congenial purpose of unpinning the other thematic white officer), should eliminate the e5P, in the other that the bB, en route from d6 to g5 or $g 7$ for the same strategic purpose, should not eliminate that Pawn. An excellent strategic problem.


## 3rd Prize, Zoran GAVRILOVSKI:

a) $1 . . . \mathrm{Bc} 52 . \mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{e} 8=\mathrm{Q}+3 . \mathrm{Ka} 5 \mathrm{Qa} 4 \ddagger$
b) $1 . . . \mathrm{Bd} 62 . \mathrm{Kb} 7$ e8=B $3 . \mathrm{Ka} 8 \mathrm{Bc} 6 \ddagger$
c) $1 . . . \mathrm{b} 42 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{e} 8=\mathrm{R} 3 . \mathrm{Qc} 6 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \ddagger$
d) $1 . . . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{g} 72 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{e} 8=\mathrm{S} 3 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{~S} \times f 6 \ddagger$

The achievement of AUW combined with a King star is reasonably well known, but the success of the composer in further combining this with four different ways on W1 of freeing the wP is definitely Prize-worthy.

## 4th Prize, Michel CAILLAUD:

1.Sd5 Be2+ 2.Kh4 R×d5 3.Rf7 Rh5 $\ddagger$
1.e2 Rd5+2.Kg6 B×e2 3.Bf2 Bh5 $\ddagger$

The $w R$ and $w B$ have respectively to go to $d 5$ and e2 for a twofold purpose: to unpin their colleague and to guard the square on which both mates are administered, h5. To set this in motion it is necessary for a black sacrificial unit to occupy the relevant square for the short time before it is captured there on move W2. This appealing geometry works perfectly. The mechanism works so felicitously that one worries about forerunners, but it appears that there is no substantial anticipation.


## 1st H.M. Valery GUROV:

1...Ra5 2.Sc5 Sb2 (2...Sc5? 3.Ra~ Re5??) 3.Sa4 Re5 $\ddagger$
1...Ba3 2.Sc4 Sc5 (2...Sb2? 3.Sa5 Bc1??) 3.Sa5 Bc1ł

Another nice mechanism. In each solution one of the white officers has to unpin a bS and, simultaneously, the wS; the unpinned bS then employs the two black moves in unpinning the white officer that has become pinned on the a-file, which switches back to its starting square to administer mate. The composer may have been hoping for a hypothetical perfect matrix in which somehow (in an alternative universe!) 1...Ba3 was followed by $2 . \mathrm{Sb} 2 \mathrm{Sc} 53 . \mathrm{Sa} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 1$. That really would be worthy of a high Prize. The problem is still excellent, though the $1 . . \mathrm{Ra} 5$ solution, in which the route of the bS through c5 temporarily intercepts the a5-e5 line, is slightly better.

## 2nd H.M. Jorma PAAVILAINEN:

1.Rh8 Sd6 2.Sc2 Bb2 3.Sd4 Ba3 $\ddagger$
1.Bg5 Bg7 2.Bb5 Se5 3.Sc4 Sd3 $\ddagger$
1.Qb5 Kc8 2.Kc6 Bd4 3.Bd6 Sd8 $\ddagger$

A satisfying threesome. In two solutions one white officer, itself unpinned on move B1, unpins its colleague; in the third solution, in a pleasing contrast, a move of the wK unpins both officers. This is an ingenious construction, albeit perhaps not a perfect matrix since $1 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 7$ (unlike 1...Sd6) serves not only to effect an unpin but also to vacate its departure square (e5) for its colleague. In such an elegant problem it doesn't seem to me a serious detraction that the motivation of $1 . .$. Sd6 isn't purely unpinning (since White would have to play it anyway to guard two flight squares).

Menachem WITZTUM Emanuel NAVON 3rd H.M.

h $\ddagger 3$
b) $\mathrm{c} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 5$
$(8+7)$

Mario PARRINELLO
1st Commendation

$h \neq 2.5 \quad 3.11$
(9+9)

3rd H.M. Menachem WITZTUM, Emanuel NAVON:
a) $1 . \mathrm{Sd} 4$ (Se5 2...Sf3 ... 3.Sg1??) e5 (exf5?) 2.Sf3 Se4 3.Sg1 Sg3 $\ddagger$
b) $1 . \operatorname{Rg} 7$ (Rd4 2... $\operatorname{Rg} 4$... $3 . \operatorname{Rg} 2$ ??)(Rh7?) d4 (dxc4?)2.R×g5 Sd3 3.Rg2 Re1 $\ddagger$

One of the most ambitious problems in the tourney - the composer has obviously thought about the interesting directions into which the set theme can be taken. In this case, the B1 moves on to the long diagonal temporarily unpin the wS, and so seem at first to make it unnecessary for White to make an unpinning move. However, the piece moving on B1 will also move off the diagonal on B2 and so an anticipatory self-unpinning move is after all required on W 1 . This move must also vacate the square that will be occupied on W2. (The bPs at $f 5$ and c4 create a good dual-avoidance by providing inadequate alternative moves by the white Pawns that would vacate respectively e4 and d3.) In the first solution, there is an even more pleasing dual avoidance, as it appears that $1 . \mathrm{Se} 5$ would be an equally acceptable way to get to $f 3$ until the solver sees that he is going to have to choose to move the wP to e5 (rendered impossible by 1.Se5). Unfortunately, this logic doesn't work as convincingly in the second solution because the reason that 1...Rd4 fails as a way of reaching g2 is not only that it prevents $2 . \mathrm{d} 4$ but also that the wPe4 blocks the line $\mathrm{d} 4-\mathrm{g} 4$. But for this imperfection this very interesting problem would have been placed higher.

## 1st Commendation, Mario Parrinello:

1...d7 2.B×e4 g×f8=Q 3.Bd3 Qc5 $\ddagger$
1...e7 2.Ba3 g8=Q 3.B×b4 Q×d5 $\ddagger$
1...f7 2.Bc6 g×h8=Q 3.Bb5 Qd4 $\ddagger$

Three such promotions by the Pawn have been seen before, but the choice of W1 line-opening Pawn moves is an attractive and thematic accompaniment.


## 2nd Commendation, Paz Einat:

```
1.Se5+ (Sg~?) Kf4 2.Kb6 (2.Ba7? Sc5 3.Kb8 Sxa6 4.Rxa6) Sd6 3.Ka7 Sxc8\ddagger
1.Sd4+ (Sf~?) Ke3 2.Ba7 (2.Kb6? Sd6 3.Ka7 Sxc8 4.Qxc8) Sc5 3.Kb8 Sxa6\ddagger
```

In order to enable the wK to unpin the b7S B1 must be a move of one of the bSs (which are guarding respectively f 4 and e 3 ); the star feature of this problem is that the move must be to a square that shields the wK from a check that would otherwise arise later in the solution.

## 3rd Commendation, Mark ERENBURG:

a) $1 . . . \mathrm{Be} 5$ (Bxf4/b8?) $2 . \mathrm{Bb} 7 \mathrm{Sa} 4$ 3.Kc6 Se7 $\ddagger$
b) 1 ...Sf6 (Sh6?) $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Sd} 3$ 3.Bf3 Bxf4 $\ddagger$

A nice light setting with pleasing dual avoidances on W1.

To all the composers for having produced an impressive set of problems in a short time my congratulations, and also my thanks for providing me with what has been an enjoyable task. Once again my thanks to Themis and Harry for all their help and support and best wishes to all those who have attended the Congress and made it such a success in such difficult times.

Christopher Jones

## $63^{\text {rd }}$ World Congress of Chess Composition Rhodes, 16-23 October 2021 Quick Composing Tourney Section: Twomovers

Direct mates in 2 moves are requested in which one or more twin positions are formed by moving the black king to a non-adjacent square. If multiple twins are used (i.e. at least two relocations of bK) their destination squares should be mutually non-adjacent too.


Closing date: Sunday 17.10.2021, 23:59.
Controller: Themis Argirakopoulos, themis.argirakopoulos@gmail.com
Judge: Udo Degener

## Preisbericht <br> WCCC2021 Rhodes，Quick Composing，\＃2

Trotz der thematisch offenen Themavorgabe，lagen nur vier Zweizüger zur Beurteilung vor．

Mein Urteil：

PREI S：Ilija Serafimovic and Zivan Susulic
Sehr originelle Idee：Fesselung und Entfesselung durch die K－Versetzung．
In den Varianten dann abwechselnd indirekte Entfesselung bzw．Block mit Mattwechsel．

Hervorzuheben ist auch die gute Figurennutzung．

b） $\mathrm{f} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 4$
a）
1．自 d5！［2．賭e4才］
1．．．气c5 2．党e5 $\ddagger$
1．．．包f6 2．崽 $\mathrm{e} 6 \ddagger$

b）
1．自 $\mathrm{C} 4!$［2．曽 $\mathrm{e} 4 \ddagger$ ］
1．．．今c5 2．㖪d6 $\ddagger$
1．．． Vff $^{2}$ 2．㡙e5 $\ddagger$
$1 .$. 党 $\times f 4+2$ ．斯 $\times f 4 \ddagger$

EHRENDE ERWÄHNUNG: Marjan Kovacevic

Auf die Zwillinge verteilter Valladao-Task. Sparsam und kurios, auch wenn der Schlüsselzug von b) keine Offenbarung ist.

a)
1.ab6 ep.! [2. $\left.{ }_{\text {. }}^{\text {a }} \mathrm{a} \ddagger \ddagger\right]$
b)

1. (1) d6! [2. .
1...楽d82.
1...0-0-0 2. $28=$ 煤 $\ddagger$
2. $\mathrm{a} 8=$ =

1．LOB：Koen Versmissen
Dieser Achtling nutzt die Themenforderung weidlich aus，wandelt aber in den
Spuren von J．J．Burbach，Deutsche Schachzeitung，1983（ Ke4，Td3，Tf5－Ka6，b）－ h） sK nach $\mathrm{c} 8, \mathrm{~h} 6, \mathrm{~h} 4, \mathrm{~h} 2, \mathrm{~h} 1, \mathrm{e} 1, \mathrm{c} 1$ ）．

b）
c）${ }^{\text {e }} \mathrm{c} 8 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 6$
d） $\mathrm{c} 8 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 3$
e）青 $\mathrm{c} 8 \rightarrow \mathrm{~g} 1$
f）
g）
h）흘 $c 8 \rightarrow a 6$
a）
1．${ }^{\text {趷 }} \mathrm{dR}$ ！［2．${ }^{\text {趷 }} \mathrm{d} 8 \ddagger$ ］
1．．．刍b8 2．党d8 $\ddagger$
b）
1．${ }^{\text {発 }} \mathrm{f} 2!$［2．箅 $\left.\mathrm{f} 8 \ddagger\right]$
1．．．筸h82．唓f8 $\ddagger$
c）
1．를 g2！blocus
1．．．身h5 2．党h7 $\ddagger$
d）
1．${ }^{\text {ang }}$ g7！blocus
1．．．为h4 2．قh2 $\ddagger$
e）
1．를 f7！blocus
1．．．筸h1 2．党f1 $\ddagger$
f）
1．${ }^{\text {Ean }} \mathrm{d} 7$ ！blocus

g）
1．${ }^{\text {E．b b }}$ ！blocus

h）
1．${ }^{\text {ane }}$ b2！blocus
1．．．象a5 2．笪a7

## 2. LOB: Paz Einat

Reziproker Mattwechsel nach K-Versetzung. Dazu gibt es zahlreiche, auch sparsamere Darstellungen.
Der gleiche Schlüsselzug ist ein Manko.
Am ähnlichsten zu dieser Aufgabe ist E . Groß, Landeszeitung für d. Lüneburger Heide, 1972 (Kd1, Dd8, Tc1, Tf4, Ld7, Sb6, Sg2, Ba3, Ba5-Kc5, Ta8, Sd4, Bb5, Bb7, Bc4, Bd6, Bf5, Bf6, Bf7, b) Kc5-e5, a) 1. Se1, b) 1. Tc3)
a)


1... 气 $\times \mathrm{e} 12$ 2. 畄 $\times \mathrm{e} 6 \ddagger$
b)




Gratulation und Dank den Teilnehmern.

## $63^{\text {rd }}$ World Congress of Chess Composition Rhodes, 16-23 October 2021 Quick Composing Tourney Section: Helpmates in 2 moves

Helpmates in 2 moves are requested in which the arrival effect of the B1 move is anticipatory unpin of a white unit. The thematic move may also have some other arrival effect (like in No. 2 in which the move $1.5 f 5$ is also a self-block); this is allowed, but the judge will value higher the 'pure' motivations and 'less evident on the initial diagram' anticipatory effects.

[9] Zvonimir Hernitz Fadil Abdurahmanović
F. Sonnenfeld MT
Boletim da UBP 1997
2. Hon. Mention

$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2$
b) $\mathbf{d} 7 \rightarrow f 5$
a) $1.93 \mathrm{Se} 42 . \mathrm{Se} 2 \mathrm{Bh} 3 \ddagger$
b) $1 . \mathrm{Rg} 3 \mathrm{Se} 82 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 5 \ddagger$
[10] Živko Janevski Quick Tourney, Bratislava 1993 2. Prix

$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2$

> 1.Sd3 Sxd5+2.Kxd5 Sd2 $\ddagger$
> 1.Bb3 Sxe5 2.Kxe5 Sd5
[8] Rainer Paslack Problem-Echo 2006

$h \neq 2$
2.1.1.1
$(4+11)$
1.Sf7 Sf4 2.e5 Bxd3 $\ddagger$
1.Bf2 Bxe6 2.Sd4 Sc3 $\ddagger$
[11] Friedrich Chlubna Schach 1978
2. Hon. Mention

$h \ddagger 2$
2.1.1.1
1.Sg4 Se5 2.Qb4 Bxc6 $\ddagger$
1.Sd4 Bc2 2.Rb4 Sd6 $\ddagger$

$h \neq 2$
2.1.1.1
(6+11)
1.Sg7 Rf6 2.Qc3 Rf2 $\ddagger$
1.Sg8 Bd8 2.Qc8 Bxa5才

## [12] David Shire

 The Problemist 20011. Prize

$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2 \quad$ 2.1.1.1
(6+8)
1.Sf4 Sb3 2.Kb5 Sd6 $\ddagger$
2. $\mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Sd} 6+2 . \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Sb} 3 \ddagger$

Closing date: Sunday 17.10.2021, 23:59.
Controller: Themis Argirakopoulos, themis.argirakopoulos@gmail.com
Judge: Harry Fougiaxis

I received from the tournament director 16 problems on anonymous diagrams. The average quality level was modest. A few remarks on some entries that I did not include in the award: $\mathrm{H} 02, \mathrm{H} 10$ and H 13 are not thematic as the unpinnings are not anticipatory, while H 03 has the same B 2 move in the two solutions. H07, which features two hideaways in each twin, is a brave attempt but in my opinion the clarity of the B1 moves as anticipatory unpins is questionable; furthermore, the construction is quite heavy (although I admit I cannot present any improvement) and there is a pin-mate only in the second solution. H11 is indeed very challenging, but uses promoted pieces; I deem that the composer should have a second chance to present an improved setting in some other tourney.

$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2$
b) 业a1 $\rightarrow g 1$
$(3+11) \quad h \neq 2$

b) 9 d 4
$(3+10) \quad h \neq 2$

c) 兽 $\mathrm{a} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 3$

1. Place H06 Hans UITENBROEK, Andy OOMS (v): Extension of the idea of the first example in the announcement to three phases. The version uses regular twinning and has the black queen already placed on the thematic pin-line.
a) $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 6 \mathrm{Kxe} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kf1} \mathrm{Qxa1} \ddagger$
b) $1 . \mathrm{Sd} 7 \mathrm{Kxd} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 4 \ddagger$
c) $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 2 \mathrm{Kxe} 5+2 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Q} 4 \ddagger$
2. Place H05 Valery KOPYL, Volodimir ARIDOV: Tempo moves of the white king in a light setting.
a) 1.c5 Ke3 2.Ba4 Bxc3 $\ddagger$
b) $1 . \mathrm{Sd} 7 \mathrm{Kd} 3$ 2.Ra4 $\mathrm{Sxc} 6 \ddagger$
3. Place H12 Michel CAILAUD: Promotions as anticipatory unpins of the half-pinned white pieces with sacrifices and Zilahi. This seems familiar, but strangely I could not spot any anticipation.
1.b1 $=\mathrm{S}$ Se3+2.fxe3 Bg2 $\ddagger$
1.b1=B Bc4+2.bxc4 Sxc $3 \ddagger$

## Éric HUBER <br> 4. Place


$\mathrm{h} \ddagger 2$
b) $\mathrm{e} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 6 \quad(5+11)$

2.1.1.1
$h \neq 2$
(6+15)

Abdelaziz ONKOUD
5. Place

b) $\mathrm{b} 4 \rightarrow \mathrm{c} 2$
(6+7)
4. Place H15 Vlaicu CRISAN, Éric HUBER: Inferior than the last example in the announcement, but even so it deserves a place in the award as there is variety in the white play compared to the earlier rendering.
a) $1 . \mathrm{b} 5 \mathrm{Sf} 62 . \mathrm{Be} 6 \mathrm{Sd} 3 \ddagger$
b) 1.Bb5 Sc6+2.Kd7 Sb6 $\ddagger$
5. Place H01 Abdelaziz ONKOUD: Anticipatory unpins with square blocks and sacrifices of the halfpinned white knights with Zilahi in a loaded setting.
1.Sce4 Sc3 2.bxc3 Sel $\ddagger$
1.Re4 Sd4 2.cxd4 Sxb4 $\ddagger$
6. Place H04 Hannu HARKOLA: Charming play with reciprocal gate openings and interferences in an elegant setting, but unfortunately thematically very close to diagram A.
a) 1.Sf3 Rxd5 2.Rb6 Ra5 $\ddagger$
b) 1. $\mathrm{Rc} 6 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{d} 52 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 3 \ddagger$

7. Place H08 Jacques ROTENBERG: Anticipatory unpins of the white queen on two distinct lines.
1.Sf4 Qc7 (Qxf3?) 2.d5 Qc3 $\ddagger$
1.Sde7 Kc7 2.Kc5 Qc4ł
8. Place H16 Vlaicu CRISAN, Éric HUBER: Simple and economic AB-BA white play.
1.Se4 c4 2.Rb6 d4 $\ddagger$
1.Re4 d4+2.Kd5 c4 $\ddagger$

Diagram A, Dmitry ZHILKO: 1. Hon. Mention Internet Ty, Belgrade 2012:
a) $1.5 \mathrm{Sd} 4 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{e} 42 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 6 \ddagger$
b) 1. Sc4 Rxe4 $2 . S f e 3$ Re7 $\ddagger$

## 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ TZUICA TOURNEY AWARD - 2021

TZUICA TOURNEY 2021 ANNOUNCEMENT ..... 1
INTRODUCTION ..... 2
ORTHODOX SECTION ..... 3
FAIRY SECTION ..... 10
FAIRY DEFINITIONS ..... 20

## TZUICA TOURNEY 2021 ANNOUNCEMENT

Theme: Helpself compositions (hs\#n/hs=n) with at least 2 solutions showing each at least one Pelle move.

1. In a help-selfmate problem in ' n ' moves (denoted hs\#n), White starts and Black collaborates with White in order to reach a position of s\#1 (selfmate in one move) at move ' $n$ ' (the last move). Helpselfstalemates are also accepted.
2. Pelle move: A pinned unit moves and is still pinned after its move.

A unit is pinned if its removal from the board would leave its King in check.
Problems with twins or zeroposition are allowed. All fairy pieces and conditions are accepted, provided that the problem is checked by a known solving program.

## Example 1 for Orthodox section

Marjan KOVAČEVIĆ Julia's Fairies 2021

1...Rh4 2.Rh5 Bxd4 3.Be5+ Bxe5\#
1...Be5 2.Bf6 Rxh3 3.Rh4+ Rxh4\#
2.Rh5/2.Bf6 and 3.Be5+/3.Rh4+ are the Pelle moves.

Example 2 for Fairy Section
S.K. BALASUBRAMANIAN

3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Prize Seetharaman-64 JT, JF 2013

1.Ka1 Se3 2.Qa7 Sg2 3.Qg1+ Kxg1\#
1.Ka2 Sd2 2.Qb2 Sb1 3.Qg2+ Kxg2\#
2.Qa7/2.Qb2 and 3.Qg1+/3.Qg2+ are the Pelle moves.

Participants:
Aleksandr Pankratiev 38; Anatoly Stepochkin 25,26,27,28,29,30,31; Andrey Frolkin 55; Andy Ooms 56; Anirudh Daga 33; Bojan Basic 68; Dimitris Liakos 65; Emanuel Navon 17*, 18*, 19* ; Franz Pachl 8,9,10*, 11*, 12*, 13*, 20, 32*,66*,67*; Hans Uitenbroek 22; Hiroaki Maeshima 7; Hubert Gockel 15*; Karol Mlynka 39,49,50,51,52,53,54,69; Kostas Prentos 61*,62*,63*; Mario Parrinello 34,35,36,37; Marjan Kovacevic 72*; Mark Erenburg 70,71; Menachem Witztum 4,5,6,17*,18*,19*; Michael Barth 32*,44,66*,67*; Michel Caillaud 23; Misha Shapiro 40,41,42,43; Ofer Comay 21,64; Petko Petkov 45,46,47,48; Rainer Kuhn 24; Ralf Krätschmer $10^{*}, 11^{*}, 12^{*}, 13^{*}, 15^{*}$; Rolf Kohring 76; Sven Trommler 32*,66*,67*; Themis Argirakopoulos 57, 58, 59, 60; Theodoros Giakatis 61*,62*,63*; Torsten Linss 16,73*, 74*, 75*; Velko Alexandrov 14; Viktor Paliulionis 73*, 74*, $75^{*}$; Vitaly Medintsev 1,2,3; Waldemar Tura 72*

## INTRODUCTION

The theme chosen for the Tzuica tourney reflects the movement constraints everyone has lived through this year. Although pinned on a line, a piece may still move and produce interesting effects. The theme seems to have inspired many composers, because we received 76 problems from 31 composers from 17 countries.

In our award we praise the realization of genuine Pelle moves. This is how we classify Pelle moves:

1. "Fictitious" when the existence of the pin is totally irrelevant, i.e. the move would be the same even in the absence of pinning by slightly modifying the position.
2. "Artificial" when the presence of the pin is essentially justified, but there is actually no choice of move for the active side except the Pelle move.
3. "Genuine" when the Pelle move is neither fictitious, nor artificial.

Because it is a thematical tournament, we chose to award the works intensively presenting the theme. Presenting a single Pelle move per phase was not sufficient. This explains why several excellent problems were not retained in this award, but will most probably be retained in other, more appropriate tourneys.

In our comments we will mainly emphasize the main effects produced by the thematic moves. That doesn't mean we overlooked the other aspects of the composition.

## ORTHODOX SECTION

More than half of the received entries were orthodox (40 entries). To get a prize, one must show at least 6 Pelle moves distributed across maximum three phases. Honorable mentions were granted to entries featuring at least four Pelle moves where at least one of thematic pieces arrives on the pin line during the solution. For commendations, four Pelle moves on static pin lines must be shown.
Ofer COMAY

1st Prize, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 $\quad$| Misha SHAPIRO |
| :---: |
| 2nd Prize, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 |

## $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Prize: Ofer COMAY (Israel)

There are 3 white Pelle moves in each solution: the first is blocking a flight, the second creating a direct battery and the third is firing the created battery, that has become an indirect battery.
Two pins already exist in the diagram and one more pin is created during the solution.
We also praised that four pairs of pieces exchange their functions: Qb1/Rf1, Qc3/Re2, Rd6/Bf4, Rd8/Bh6.
The only slight blemish is that bBg 8 is used for selfblock in b ) and is a mere cookstopper in a ).

## $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Prize: Misha SHAPIRO (Israel)

This is the most economical rendering of 6 Pelle moves in orthogonal-diagonal correspondence. Black selfblocks with the first Pelle move, while White plays a critical Pelle move. In the end, the third Pelle move is an active sacrifice of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ black piece on a square guarded by the black Queen.


## 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Prize : Menachem WITZTUM \& Emanuel NAVON (Israel)

This problem shows the same thematic as the $2^{\text {nd }}$ prize, in a less economical setting. The only slight difference is that the white Pelle move is no longer critical but a mere square vacation. We didn't want to disqualify this entry based on the superior presentation of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize.

## $4^{\text {th }}$ Prize $:$ Petko PETKOV (Bulgaria)

This problem displays an amazing strategic wealth: double bicolor Bristol, Loshinsky of wRs and bR , active play of the bK .
The first Pelle move by the white Rook supports the active sacrifice performed in the second Pelle move by the white Bishop. We were impressed all this content could be shown in Meredith form ending with model pin mates. Only the density of thematic Pelle moves per phase hindered a higher classification.

| Petko PETKOV $1^{\text {st }}$ HM, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 | Mario PARRINELLO <br> $2^{\text {nd }}$ HM, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  <br> hs\#4 <br> b) e e4-->b4 <br> $(8+4)$ <br> a) 1.Ba2-g8 Qb6-e6 $2 . \mathrm{Sg} 3-\mathrm{e} 2+\mathrm{Kd} 3-\mathrm{c} 4 \quad 3 . \mathrm{Se} 2-\mathrm{d} 4$ Qe6-f7 4.Re8-c8 + Rf8*c8 \# <br> b) 1.Bc3-h8 Qb6-f6 2.Sg3-f1 + Kd3-d4 3.Rh3-e3 Qf6g7 4.Re8-d8 + Rf8*d8 \# | hs\#3 2.1.1... $(9+6)$ $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.Rb1-c1 Rd1*c1 + 2.Qa2-b1 Rc1-g1 } \quad \text { 3.Qb1-d1 + Rg1*d1 \# } \\ & \text { 1.Bb2-c3 Bd4*c3 + 2.Qa2-b2 Bc3-f6 } \\ & \text { 3.Qb2-d4 + Bf6*d4 \# } \end{aligned}$ |

$1^{\text {st }}$ Honourable Mention: Petko PETKOV (Bulgaria)
The first Pelle move is played by the black Queen on a newly created pin line, while the second Pelle move is played by the white Rook on an existing pin line.
The strategic content is enhanced by critical moves of the white Bishops and the artistic Meredith presentation by the model mates with pinned black Queen.

## $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Honourable Mention: Mario PARRINELLO (Italy)

The first Pelle moves aims to sacrifice the pinned unit, which is then replaced by the white Queen. The white Queen subsequently plays the second Pelle move on the same pin line. We highly praised that all the original action and all moves are played only on the thematic pin lines.

| Torsten LINSS \& Viktoras PALIULIONIS 3rd HM, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 | Misha SHAPIRO $4^{\text {th }}$ HM, Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
| hs\#4.5 2.1.1... ( $2+4$ ) $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1...Qb1-b3 2.Qe1-a5 Kd3-e4 + 3.Qa5-b5 Qb3-g3 } \\ & \text { 4.Qb5-c4 + Ke4-f3 5.Qc4-e2 + Ba6*e2 \# } \\ & \text { 1...f4-f3 2.Qe1-d1 + Kd3-e3 + 3.Kf1-g1 Ba6-e2 4.Kg1- } \\ & \text { h1 Ke3-f2 5.Qd1-g1 + Qb1*g1 \# } \end{aligned}$ | hs\#2.5 2.1.1.1.1 ( 9 + 2 ) <br> 1...Bd4-e5 2.Qc6-e8 Be5-f6 3.Bc3-e5 Bf6*e5 \# 1...Kg7*h8 2.Qc6-h1 Bd4-g7 3.Bc3-f6 Bg7*f6 \# |

## $3^{\text {rd }}$ Honourable Mention: Torsten LINSS \& Viktoras PALIULIONIS (Germany \& Lithuania)

The theme can be doubled in miniature form as the two computer experts demonstrate. In the first solution the thematic moves are played on a newly created diagonal pin line. In the second solution the action takes place on the existing orthogonal pin line. The white material is reduced to the minimum.

## $4^{\text {th }}$ Honourable Mention: Misha SHAPIRO (Israel)

The mutually pinned Bishops play the five thematic moves spread over two phases. The white Queen must either guard a flight or hide away in a corner. Simple yet ingenious.

## Commendations without order



## Commendation: Vitaly MEDINTSEV (Russia)

The thematic moves are interchanged: W1 vacates a square in order to allow the unpinning of the white officer while W4 actively sacrifices the second white officer for the mate.
The orthogonal-diagonal correspondence is pleasing, as is the active play of the black King.

## Commendation: Ralf KRÄTSCHMER \& Franz PACHL (Germany)

Exquisite doubled presentation of the theme: switchback of the thematic piece on the pin line, back and forth Pelle moves, also showing an original combination of Pelle moves and Klasinc theme.

| Ralf KRÄTSCHMER \& Franz PACHL Comm. , Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 | Ralf KRÄTSCHMER \& Franz PACHL Comm. , Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
| hs\#2 b) c6-->b5 (6+6) <br> a) 1.Qe4-g6 (A) Qh7-h2 2.Rc3-b3 + (B) Ra3*b3 \# <br> b) 1.Rc3-b3 (B) Ra3-a2 2.Qe4-g6 + (A) Qh7*g6 \# | hs\#3 <br> b) <br> a) 1.Rc6-c5 Qb7-c7 2.Rb8-b2 h4-h3 3.Rc5-c4 + Qc7*c4 \# <br> b) 1.Qf6-e5 Qb7-g7 2.Rb8-b3 Rc8-a8 3.Qe5-d4 + Qg7*d4 \# |

Commendation: Ralf KRÄTSCHMER \& Franz PACHL (Germany)
A shortie featuring the interchange of white Pelle moves, like the commended problem by Medintsev.
We particularly liked that the first Pelle move pins the black Knight.

## Commendation: Ralf KRÄTSCHMER \& Franz PACHL (Germany)

Doubled Pelle move by the same unit. The motivation of the first Pelle move is a pure tempo.


## Commendation: Emanuel NAVON \& Menachem WITZTUM (Israel)

The pinned pinners: a black unit and a white unit reciprocally pin each other on the same line. But still move intensive is the $3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize by the same authors.

## Commendation: Aleksandr PANKRATIEV (Russia)

The second Pelle move is an active sacrifice allowing the creation of a royal battery.Very economical presentation in diagonal-orthogonal correspondence.


Commendation: Marjan KOVACEVIC \& Waldemar TURA (Serbia \& Poland)
This is probably a Letztform of the thematic example in a beautiful aristocratic form.

## Special Commendation: Anirudh DAGA (India)

In spite of the heterogeneous motivations of the three thematic moves, it is impressive that the problem was created and improved by a young, bright and talented composer.

## FAIRY SECTION

We received 36 problems for the fairy section.
We decided to exclude the following problems due to various reasons:

- TZ08, TZ20 are excellent problems but not suitable for this thematic tournament;
- TZ42, TZ43 due to fictitious strategy (see Introduction)
- TZ57,TZ58: the composer was misled by a solving program into believing that in fairy condition Fusil (Rifle chess) the capturing piece comes back to the square it occupied before the capture. However, in the original definition of the condition, it is clearly stated that the shooter doesn't actually move. Thus the captures are not Pelle moves.
- TZ56 where 5 fairy pieces are inactive and Double-Rookhopper d3 is useless in twin b);

Here the criteria were slightly different from those of the orthodox section. In fairies, it is possible to give (stale)mate by a Pelle move or Pelle moves played by non-linear pieces (e.g. Knight or Pawn) - and this feature was highly praised by us.
To get a prize, one must show at least 6 Pelle moves distributed across maximum three phases. Honorable mentions were granted to entries featuring at least four Pelle moves or having fairy specific Pelle moves. For commendations, four Pelle moves on static pin lines must be shown.


## $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Prize: Petko PETKOV (Bulgaria)

The absolute record of the tournament: 9 Pelle moves! The white Rooks are both pinned by the black Lion al while the Queen and Bishop are pinned by black Lion h8. All white moves are played on the pin lines while the black Grasshopper blocks a flight.
The activated black royal battery delivers a fourfold pin mate. After the mating move, the black King also forms an antibattery with the third black Lion.

2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Prize: Mario PARRINELLO (Italy)
The first Pelle moves enables the patrol of white Rook by white Leo. The second Pelle move is a check that can be parried only by the interference of the black Pao. The cycle of white moves is impressive.
Anatoly STEPOCHKIN
3rd Prize, Fairy Section Tzuica 2021
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize: Anatoly STEPOCHKIN (Russia)
The six Pelle moves are distributed between two phases and two thematic pieces: white Rook and white Queen. The first Pelle move enables the hop of the black Grasshopper and the second Pelle move is a switchback enabling the guard of flight el by the black Grasshopper. The third Pelle move is also a Loshinsky. The construction is very clever.

## $4^{\text {th }}$ Prize: Petko PETKOV (Bulgaria)

The pinned white Queen makes six different Pelle moves due to the peculiarity of the Double Rookhopper (the pin line is a broken line h2-h8-a8). The solutions are neatly differentiated by the b6 Forsberg triplets that play a bivalve move.
Like in the orthodox section, only the slightly inferior thematic density prevented a higher classification.

| Theodoros GIAKATIS \＆Kostas PRENTOS $5^{\text {th }}$ Prize，Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 | Themis ARGIRAKOPOULOS <br> Special Prize，Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\begin{array}{cc} \text { hs\#2 } & \text { 3.1.1.1 }(6+1+5) \\ & \text { Lion } \end{array}$ | hs\＃5 Zeroposition（3＋7） <br> a）泪 $\mathrm{a} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 8$ ；b） 云 $\mathrm{f} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 8$ <br> Anti－Nextmate <br> Royal piece d5 <br> Zllontra－Grasshopper <br> 最＝Grasshopper <br> 吅河＝Wazir <br> a）1．WAd4 WAb8 2．WAe4 Gd3 3．WAd4 WAb7 4．WAc4 CG＊c4 5．G＊a7＋CGg8\＃ <br> b）1．WAc5 WAa2 2．WAc6 Gb5 3．WAc5 WAb2 4．WAc4 CG＊c4 5．Ga1＋CGg8\＃ |

$5^{\text {th }}$ Prize：Theodoros GIAKATIS \＆Kostas PRENTOS（Greece \＆USA）
The thematic white Rook sacrifices itself to allow the promotion of a neutral Pawn，hence creating a neutral battery which fires after the active sacrifice of the second thematic piece，the white Queen．This might seem slightly monotonous at the first glance but the use of the neutral pieces is very economical．

## Special Prize：Themis ARGIRAKOPOULOS（Greece）

The author skillfully exploited a glitch in the definition provided in the tourney announcement． Here the white thematic Wazir must stay next to the royal Pawn due to the restrictions imposed by the fairy condition Anti－Nextmate，and not due to the effects of a piece of the other side．
The judges acknowledge the flaw in the definition and decided to distinguish this work with a special award，for its theoretical value and its presentation of 8 ＂Pelle＂moves．
The zeroposition however is quite difficult to swallow．

| Mario PARRINELLO <br> $1^{\text {st }}$ HM，Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 | Hans UITENBROEK <br> $2^{\text {nd }} H M$ ，Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
| hs\＃3 b）清a7－－＞a1（5＋3） Ultrapatrol部亚Leo Royal pieces a7，g7 <br> a）1．Sd5－c7 Qg5－e7＋2．LEg6－f7 Qe7－d7 3．LEf7－e7 Qd7＊e7 \＃ <br> b）1．Sd5－c3 Qg5－e5＋2．LEg6－f6 Qe5－d4 3．LEf6－e5 | hs\＃3 b） $\begin{aligned} & 8 \text { f5-->e4 }(9+8) \\ & 5 \text { Roses } \end{aligned}$ <br> a）1．ROb7－f7 ROa5－b7 2．Ra3－c3 Qh8－a8 3．Kf3－e4＋ROb7＊f7 \＃ <br> b）1．ROb7－g5 ROa5－f7 2．Ra1－c1 Qh8－f8 3．Kf3－f2＋ROf7＊g5 \＃ |

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Honorable Mention：Mario PARRINELLO（Italy）

All the play takes place only on the thematic lines：on the $7^{\text {th }}$ rank in twin a）and on diagonal a1－ g 7 in twin b）．Both white and black thematic piece arrive on the pin line during the solution．The zugzwang mate is highly surprising．The restrictive fairy condition enables a very economic presentation．

## $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Honorable Mention：Hans UITENBROEK（Netherlands）

The first war of the Roses starts with two thematic moves by the two reciprocally pinned Roses on the pin line．The white Rose is the rear piece of a royal battery，while the black Rose is the front piece of a Queen－Rose battery．The twinning is ingenious．

| Michel CAILLAUD <br> 3rd HM, Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 | Bojan BASIC $4^{\text {th }}$ HM, Fairy Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :---: | :---: |
| hs\#4 2.1.1.. ( $13+7$ ) <br> * Rose <br> 1.Bc5-a7 e2*f1=RO 2.Ba7-b8 ROf1-e3 3.Ka6-a7 h2*g1=B 4.ROe6-a6 ROe3-e7 \# <br> 1.Bc5-b6 e2*f1=B + 2.ROe6-e2 h2*g1=RO 3.ROe2-b5 + ROg1-e2 4.ROb5-a7 ROe2-e6 \# | hs=2.5 3.1.1... $(8+8)$ <br> Antikings <br> M Moarider-Lion Locust <br> 1...Qg3-e3 2.Lf2*e3-d4 + Rf5-f6 3.Ld4*f6-g7 Se6-f4 = <br> 1...Rf5-f7 2.Lf2*f7-f8 + Se6-c5 3.Lf8*c5-b4 Qg3-f4 = <br> 1...Se6-d4 2.Lf2*d4-c5 + Qg3-c7 3.Lc5*c7-c8 Rf5-f4 = |

## $3^{\text {rd }}$ Honorable Mention: Michel CAILLAUD (France)

In the second war of the Roses, the promoted pinned black Rose is the front piece of a black battery. The quiet white moves force chameleon echo mates by a Pelle move.
The extra white thematic move from the second solution embellishes the overall thematic content.

## $4^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention: Bojan BASIC (Serbia)

The three thematic black pieces are initially part of a third-pin on a specific pin line produced by the white Moarider-Lion.
Two of the black thematic pieces are captured by the white Locust during the solution while the third moves on f 4 to give stalemate by a specific Pelle move. The result is a sort of cyclic Zilahi highly facilitated by the restrictive fairy condition.


## $5^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention: Hubert GOCKEL \& Ralf KRÄTSCHMER (Germany)

The truly unbelievable Pelle move by the white Knight deserves recognition. The black economy and the zugzwang mate are remarkable.
$\mathbf{6}^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention: Franz PACHL, Michael BARTH \& Sven TROMMLER (Germany) Here too the specific mate is forced by zugzwang, but the condition is entirely different.
The mate is given by the pinned black Knight which is still pinned after moving because the black Queen observes the white pinning officer. An exquisite presentation.


## $7^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention: Michael BARTH (Germany)

Another big surprise: the thematic move is played by a black Pawn! Due to Take\&Make specific the Pawn delivers the final mate while capturing a white piece and moving to another square of the pin line.

## $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention: Hiroaki MAESHIMA (Japan)

Love at first sight: the mates by Pelle moves are forced by zugzwang, in orthogonal-diagonal correspondence.
The white Bishop may not be active, but it plays a role in each solution. In Andernach Chess the mating black Queen can't be captured due to self-check.

Commendations (without order)


## Commendation: Karol MLYNKA (Slovakia)

The Volage condition is exploited virtually: it prevents $3 \ldots \operatorname{Rxd} 3$ in a) or $3 \ldots \mathrm{Rf} 2$ in b)
The strategy is not fictitious because White has other available moves in each phase. A neat miniature.

Commendation: Theodoros GIAKATIS \& Kostas PRENTOS (Greece \& USA)
The motivation of the first Pelle move is to create a hurdle for the black Lion. The second thematic move is an active sacrifice of the white Queen. The black Lions exchange their duties in guarding flights.

|  | Ofer COMAY <br> Commendation, <br> Orthodox Section Tzuica 2021 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Commendation: Ofer COMAY (Israel)

After two wars of the Roses, we conclude with a war of the Lions.
Well unified motivation of Pelle moves: hurdle creation for both White and Black.
Two pairs of White Lions are pinned each by a black Lion. One pair moves while the other pair is unpinned. The slightly unmatched black strategy prevented a higher classification.

$$
8
$$

We thank to all the participants for their efforts and wish them also enjoy the excitement produced by their beautiful problems.

Vlaicu Crişan \& Eric Huber
October 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }} 2021$, Rhodos

## FAIRY DEFINITIONS

Andernach Chess: A unit (not K) when capturing, changes colour
AntiKings: A king is in check if he is not attacked. Mate occurs when a king is not attacked and his side has no move which exposes him to attack
Anti-Nextmate : A King is in check only if its field is empty.
Bishop-Lion: $(1,1)$ Lion. Moves along Bishop lines over another unit of either colour to any square beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.

Bolero : A Piece (King and Pawn excluded) captures as usual but moves without capturing as the piece of the first rank which is, in the game array, on the column on which it is located.

Camel: $(1,3)$ Leaper
ContraGrasshopper: Moves like a Grasshopper but in reverse: the hurdle must be adjacent to the CG, which may land anywhere on the line beyond.
Double-Grasshopper: Must make two consecutive moves as part of a single turn of play, in each one moving any distance on queen lines over a hurdle to finish on the first square beyond it, [i.e. making two consecutive Grasshopper moves]. The first such Grasshopper move must be to a vacant square; the second may be a capture, and may involve change of direction, including switchback.
Double-Rookhopper: Moves like a Double-Grasshopper, but only on Rook lines.
Functionary Chess: A piece can move only if it is threatened.
Giraffe: $(1,4)$ Leaper.
Grasshopper: Moves along Q-lines over another unit of either colour to the square immediately beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.
Leo: $(0,1)+(1,1)$ Chinese. Chinese Queen. Moves as Queen, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.
Lion: $(0,1)+(1,1)$ Lion. Moves along Queen lines over another unit of either colour to any square beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.
Locust: $(0,1)+(1,1)$ Locust. Moves along Queen lines only by capturing an enemy unit, arriving on the square immediately beyond that unit, which must be vacant.
Moa: Has a fixed 2-step move consisting of a $(1,1)$ step followed by a $(0.1)$ step to reach a square a knight's move away (e.g. al-b2-c2); the intermediate square must be vacant.

Moarider: Moves in a series of alternating pairs of $(1,1)$ and $(0,1)$ steps to reach a square a number of knight's moves away (e.g. a1-b2-c2-d3-e3 or a1-b2-c2-d3-e3-f4-g4); all intermediate squares must be vacant.

Moarider-Lion: Prolonged Hopper moving on the lines of a Moarider (the hurdle can be on any square where a Moarider would be intercepted).
Pao: $(0,1)$ Chinese. Chinese piece operating along Rook lines: moves as Rook, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.
Rook-Lion: $(0,1)$ Lion. Moves along Rook lines over another unit of either colour to any square beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.

Rose: $(1,2)$ Octagonal Rider (extends the move of the Knight on a circular path e.g. a4-b6-d7-f6-g4-f2-d1b2 or a4-c5-e4-f2).
Royal unit: The side that has this piece is in check if it is threatened.
Superguards: Any unit (including Kings and pawns) observed by another unit of the same colour cannot be captured. Pinned units also observe.

Take\&Make: Having captured, a unit must immediately, as part of its move, play a non-capturing move in imitation of the captured unit from the capture-square. If no such move is available, the capture is illegal. Promotion by capture occurs only when a pawn arrives on the promotion rank as the result of a take\&make move. Checks are as in normal chess: after the notional capture of the checked K , the checking unit does not move away from the King's square.
Ultra-Patrol:A piece can move only if it is controlled (guarded by a piece of its own side)
Volage: A piece (King excluded) changes color the first time it changes of square color.
Wazir: $(0,1)$ Leaper

## Champagne Tourney Rhodes 2021

The Tourney is divided in 2 sections (with separate awards) :
A . ProofGames
B. Any other kind of Retro problems

Theme (in honour of Nikita Plaksin for his $90^{\text {th }}$ birthday) :
The same piece captures at least 2 promoted pieces.
(capturing piece is a Pawn in the examples but any other kind of capturing piece is accepted)

Example for Section A :
Nikita PLAKSIN, Michel CAILLAUD $1^{\circ} \mathrm{HM}$ feenschach 1982 (v)

1.h4 Sa6 2.h5 Sç5 3.h6 Sé4 4.h $\times$ g7 h5 5.g4 Sh6 6.g8=L Lg7 7.g5 Lf6 8.g6 Lh4 9.g7 f6 10.Lb3 Sg5 11.g8=L Sh3 12.Lgç4 d5
$13 . \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{~d} \times$ ç4 14.Ta2 Dd3 15.é $\times \mathrm{d} 3 \mathrm{Ld} 7$ ! 16.Ké2 0-0-0 17.f4 Tdg8
18.f5 Tg6 19.f $\times \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{ç} \times \mathrm{b} 320 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{~b} \times \mathrm{a} 221 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{L}$ a1 $=\mathrm{T}$
22.Lç4 Ta2 23.La6 b×a6 24.Dé1 Kb7 25.Kd1 Lç8 26.Sé2
$\mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{a} 2,21 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{a} 6$ are not thematic

Example for Section B :
Nikita PLAKSIN

## $1^{\circ}-2^{\circ}$ Prix e.a., Shakhmatny Vestnik 1993


History of black Pg2 ?
$(10+13)$
-1.Sg3-h5 + f3×Lg2 -2.Kb5-a6 é4×Lf3 -3.Ka4-b5 d5 $\times$ Dé4 -4.Dé5-é4 a6-a5 -5.Db8-é5 d6-d5 -6.b7-b8=D a7-a6 -7.a6×D(L,S)b7 then : Lf3 to ç8, ç7-ç8 $=\mathrm{L}, ~ c ̧ 6-c ̧ 7, ~ c ̧ 5-c ̧ 6, ~ L g 2 ~ t o ~ c ̧ 8, ~ c ̧ 7-c ̧ 8 ~=~ L, ~ c ̧ 6-c ̧ 7, ~$ ç $7 \times$ Dd6, Dd6 to h8, h7-h8 = D, h6-h7, h5-h6, h6×g5 and position unlocks.
black Pg2 captured 4 promoted pieces (only 2 are needed for the tourney).

$$
\text { Pç7×Dd6-d5 ×Dé } 4 \times \text { Lf } 3 \times \text { Lg2 }
$$

Fairy conditions (but not fairy pieces) allowed in both sections.
Maximum 2 entries per composer per section (collaboration counts for 1 full entry).
Maximum 1 non computer tested entry per composer in section A

Entries to the director Eric Pichouron, by Wednesday 20th October 20:00 PM e-mail : chess.champagne2021@gmail.com
who will transmit problems to the judge Michel Caillaud in anonymous form.

Prizes in each section :
subscription to Phénix 2022 for the first place, Winchloé light for the second place

Thanks to Laurent Riguet and Christian Poisson for providing the Prizes.

Phénix, created by Denis Blondel, now edited by Laurent, is the french problem magazine, with retro section run by Thierry Le Gleuher, and regularly published retro articles.

Among others :
2020 : a top class article by Pascal Wassong on the genesis of a classical retro 2021 : the quest for the Longest exact Proofgame by Thierry Le Gleuher ( 410,5 moves)
http://www.phenix-echecs.fr/

Winchloé light, developped by Christian, is a problem database, updated every month (now 823512 problems).

The most complete database for Proofgames (now 8462 of them).
http://winchloe.free.fr/

Great thanks to Eric Pichouron who submitted to me the entries in anonymous form.
Due to short delay in producing the award, some non computer-tested entries could not be deeply tested...

Here are some criteria I used for the appreciation of the problems.
-number of promoted pieces (of course...).
-number of moves by the promoted pieces.
-lesser number of captures by the promoted pieces.
-capturing piece not being a Pawn
when a Pawn, "invisibility" of the capturing path on the diagram.
-last thematic capture not being a check on the diagram.

## Section A

27 entries; 23 participants from 15 countries; 2 entries were cooked (A20,A27).
List of participants :
Silvio Baier (Germany) - A10,A14*
Michael Barth (Germany) - A14*
Arnold Beine (Germany) - A5,A6
Marco Bonavoglia (Italy) - A15
Dirk Borst (Netherlands) - A23
Ofer Comay (Israël) - A7,A8
Vlaicu Crisan (Romania) - A20*
Anirudh Daga (India) (13 years old!!) - A12,A13
Ivan Denkovski (Macedonia) - A3,A4
Jacques Dupin (France) - A11
Bjorn Enemark (Danemark) - A1
Andrey Frolkin (Ukraine) - A21*, A22*
Bernd Graefrath (Germany) - A2
Eric Huber (Romania) - A20*
Marek Kolcak (Slovakia) - A17
Jorge Lois (Argentina) - A24,A25*
Oto Mihalco (Slovakia) - A18
Per Olin (Finland) - A16
Roberto Osorio (Argentina) - A25*,A26
Paul Raican (Romania) - A9
Victor Sizonenko (Ukraine) - A27
Igor Vereshchagin (Russia) - A21*, A22*
Hitoshi Yanami (Japan) - A19
The number of entries was high and the level was quite good, each of them worth publication in any magazine.
The work of the judge is to do a selection and I found it hard in a short time.
Some good problems (A3,A7,A19) that showed the theme with additional non thematic but valuable content, which would certainly have been included with lower participation,
were excluded so that the selection was for problems concentrating mainly on the theme.
When 2 problems showed similar content (though in different form) I chose one :
A2, A13 : A2 selected because of the switchback by the capturing King.
A24, A25: A25 selected because of the better artistic feeling by the judge.
Some words about other non selected entries.
A1 : with the used condition, captures leave pieces on the board.
A15 : the theme in 2 solutions, but I found the solutions too similar.

## $1{ }^{\circ}$ Prize : A10 - Silvio BAIER



2b5/1pbps3/1r1q4/r1p1p3/s4k1p/1p6/1pPPP3/RSBQKBSR
SPG $28.0(11+15) \mathrm{C}+$
1.h4 a5 2.h5 a4 3.h6 a3 4.h×g7 a×b2 5.a4 Ta6 6.a5 Tb6 7.a6 h5 8.a7 h4 9.a8=D Th5 10.Da2 Ta5 11.f4 é5 12.Dé6+ f×é6 13.f5 Kf7 14.f6 Kg6 15.f7 Ld6 16.f8=D Sa6 17.Df3 Df6 18.Dd5 Sé7 19.g8=T+ Kf5 20.Tg4 é×d5 21.Tç4 d×ç4 22.g4+ Kf4 23.g5 Sç5 24.g6 Sa4 25.g7 ç5 26.g8=T Lç7 27.Tg3 Dd6 28.Tb3 ç×b3

A record of 4 promoted pieces captured by a unique piece (black Pawn f7).
A clockwork piece where each promoted piece reach its capture square in exactly 2 moves. No unthematical white move. A brilliant technical achievement!

## $2^{\circ}$ Prize : A25 - Roberto OSORIO \& Jorge LOIS


rsbqkbsr/p1ppp3/p7/P2R1B2/8/2P1PP1P/1P5S/1Q1S1K1R
SPG $22.0(13+13) \mathrm{C}+$
1.a4 f5 2.a5 f4 3.a6 f3 4.Ta5 f×g2 5.Sf3 g1=L 6.Lh3 g5 7.Lf5 g4 8.h3 g3 9.Sh2 g2 10.f3 Ld4 11.Td5 Lç3 12.d×ç3 g1=L 13.Lf4 Lç5 14.Lg3 Lb4 15.ç×b4 h5 16.Sç3 h4 17.Db1 $\mathrm{h} \times \mathrm{g} 3$ 18.Sd1 g2 19.ç3 $\mathrm{g} 1=\mathrm{L} 20 . \mathrm{Kf1} 1 \mathrm{Lb} 621 . e ́ 3 \mathrm{La} 522 . \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{a} 5 \mathrm{~b} \times \mathrm{a} 6$

3 promoted pieces captured by a single Pawn already exist (some examples can be found among the $11^{\text {th }}$ WCCT entries, and some others existed before...).
Here the captures (by white Pawn d2) are made invisible on the diagram and white Pawn a5 is an impostor Pawn.
2 entries (A24,A25) displayed a similar motivation and I selected this one for its very strong artistic appeal. The promotions are on the same square, the moves by the promoted Bishops are echoed, and as a nice finishing touch, the moves of the sacrificed white Bishop also echo that of the black ones!

## $3^{\circ}$ Prize : A26 -Roberto OSORIO


q1s1rk2/pp1s1p2/2rp4/2p3p1/b2Pp3/1P2b3/P1PKPP2/RS1Q1BSR SPG 19.0 (13+15)
1.b3 é5 2.La3 é4 3.Ld6 L×d6 4.g4 Sé7 5.g5 0-0 6.g6 Té8 7.g×h7+ Kf8 8.h8=L g5 9.Lé5 ç5 10.Lf4 L×f4 11.h4 d6 12.h5 Ld7 13.h6 La4 14.h7 Sd7 15.h8=L Tç8 16.Ld4 Tç6 17.Lé3 Da8 18.d4 Sç8 19.Kd2 L×é3+

Black Bishop f8 plays 3 moves capturing «in the air» 3 white Bishops, first white original Bishop c1 (Champagne 2020!), then 2 promoted Bishops (Champagne 2021). This is motivated by the fact that there is no other way to get rid of these pieces. Another artistic rendering and the necessary technical check at the end is easily forgiven.
I was of course sensitive to the fact that the composer included 2 successive Champagne themes in an unified way...
(the composer gives it as C+, but I hardly believe it ; the problem is correct though, as the 4 possible positions before last move are tested with Natch 3.3 : HC+ rather than C+?!)

## $4^{\circ}$ Prize : A21 - Andrey FROLKIN \& Igor VERESHCHAGIN



2bs $4 / 2 \mathrm{pp} 1 \mathrm{krp} / \mathrm{s} 7 / \mathrm{p} 1 \mathrm{~b} 2 \mathrm{p} 2 / 8 / 5 \mathrm{q} 2 / 2 \mathrm{PP} 1 \mathrm{Prp} / \mathrm{RSBQKBSR}$
SPG $19.0(11+14) \mathrm{C}+$
1.a4 g5 2.a5 g4 3.a6 g3 4.a×b7 a5 5.b4 Ta6 6.b5 Tg6 7.b6 Sa6 8.b8=S g×h2 9.Sç6 T×g2 $10 . S \times$ é $7 \mathrm{~S} \times$ é7 11.b7 Thg8 12.b8 $=\mathrm{S}$ T8g7 13.Sç6 $\mathrm{S} \times$ ç6 14.é4 Df6 15.é5 Df3 16.é6 f5 17.é7 Kf7 18.é8=T Lç5 19.Td8 $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 8$

A record of 3 promoted pieces captured by a piece which is not a Pawn (here : bSg8). Expertly done with the capture on é 7 a little blemish.
The overall artistic impression (admittedly subjectivity by the judge) is the reason why this problem, anyway very good, is behind the 2 previous ones.

Special Prize : A6 - Arnold BEINE

r3kbs1/1pp1pppp/2sq4/1p6/8/8/PP2PP2/RSBQK1SR

SPG 7.0 Annan + Make\&Take $(11+13)$ C +
1.g2-g6×h8=S db5 2.Sg6+ a7-ç6×g6 3.h2-d6×d8=T Sç6 4.Td5 g6-é6×d5 5.ç2-
$\mathrm{f} 5 \times$ ç $8=\mathrm{S} \mathrm{d} 5-\mathrm{g} 2 \times \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{D} 6 . \mathrm{d} 8=\mathrm{S}$ D-d $2 \times \mathrm{d} 87 . \mathrm{Sd} 6$ D-é $6 \times \mathrm{d} 6$
An impressive content : 4 thematic captures by the same piece, as in the first Prize. Black Pawn a7 make the first 2 captures as a Pawn then the following 2 as a promoted Queen that goes "Pronkin en passant"!!
My only reserve is that the combination of strong fairy conditions make it almost out of human reach (I feel quite unable to solve such a problem).
$\mathbf{1}^{\circ} \mathrm{HM}$ : A16 - Per OLIN


1sbqkb1r/1p1ppppp/1r3s2/8/5P2/2S4K/1P1PPPP1/1RBR4
SPG $18.0(11+14)$ C+
3q4/k2pppbp/ss1Rr3/3p4/2br4/7K/1P1PPP2/1RBS4
b) SPG18.0 from position a) $(9+13) \mathrm{C}+$
a) 1.Sf3 a5 2.Sd4 a4 3.Sb3 $\mathrm{a} \times \mathrm{b} 34 . \mathrm{a} 4 \mathrm{Ta} 65 . \mathrm{a} 5 \mathrm{~Tb} 66 . \mathrm{a} 6 \mathrm{~b} \times$ ç2 $7 . \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{ç} \times \mathrm{d} 1=\mathrm{S} 8 . \mathrm{a} 8=\mathrm{D}$ Sé3 9.Da4 $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{f} 1$ 10.Dd1 Sg3 11.h $\times$ g3 ç5 12.0-0 ç4 13.Kh2 ç3 14.Kh3 ç2 15.Sç3 ç $\times \mathrm{d} 1=\mathrm{D}$ 16.Tb1 Da4 17.Td1 Df4 18.g $\times f 4$ Sf6
b) 1.f5 Sd5 2.f6 Té6 3.f×g7 Da5 4.g8=S Kd8 5.Sf6 Tg8 6.Tg1 Tg4 75.Sd1 Td4 8.g4 Kç7 9.g5 Kb6 10.g6 Ka7 11.g7 Dd8 12.g8=D Sb6 13.Dg2 Lg7 14.Dç6 b×ç6 15.Tg5 La6 16.Td5 Lç4 17.Td6 Sa6 18.Sd5 ç×d5

I am not a big fan of such a presentation. I consider it more as two distinct problems (of course with expertise of composer needed) than an unified concept.
However, the composer did it in one of the best ways here. The 2 "twins" have the same number of moves and the color echo is good : same type of promotions on a unique square.
a) is better with both promotions capturing a Queen, the second Queen being a Pronkin, so that a) "alone" would also have got a good place in the award.
$2{ }^{\circ}$ HM : A22 - Igor VERESHCHAGIN \& Andrey FROLKIN

r7/1bprbpp1/4k3/1p1s4/7p/8/P1PPP1PP/RSBQKBSR
SPG $11.0(14+11) \mathrm{C}+$
1.f4 Sf6 2.f5 Sd5 3.f6 h5 4.f×é7 h4 5.é×d8=T+ Ké7 6.b4 Ké6 7.b5 Lé7 8.b6 T×d8 $9 . \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~b} 510 . \mathrm{a} \times \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{S}$ Lb7 11.S $\times \mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{~T} \times \mathrm{d} 7$

Several entries display the theme in the «minimal» number of 12,0 moves (for orthodox SPGs). But A22 cleverly shows that the real minimal is in fact 11,0 moves, using a Schnoebelen promotion.
$3^{\circ} \mathbf{H M}$ : A9 - Paul RAICAN


1kb1sb1r/3k2pp/qpp5/r4p2/8/1p6/P1KPP1PP/RSBQ1BKR
SPG 12.5 Knightmate + Glasgow (13+14) C+
1.ç4 a5 2.ç5 a4 3.ç6 Ta5 4.ç×d7=T ç6 5.f4 Db6 6.f5 Da6 7.f6 b6 8.f×é7=L f5 9.SKç2 Kf7 10.SKa3 K×é7 11.Kç2 K×d7+ 12.b4 a×b3 e.p.+ 13.SKb1

Combination of several fairy elements makes me generally suspicious (not only in the frame of retro problems); the justification of the combination is not always convincing. Éric PICHOURON already demonstrated that Schnoebelen promotions can be played in Knightmate without moving the royal Knight. The addition of Glasgow allows such promotions of different kinds, thus justifying the combination.

Annex 49
Éric PICHOURON
Phénix 2020


3k1rs1/pp1k1p1p/2P4B/3p1b2/8/5rp1/P3PPPP/RK1QSBKR SPG 14,0 Knightmate (14+12) C+
1.d4 g5 2.d5 g4 3.d6 g3 4.d×é7 d5 5.b4 Lf5 6.b5 Kç8 7.b6 Kd7 8.b×ç7 Tç8 9.ç×d8=L Tç3 10.é×f8=L Tf3 11.ç4 K×f8 12.ç5 Kfé7 13.ç6 0-0 14.Lh6 K×d8

## $4^{\circ}$ HM : A5 - Arnold BEINE


ksb2bsr/p2ppp1p/2p5/8/8/8/P1PPPP1P/RSBQ2SK
SPG 5.5 Make\&Take (12+12) C+
$1 . \mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{~b} \times \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{S}+2 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{ç6} 3 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{d} 8=\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{d} 84 . \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{a} 8=S+\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{a} 85 . \mathrm{Ké} 1 \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{h} 1=S+$ 6.K $\times \mathrm{h} 1$

Schnoebelen promotions are already the subject of several Make \& Take proofgames. Annex also shows a bicolor doubling of the theme + swithbacks by the capturing pieces. In A5, no switchbabks but color echo in the play and shortest number of moves.

## Annex 45

Michel CAILLAUD \& Éric HUBER
$3^{\circ}$ Prize, Jubilé Feenschach-70, 2020


1sb1kbsr/1p1ppp1p/8/8/2p2P2/8/1PPPP2P/RSB1KBS1
SPG 7,0 Make\&Take (12+12) C+
$1 . \mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{ç} 52 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{d} 8=\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 83 . \mathrm{f} 4 \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{h} 1=\mathrm{S}+4 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{h} 1 \mathrm{ç} 45$.Dé1 $\mathrm{a} \times$ é1 $=\mathrm{S}+6 . \mathrm{K} \times$ é1 Tb8 $7 . a \times b 8=S+S \times b 8$
$5^{\circ}$ HM : A14 - Michael BARTH \& Silvio BAIER


1s2k3/2sp3p/pp6/3r4/2b1Pp2/2pP4/PPq3P1/RS1QK1SR SPG $17.0(11+12) \mathrm{C}+$
1.f4 Sf6 2.f5 Sd5 3.f6 a5 4.f $\times$ é 7 f5 5.é $\times f 8=\mathrm{L} 44$ 6.Lb4 a $\times \mathrm{b} 4$ 7.é4 Ta5 8.La6 b×a6 9.d3 Lb7 10.Lé3 Dç8 11.Lb6 ç×b6 12.h4 D×ç2 13.h5 Sç7 14.h6 Ld5 15.h×g7 Lç4 $16 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{h} 8=\mathrm{L}$ Td 5 17.Lç3 $\mathrm{b} \times$ ç 3

The Pawn captures are made invisible, implying «cyclical exchange» of 3 Pawns, 1 of them capturing the promoted Bishops, the 2 others capturing the original ones.

Commended without order (ordered by number of moves and pieces)

## A11 - Jacques DUPIN


rsbqkbsr/ppppp2p/6P1/8/6PQ/5S1P/PPPPP1B1/RSB3KR SPG 7.5 Anti Take\&Make non strict (Circe Make) (16+14) C+
$1 . \mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{f} 52 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{f} 5(\mathrm{f} 4) \mathrm{g} 53 . \mathrm{f} \times \mathrm{g} 6$ e.p.(g4) g3 $4 . \mathrm{f} \times \mathrm{g} 3(\mathrm{~g} 2) \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{Lg} 2) 5 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{f} \times \mathrm{g} 3(\mathrm{~g} 4)$ 6.Dé1 $\mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{h} 2(\mathrm{~h} 3) 7 . \mathrm{Dh} 4 \mathrm{~h} \times \mathrm{g} 1=\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{Sf} 3) 8 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{g} 1$

In the past, new fairy conditions appeared from the imagination of problemists. With development of Winchloé and Jacobi, "computer generated conditions" are appearing, that Christian Poisson and François Labelle are producing "en passant" when programming other conditions. The composer seems to be one of those who explore these. The result with 2 Schnoebelen promotions is quite fresh. I found no existing example (with any stipulation) with this new condition.

Anti Take\&Make : when captured, a piece (King excepted) is reborn, playing a captureless move from capture square; when the rebirth is impossible, the capture is impossible. Anti Take\&Make non strict : when the rebirth is impossible, the captured piece disappears.

## A18 - Oto MIHALCO



1sbqk1sr/p1sp1ppp/8/8/8/8/P2PP1PP/R1BQK1SR
SPG $12.0(11+12) \mathrm{C}+$
1.f4 b5 2.f5 b4 3.f6 b3 4.f $\times$ é $7 \mathrm{~b} \times$ ç2 5.é $\times f 8=\mathrm{L}$ ç $\times$ b1 $=\mathrm{S}$ 6.La3 $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{a} 3$ 7.b4 Sç4 8.b5 Sé3 9.b6 S $\times$ f1 10.b7 Sé3 11.b $\times$ a $8=S$ Sd5 $12 . S \times$ ç7 $+S \times$ ç7

The only entry where the thematic captures are made by a promoted piece. The drawback is a promoted piece apparent on the diagram.

## A2 - Bernd GRAEFRATH


rsb1k2r/1pppp3/8/2q3p1/8/p7/PP1PP2P/RS1QKBSR
SPG $12.0(12+12) \mathrm{C}+$
1.g4 a5 2.g5 a4 3.g6 a3 4.g×h7 g5 5.h×g8=L Lg7 6.L×f7+K×f7 7.f4 Dg8 8.f5 Dh7
9.f6 $\mathrm{D} \times$ ç2 $10 . \mathrm{f} \times \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{D} \times$ ç1 11.g8 = T Dç5 12.Té8 $\mathrm{K} \times$ é 8

Thematic captures by a piece performing a switchback (black King).

## A17- Marek KOLCAK


rsbqkbsr/p1ppp1pp/6RR/5P1Q/PP5P/8/3P2P1/2BKS3
SPG $13.5(12+14) \mathrm{C}+$
1.a4 f5 2.Ta3 f4 3.Tg3 f3 4.Tg6 f×é2 5.f4 é×f1=S 6.f5 Sg3 7.h $\times \mathrm{g} 3$ b5 8.Thh6 b4 9.Dh5 b3 10.Sf3 b×ç2 11.b4 ç $\times$ b1 =D 12.Kd1 Dé4 13.Sé1 Dh4 $14 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{h} 4$

The Pawn captures are made invisible in a neat realization.

## A4 - Ivan DENKOVSKI


rsbqkQsr/p2p1pP1/2p5/8/8/2RR4/1PPPP1P1/1SK2BS1 SPG $15.5(13+11) \mathrm{C}+$
1.a4 b5 2.Ta3 b×a4 3.Tç3 a3 4.h4 a2 5.h5 a1=S 6.h6 Sb3 7.h $\times \mathrm{g} 7$ h5 8.Thh3 h4 9.Thd3 h3 10.f4 h2 11.f5 h1=S 12.f6 Sf2 $13 . f \times$ é $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 114 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{d} 1 \mathrm{~S} \times$ ç1 $15 . K \times$ ç1 ç6 16.é $\times$ f8 $=\mathrm{D} \ddagger$

Rule and exception : I generally considered capture by the promoted piece as a drawback. Here it contributes to the homogeneity of the result, nicely crowned by a Phenix promotion.

## A23 - Dirk BORST



1sbqkbsr/1ppRpp2/3p2r1/7B/P7/3P1SR1/2PP1P2/1SB1K1QR
SPG 16.5 Circe Rex Inclusiv (14+13)
1.b4 g5 2.b5 g4 3.b6 g3 4.b×a7 g×h2 5.a $\times \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{T}$ Ta6 6.a4 Tg6 7.Ta3 d6 8.Tg3 Lf5 $9 . \mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{d} 8+\mathrm{Kd} 7$ 10.T $\times \mathrm{d} 7$ (Ké8) Ld3 11.é $\times \mathrm{d} 3$ (Lç8) h5 12.Lé2 h4 13.Lh5 h3 14.Sf3 h×g2 $15.0-0 \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{D}$ (Th1) $16 . \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{f} 1(\mathrm{Dd} 8) \mathrm{h} \times \mathrm{g} 1=\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{Ké} 1) 17 . \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{g} 1(\mathrm{Sb} 8)$

With Circé condition, captured pieces don't disappear, which is not so in the spirit of the theme. This is compensated by disappearance of original pieces, so that the promoted pieces are both Schnoebelen and Pronkin! The promoted piece on the diagram is a drawback.
Good use of the Rex inclusiv condition with both white and black King involved.
Thematic promotions replace white King and Rook in their initial position after castling.

## A12 - Anirudh DAGA



Q1b2r2/pp1ppp2/qrp5/s4k2/8/4b3/P1P1PP2/R1B1KBSR SPG $18.0(11+13)$ C +
1.g4 Sç6 2.g5 Sa5 3.g6 ç6 4.g×h7 Db6 5.h×g8=S Da6 6.Sf6+ g×f6 7.h4 Lh6 8.h5 Lé3 9.h6 0-0 10.h7+ Kg7 11.h8=D+ Kg6 12.Dh2 Kf5 13.Dé5 + f×é5 14.d4 é×d4 15.Sç3 $\mathrm{d} \times$ ç 3 16. $\mathrm{Dd} 6 \mathrm{ç} \times \mathrm{b} 2$ 17.Db8 b1 $=\mathrm{T} 18 . \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{~Tb} 6$

The thematic Pawn captures are made invisible on the diagram as the Pawn goes on to disappear as a Phenix piece. A blemish is that one of the black Rooks is obviously promoted.
(A posteriori : it is striking that such a bold concept was produced by a 13 years old composer who started composing some months ago!!)

## A8 - Ofer COMAY


rsbqkbsr/2ppppp1/p2S4/8/1B1P1S2/4Q1P1/P1PPPP1P/R4R1K SPG $18.5(15+14) \mathrm{C}+$
1.g3 h5 2.Lh3 h4 3.Lg2 h3 4.Sa3 h×g2 5.Sh3 g1 = S 6.Sf4 Sh3 7.Sç4 Sg5 8.0-0 Sé4 9.Kh1 Sç3 10.b×ç3 b6! 11.La3 b5 12.Ld6 b4 13.Dç1 b3 14.Da3 b2 15.Dç5 b1=D 16.Dé3 Db6 17.Lb4 Dd4 18.ç×d4 a6 19.Sd6+

The only entry where one of the promoted pieces plays more than 2 captureless moves (promoted Knight plays 4 captureless moves). The tempo by the other promoting Pawn is a nice addition.
The addition of 2 the last halfmoves is arguable.

## Section B

6 entries; 5 participants from 5 countries.
List of participants :
Dmitry Baibikov (Israël) - B5,B6
Vlaicu Crisan (Romania) - B1
Joaquim Crusats (Spain) - B2
Andrey Frolkin (Ukraine) - B3,B4*
Igor Vereshchagin (Russia) - B4*
With low participation, I included all the entries in the award.
$\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~B} 3, \mathrm{~B} 4$ have been corrected after the versions presented for the award ceremony (on $22^{\text {nd }}$ October) have been cooked.

## 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Prize : B5- Dmitry BAIBIKOV



SS6/BrpP1ppp/pp6/kB6/ppK5/PP1Q4/2P5/8
White to move. History of black Pawns a4 and b4? (10+10)
Retro: $-1 \ldots . . c ̧ 5 \times$ Sb4 -2.Kd4-ç4 d6×Sç5+ -3.Lç4-b5 b $5 \times$ Sa4 and further $-4 . S d 5-\mathrm{b} 4$ ç6 $\times$ Sb5 $5.5 . S f 6-\mathrm{d} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 4-\mathrm{a} 5-6 . \mathrm{a} 2-\mathrm{a} 3+$, then: Sé8-f6, é7-é8 $=\mathrm{S}$, f6×Té7, Té 7 to h8, g $5 \times$ Lf6, Lf6 to f8, Sç5 to é8, é 7 -é $8=S$, Pé 7 to é $2, \mathrm{Sb} 5$ to é 8 , é 7 -é $8=S$, Pé 7 to é 3 , Sa4 to é8, é 7 -é $8=S$, é6-é 7 , é $7 \times$ Td6 and position unlocks (further d7 $\times$ Tç6).

The theme is performed by bPd7 and bPé7, each capturing 2 of the 4 promoted Knights, and also on their first moves a white Rook, completing the histories of the Pawns so that they are perfectly echoed, chameleon-like : $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{S}$.
An impressive achievement.

## 2nd Prize : B1v - Vlaicu CRISAN


$2 \mathrm{~b} 1 \mathrm{~kb} 2 / 3 \mathrm{p} 4 / 2 \mathrm{SPP} 3 / 8 / 2 \mathrm{pK} 4 / 8 / 8 / \mathrm{R} 7$
$-8 \& \mathrm{~s} \ddagger 1$ Proca Retractor Circe Assassin (5+5)
$-1 . \mathrm{Tb} 1 \times \mathrm{La} 1(\mathrm{Lf} 8,-\mathrm{bLf} 8) \mathrm{a} 2-\mathrm{a} 1=\mathrm{L}+-2 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \times \mathrm{Pd} 4(\mathrm{Pd} 7,-\mathrm{bTd} 7)$ ç5-ç4+
$-3 . T c 1 \times$ Lb1 (Lç8,-bLç8) b2-b1 $=\mathrm{L}+-4 . \mathrm{Kd} 2-\mathrm{d} 3$ Té7-d7++
$-5 . T d 1 \times$ Lç1(Lf8,-bTf8) ç2-ç1 $=\mathrm{L}+-6$. Ké2-d2 Td7-é7++
$-7 . T d 3 \times$ Ld1 $(L \operatorname{Lc} 8,-w S c ̧ 8) \mathrm{d} 2-\mathrm{d} 1=\mathrm{L}+-8 . \mathrm{d} 5-\mathrm{d} 6 \& 1 . \mathrm{Sd} 6+\mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{d} 6(\mathrm{Sg} 1) \ddagger$
4 Schnoebelen Bishops uncaptured by white Rook.
Circe Assassin allows spectacular solutions and economical positions.
The result is hard to solve (if possibly solvable...).

## Special Prize : B6- Dmitry BAIBIKOV



1s6/2pp3p/1p\$k5/1Rp1P1p1/BKpp4/s\$1P5/SbPP4/qRBS4
Solve the position (11+13)

## =Trou de ver (Wormhole)

Retro : -1...d6xSç5+-2.Sé4-ç5 (-2.Sé6-ç5? d5-d4 -3.Sf8-é6 é7×Ld6 -4.f7-f8=S é6×Td5 $-5 . \mathrm{f} 6-\mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{~g} 6-\mathrm{g} 5-6 . \mathrm{g} 5 \times \mathrm{f} 6$ ?? illegal, as with $\mathrm{b} 2 \times$ ç 3 and $\mathrm{h} 6 \times \mathrm{g} 7$ all 3 white captures would be on black square, leaving unexplained disappearance of bLç8) and further $-2 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 5-\mathrm{d} 4$ $-3 . S f 6-\mathrm{g} 8$ é $7 \times$ Ld6 -4. Sg8-f6 é $6 \times$ Td5 $-5 . \mathrm{g} 7-\mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{S}$ g6-g5 $-6 . \mathrm{h} 6 \times \mathrm{Tg} 7$, then : Tg7 to h8, Td5 to $\mathrm{f} 8, \mathrm{f} 7-\mathrm{f} 8=\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{Pf} 7$ to $\mathrm{f} 2, \mathrm{Ld} 6$ to $\mathrm{f} 8, \mathrm{f} 7-\mathrm{f} 8=\mathrm{L}, \mathrm{f} 6-\mathrm{f} 7, \mathrm{f} 7 \times$ Dé 6 , Dé 6 to $\mathrm{a} 6, \mathrm{Sd} 1$ to b7(retroscreen), Da8-a6, a7-a8=D, a6-a7, a7×Db6, Db6 to d1, Ka5-b4, ç5-ç4, Kç4b3(Kç6) and position unlocks.

The theme is performed by bPé 7 and bPf7, each capturing 2 of the 4 promoted pieces. The fairy element has the same function as additional stipulations used in some problems by Nikita Plaksin or Aleksandr Zolotarev (such as "Minimal number of moves of a given piece") : fixing some pieces in the cage (here bKç6 and wLa4), otherwise the resolution is orthodox with known patterns such as d7, é6, g6, h7 excluding Knight promotions on f8. The result is an impressive monochromatic AUW Ceriani-Frolkin, that has not yet be shown in purely orthodox classical retro form.
I modified the presentation : the composer submitted it as a board-jigsaw-puzzle, what I considered unneeded as the content was already very rich...

## $1^{\circ}$ HM : B3v - Andrey FROLKIN

 dedicated to Andrew BUCHANAN

8/5p2/5S2/3QR3/3R2K1/1PPPPBPP/2PpPbkr/4Bsrs
Last 4 single moves? $(15+8)$
$-1 . L e ́ 4 \times$ Sf3 $\ddagger$ ! Sg5-f3! (shielding!) $-2 . L h 7 \times$ Dg6+! (Bristol!) Dg6-é4+
then Dg6 to a1; a3-a2-a1=D; a2×Lb3; Sg3 to b1; b3-b2-b1=S; b2×Dç3; ç3×Sd2
The theme in classical retro form, with the capturing piece not being a Pawn.
The nice point is that $-2 . L \sim \times$ Pé $4+$ ? doesn't work. The promoted Knight cannot reach a1 so it has to unpromote on b1 to unlock the cage and another promoted piece has to be produced to unpromote on a1.
$2^{\circ}$ HM : B2 - Joaquim CRUSATS

s3BqSk/2S1pRp1/1PrP1Prp/2P3P1/3PP3/8/3P1K2/8
$-9 \& \ddagger 1$ Proca Retractor (6+4)

Main plan : -1...h7-h6 -2.Sh6-g8 \& 1. T×f8 $\ddagger$ but $-1 . .$. Kh7-h8!
Solution :
$-1 . e ́ 5 \times$ Ld6 Kh7-h8 -2.f4×Lé5 Kh8-h7 -3.g3×Lf4 Kh7-h8 -4.h $2 \times \operatorname{Lg} 3$ Lh4×(D/T/L)g3+ (first occurrence of this position) -5.Kg1-f2 Kh8-h7 -6.Kf2-g1 Kh7-h8 (second occurence) $-7 . \mathrm{Kg} 1-\mathrm{f} 2 \mathrm{Kh} 8-\mathrm{h} 7-8 . \mathrm{Kf} 2-\mathrm{g} 1$ and now $-8 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 8-\mathrm{h} 7$ ? is illegal because of triple repetition of the position so : $-8 \ldots \mathrm{~h} 7-\mathrm{h} 6$ (only legal move) -9 . Sh6-g8 \& $1 . \mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{f} 8 \ddagger$

4 promoted black Bishops captured by white Pawn (black Pawn é7 and g7 ensure that the Bishops are promoted). The motivation is that the uncaptured pieces must be restricted and not provide unwanted moves. I was not so convinced by the result, with lengthy finale after the thematic retroplay.

## Com : B4v - Igor VERESHCHAGIN \& Andrey FROLKIN dedicated to Mario RICHTER



2b2b2/pp1pp2p/7p/7P/3s4/3SkP1B/7K/3R2S1
-2 \& $\mathrm{s} \ddagger 1$ Help Retractor (7+10)
With a selfmate goal, White is to retract first :
$-1 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \times$ Th 2 ! $\mathrm{g} 7 \times$ Sh $6-2$. Kh $4 \times \mathrm{Tg} 3 \& 1 . \mathrm{Sf} 5+\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{f} 5 \ddagger$
Black Pawns and Bishops ensures that the 2 Rooks uncaptured by white King are promoted ones.
A nice puzzle, but 7 black pieces are added artificially to fulfill the thematic requirement. The Help Retractor part of the problem is tested by Mario RICHTER with his program rawbats.

## $24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Composing Tourney，Rhodes Congress 2021 <br> Judge：Menachem Witztum

Theme：In the diagram position there are no pinned black pieces．In at least one solution one of the black pieces is pinned in the mating position．In at least one additional solution two black pieces are pinned in the mating position．

Examples

$\mathrm{H} \# 2 \mathrm{~b}) \mathrm{bPd} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 56+11$
a） $1.0 \mathrm{~g} 2 \mathrm{ga} 32.0 \mathrm{e} 3 \mathrm{fxe} 3 \#$
b）1． 0 e 2 盈 $72 . \triangleq \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{d} 2 \#$

$\mathrm{H} \# 2 \mathrm{~b})$－ l h6 7＋10

b）1．fxg5 留c3 2．gxh4 是xd6\＃

I received 24 anonymous problems for judging from the director Paz Einat．In most Sabra tourneys I normally receive a higher number of entries and the reason for the lower number this time is possibly due to the non－standard theme，which is intrinsically not harmonious．Overall，the level was good and I thank all composers who responded to the challenge．

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Prize：No． 17 Vitaly Medintsev

A rich problem．In each phase black captures two white pieces，with Zilahi， and the black queen making selfblocks．The composer found a way to present a non－harmonious theme in a harmonious way and the result is extraordinary！



Vitaly Medintsev
$1^{\text {st }}$ Prize
24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021


## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize：No． 3 Kenan Velikhanov \＆Anatoly Skripnik

Two problems presented the theme in four solutions（the second one is symmetric）．In each solution the black king arrives at a different square． Without a doubt，an impressive technical achievement



d） 1 ．具 6 笪 $\mathrm{xb} 4+2$ ．${ }^{\text {ed }} \mathrm{d} 5 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~g} 5 \#$

Kenan Velikhanov
Anatoly Skripnik
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize
24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021

$\mathrm{H} \# 2$ b） $0 \mathrm{~g} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 15+13$
c） $0 \mathrm{~g} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 2 \mathrm{~d})(\mathrm{g} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 8$

## 3－4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Prize：No． 4 Misha Shapiro

A complex problem with tries involving bishop \＆knight promotion and dual avoidance．Very enjoyable．




3－4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Prize：No． 7 Oleg Pervakov，Boris Shorokhov，Valery Gurov
A beautiful problem with three solutions employing two batteries with halfpins．The black bishop and black rook are each pinned once in two solutions while in the third solution both are pinned－＂complementary harmony＂




## $5^{\text {th }}$ Prize：No． 16 Emanuel Navon

The half－pinned black knights must move and the black queen and rook，in the respective solutions，must evacuate their place for the knights．Rich content．

1．甾e4 0 D 22 2． 0 d 4 筸xc4\＃
$1^{\text {st }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 20 Johan de Boer



$2^{\text {nd }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 12 Pietro Pitton


d） $1 . c 5$ bxc5 2 ．${ }^{\text {P }} 5$ 莒xd6\＃

## 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 25 Mark Erenburg



1．Wb 号e2 2．M M 5 f5\＃

$\mathrm{H} \# 2$ b）莹 $\mathrm{e} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 36+11$
c） $\mathrm{b}+$ 峦 $\mathrm{d} 6 \leftrightarrow \rightarrow \mathrm{bPf} 6$
d） $\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{g} \mathrm{f} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 3$

Misha Shapiro
3－4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Prize
$24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021

$\mathrm{H} \# 2$ b） $\mathbf{\pm} \mathrm{g} 6 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 39+11$


Mark Erenburg $3^{\text {rd }} \mathrm{HM}$


H\＃2 3．1．1．1 $11+9$

| Francesco Simoni $4^{\text {th }} \mathrm{HM}$ | A．Pankratiev Evgeny Gavryliv $5^{\text {th }} \mathrm{HM}$ | Ricardo Vieira $6^{\text {th }} \mathrm{HM}$ | Sébastien Luce $7^{\mathrm{th}} \mathrm{HM}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021 | $24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021 | $24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021 | $24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021 |
| Q ${ }^{\text {MM M M M M }}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | WIM |
| 晹或》 |  |  | OMM E |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 重 |
|  | 夏 |  |  |
| $\pm$ |  |  | 쥰 MWI |
| 第 | ＂9\％ |  |  |
| H\＃2 3．1．1．1 $6+14$ | $\mathrm{H} \# 2 \mathrm{~b})$ ¢ $2 \rightarrow \mathrm{~g} 8$ 6＋13 | $\mathrm{H} \# 2 \mathrm{~b})$－b㬝f7 $8+12$ |  |
|  | c）约 $\mathrm{b} 5 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 7$ |  | ）bPd4 $\rightarrow$ e6 |

## $4^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 23 Francesco Simoni


$5^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 15 Aleksandr Pankratiev，Evgeny Gavryliv
 $6^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 21 Ricardo de Mattos Vieira

$7^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention：No． 9 Sébastien Luce
a） $1 . \triangleq \mathrm{D} 6$ 县 f 82 ． $\mathrm{xc} 2 \mathrm{Zxc} \mathrm{xc} \#^{2}$
b）1．W7 g g g 72.0 d 6 号c7\＃
c）1．貃b3 苗xf5＋2．．

## Commendations without ranking

No． 1 Anatoly Styopochkin
a）1．$\triangle \mathrm{c} 4$ 0－0－0 2．畄e5 具xc6\＃


## No． 2 Ralf Krätschmer

a）1．© d5 营d1 2 ． e e6 c4\＃
b）1． $\mathrm{bf5} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{a} 42$ ． e e 4 c 3 \＃

## No． 5 Franz Pachl


b）1．$x$ xd6 D 2 2．f8 留e4\＃

## No． 6 Fadil Abdurahmanovic \＆Marko Klasinc




H\＃2
b） ga a $\rightarrow \mathrm{h} 5 \quad 6+7$

Ralf Krätschmer
Com．
$24^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021

$\mathrm{H} \# 2$ b）当 $\mathrm{e} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 5 \quad 6+5$

Franz Pachl Com．


H\＃2

F．Abdurahmanovic Marko Klasinc Com．


H\＃2
2．1．1．1 $6+8$


No. 8 Semion Shifrin

No. 10 Anirudh Daga



## No. 11 Kostas Prentos


No.13(19) Ovidiu Craciun

No. 14 Mykola Vasyuchko, Mykola Cherniavskyi \& Mala Snihurivka


## No. 18 Michael McDowell



## No. 22 Stefan Parzuch




No. 24 Vlaicu Crisan \& Eric Huber



Mykola Vasyuchko, Mykola Cherniavskyi

Mala Snihurivka
Com.


Michael McDowell Com.


Stefan Parzuch Com.
24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021


H\#2

Vlaicu Crisan Eric Huber Com.
24 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Sabra Ty 2021


## 13th ARVES Jenever Tourney 2021

This tourney was organised during the 63rd WCCC at Rhodes．
Theme：Reciprocal stalemate．Black tries to avoid stalemate，but in the end is stalemated himself．

There were 7 entries from 6 composers，which was a success for a tourney with a rather dif－ ficult theme．Sadly most studies were more or less a helpstalemate instead of a real study．The prizewinner shows a final stalemate as a consequence of a hard fought battle．

Prize：Martin Minski
1st honourable mention：Oleg Pervakov；2nd honourable mention：Darko Hlebec
1st commendation：Volodimir Sergiienko and Vladislav Tarasiuk；2nd commendation： Volodomir Sergiienko；3rd commendation：Darko Hlebec；4th commendation：Evgeny Kopylov





 9．g8斯 解 $\mathrm{e} 8+10$ ．斯 $\times \mathrm{e} 8$ Black is stalemated




 stalemated．

All the details about the other studies can be found on www．arves．org．


[^0]:    Michel CAILLAUD, Julia VYSOTSKA, Tournoi de Noël, Julia's Fairies 2012, $1^{\circ}$ Prix:
    1.Fe5 NCne3 2.NCng7 PAnxe4 $\ddagger$
    1.Cd3 PAnf6 2.PAnf4 Vnxc2 $\ddagger$
    1.Td4 Vnf3 2.Vnd1 NCnxe6 $\ddagger$

