Julia's Fairies • Tournament Retro & PG 2019-2020 • Award Vlaicu Crișan, Cluj-Napoca, April 2021

I was very happy to accept Julia's invitation to judge the fairy retro informal tournament: based on the previous years' experience, I was expecting to see a good participation with many interesting compositions. And my expectations were exceeded, as I had to judge 38 problems.

My first decision was to split the award into two sub-sections – one for the proof games, the other for the other retro stipulations. The main reason for this decision is to be able to apply consistent evaluation criteria in each sub-section. This aspect must be underlined because the general chess composition principles are applied in a different way in retro genre. Moreover, as we have a *fairy* retro tournament, the fairy element should also play a significant role.

Proof Games Section

This section is quantitatively better represented, with 23 compositions created by 15 authors from 8 countries. The range of the fairy elements is quite very wide: 19 different elements (2 pieces and 17 conditions) are present, some of these fairy elements being shown for the first time in a fairy proof game.

In my evaluation of the proof games, I considered several criteria: the difficulty of the theme, the quality of the presentation, the specific density of the fairy element and the interplay. The theme is the most important and it is not surprising that the most ambitious compositions were ranked higher. Known or previously shown themes in the orthodox proof games have not made it into the award. The quality of the presentation has to do with tricky aspects such as the lack of obvious thematic traces, the economy of material principle – which in proof games surprisingly means as few "technical" captures as possible and the economy of time principle – which means avoiding artificially added moves. The specific density of the fairy element means that in order to be eligible to receive a higher reward, a composition should intensively exploit the fairy elements. Last but not least, the interplay requires the existence of a certain dependency of both parts movements on the other part movements.

I had to eliminate from the competition all the four cooked versions of <u>1397</u>. 16 out of the 19 remaining compositions have been completely checked by the specialized programs Jacobi and Winchloe. The continuous development of software targeted for checking fairy proof games is definitely a booster for the composers' imagination, as the composing cycle is much accelerated due to the machine's superior performances in the checking phase.

A few words about the proof games not retained in the award, some of them just narrowly:

- No <u>1373</u> by Bernd Gräfrath – the Knight Rundlauf in Losing Chess has been shown before, but this is perhaps the longest circuit. The position featuring a white Homebase is very appealing, yet the high number of captures by the wS slightly detracts the aesthetic impression.

- No $\underline{1374}$ by Paul Răican – there are three checkmates, two of them made by batteries, but the traces are still visible: one wS and one bR. I think this proof game is less impressive than $\underline{1345}$ by the same author.

- No <u>1442</u> by Joost de Heer – two Impostors (wR and wS) have been previously shown in Circe Assassin proof games (see Annex A)

- No <u>1484</u> by Nicolas Dupont – a nice *shortie* displaying some peculiar subtleties of Nanna, but which seems more an exploratory proof game.

- No <u>1503.2 and 1503.3</u> by Alexandre Leroux – two neatly engineered sequences of moves ending with Pandemic [stale]mates, but without any other clear theme.

- No <u>1503.4</u> by François Labelle – a massacre proof game in Pandemic: a technical virtuosity demonstration, but somehow lacking a human touch.

- No <u>1505</u> by Bernd Gräfrath – the challenge of a triple check mate in Fuddled Men has been shown with a better economy of time (1.5 moves less).

- No <u>1510</u> by Andrew Buchanan and Thomas Thannheiser – an appealing Homebase Proof Game, one move shorter and with two more pieces compared to Christian Poisson (see Annex B).

- No <u>1558</u> by Pierre Tritten – a highly instructive demonstration of an original mix of fairy conditions ending with a specific mate, but again without any other theme.

For the remaining 9 proof games I suggest the following classification.





1.a3 e6 2.axf8=S+ hxf8 3.hxh8=S axa1=S 4.cxa1 fxh8 5.axa8=S cxa8 6.Qa4 Qb6 7.Qa7 bxg2 8.Sf3 gxf1=S+ 9.dxf1 d1=S+ 10.bxd1 g1=S 11.exg1 dia

(10+9) PG 10.5 Transmission Menace

7 Knight Schnoebelen promotion is an extraordinary achievement, beating the previous record of 6 Knight Schnoebelen promotions (see Annex C). The fairy condition Transmission Menace is a very appropriate choice in facilitating this task rendering, each promoted Knight being subsequently captured by a Pawn. The clever placing of wQ on the 7th rank facilitates the fast Excelsior of three black Pawns, ensuring as well the order of promotions. The aficionados of this special theme can discover how much things have changed since the article <u>"Schnoebelen Theme in Shortest Proof Games"</u> was published. It is interesting to compare the problem with the 7-fold rendering of Knight active suicides, as mentioned by the author in his comment (see Annex D). A clear first prize winner, scoring high in all the set evaluation criteria!

2nd Prize – No <u>1488</u> Nicolas Dupont



1.e3 c5 2.Bb5 c4 3.Se2 h5 4.O-O c3 5.Bd3 Rh6 6.Bh7 Ra6 7.f3 Ra4 8.Bd3 Sc6 9.Ba6 Se5 10.Kf2 Sg6 11.Rh1 Sh8 12.Sg1 g6 13.Bf1 b5 14.Ke1 dia

An exquisite final position, with a totally unexpected castling motivation! White needs to spend two tempi before going with the Bishop on h7. The only way to achieve this aim without being forced to return to f1 is by playing Se2 and 0-0. However, the combination Leffie + Back Home has been previously used by the author in the Quartz TT 13 in order to display similar paradoxical effects: the return of the pieces to their original squares is hindered by the illegal Leffie paralysis (see Annex E). The absence of captures makes this remarkable proof game worth a prize.

3rd Prize – No 1521 Eric Huber



1.a3 e6 2.axf8=S+ dxf8 3.dxd8=S+ exd8 4.Bg5 d7 5.Be7+ fxe7 dia

In a deceptively simple yet appealing setting, with both White and Black in Homebase, the author managed to show, probably for the first time, the combination SC(S,S) & IN(p,p). For the readers unfamiliar with the notations from the series *Future Proof Game chronicles* written by Silvio Baier, Nicolas Dupont and Roberto Osorio, this obscure acronym actually means: two Schnoebelen white Knights and two interchanges of black pawns. Modest, the author also provides the inspiration source, but there is a significant progress compared to its predecessor. Some very keen purists might debate whether Impostor is a better designation than Interchange or not, particularly when dealing with Pawns. In this particular case, I think Interchange is properly used as the pawns really mutually changed their places. The excellent economy, both in terms of time and material, make this difficult to solve *shortie* memorable!

1st Honourable Mention – No <u>1394</u> Nicolas Dupont



1.f3 a4 2.Ba6 d3 3.a5 Qd4 4.Ba7 Bd7 5.Bxb8 b5 6.Ba7 0-0-0 7.Bd2 e5 8.Be2 Ba3 9.Bf1 Qb4 10.Be3 Bd4 11.c4 Rd7 12.b2 Ba2 13.Bc1 dia

Another proof game with no obvious trace of what happened: the white Bishops actually exchanged their places! The main theme is further enhanced by a second related theme: the black Bishops also changed their colours. A couple of years ago, such a theme would have been instantly rewarded with a first prize. Nowadays, the theme has been already shown using several fairy conditions even in repeated form (see Annex F for the absolute task of four Bishops' interchanges). Nevertheless, this is the first time when the theme is shown using Annan Chess. The white pieces at home and just one single capture significantly enhance the presentation value.



2nd Honourable Mention – No 1434 Bernd Gräfrath

1.e4 e5 2.Qe2 d5 3.Qc4 dxc4 4.c3 b5 5.b4 cxb4 ep. 6.Ba3 bxa2 7.Bxf8 axb1=S 8.Ba3 Sxa3 9.0-0-0 Sc2 10.Kxc2 Sf6 11.Kb3 Sxe4 12.Kb4 Sxc3 13.Kc5 Sb1 dia

This ingenious mix of two difficult themes – Valladao and Anti-Pronkin – would have definitely fared well in the 2^{nd} Murfatlar 2019 tournament organized during the WFCC Congress at Vilnius. An analogy can be made with the $3^{rd} - 4^{th}$ HM ex aequo from that competition (see Annex G). In spite of the similarity of the en passant capture and the Valladao theme, both problems have their own rights of existence. I prefer 1434 for the humorous Anti-Pronkin, although others might feel it has been artificially added after the Valladao was finished. As there are many changes of Duellist for both sides, the fairy specificity is quite high!

3rd Honourable Mention – No <u>1532</u> David Antonini & Nicolas Dupont



1.Sc3 2.Sd5 e5 3.Sf6+ Ke7 4.b4 d5 5.b5 d4 6.b6 a5 7.bxc7 Qd5 8.h4 Qc4 9.Sd5+ Kd6 10.cxb8=Q+ Kc5 11.h5 e4 12.h6 Rxb8 13.hxg7 h5 14.gxh8=Q Sh6 15.Sc3 Bg7 16.Sb1 Bxh8 dia

Many interesting possibilities in the proof game field were open by the imaginative team of French composers who invented first the fairy condition "Strong Black Ambush". Their intensive research in August-September 2020 can still be admired on the <u>France-Echecs Forum</u> pages. The current proof game theme might not seem too exciting compared to the previously retained compositions: "only" two Q Schnoebelen and wS Rundlauf in a stylish white Homebase position. However the theoretical possibilities opened by their discovery of Black Passes If Stuck *astuce* still deserve a high recognition. Commendations without order

Paul Răican & Michel Caillaud Image: Second constraints Imag

Commendation – No 1502

1.Sf3 Sc6 2.Sd4 Sxd4 (+Se6) 3.f4 fxe6 (+Sg5) 4.Sxh7 (+Ph5) Sxe2 (+Pe4) 5.Sf6+ gxf6 (+Sg4) 6.Bxe2 (+Sc3) hxg4 (+Se5) 7.dxc3 (+Sd5) fxe5 (+Sf3) 8.exd5 (+Sb4) gxf3 (+Sg1) 9.cxb4 (+Sc6) fxe2 (+Bf3) 10.dxc6 (+Sb8) dia

Starting probably from a cooked Anti-Take & Make proof game published by Paul in Phénix 2019 and dedicated to Michel, the co-authors have created two entirely different proof games with similar echo manoeuvres. This one has the greater fairy specificity, with ten consecutive spectacular captures ending the Knights' circuits. However, for a higher classification I would have preferred the other one (see Annex H), showing a surprising interchange of the black Knights.

Commendation – No <u>1509</u> Stephen Emmerson



1.f4 c6 2.Kf2 Qb6 3.Sf3 h5+ 4.Kg3 Qg1 5.Se5 h4 6.Kg4 Qxh1 7.Sxd7 Bxd7 8.Kh3 Qxh2+ 9.g4 hxg3 e.p. dia

The best from the bunch of solver-appealing proof games ending with [stale]mate. The seemingly innocent constraint of not being able to move the same piece in two consecutive moves can lead to surprising effects. Here we can see how a triple check mate is engineered out of the blue. One must pay attention that 8... Qxh2+ is actually only a Bishop check. As usual with Stephen's works, this composition has also didactic value – a beginner can easily grasp Fuddled Men from this proof game.





1.h4 g5 2.Rh3 g4 3.Rxg4 f5 4.Rg5 Bh6 5.Rh5 g6 6.h2 Bg5 7.Rxh8 f7 8.Rh5 Bf4 9.Rg5 h7 dia

The last *shortie* contains also a theme possible only in fairy proof games: the interchange of two black pawns! I particularly liked that both the wP and the wR are influencing each other's movements during the play. The diagram deserves a question in Smullyan's style: who captured the black Rook?

Other Retro Section

This section is also well represented, with 15 compositions created by 9 authors from 6 countries. The range of the fairy elements is restricted to 8 different elements (4 pieces and 4 conditions), with the defensive retractors taking the lion's share among the 5 stipulations.

What should a fairy retro be in order to be worth recognition? My own preferences go first to the accuracy of the retro play, with longer problems being better evaluated. The problem must also show some surprising fairy features, which can't be shown in an orthodox [retro] form. Here the economy of material has an entirely different meaning and significance than in proof games.

Unfortunately, some of the most ambitious compositions had to be eliminated due to either duals (<u>1524</u>: see comments) or shorter cooks (<u>1440</u>: -1.Bb6xSf2(>Bc1) Sd1-f2/Qb1-c2+ -2.Kf7:Se8(>Ke1) & 1.Ke6# and <u>1496</u>: -1.Kc5:Rd5(>Ke1) Rd8-d5+ -2.f7:Se8=B(>Bf1) & 1.Kb6#). Here, I have to deplore the absence of any tools for checking the soundness of the compositions. There is one significant exception – Pacemaker – which can be used for testing Proca Retractor AntiCirceCheylan, but unfortunately it can only be run on an out-of-support operating system. The development of specialized tools for fairy retractors will definitely raise the interest of more composers to this particular genre.

The list of not retained problems is quite long:

- No <u>1413</u> by Andreas Thoma: I liked a lot the first solution, with a double avoidance of a forward defence. The second solution is not so interesting. Although I totally agree with Günther Weeth's opinion that the multiple black retractions do not constitute duals, such continuations might also obscure the theme.

- No <u>1439</u> by Andreas Thoma: The forward stipulation (stalemate in 1) is rather unusual and the final position is absolutely astonishing, with the white King stalemated in an almost mirror position. The crowded position and the absence of a formal theme narrowly hindered its classification.

- No <u>1489</u> by Adrian Storisteanu: The rebirth of four white Queens out of the blue is definitely a task worth being mentioned, making one step further compared to the author's previous record (see Annex I). But, for perhaps obvious reasons, I prefer the quoted version: one piece less and one phase more.

- No <u>1496.1</u> by Paul Răican & Klaus Wenda: I generally dislike the constraint No Forward Defence used in the defensive retractors. This trick strongly reduces one side's power in the antagonistic stipulations, so it is better to avoid it.

- No <u>1503.1</u> by Alexandre Leroux: The best entry from the Pandemic article. The surprising conclusion is the result of an impressive deductive effort. Alas, the lack of (exact) retro play or last moves slightly mars the impression.

I propose the following ranking:



1st Prize – No <u>1496.2</u> Paul Răican& Klaus Wenda

The long sequence of retraction moves can be seen as a successive chain of preparatory plans, with the aim of decoying the black King from a6 to d8. The beginning is known from previous compositions (see Annex J, among others), but the following clever sequence seems entirely new. Another positive aspect is the activity of all white and black figures in the retro play, with the white King occupying several times the squares released by the black pieces (Follow-My-Leader effects). The foresighted play of the white Rook, blocking a prospective flight, is also a very nice embellishment. The forward play, featuring a royal duel, ends also with a fairy specific mate. An excellent composition in a polished setting, which scores high marks both at the technical merit and the artistic impression.



2nd Prize – No <u>1539</u> Andreas Thoma

This Rex Solus features several quiet retraction moves. All the play is based on continuous zugzwang, which is quite rarely seen in defensive retractors. In both solutions, the uncaptured black Queen must not be able to

escape the white cage and it is conclusively trapped in the corner. There is a cycle of piece occupying the same squares occupied in both solutions: b3 (wQ / wR), e1 (wR / wS) and a3 (wS / wQ), which seems to be a novelty. All white pieces actively play in both solutions, except the wSc1 in the second. There are no repeated moves in the retraction play. Only the same (dualistic) black mate in the forward play slightly detracts from the overall positive impression.

1st Honourable Mention – No <u>1223.2</u> Günther Weeth & Klaus Wenda Dedicated to Julia, the Latvian Queen of Fairies



(3+9)-7 & #1 Hoeg Retractor AntiCirce Magic Wandering Unit type II Sc1

-1.Bd1-c2! bSd3-c1=wS+ (1st occurrence) -2.wSe5-d3=bS bSd3-e5=wS+ (2nd occurrence) -3.wSc1-d3=bS bPc2-c1=wS+ (forced) -4.Kg5-f5 h7-h6+ -5.wPd5xc5 e.p(bPc2)!! c7-c5 (forced due to Hoeg convention) -6.Kf6-g5 Pb4xQc3(c7) -7.Kg5-f6 & 1.Bxa4(Bf1)#

The most refined retro from the whole tournament! The play contains subtle finesses, which require a deep understanding of the properties of Magic Wandering Units. The retraction play starts with a specific three-moves draw pendulum, forcing the unpromotion of the wS. After a short intermezzo, follows the en passant capture justified by the need to deactivate a black defense based on an en passant capture: 5.wPb5xc5e.p (bPc2)? c7-c5 6.Kf6-g5 d4xc4 e.p (c7)!! The reason for eliminating the alternate en passant capture is not the illegal doubling of the pawns in AntiCirce, but the illegal placement of bPd4 with a MWU pawn on the same column.

The key shows foresight: White must first paradoxically occupy the rebirth square of the wQ in order to be able to avoid an unwanted check. Why not a well-deserved prize for this wonderful problem, then? The only reason for downgrading the problem is the existence of a predecessor showing similar motives (see Annex K), without actually reaching the aesthetic heights of the present composition. A magnificent opus – the amazing result of the craftsmanship of the world's top experts in the field!

2nd Honourable Mention – No <u>1420</u> Klaus Wenda



-1.Bb6xBHg1(Bc1)! bQf2-f1=wQ+ (1st occurrence) -2.wQe1-f2=bQ bQf2-e1=wQ+ (2nd occurrence) -3.wQf1-f2=bQ bPf2-f1=wQ+ (forced) -4.Ka6-a7 Ge8-c6+ -5.wPg5xf5 e.p(bPf2) f7-f5 -6.Ka7-a6 & 1.Kb8+ Ge1#

(5+7)-6 & S#1 Proca Retractor AntiCirce Cheylan Grasshopper c6 Bishop-hopper d7 Magic Wandering Unit type II Qf1

After the draw-pendulum leading to the unpromotion of the Magic Wandering Unit, the black Grasshopper is decoyed to the black King's rebirth square. Here the right choice of the en passant capture is justified by the need to preserve the 'e' file open in the forward play. The AntiCirce must be of type Cheylan in order to avoid the retraction h2xXg1=BH(Bhg1). Both black Knights act solely as blocking pieces: bSb1 occupies the bG's rebirth square, enabling the execution of the forward play without self-check, while bSa8 occupies a potential wK flight. One might wonder why the position after the last White move is still legal. The answer is another hidden retraction: -6...e3xXf2(f7)! (as claimed by the author) or -6...BH(a2-e6)xXg8(BHg1) – the retraction dual having no particular importance in this case, as it is virtual. However, these retractions are no longer possible when White uncaptures a bGf6, hence leading to an illegal position. While the MWU properties are well exploited, the other fairy pieces have a discrete presence. Nevertheless this stylish presentation has its own merits and deserves recognition.

3rd Honourable Mention – No <u>1548</u> Paul Răican & Bojan Bašić



(6+7)-8 Proca Retractor Circe Assassin

-1.Kg3xRg4(Ra8)! Rh4-g4+ -2.Kf2-g2 e4-e3+ -3.Kf1-f2 e5-e4+ -4.Bd1-f3 c3-c2+ -5.Bb3-d1 Ra8-b8+ -6.Sg3xRh1(Ra8, -bBa8) Bg1xh2(h2, -bBh2)!+ -7.Kg2-f1 Sf3xh2(h2, -bSh2)!+ -8.Bg8-b3 & 1.Sf5# After a specific key freeing the prospective rebirth square for the bR, the play continues with some technical moves enabling the wK to reach the wB's rebirth square. Then the wB becomes the main actor, decoying the bR into the corner. Now the play becomes again more intense, with the bR's uncapture and the passive annihilation of the bB, obliging Black to actively suicide another bB and a bS, allowing the wK to specifically guard the flights f8 and g8 and subsequently deliver a specific mate. None of these motives is really new (see Annex L), but they produce a good impression. Unfortunately, there are some merely night watchers by both sides (wSf4, bQc8) which prevent a higher classification.







The best *shortie* from the tournament! Of course, the idea of mixing the en passant capture with promotion was shown as early as the 19th century (see Annex M), but doubling it in a Rex Solus presentation, with two different en passant captures and two different promotions is a novelty. The model mates are a bonus. However the whole interest of the solution resides in the forward play, not in the retro play. Even so, this problem should simply not go unnoticed, because it is one of the best problems I have ever seen to explain a novice what fairy retro is about!

I would like to thank all the participants for the entertaining moments they offered, to our energetic editor and host Julia and all those who posted comments – your contribution is essential in making the judge's life easier! For a printed magazine, I would have been more concise due to limited space, but in the online environment I have indulged myself a more elaborate award. For all who resisted reading this rather lengthy award up to this point, many thanks for following and hope you will be forever caught by the unlimited wonders of the fairy retro field.

11th April 2020, Cluj-Napoca.

Annex

A. Michel Caillaud & Dirk Borst, 1st Place Nunspeet 2018



1.c4 d5 2.Sc3 Bf5 3.Rb1 Bxb1(Rh1) 4.d4 Bf5 5.Qc2 dxc4(c2) 6.Bd2 Qxd4(d2) 7.h3 Qxc3(Sg1) 8.Rh2 Qxh3(h2) 9.e3 Kd7 10.Bxc4(c7) Kc8 11.Se2 Qxe3(e2) 12.Bxf7(f7)

B. Christian Poisson, 562 Parties Justificatives Homebase 2019



1.a4 a5 2.Ra2 Ra6 3.Ra3 Rb6 4.Rb3 Rxb3 5.Sa3 Rxa3 6.b4 Rxa4 7.bxa5 Rxa5 8.Bb2 Ra1 9.Ba3 Rc1 10.Bxc1

C. Michel Caillaud & Eric Huber, 1^{st} Prize feenschach 70 JT, 2020



1.b4 g7-b2xc1=S 2.a3 e5 3.b4-e7xd8=S Sb8-c6xd8 4.a3-e7xf8=S+ Sd8-e6xf8 5.g2-g7xh8=S+ Sf8-g6xh8 6.Qd1-b2xc1 b7-g2xf1=S+ 7.Ke1-g2xf1 e5-b2xc1=S 8.c3 Rb8 9.Ra1-c2xc1

D. Kostas Prentos, Phénix 2020



1.e4 a6 2.Bxa6(-wBa6, bPf1=S) Sxd2(-bSd2, wPf1) 3.Qxd7(-wQd7, bPd1=S) Sxb2(-bSb2, wPd1) 4.h3 Bxh3(-bBh3, wPc8=S) 5.Rxh7(-wRh7, bPh1=S) Sxf2(-bSf2, wPh1) 6.Sxe7(-wSe7, bPc8) Rxh1(-bRh1, wPh8=S) 7.Sxf7(-wSf7, bPh8) Kf7 8.Bh6 Qe8 9.Sd2 Qxe4(-bQe4, wPe8=S) 10.Sxg7(-wSg7, bPe8) Bg7 11.Rc1 Ba1 12.c3 Bxc3(-bBc3, wPa1) 13.Rxc7(wRc7, bPc1=S) Sxa2(-bSa2, wPc1)

(9+8) PG 13.0 Kamikaze Rex Inclusive PWC

E. Nicolas Dupont, 1st Prize Quartz TT 13, 2019-20



(16 + 16) PG 22.0 Leffie Back Home

1.d4 Sf6 2.Bh6 g5 3.e4 Rg8 4.Bg7 a5 5.Qd3 h5 6.h4 Sh7 7.Bé5 Bh6 8.Bg7 Sf8 9.Be5 Rg6 10.Bf4 Bg7 11.Bc1 Bh8 12.f4 Rg8 13.Qe3 Sc6 14.Ba6 b5 15.g4 Rb8 16.Bb7 Sa7 17.Bd5 Ba6 18.Bb7 Sc8 19.Bd5 Rb6 20.Bc4 Bb7 21.Bf1 Ba8 22.c4 Rb8

F. Nicolas Dupont, feenschach 2019 Dedicated to V. Crişan



(16 + 16) PG 16.0 Vertical Mirror Circe

1.e3 Sc6 2.Bb5 Sa5 3.Ba4 b5 4.b3 Ba6 5.Bb2 bxa4(Bc1) 6.Bxg7(b7) Bxg7(Bf1) 7.Ba3 Kf8 8.Bd6 c5 9.Bb5 exd6(Bf1) 10.Bc6 dxc6(Bc1) 11.Bb5 Sc4 12.Ba3 cxb5(Bc1) 13.Bb4 cxb4(Bf1) 14.Ba3 Bb2 15.Bd3 bxa3(Bf1) 16.Bg6 fxg6(Bc1) G. Nicolas Dupont, 3rd – 4th Honourable Mention 2nd Murfatlar Tournament Vilnius 2019 Dedicated to Bernd Gräfrath



1.d4 d5 2.g4 Sd7 3.g5 Sf6 4.gxf6 Kd7 5.fxe7 Kd6 6.e8=Q Qxe8 7.f3 Qxe2+ 8.Sxe2 g5 9.Sf4 gxf4 10.Bc4 dxc4 11.c3 b5 12.b4 cxb3 e.p. 13.0-0

H. Michel Caillaud & Paul Răican, The Problemist 2020



(16 + 16) PG 8.5 Anti Take & Make

I. Adrian Storişteanu, Springaren 2018 (v 2021)



Nightriders a1, c1 B: Kd5 \rightarrow d6

1.Sf3 Sc6 2.Se5 Sxe5(Sc6) 3.b4 Sd3+ 4.cxd3(Sc5) e6 5.bxc5(Se4) Se7 6.dxe4(Sd6) Sxc6(Sb8) 7.cxd6(Sf5) Sxb8(Sa6) 8.exf5(Se7) bxa6(Sb4) 9.dxe7(Sg8)

A: -1.Bf4xNc1(+bNc1, -wBc1) Ne3-a1 -2.Rh1xNc1(+bNc1, Ke4xRd5(+wRh1, -wRc1) -wQh1) & 1.Kxf4(+wBc1, -bNc1) Qg2= B: -1.Qc4xNc1(+bNc1, -wQc1) Nd3-c1 -2.Qd1xNa1(+bNa1, -wQa1) Ne3xQa1(+wQd1, -wQd1) & 1.Nxd1(+wQd1, -sNd1) Qg7=

J. Andreas Thoma, ChessProblems.ca 2016



-1.Ke1xPd2(Ke1)! d3-d2+ -2.Ke1xRd1(Ke1) Rd2-d1+ -3.Kf2xBg2(Ke1) Rd1-d2+ -4.Kf1-f2 Ba8-g2+ -5.Ke1-f1 Rd2-d1+ -6.Kd7xSe8(Ke1) S~-f8+ -7.Kc6-d7 & 1.Kb5#

K. Klaus Wenda, Quartz 2019



(5+4)-6 & #1 Proca Retractor AntiCirce Magic Wandering Unit type II Rc1

L. Vlaicu Crişan & Paul Răican, 3rd Prize Springaren Winter Tournament 2010



(10+8)-10 & S#1 Proca Retractor Circe Assassin

- -1.Qa2xBb1(Qd1) bRc2-c1=wR+ (1st occurrence)
- -2.wRb2-c2=bR bRc2-b2=wR+ (2nd occurrence)
- -3.wRc1-c2=bR bPc2-c1=wR+ (forced)
- -4.Kh6-h7 Kd8-e7+
- -5.wPb5xPc5 ep. (bPc2) c7-c5
- -6.Qe6-a2 & 1.Sf7#

- -1.Bc5xQg1(Qd8, -bBd8)! Qh2-g1+
- -2.Sd7xPb6(b7) b7-b6+ (1st occurrence)
- -3.Bb6-c5 Be7-d8+
- -4.Bc5-b6 Bd8-e7+ (2nd occurrence)
- -5.Bb6-c5 Be7-d8+
- -6.Bc5-b6 Rd6xd2(d2, -bRd2)+ (forced)
- -7.Bb4-c5 a6-a5+
- -8.Bc3xPb4(b7, -bSb7) b5-b4+
- -9.Bd4-c3 Bd5xg2(g2, -bBg2)+
- -10.Be3-d4 & 1.Bg5+ Kg6#

M. Louis Goldsmith, The Standard Union 1892



-1.e5xd5 ep. & 1.c8=Q(B)#

Annex 2, October 2022

In the initial award I decided not to award a prize to the problem 1223.2 from the "Other Retro Section", due to the existence of a predecessor. However, the aforementioned problem is actually the correction of the original problem <u>1223</u> published in 4th June 2017, published two years before the predecessor.

The correction <u>1223.2</u> was published in 24th June 2019, two years after the publication of the original setting. In accordance with the first paragraph of the article 23 from the Codex, *if a published chess composition is found to be unsound, it loses its priority date unless a correction is published within three years after the publication of the unsoundness*. That also means <u>1223.2</u> can't be penalized for this reason and my decision to downgrade it to the 1st Honourable Mention must be reconsidered.

To be fair, based on the assessment criteria used in the award, this problem must actually be placed on the top of the section. However, lowering the initial place of the higher ranked problems after the award is published can be perceived as an injustice.

Therefore, my decisions are the following:

1. To remove the following sentences regarding the assessment of problem <u>1223.2</u> from the award: "Why not a well-deserved prize for this wonderful problem, then? The only reason for downgrading the problem is the existence of a predecessor showing similar motives (see Annex K), without actually reaching the aesthetic heights of the present composition."

2. To grant the problem <u>1223.2</u> the distinction **Special Prize** "*Errare humanum est*". The naming of this distinction is inspired by the Romanian International Grand Master Emilian Dobrescu, who published in Buletin Problemistic 68/1997 the following words in "*I suggest instituting the Special Prize* "*Errare humanum est*" [...]. *I am sure you will agree with this initiative which might be followed by other judges.*"

3. All the other Honourable Mentions climb up one place: <u>1420</u> becomes the 1^{st} Honourable Mention and <u>1548</u> becomes the 2^{nd} Honourable Mention.