

INTERNET COMPOSING TOURNEY 2004

List of participants

Argentina (Kapros & Lois 24), Austria (Wenda 25; Zajic 26; Wenda & Zajic 27), Belarus (Miholap 65), Croatia (Pernarić 34, 35, 36, 37; Predrag 57; Hernitz 58), Finland (Heinonen 17), France (Caillaud 64), Germany (Böttger & Degenkolbe 16; Barth & Müller 28, 44; Libelle 38, 38bis; Müller 40, 41), Great Britain (Reedes-Smith 5; Feather 6, 39; McDowell 9), Israel (Shapiro 11, 12; Witztum 42, 43; Retter 45, 46, 47, 48), Italy (Simoni 4; Parrinello 18, 19), Latvia (Ketris 20), Macedonia (Miloseski 13, 14; Stolev 49; Janevski 52, 53; Ilievski 62; Hadzi-Vaskov 63), Romania (Crisan & Murarasu 29; Murarasu 30, 31, 32, 33), Russia (Nefyodov 15; Gurov 55), Serbia & Montenegro (Šaletić 56; Kovačević 59, 60), Slovakia (Klemanič & Kovalič 10), Slovenia (Ugren 50, 51), Sweden (Jonsson 21, 22, 23, 24), Switzerland (Schönholzer 1), Ukraine (Gordian 2, 3; Semenenko 7, 8; Syzonenko 54, 61; Frolkin 66)

Theme

Helpmates in 3 or 4 moves are requested featuring "active" sacrifices of one or more white pieces (not pawns). The sacrifices may occur on vacant (preferably) or occupied squares. At least two phases are required (set play, twins, solutions, variations type Onitiu or Gussopulo), but duplex or zero-positions are not allowed. H#3½ with two or more solutions are also allowed, but H#2½ are not.

Introduction

When we were searching for a theme for this tourney, we quickly decided that we should not ask for h#2, so that we keep the number of entries to a reasonable level. However, we obviously ignored the fact that three- and more-movers have surpassed the h#2's, which are nowadays practically played out. So, this tourney attracted a total of no less than 67 compositions by 45 composers from 20 countries, a truly remarkable figure for a thematic tourney! Yet, what is more impressive is the exceptional quality of the entries, which is reflected to the number of problems (more than half!) appearing in the award. Under these circumstances, we deem that you can easily understand why it was not possible to have the award finished within the congress week and we trust that this two-month delay can be justified.

Before presenting the award, let us mention some remarks on the unsuccessful entries:

Anticipations

The sacrifices for promotion featured in No.3 and 40 have been ideally presented by Christer Jonsson & Rolf Wiehagen, HM Ideal-Mate Review 1997 (**Diag. A1**). The mechanism of No.22 is familiar from Toma Garai, Commend Candela-Sanz JT 1986, Manfred Seidel, 2 Commend Probleemblad 1999 and Christopher Jones, 2 Pr Problem Forum 2001 (**Diag. A2, A3 & A4 respectively**), while No.28 and 58 are fully anticipated by Toma Garai, 1-2 Pr Sinfonie Scacchistiche 1987-89 (**Diag. A5**), and No.38 by Jorge Kapros & Jorge Lois, HM Nagnibida JT-60 1999 (**Diag. A6**). The composer of No.41 has used the very same mechanism of Dieter Müller & Aleksandr Pankratiev, 3 HM feenschach 1998 (**Diag. A7**), and we feel that this work does not enhance the idea any

further. No.46 has the same setup as Abdelaziz Onkoud, StrateGems 2001 (**Diag. A8**), with the forerunner using 6 pieces less at the cost of twin. The wL/S sacrifices to black pawns of No.47 have been done with ideal mates by Gennady Chumakov, Ideal-Mate Review 1992 and U.S. Problem Bulletin 1993 (**Diag. A9 & A10**).

The wS sacrifices as replies to discovered checks of No.52 are known from Christer Jonsson, 2 Pr Suomen Tehtäväniekat 1993 (Diag. A11), which of course does not feature reciprocal square vacation between the knights and it is 3 units heavier, but on the other hand it has dual-avoidance and it is in 2 solutions form. We have the feeling that Živko accidentally re-composed No.53; there is his Commendation in Die Schwalbe 2001 (Diag. A12) and, even more, the striking Chris Feather, Moultings No.9 1992 (Diag. A13), where the composer managed to fit passive captures of white units in the introductory black play. We take the opportunity to quote two fine compositions of Toma Garai, who has also combined this idea with additional strategy: 3 Pr Shakhmatna Misl 1995 (Diag. A14) shows wK tempo moves with dual-avoidance, while the more recent Umenie 64 2002 ends in pin-mates (Diag. A15).

No.26 has wT/L sacrifices, in Zilahi form, as result of Anti-Ziel-Element direct black checks. The rook and bishop do not seem to be the appropriate pieces for this idea, and pity for the bK-shift twinning, which makes a lot of black material utilised only partially. Toma Garai has already presented this idea in Die Schwalbe 1992 (Diag. A16) with knights as thematic units in 2 solutions form and lighter construction. Mikhail Gershinsky even managed to fit ideal mates in the idea with his HM Ideal-Mate Review 2000 (Diag. A17), where wL/S are utilised. It seems that indirect checks fit better to this theme, as shown in Michel Caillaud, 2 Pr Zadachi i Etyudy 1996 (Diag. A18).

Constructional flaws

The white pawn-plugs in No.48 are rather awkward. Interesting sacrifices with the white pieces moving along the pin-lines in No.49, which are familiar from Toma Garai, Probleemblad 1996 (**Diag. A19**), but spoiled by the repeated W2 move. We deem that the perpetuum mobile in No.62 does not really compensate for the additional white pawn (version: -wpe2, -bDe6, +bTe7 with 2 solutions). Why has the composer of No.65 added the artificial bT, when he could reach the same end result without it?! (if we simply remove the bT, we get 2 solutions with 1.f3 in the second).

Entries of less interest

No.11 and 56 are surpassed by No.12, and No.45 by No.27. No.13 incorporates an anticipatory black half-pin, however this gives a very strong impression of an "extended" h#2, the sacrifices are on occupied squares and the B3 move is repeated. The three wT sacrifices in No.14 are quite mechanical and, in any case, four off have been already achieved by Andrey Lobusov, 1 PI 14th USSR Championship 1990 (**Diag. A20**), using a Siers battery. Repeated B2 and B3 moves in No.15. The effects of the white sacrifices in No.20 are unbalanced and the twinning rather too drastic; yet, the logic behind the move Lh7 in part (b) to allow the black castling is quite original. The black play of No.31 is too forced and there is no Zilahi, as the composer claims. Economical Zilahi in No.37, but this lacks real strategy. Both No.50 and 51 have quite heavy construction, not justified by the content. Unbalanced play and same B3 move in No.63.

Award

Since we had to classify so many problems, sometimes of more or less equal quality, it was important to establish certain criteria to follow. These are in order of precedence:

- 1. Number of sacrifices and number of different white units that are sacrificed
- 2. Strategic motif of the sacrifices, i.e. why White should offer his pieces
- 3. Sacrifices on vacant squares have been favored
- 4. Other elements presented, provided that these did not in fact constitute the core idea of the composition. In other words, problems where the sacrifices are merely a decorative add-on were downgraded, considered as not "suitable" for this tourney.

Obviously, we could not adhere strictly to the above order. In certain cases, we decided to place problems showing only two sacrifices, higher than others featuring more, due to the originality of the effects and the overall impression of the composition. We are pretty sure that some other judge would perhaps rank the Prizes and the Honourable Mentions quite differently, but we really did our best to be fair and to justify our selection.

Enough is enough, get your chess boards and let the show begin!



1 Prize Aleksandr & Valery Semenenko (Ukraine) No 7

(i) 1.d4 Ld5 2.Kxd5 Te4 3.Kxe4 Sxf6#

(ii) 1.Ld7 Sd6 2.Kxd6 Le6 3.Kxe6 Txf6#

A monumental task featuring double wL sacrifices and wT/S Zilahi on vacant squares with model mates occurring on the same square and without any white pawns! Seeing why the moves Sc7/Sg7 are ruled out in the second solution is very rewarding. We prefer to have a more useful third black move even if this is only a self-block, instead of the 3-move bK marches shown in same composers' Chervony Girnyk 1999 (**Diag. A21**), which shares some elements with this 1st Prize.

2 Prize I.M. Reedes-Smith (Great Britain) No 5

(i) 1...Lh7 2.Txh7 a7 3.Kd3 a8=D 4.Kc3 Da3#

(ii) 1...Sd4 2.Tb7+ axb7 3.cxd4 bxc8=D 4.Kf3 Dxh3#

Very original and peculiar wL/S tempo sacrifices, followed by wD promotions and longrange mates. Few may claim that this composition violates the well-known "economy of time" principle, however this would be cooked as a h#3, while it is exactly this exception to the rules that produces such a spectacular effect. The bTa7/Sc8 are cleverly arranged to override any wK tempo moves and be thematic at the same time. The only slight blemish is that the second mate is not model.

3 Prize Marjan Kovačević (Serbia & Montenegro) No 60

Three wL sacrifices on empty squares along the diagonal followed by D/T/S promotions in uniform twinning. It may look simple at first, but it is in fact the perfection of the patent... We are aware of Tode Ilievski, Pr Orbit 2000 (Diag. A22), yet this has two solutions only and the wL move off the diagonal is blocked.

(a) 1.d2 Lc4 (Lh7?) 2.Kxc4 g8=D+ 3.Kd3 Db3#

(b) 1.a4 Lb3 (Lh7?) 2.axb3 g8=T 3.Kc4 Tc8#

(c) 1.Le3 Ld5 (Lh7?) 2.Kxd5 g8=S 3.Ke4 Sf6#



4 Prize Aleksandr & Valery Semenenko (Ukraine) No 8

(i) 1.Kc5 Sc4 2.dxc4 Lxd4 3.exd4 Sxe4#

(ii) 1.d3 Se6 2.fxe6 Txe5 3.Kxe5 Sc4#

The two white indirect batteries are mutually activated with sacrifices of the knights on vacant and of the rear pieces on occupied squares, yielding a pleasant, sort of double Zilahi. As in the 10th Prize, the capture of the black pawn in the sacrifice Lxd4 can be easily disregarded, since the motivation is to let the bpe5 open the wT battery and not make the square d4 accessible to Black. The composers have recently used the same, more or less, scheme with acute angled batteries in one of their entries to the V. Chepizhny JT-70 (**Diag. A23**, the award is not published yet), where the sacrifices of the front units on occupied squares are less ambitious.

5 Prize Mario Parrinello (Italy) No 19

(a) 1.Sd5 (1.Se~?) Tb5 2.cxb5 Kxd5 3.Sg3 Le3#

(b) 1.Sd6 (1.Sf~?) Lb6 2.cxb6+ Kxd6 3.Sg4 Tf5#

wT/L Zilahi with another very original motif for the sacrifices; the black pawns have to unguard d5/d6, so that the wK manages to capture the bS's, which offer themselves in the first black move, and also to open the gate for the mating pieces. Nice delayed Follow-My-Leader (FML) mates, noteworthy exchange of black roles and perfect diagonal-orthogonal echo.

6 Prize Marjan Kovačević (Serbia & Montenegro) No 59

(i) 1.Td3 Le3 2.Ke4 Ke6 3.Sxe3 Txh4# (1.Ke4? Lxe3 2.Sxe3 Ke6 3.Xd3??)

(ii) 1.Te4 Te3 2.Kd4 Kd6 3.Lxe3 Td1# (1.Kd4? Txe3 2.Lxe3 Kd6 3.Xe4??)

The best entry among those where the sacrificed white pieces are captured by black units, other than the king or a pawn; the wT/L Grimshaw apparently aims to provide flights for the bK, but the real target is to create black self-pins. The order of moves is very skillfully arranged: the bT cannot simply wait on e3, since it has to prepare in advance the mating net. This makes the sacrifices capture-free and produces a peculiar bi-colour FML effect in the first move. Few may suggest that the W2 moves are not of any particular interest, but this "weakness" seems unavoidable.



7 Prize Emil Klemanič & Ján Kovalič (Slovakia) No 10

(a) 1.Dxd2 Txe4 2.Kxe4 Txd5 3.Kxd5 Lb7#

(b) 1.Dxe2 Lxf4 2.Kxf4 Lxf5 3.Kxf5 Tf6#

A great task achievement which manages to show two sacrifices on occupied squares and one passive capture in <u>each</u> phase, by involving both pairs of white rooks and bishops in reciprocal roles! The captures carried out by the bD are, of course, accidental, nonetheless the gate openings are quite pleasant. While searching for anticipations, we had the nice opportunity to enjoy, once again, the amazing 1st and 2nd Places of the 11th Problemkiste TT 1994 (**Diag. A24 & A25**), which we feel we should quote here for reference.

8 Prize Menachem Witztum (Israel) No 42

(a) 1.Sf2 Th5 2.Lh6 Tb5+ 3.cxb5 Lxd6#

(b) 1.Lh5 Lf2 2.Tg3 Lc5+ 3.bxc5 Tb7#

Very interesting wT/L Zilahi with the sacrifices aiming to divert the black pawns off the mating lines. On top of that, the composer managed to pack a lot of strategic elements, like indirect unpins of the thematic white units (totally four off!), moves along the pin-lines and gate openings.

9 Prize Nikola Predrag (Croatia) No 57

(a) 1.Kf5 (1.Lf6?) Lf6 (Le5?, Lg7?) 2.Lxf6 Sg7+ 3.Ke5 d4#

(b) 1.h5 (1.Lg7?) Lg7 (L~?, Se5?) 2.Lxg7 Se5 3.Kh6 Sf7#

Like the 2nd Prize, tempo sacrifices on vacant squares, but in less interesting dress; this time, there is a single white unit that is sacrificed (of course, twice!) and the twinning tries to hide that the white pawn is of no use in the second part. Nevertheless, the mutual

collisions of the bishops along the diagonal and the excellent economy are to be highly praised.



10 Prize Francesco Simoni (Italy) No 4

(a) 1.Te5 Lf5+ 2.gxf5 Lg1 3.De8 (Dg6?, Df7?) Sf6# [1.Td4? Lxf4 2.gxf4 ?? 3.De5 Sf2?] (b) 1.Td4 Lxf4 2.gxf4 Le6 3.De5 Sf2# (Sf6?)

Together with the 6th Prize, probably the most original concept for the sacrifices of the white bishops; they offer themselves to pawns, so that two lines are opened for the bD, which cannot unpin the wS in some other way. In part (b), the thematic move Lxf4 captures a pawn, which is an undesired condition, however this cannot be considered a weakness, since the pawn f4 does not, in fact, force Lf4 and 2.gxf4, but it is necessary only to block this square in part (a). If only 3.De5 were a hideaway too...

11 Prize Dieter Müller & Michael Barth (Germany) No 44

(i) 1.Tac5 Sxd4 2.Kxd4 Sxc4 3.Kxc4 Txa4#

(ii) 1.Sf5 Sxe4 2.Kxe4 Sxe5 3.Kxe5 Txe6#

Double wS sacrifices in each solution, to let the bK get trapped, with model mates by the same rook in a rather controversial setting (White has no pawns, yet Black is fully armed!) As explained in the introduction, we preferred sacrifices on unoccupied squares, thus this eventually got one of the lower prizes...

Special Prize Klaus Wenda & Helmut Zajic (Austria) No 27

(a) 1.c4 Sb3 (Sc2?) 2.Kxb3 Lb4 3.Kxb4 Txb5#

(b) 1.d1=T Sc2 (Sb3?) 2.Kxc2 Ld2 3.Kxd2 Tf2#

In each solution, both wS and L are sacrificed on empty squares to allow the bK pass through and get ready for the rook mates. Do not miss the white dual-avoidance, too. Apart from the 1st Prize, this is the second entry that shows four sacrifices on vacant squares, but our strong objection, which prevents a higher placement, is that it is too symmetric.



1 Hon. Mention Viktor Syzonenko (Ukraine) No 54

(i) 1.Kd6 Lc6 2.Kxc6 Ka3 3.Kb5 Scd4#

(ii) 1.Kf4 Lf3 2.Kxf3 Kc1 3.Ke2 Sbd4#

(iii) 1.Se3 Sc5 2.bxc5 Sb4 3.Kd4 Sc6#

Three sacrifices on empty squares, two of them to let the bK pass through and the third to allow a self-block by a pawn, instead of just hiding away. Full marks for the 3 solutions form, economy and model mates; the only reason that we do not reward this with a Prize is that two of the solutions are completely symmetric.

2 Hon. Mention Chris Feather (Great Britain) No 39

(i) 1.Db6 Lg3 2.hxg3 fxg3 3.Tb5 Ta2#

(ii) 1.Da4 Tg5 2.fxg5 fxg5 3.Lb5 Lc7#

wT/L alternate sacrifices to black pawns for line-opening with aesthetically very pleasant black FML play and Grimshaw. Better than No.18 (5th Commendation) and No.33 (11th Hon. Mention), which follow the same concept. The composer has presented this mechanism in Moultings No.11 1992 (**Diag. A26**) with somewhat similar play, but without diagonal-orthogonal echo.

3 Hon. Mention Valery Gurov (Russia) No 55

(i) 1.Kd4 Lb3 (L~?) 2.axb3 Kc6 3.Kc4 Ta4#

(ii) 1.Ke4 Te5+ (T~?) 2.dxe5 Ke7 3.Kf5 Lh7#

Very elegant Meredith with wT/L Zilahi and model mates, where the sacrifices (instead of hideaways) are due to self-blocks by pawns. This differs from the lot of the entries based on bK marches, since the white units are not captured by the black king.



4 Hon. Mention Michael McDowell (Great Britain) No 9

(i) 1.Td5 Sg1 2.fxg1=L Sa3 3.Lc5 Sc4#

(ii) 1.Ld5 Se1 2.fxe1=T Sg5 3.Te6 Sf7#

Cute and economical Zilahi with wS sacrifices to allow black under-promotions for selfblock. Pity that no Grimshaw occurs on d5, but even so, the orthogonal-diagonal echo is most appealing. This is strategically less challenging than No.12 (2nd Commendation), but we are inclined to appreciate economy more than strategy in this type of sacrifices. We would perhaps prefer the wSh3 starting from f3, so that we get dual-avoidance in both solutions (Sa3!/Se3?, Sg5!/Se5?), even if this requires an additional black pawn on f4.

5 Hon. Mention Chris Feather (Great Britain) No 6

(i) 1...Se6+ 2.dxe6 dxe6 3.Tc7 e7+ 4.Kc8 e8=D#

(ii) 1...Lc6 2.dxc6 dxc6 3.Sb7 cxb7 4.Te7 b8=D#

The sacrifices allow the captures by the black pawn, which serve as side-way steps for the white pawn towards the queen promotions. Side model mates and excellent construction.

6 Hon. Mention Michel Caillaud (France) No 64

(i) 1.Lxc4 Lxa7 2.Txa7 Txc4 3.Tg7 Th4#

(ii) 1.Txc5 Txe2 2.Lxe2 Lxc5 3.Lh5 Lf8#

Splendid diagonal-orthogonal echo with parallel play of the white and black rooks and bishops. As the author notes, this was composed for the 7th WCCT and certain lack of strategy is assumed, since it is not the point of the problem.



7 Hon. Mention Viktor Syzonenko No 61

(i) 1.Kc4 Ld4 2.exd4 Le6+ 3.Kc5 Sxd3#

(ii) 1.Kd2 Sc2 2.dxc2 Lg4 3.Ke1 Lb4#

Noteworthy Zilahi with sacrifices of the wL/S to enable captures by black pawns for interesting and different reasons: the wL cannot simply wait on c5 since this would mean a flight on d4, while the wS should divert the black pawn away from the diagonal b4-e1. Model mates are a bonus.

8 Hon. Mention Menachem Witztum (Israel) No 43

(i) 1.Sc6 Txe5+ 2.dxe5 Th7 3.Sh5 Td7#

(ii) 1.Lc6 Txd2+ 2.cxd2 Th2 3.Lh4 Txd2#

Interesting Zilahi of the half-pinned white rooks with uncommon sacrifices to enable the concurrent mates along the d-file; pity there is no clear-cut dual-avoidance between the changed self-blocks in the B1 moves.

9 Hon. Mention Ion Murarasu (Romania) No 32

(a) 1.Ta6 Sa3 2.Dxb3 Lxb3 3.bxa3 Ld5#

(b) 1.De5 Sc3 2.Txb3 Txb3 3.bxc3 Tb6#

The wS has to be sacrificed to unpin the wT/L and let the black pawn capture and open the rook-line, while the bD/T eliminate the white pawn so that batteries are created. Nice orthogonal-diagonal echo, exchange of both black and white functions and double-check model mates.



10 Hon. Mention Christer Jonsson (Sweden) No 21

- (a) 1.Te5 Ld5+ 2.Kxd5 Kg6 3.Ke6 Sf4#
- (b) 1.Kb5 Lb4 2.Kxb4 Sd4 3.Ka3 Sc2#
- (c) 1.Ka8 Sg1 2.hxg1=L Ld6 3.La7 Ld5#

The most economical entry among those showing three sacrifices, two of them to let the bK pass through and one to allow a black promotion for self-block. The mates are models, but the twinning looks a bit odd.

11 Hon. Mention Ion Murarasu (Romania) No 33

(a) 1.Kf5 cxb5 2.Lf4 Tc3 3.dxc3 d4#

(b) 1.Ke5 La4 2.Tf4 Lc6 3.dxc6 dxc6#

wT/L alternate sacrifices to black pawns, so that the white pawn-batteries work and changed self-blocks on bK initial square, in less successful execution compared to the 2nd Hon. Mention. The twinning does not fit to the matrix, but we could not find a position with 2 solutions.

12 Hon. Mention Vlaicu Crisan & Ion Murarasu (Romania) No 29

(i) 1.Tg8 Sxf3 2.Kxf3 Lxg6 3.Kg4 Lh5#

(ii) 1.Le7 Sd3 2.exd3 Txg6 3.Ke4 Te6#

Rich blend of various strategic elements (direct unpins of the white pieces, reciprocal battery-creation, masked pin-mates) in orthogonal-diagonal correspondence, yet the wS sacrifices (one on a vacant square to enable the capture by the pawn and the other on occupied to let the bK move forward) are rather colorless. We have the feeling that this composition might have been placed higher in a non-thematic tourney.



13 Hon. Mention Josip Pernarić (Croatia) No 36

(i) 1.Ke4 Lh1 2.Dxh1 Sd6+ 3.Kf3 Sf5 4.Kg2 Sh4#

(ii) 1.Kc4 Sc5 2.Dc3 Lb7 3.bxc5 Lc8 4.Ld5 La6#

A four-mover with very interesting wL/S sacrifices and a lot of activity along the diagonal a8-h1: in one solution, the wL makes way for the bD and K, while in the other, the wS has to vacate b7 for the bishop, but if it simply moves away it leaves a hole on c5. The position is indeed loaded, but this is practically inherent in the particular matrix (the only cook-stopper is Sh7).

14 Hon. Mention Andreas Schönholzer (Switzerland) No 1

(a) 1.Tf6 Ld3 2.cxd3 Se2 3.Tb4 Sxc3#

(b) 1.Tf3 Sf6 2.exf6 Le4 3.Lb4 Lc6#

Alternate wL/S sacrifices, in Zilahi form, to black pawns that open the bT/L gates towards b4, nicely blended with introductory interferences. The side model mates add spice, but the displacement of one of the thematic pieces in the twin does not look so nice. The earlier Toma Garai, Schach-Echo 1986 (**Diag. A27**), that is herewith quoted for reference only, uses wT/L and features less interesting self-blocks in the first black moves.

15 Hon. Mention Andrey Frolkin (Ukraine) No 66

(i) 1.e5 Sf5 2.Sxf5 Sd8 3.Kd4 Se6#

(ii) 1.De5 Se2 2.Sxe2 Sa5 3.Kd4 Sb3#

Two striking sacrifices of the wSd4 to gain a tempo, accompanied by changed distant selfblocks. Quite symmetric and repeated B3 move, though.

Unto Heinonen

Halkidiki Internet Ty 2004 16 Hon. Mention



16 Hon. Mention Unto Heinonen (Finland) No 17

(i) 1.Se4 Tf3+ 2.Kxf3 Td6 3.f4 Td3#
(ii) 1.Th4 Tg5 2.Kxg5 Txe7 3.Df4 Tg7#
Active Zilahi of the white rooks with sacrifices on empty squares to let the bK get trapped. Nice chameleon-echo model mates and changed self-blocks on f4.



1 Commendation Jorge Kapros, Jorge Lois (Argentina) & Christer Jonsson (Sweden) No 24

(i) 1.Tf7 Sxd6 2.Kxd6 bxc7 3.Ke7 c8=S#

(ii) 1.d5 Sxc6 2.Kxc6 b7 3.Kd7 b8=S#

wS sacrifices, with Zilahi, on occupied squares to clear the path of the bK and Phoenix as a pleasant add-on feature. Compare to the recent StrateGems 2004 (Diag. A28) by the same composers.

2 Commendation Misha Shapiro (Israel) No 12

(a) 1.Le5 Scb1 2.cxb1=L Sf3 (Se4?) 3.Lg6 Sg5#

(b) 1.Te5 Sdb1 2.cxb1=T Sd5 (Sb5?) 3.Tb8 Sc7#

Despite the bK-shift twinning, this is in our opinion the strategically most interesting among the entries showing wS alternate sacrifices to enable black promotions for self-block. In particular, notice the white dual-avoidance and black Grimshaw (without self-block!)

3 Commendation Klaus Wenda (Austria) No 25

(i) 1.Lg2 Le2 2.fxe2 Txd4+ 3.Kf3 Tf4#

(ii) 1.Le2 Td2 2.cxd2 Kb3 3.Kd3 Lc2#

Pretty and very economical Zilahi with wT/L sacrifices to unlock the position by enabling the captures by the black pawns, and distant self-blocks by the bL. Pity that only one mate is model.



4 Commendation Josip Pernarić (Croatia) No 34

(a) 1.Db2 Sb4+ 2.axb4 Sd5 3.b3 Sb4#

(b) 1.Th1 Sh3+ 2.gxh3 Sf4 3.h2 Sh3#

Alternate wS sacrifices to black pawns for self-block in cute FML sequences. Quite heavy and, in fact, the black Lf3 could have been saved easily (-bLf3, bpe2 to f3). Živko Janevski has presented, with his 6 Commend Uralsky Problemist 2001 and StrateGems 2002 (Diag. A29 & A30 respectively), a similar idea, but without FML manoeuvres and with the sacrifices on occupied squares.

5 Commendation Mario Parrinello (Italy) No 18

(i) 1.Db8+ Tff4 2.Dxf4+ exf4 3.Ta2 Te1#

(ii) 1.Tg7+ Tg4 2.Txg4+ fxg4 3.Da2 Tf1#

A blend of consecutive checks to the wK, Zilahi, pin-mates and both black and white exchange of functions, but in fact the line-opening mechanism seems to be based mainly on sacrifices of the black, and not of the white, pieces.

6 Commendation Josip Pernarić (Croatia) No 35

(a) 1.0-0 Txh7 2.Kxh7 0-0-0 3.Tg8 Th1#
(b) 1.0-0-0 Txb7 2.Kxb7 0-0 3.Kb6 Tb1#
Black and white castlings with Zilahi of the white rooks in quite loaded position.

Christer Jonsson Halkidiki Internet Ty 2004 Special Commendation



Special Commendation Christer Jonsson (Sweden) No 23

(i) 1.Kg7 Lg6 2.Kxg6 Kg2 3.Kh5+ Kh3 4.Tg5 Sf4#
(ii) 1.e5 Se7 2.Kxe7 Kf2 3.Ke6 Ke3 4.Kd5 Lf7#
The mechanism of the white pieces sacrificing, in Zilahi, on vacant squares to let bK march towards the square that they stand on the initial diagram, found in No.2, 16, 23, 30, has been shown by the composer himself in his 3 Pr Springaren 1999 (Diag. A31). In fact, Jonsson displays in this tourney the "Letztform" of the idea, which saves the white pawn and, therefore, even if anticipated, it deserves a Sp Commend. The pioneer example seems to be Viktor Syzonenko, Die Schwalbe 1996 (Diag. A32). There is also Christer Jonsson & Rolf Wiehagen, Pr The Problemist 2002 (Diag. A33) with maximal economy in three moves.

Athens and Thessaloniki, 31 October 2004 Harry Fougiaxis & Kostas Prentos

APPENDIX – QUOTED COMPOSITIONS



[A1] Christer Jonsson & Rolf Wiehagen, HM Ideal-Mate Review 1997

(a) 1...La2 2.c2 Lb1 3.cxb1=T Se4 4.Tb6 Sc5#

(b) 1...Se2 2.f2 Sg1 3.fxg1=L Le6 4.Lb6 Lc8#

[A2] Toma Garai, Commend R. Candela-Sanz JT 1986

(i) 1.Lc4 Lxe4+ 2.Kxe4 Kg6 3.Sd5 Txc4#

(ii) 1.Sc2 Txe4 2.Kxe4 e3 3.Ld5 Lxc2#

[A3] Manfred Seidel, 2 Commend Probleemblad 1999

- (a) 1.Se6 Txd5+ 2.Kxd5 Sc4 3.Ld4 Lxe6#
- (b) 1.Lc5 Lxd5 2.Le6 Sf5+ 3.Kxd5 Txc5#



[A4] Christopher Jones, 2 Pr Problem Forum 2001

(i) 1.Ld3 Txe4 2.Kxe4 Lb1 3.Df4 Lxd3#

(ii) 1.Lc4 Lxe4+ 2.Kxe4 Ta4 3.Df5 Txc4#

[A5] Toma Garai, 1-2 Pr Sinfonie Scacchistiche 1987-89

(i) 1.Tcd5 b8=S 2.Kc5 Sxc6 3.Kxc6 c8=D#

(ii) 1.Da5 c8=S 2.Kb5 Sxb6 3.Kxb6 b8=D#

[A6] Jorge Kapros & Jorge Lois, HM N. Nagnibida JT-60 1999

(i) 1.Txd2 Sg3 2.Tdd7 Th2 3.hxg3 Th8#

(ii) 1.Txe2 Sf3 2.Tee7 Tg2 3.gxf3 Tg8#



[A7] Dieter Müller & Aleksandr Pankratiev, 3 HM feenschach 1998

(i) 1.Kxe3 dxe4 2.Kxe4 Txe5+ 3.Kxe5 Te8#

(ii) 1.Kxd3 exd4 2.Kxd4 Txd5+ 3.Kxd5 Td6#

[A8] Abdelaziz Onkoud, StrateGems 2001

(a) 1.Lf6 Ld4+ (Lh2?) 2.Kxd4 Tb4+ 3.Ke5 Te4#

(b) 1.a4 Tb4 (Txa6?) 2.Kxb4 Ld4 3.Ka5 Lc3#

[A9] Gennady Chumakov, Ideal-Mate Review 1992

Set: 1...Lb3 2.c6 Ld5+ 3.cxd5 Sd6# 1.Dd5 Sd4 2.c5 Lb5 3.cxd4 Ld3#



[A10] Gennady Chumakov, U.S. Problem Bulletin 1993

(a) 1.Ta4 Sc5 2.bxc5 La6 3.Tac4 Lb7#

(b) 1.Tbc4 Kf5 2.Tc5 Lc4+ 3.bxc4 Sb4#

[A11] Christer Jonsson, 2 Pr Suomen Tehtäväniekat 1993

- (i) 1.d2+ Sd3 2.Kxd3 Sxg6! (Sxd5?) 3.e4 Sf4#
- (ii) 1.Tc5+ Sd5 2.Kxd5 Sa2! (Sxd3?) 3.De4 Sb4#

[A12] Živko Janevski, Commend Die Schwalbe 2001

- (i) 1.Tf6 Sxe6 2.Kxe6 g4 3.Ld5! (d5?) Sg5#
- (ii) 1.Lf6 Sxe5 2.Kxe5 g3 3.d5! (Ld5?) Sf7#



[A13] Chris Feather, Moultings No.9 1992

- (a) 1.Dxe8 Sxe4 2.Kxe4 Le5 3.f3 Sf6#
- (b) 1.Dxc7 Sxf4 2.Kxf4 Te5 3.Tf3 Sd5#

[A14] Toma Garai, 3 Pr Shakhmatna Misl 1995

(i) 1.Lf4 Sxe3 2.Kxe3 Kxb7! (Kb8?) 3.Se4 Sg4#

(ii) 1.Sf4 Sxf3 2.Kxf3 Kb8! (Kxb7?) 3.Le4 Se5#

[A15] Toma Garai, Umenie 64 2002

(a) 1.Dc1 Sxd5 2.Kxd5 Th5 3.Dc5 Sf4#

(b) 1.Sb7 Sxd4 2.Kxd4 Lf2 3.Sc5 Se2#



[A16] Toma Garai, Die Schwalbe 1992

(i) 1.Lxc4+ Sd3 2.Kxd3 Sf3 3.De4 Se1#

(ii) 1.Txf4+ Sf3 2.Kxf3 Sd3 3.Se4 Se5#

[A17] Mikhail Gershinsky, HM Ideal-Mate Review 2000

(a) 1.Dd3+ Sc4 2.Kxc4 Lxd7 3.c5 Le6#

(b) 1.Dd6+ Lc6 2.Kxc6 Sc2 3.Tc5 Sxb4#

[A18] Michel Caillaud, 2 Pr Zadachi i Etyudy 1996

(i) 1.De5 La5 2.Te4+ Sd4 3.Kxd4 Lb6#

(ii) 1.Te2 Sh2 2.Le1+ Ld2+ 3.Kxd2 Sf1#



[A19] Toma Garai, Probleemblad 1996

(i) 1.Dd2 Td3 2.Kxd3 axb3 3.Le4 Lc4#

(ii) 1.Lg4 Lf5+ 2.Kxf5 h4 3.De4 Tf6#

[A20] Andrey Lobusov, 1 PI 14th USSR Championship 1990

(a) 1.Kd4 Tf2 2.exf2 Sxe1+ 3.Ke3 Sg2#, 1.Tf5 Tf4 2.exf4 Sf2+ 3.Ke5 Sg4# (b) 1.Tf4 Tf3 2.exf3 Sf5+ 3.Ke4 Sg3#, 1.Tf6 Tf5 2.exf5 Sf3+ 3.Ke6 Sg5#

[A21] Aleksandr & Valery Semenenko, Chervony Girnyk 1999

- (i) 1.Kxc4 Ld5+ 2.Kxd5 Sxe6 3.Kxe6 Sc7#
- (ii) 1.Kxd4 Sxc5 2.Kxc5 Lc6 3.Kxc6 Tc8#



[A22] Tode Ilievski, Pr Orbit 2000

(i) 1.Lxe4 Ld5+ 2.Kxd5 g8=S 3.Dc5 Se7#

(ii) 1.Lxb3 Lc4 2.Kc5 g8=T 3.Kxc4 Tc8#

[A23] Aleksandr & Valery Semenenko, V. Chepizhny JT-70 2004(?)

- (i) 1.Dd6 Sxe5 2.Kxe5 Lf3 3.exf3 Sg4#
- (ii) 1.Dd3 Sxd5 2.Kxd5 Txe4 3.Kxe4 Sg5#

[A24] Michel Caillaud, 1 Pl 11th TT Problemkiste 1994

- 1... Sxd5 2.Kxd5 Txc4 3.Kxc4 Sb6#
- 1... Sxc5 2.Kxc5 Lxd4+ 3.Kxd4 Se6#
- (i) 1.Sxc1 Sxd5 2.Kxd5 Lxc4+ 3.Kxc4 Sb6#
- (ii) 1.Sxb2 Sxc5 2.Kxc5 Txd4 3.Kxd4 Se6#

[A25] Zvonimir Hernitz [A26] Chris Feather [A27] Toma Garai 11th TT Problemkiste 1994 Moultings No.11 1992 Schach-Echo 1986 2 Place Å ÏÏź 31 1 I Q Î 6-¥ 5-¥ 兌 ft 🕇 🗟 **(** 1 6-2 Î 5-¥ 쥤 1 **1 1** \$ £ 6-4 1 兌 Д 5 1 1 쥤 M Š, P 6-U 1 A 1 Щ 2.1.1... H#3 (8+8)H#3 2.1.1... (4+13)H#3 (8+12) 2.1.1...

[A25] Zvonimir Hernitz, 2 PI 11th TT Problemkiste 1994

(i) 1.Sxc4 Le4+ 2.Kxe4 Txe5+ 3.Kxe5 Te7#

(ii) 1.Kxc4 Lxd5+ 2.Kxd5 Te6 3.Kxe6 Txd6#

[A26] Chris Feather, Moultings No.11 1992

- (i) 1.Ka5 Tf4 2.gxf4 exf4 3.b5 Da3#
- (ii) 1.Ka6 Df5 2.gxf5 exf5 3.Sb5 Ta4#

[A27] Toma Garai, Schach-Echo 1986

(i) 1.Scb5 Lg6 2.fxg6 Ta1 3.Tb7 Txa4#

(ii) 1.Sdb5 Txb2 2.cxb2 Lxf5 3.La5 Lc8#



[A28] Jorge Kapros, Jorge Lois & Christer Jonsson, StrateGems 2004

- (i) 1.d3 Sxe4 2.Kxe4 bxc8=S 3.Le3 Sd6#
- (ii) 1.Ld3 Sxd4 2.Kxd4 b8=S 3.e3 Sc6#

[A29] Živko Janevski, 6 Commend Uralsky Problemist 2001

(i) 1.Lh4 Sxf4 2.Kxf4 Sd4 3.Kg3 Se2#

(ii) 1.h5 Sxg5 2.Kxg5 Sd4 3.Kh4 Sf3#

[A30] Živko Janevski, StrateGems 2002

(i) 1.Ke6 Sxd6 2.Kxd6 Se3 3.Le6 Sc4#

(ii) 1.Kg5 Sxh4 2.Kxh4 Se3 3.Tg5 Sg2#



[A31] Christer Jonsson, 3 Pr Springaren 1999

(i) 1.Tc5 Lf6 2.Kxf6 d3 3.Ke5 Kd2 4.Kd4 Sf3#

(ii) 1.g4 Sg6 2.Kxg6 Kf1 3.Kg5 Kg2 4.Kh4 Lf6#

[A32] Viktor Syzonenko, Die Schwalbe 1996

(i) 1.d4 Sd6 2.Kxd6 Le8 3.Kd5 Lh5 4.Ke4 Lf3#

(ii) 1.Sb4 Lc6 2.Kxc6 Ke3 3.Kb5 Kd4 4.Lc6 Sc3#

[A33] Christer Jonsson & Rolf Wiehagen, Pr The Problemist 2002

(a) 1.Db4 Lb5 2.Kxb5 c3 3.Ka4 Txb4#

(b) 1.De5 Td4 2.Kxd4 e3+ 3.Ke4 Lc2#