

# JULIA'S FAIRIES WEBSITE 10 YEARS JUBILEE TOURNAMENT

AWARD BY KJELL WIDLERT

## **LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Name	No.
Achim Schöneberg	40, 41, 42
Anatoly Skripnik	7
Andreas Thoma	20, 21, 22
Anirudh Daga	47, 48, 49
Dan-Constantin Gurgui	25, 26
Emanuel Navon	11*
Eugene Fomichev	8, 37
Georgy Evseev	43
Hans Uitenbroek	16, 17
Hiroaki Maeshima	3
Hironori Oikawa	6
Hubert Gockel	2
Igor Kochulov	5
Ilija Serafimović	53
Jacques Dupin	51*, 56
James Quah	15
János Mikitovics	57
Juraj Lörinc	14, 23
K. Seetharaman	24*, 29*, 32*, 33*
Marjan Kovačević	12, 13
Maryan Kerhuel	51*, 52
Menachem Witztum	11*, 18*, 55*
Michel Caillaud	45
N. Shankar Ram	29*, 35*, 46
N. Velmurugan	29*, 32*, 33*
Ognian Dimitrov	50
Paz Einat	18*
Petko Petkov	54
R. Phani Bhushan	34, 35*, 36
Ricardo de Mattos Vieira	27, 28, 55*
S. Manikumar	30, 31, 32*, 33*, 35*
S.K. Balasubramanian	24*
Semion Shifrin	4
Srećko Radović	9, 10, 19
Stephan Dietrich	1
Sven Trommler	38, 39, 58
Vlaicu Crișan	44, 59

## Julia's Fairies - 10 JT | Award by Kjell Widlert

#### INTRODUCTION

In just 10 years, Julia's Fairies has established itself as a central point in our fairy chess world. Many of the best fairies are published here, commented on by other fairy enthusiasts in the friendly atmosphere that is so typical of the site. Of course this anniversary must be celebrated with a composing tournament!

I was very happy to be asked to judge this event, and to discuss the rules of the event with Julia. We wanted the tourney to have a broad appeal and wanted a varied award without many similar problems. So we divided the tourney in three sections for different types of problems (direct mates, helpmates, helpselfmates). We also chose to limit the number of pieces in each problem to 15, changed from the original 12 (the complex blockbusters will have their chance in other tourneys), and to allow several of the most popular fairy pieces and conditions on the site (not the most esoteric ones – they too have their chances in other tourneys). We also wanted to have many different composers represented in the award, reflecting the situation on the JF site, so we limited the number of entries of each composer to three (with joints between two composers counting as one half for each of them, etc).

It turned out to be a good idea to raise the number of pieces allowed to 15 some time into the tourney. Many of the best problems use 15 pieces, among them **all** the awarded problems in the direct-mate section! Our idea was to have the problems in the award feel reasonably light, and I feel that wish has been fulfilled. Of course I wonder which ambitious ideas turned out to need 16 or more pieces on the board and therefore couldn't be entered here – I believe we shall soon see those on Julia's Fairies or in other places.

One final decision was to give composers a starting-point by stipulating a theme, but a very free one so as to avoid repetition in the award – and to give us a chance to study how a simple motif can be varied in different forms of fairy chess. The chosen theme was **unpin**, which is an easy concept in orthodox chess but which is not clearly defined in fairy chess with its unlimited possibilities. For this tourney, we stated that a piece is pinned if a random move by it will expose its own K to check, and an unpin is any move that eliminates this situation (except when the pinned piece is captured and removed from the board – it is unreasonable to call that piece unpinned). So other ways of releasing a piece – such as a paralysing piece moving away from observation of the piece – do not count as unpin here.

Theoretically, you can distinguish between three forms of unpin (the announcement only mentioned two, but I gladly accepted the suggestion in a comment), all of course allowed in this tourney:

- the pinning side releases the pin (unpin)

- the pinned side releases the pin (self-unpin)

- the pinned piece itself releases the pin (auto-unpin).

As this is a thematic tourney, I have based the judgement on how well the unpin motif is used in each problem, combined with normal criteria such as economy, complexity, originality etc. I have not simply counted the number of unpins (I am no computer). I can see several forms of using the motif, in order of increasing interest:

– a piece is unpinned, but this unpin plays no role whatsoever in the play. That is only formally an unpin, and such problems have better chances in another tourney (for some entries, this is the reason I have counted fewer unpins than the composer probably intended, and the reason why they are classified lower than the composer probably hoped for)

- a piece is unpinned, and then moves either actually or virtually (such as by avoiding a dual or – in one interesting example in the award – by forcing a re-pin): this might be called the "normal form"

- same as above, plus: if the unpin is a positive effect rather than a negative sideeffect, then the unpin is deliberately played (meaning that without the need to unpin, other moves would have been possible; it is not so that the unpinning move has to be played for other reasons but then by good luck turns out to bring the necessary unpin too). Yes, I am talking about the concept of "purity of aim" here; this might be called "strategic unpin".

In any case, I want the required unpin to be a central motif in the problems. Entries where the unpin plays a minor part in the composition have been placed lower. Something similar can be said about the use of fairy forms in the problems. I would like each fairy element to have a real function, preferably as a part of the problem's idea and not just as a technical help in construction. I have not awarded problems where some fairy element (usually a fairy piece type) can easily be avoided. And now the numbers: I received 10 direct mates in 2-4 moves + 32 helpmates in 2-4 moves + 17 help-selfmates in 3-4 moves, grand total 59 problems, all in anonymous form. Thanks to Julia for making my job easier by delivering an Olive database with all entries and solutions, and to Dmitri Turevski for Py2Web allowing me to study most entries without pulling out my chessboard.

So now the question is, was the tourney successful? YES!! As I was hoping for, there is a great variety of interpretations of the unpin motif, making the task of studying the entries most enjoyable. There wasn't just great variety, there was great quality too. Three prizes in each section were promised, and I had no problems finding at least three deserving prize-winners in each of them. The three winners are great problems, which I expect to find (together with a number of the others) in a forthcoming FIDE-Album. Almost all entries were interesting and more or less original, so I have decided to show a large number of them in the award. Although the variety was great, as I said, I must note the strange coincidence that two different composers (as Julia told me) hit on the same theme and the same matrix. Both versions appear in the award, but in a few other cases where I assume the same composer has entered two different versions of the same idea, I have chosen the best one (to my taste) for the award. This tourney doesn't mean that the unpin motif is now worked to death: I believe much more is possible with neutrals or Chinese pieces, for example.

Finally, a note on a sad subject: I decided to allow all entries, regardless of nationality of the composer, despite the dramatic deterioration in the world situation that took place a couple of weeks after the deadline of the tourney.

## **SECTION A** (#2-4)

As expected, this was the smallest section with only 10 entries, but the quality of the entries makes up for the low number. There was no more-mover centering on an unpin motif; this is a field for future exploration.

The problems that didn't make it into the award are these:

**No 21 (Kf5-Kd5)** This shows a direct unpin of a bB, reminiscent of no 20 in the award, but has higher ambitions: the unpinned B plays four moves (a B star!) leading to three Circe-rebirth-motivated mates. But the fairly simple idea cannot excuse the taking of a flight for the bK in the key.

No 26 (Kd2-Kf3) The play has no special interest, and the key takes a flight.

### 1st Prize: no 13 - Marjan Kovačević

It looks as though the wQ can mate immediately in several ways, but Masand stops that: 1.Qe3+? turns Pf2 (and others) black, so the Q isn't guarded and can be captured by the bK. Similarly, 1.Qd4+? turns Pc3 (and others) black so 1...Kxd4 may follow.



line to g6. But all four possible bQ moves puts it within reach of the wQ in one of its three thematic moves, allowing a white auto-unpin by re-colouring of the pinner, where the recoloured bQ also guards the square that made the immediate white check unsuccessful. (I count this as three thematic variations as there are only three different thematic mates: 1...Qd6 and Qf6 lead to the same conclusion.) That these highly specific variations could be fitted with a self-pinning key is nothing but a miracle. That they could be combined with white Q and R promotions on d8, played by the wP of the key, makes it more miraculous still. And there's even a second mate by a Pelle move in the by-variation 1...Rxe7!

I don't mind that there's no thematic variation ending in Qb1# (even though it would have been wonderful to have it, of course). I would rather say it is an advantage that the cook-try 1.Qb1+? is avoided by a Masand-specific effect instead of by some more orthodox device.

In summary, this is a spectacular two-mover, centering around very specific autounpins prepared by anti-Bristols.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Prize: no 23 - Juraj Lörinc

The key sets up both a zugzwang position and a threat – by which I mean that there is no black move leading to the threat. Three of Black's moves are unpins of NAa5 (similar to orthodox unpins, not very fairy specific as in the 1st Prize – but that was not required in the tourney). The main point is in the triple avoidance in these variations: the unpinned NAa5 has three possible attacks, but each of these three black moves rules out three of these four continuations by a mixture of effects. To be exact,



no clear unity, but in the fact that they all work quite naturally without extra force on the board. And in addition, there is the by-variation 1...LEa3, defending the threat by replacing zugzwang with a switchback (2.NAc5? LEa4!), but allowing 2.NAe2 by loss of access to e8.

To quote the composer, it is a small miracle this this works within the limit of 15 pieces. The price for this result is the technical Nb3 (guarding h6 and serving as a hurdle), its properties unused in the play. That is a price I am easily willing to pay.

#### 3rd Prize: no 46 – N. Shankar Ram

Reciprocal change caused by an interchange in files guarded by the row-7-R and the row-8-R, which interchanges the losses of guard due to Madrasi paralysis. This motif in itself is not new, it has been shown several times and it has even been doubled with two thematic bR's: see diagram. But this setting has two clear advantages. One is that the dual avoidance separating the two mates in try and solution shows a Madrasi form of the complex Java theme: in orthodox, Black cuts one white guarding line towards a bK flight so that the mate may not cut another, here in Madrasi, the black interference is replaced by paralysis of a guarding piece. The other is that the defences show



Madrasi unpins by self-paralysis of Black's pinner. This, together with the elegant matrix based on many white lines, makes the problem quite sufficiently original and also prize-worthy.

```
1.Rf7? [2.Bf5#]
1...Rb8 2.Sd2# A (Sc5+ ? Kd4 !)
1...Rb7 2.Sc5# B (Sd2+ ? Kf4 !)
1...Bb7! (2.Bf5+ Bc8!)
```

```
1.Rf8! [2.Bf5#]
1...Rb8 2.Sc5# (Sd2+ ? Kf4 !) B
1...Rb7 2.Sd2# (Sc5+ ? Kd4 !) A
```

I actually like this problem more than the fairly repetitive forerunner!

(Did I hear someone complain about the three white rooks and three white bishops? I don't mind them at all. This is fairy chess, and in this tourney we allow many fairy pieces on the board, so why not three rooks? To me, the only requirement is that the pieces are used economically, and that is obviously the case here.)



## 1st Honourable Mention: no 12 - Marjan Kovačević

Three self-unpins by interference on the d file. They may look orthodox, but are in fact specifically motivated by Masand: 2.Rd7+ Sf6+[d7=w]! All three defences lead to



Masand mates: 1...Bd4 allows Bh8 to create a guard of e5; 1...Sd4 allows Sa7 to create a guard of c6 (with an Umnov mate); and 1...Rd4 allows another Umnov mate, re-pinning Sd5. This last effect is a nice twist

```
Set-play: 1...S×a7 2.Rd7[a7=w] #
1.c7 ! threat: 2.Rd7[c7=b] #
1...Bd4 2.Be5[d4=w][f4=w] #
1...Sd4 2.Sb5[d4=w][c7=b] #
1...Rd4 2.Qf4[d4=w][f5=w][g5=w] #
```

1...S×a7 2.c8=S[a7=w] #

on our stipulated theme: a black unpin is turned into a white pin! There are also two specific by-variations,

one of them (1...Sxa7) with a Masand-specific set mate, plus a key that shows an interesting Masand-motivated self-interference (1.Rd7+[a7=b]? Kxc6!). So as an extra, there is a Dombrovskis effect here: the defence Sxa7 allows Rd7# in the set, but stops it in the solution.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Honourable Mention: no 2 - Hubert Gockel

This shows four specific unpins of Rb3. Especially interesting are the first two unpins (1...Rc4, Rd5), where Black even reinforces the pin to a double-pin (by Einstein transformation) but allows an auto-unpin by the analogous Einstein-transformation of Rb3, Madrasi-paralysing Black's front pinner. One other variation (1...Rb5,Rxe5) is an auto-unpin using Einstein alone, and the last thematic variation (1...Oc4,Od5) is a



#2 8 + 7Einstein Chess Madrasi

direct unpin using Einstein.

A fine technical detail is that every move of Rc5 parries the threat, and a "random" move would allow

```
1.Sd4[=P]! (2.d \times c5[=S]#)
1...Rc4[=B] 2.Rd3[=B]#
1...Rd5[=B] 2.Rf3[=B]#
1...Rb5[=B], R×e5[=Q] 2.R×q3[=Q]# (2.S \times c6[=B]+?)
1...Qd5[=R] 2.Rc3[=B]# (2...Q×d1?? wPd4!)
1...Qc4[=R] 2.Rc3[=B]# (2...Qq4[=B]?? wPd4!)
1...Rc2[=B], Rc3[=B] 2.S×c6[=B]#
1...Q \times b3 + 2.R \times b3[=Q]#
1...a \times b4?? 1...Ra5[=B] 2.S \times c6[=B]#/R \times g3[=Q]#
```

two mates (Rxg3 and Sxc6) – but all six concrete moves allow just one of those mates. So we have some dual avoidance effects.

## 3<sup>rd</sup> Honourable Mention: no 9 - Srećko Radović

There are two changed mates (for 1...Sf6 and 1...Se3) and one transferred mate (Sxg4#), with the thematic feature that all four mates involved in the changes are Goethart unpins: White must not unpin NAg7 or PAc3 until Black has closed the lines



key takes d8 but gives b6. It is a very harmonic matrix, albeit a bit symmetric – but the play is essentially orthodox, and in fact it has been done in orthodox form a long time ago: see diagram. This form with Chinese pieces has three advantages over Mansfield's problem: there is a set mate for the K flight, and a self-block on the bK's flight not only in the solution but also in the set (producing the mate transfer), and there is no unprovided check like 1...Rc3+ 2.? in Mansfield's setting. That is enough to motivate the use of fairy pieces, but the problem has limited originality.



## 4th Honourable Mention: no 52 - Maryan Kerhuel

You may very well ask: where is the pin that will lead to an unpin here? The answer is that the wK walks into two pins in the key-move! These pins are eliminated by direct



#2 Try 8+7 Bishop Locust g5, f3, b8, f5 Bishop-Lion b6, g8 Nightrider Lion h1 Rook Locust d6 unpins (withdrawal of the pinner) in the thematic variations. The idea of the problem is not only that – which would clearly be too little – but the fact that the unpins are part of a Dombrovskis: there are two tries

1.Kf?? [2.Bf6# A] 1...RLO×b6-a6! a 1.Ke?? [2.Rc5# B] 1...BLO×c2-b1+! b 1.Kd7! 1...RLO×b6-a6 a 2.Bf6 # A 1...BLO×c2-b1 b 2.Rc5 # B where White threatens the thematic unpin mates, but Black refutes by the same moves that unpin in the solution. There is even a Sushkov motif: 1.Kf7? and 1.Ke7? should in

principle threaten both thematic mates, but 1.Kf7? excludes one threat by provision of a hurdle for the BLg8, and 1.Ke7? excludes the other threat by selfinterference of Bd8. This goes well with the fact that 1.Kd7! excludes both threats by self-pin.

This all sounds quite good, but there are some

weaknesses. Most importantly, both tries and key take the unprovided flight e6. This seems inherent in the matrix (that's how the tries set up their threats), but it is still a serious drawback. The lion pieces are also a bit weak: the B lion is only there for the dual avoidance effect, and the N lion is only there to turn 1.Ke7? LBf5xc2-b1+! into a refutation by a crude check. The bottom line is: an interesting mechanism, but the basic idea deserves a better setting.



## 1<sup>st</sup> Commendation: no 20 - Andreas Thoma

A small but neat problem where the unpins occur in the try-play: two tries with direct unpins of Be5 are refuted by captures by that bishop, stopping the intended mates by Circe rebirths. Fortunately, the

1.Rc7 / Rh7 ? 1...B×f4[+wBc1] / B×f6[+wSq1] !

1.K×a2[+bPa7] ! threat: 2.R×e5[+bBf8] # solution has another Circe motif (without unpin effects); otherwise, the problem would not have reached the award. There is an un-evenness in that 1.Rc7? threatens mate, while 1.Rh7? is

zugzwang. So it would be better to remove Pg3 (it serves no function!) and move Bg2>h3, with 1.Rc7? and 1.Rg7? both threatening mate.

## **SECTION B** (H#2-4)

Not unexpectedly, this was the largest section with 32 entries, and the quality was excellent: I could easily have given several more prizes, and the number of worthy honourable mentions is great. Another judge would have put them in a different order.

The problems that didn't make it into the award are these:

**No 4 (Kd8-Kc5)** The unpins in the mating moves are purely formal, for they don't affect the play in any way. The problem has much better chances in another tourney.

**No 6 (Kh1-Kd4)** Unpins of two white pieces in each solution, but only one of them is used. wSh4 has no active function in one solution (it might be replaced with a bP in that solution. **No 30 (Kh7-Ke4)** Two chained unpins in each solution, but the

second solution is an almost complete reflection of the first. **No 32 (Kg3-Ka8)** Uses almost the same matrix as no 33, and both settings have their advantages. I placed the version that I preferred.

**No 37 (Kg7-Kd4)** Unthematic for this tourney: there is no pin involving avoided self-check, there just Madrasi un-paralysing of two white pieces.

**No 40 (Kg8-Kf5)** and **no 41 (Kg3-Ke4)** These two do not add anything special to orthodox settings of multiple Gamage mates, such as Kg4-Kd4 below.



#### 1st Prize: no 45 - Michel Caillaud

This is a really spectacular problem, with five AntiCirce-specifically unpinning



promotions on g8, naturally combined with five different moves by the unpinned Re5 but also with five self-blocks on f2. There are mixed reasons for the different rook moves (AntiCirce sacrifices on e6-e7-e8, vacation of d5, parrying of a check on the g file) and for the different self-blocks (opening of

```
1.Rf2 g8=R 2.Re8 R×e8[wRe8->h1] #
1.Bf2 g8=S 2.Re7 + S×e7[wSe7->g1] #
1.Qf2 g8=B 2.Re6 B×e6[wBe6->f1] #
1.f2 g8=Q 2.R×d5[bRd5->a8] Qb3 #
1.LIf2 g8=LI + 2.Rg5 LIb3 #
```

h1-h3, unblock of g1 or f1, opening of b3-g3, opening of e5-g5). The double-check in the LIb3# is obviously necessary, and the same is true for Qb3# only because of the bR rebirth on a8! It is a miracle how everything fits together, and it doesn't even need all of the 15 pieces allowed.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Prize: no 10 - Srećko Radović

Another extremely impressive problem with  $3x^2$  solutions (an extended HOTF), all with different unpins of Qd1 = 6 unpins in all. One pair has unpin by a Circe-reborn white (newly promoted) piece; the next pair has unpin by a wK move; the last pair has unpin by a Circe-reborn black (fairy) piece. All mates are Circe-specific, and the position is amazingly economical. Perfection is near, but not quite there: all mates could have been models, but in two cases the bSg2 destroys the purity of the mate by



Circe Leo d8 ; Nao c6, d7

S. Manikumar, K. Seetharaman, N. Velmurugan JF10JT - Section B - 3<sup>rd</sup> Prize



unnecessarily blocking that square. This isn't just bad construction: something must be on g2 to stop the

1.Ke4 b8B! 2.R×b8! [+wBc1] Qd5# (2.Q×b8? Qd5? R×d5!) 1.Ke3 b8S! 2.Q×b8! [+wSg1] Qd4# (2.R×b8? Qd4? Q×d4!) 1.Qe3 K×a2 [+bPa7] 2.NAce5! Qg4# (2.NAce5? Qg4? Nac×g4!) 1.Rg5 Kb2 2.NAde5! Qf3# (2.NAce5? Qf3? Nad×f3!) 1.NAe2 b8LE+ 2.Kf3 Q×e2# [+bNAe1] 1.LEc8 bc8NA [+bLEc1] 2.Kg3 Qg4#

dual 1.Rg5 Qxh1 (instead of Kb2) 2.NAe5 Qf3#. If only Rh1 could have been placed one step further to the right... I don't regard the repetition of Qg4# as a flaw, as the bK is on different squares so the mates are totally different.

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Prize: no 33 – S. Manikumar, K. Seetharaman, N. Velmurugan

A task with 7 different unpins of LIf4 by Se5, so we have 7 moves by Se5 (all except Sxd7) followed by 7 moves by LIf4. That the wLI mates twice on h8 and twice on c8 does not matter, when the ways there are so different (which could even be seen as an interesting point in itself). The unexpected mate by

```
1.Sg4 + LIh4 2.BLh6 LIh8 #

1.Sg6 + LIa4 2.Sf8 LIe8 #

1.Sf7 + LIf8 + 2.Sd8 LIc8 #

1.Sc6 + LIc1 2.NLd8 LIc8 #

1.Sc4 + LI×b4 2.BLg8 LIf8 #

1.Sd3 + LIh6 2.BLh7 LIh8 #

1.Sf3 + LIf2 2.Sd4 Ra7 #
```

the wR is more of a stroke of genius to realize the seventh moves by Se5 and LIf4, than a flaw. Entry no 32 shows the same idea in a very similar matrix, with

only 5 unpins but some interesting correction play in return. I assume the two are by the same composer and have chosen to award the most impressive of them.

## 1st Honourable Mention: no 54 - Petko Petkov

The problem uses the properties of the Chinese pieces very well, by having two white pieces pinned on the same line and two black pieces on another line. Take&Make



makes an interesting unpin play possible: In W1, one of the white thematic pieces unpins one of the black ones by "shooting off" its colleague (as in Rifle Chess, an uncommon chess variant nowadays); the

1.LEc1 B×f6-d8 + 2.N×g8-e7 + B×e7-c6 # 1.LEd2 N×c6-g8 + 2.B×d8-e7 + N×e7-d6 #

unpinned piece then in B2 unpins its unpinner by shooting of *its* colleague on row 8 – but not with a switchback to its original place (which would be a self-check), but stopping half-way back on e7. This enables the unpinned white piece to capture it, using T&M to give an anti-battery mate on row 6 (while guarding b5+b7). The B1 move is outside of the unpin play but is very neatly connected to it – it is a hideaway of the black leo, choosing a square on the same file where the anti-battery front piece will end

up, so the leo cannot parry the mate. The T&M effects in both W1 and B2 are of the types required in WCCT-10, but the unpin play couldn't occur there as fairy pieces weren't allowed. We can also note a Zilahi (or rather a pseudo-Zilahi, as the thematic piece that is captured in one solution doesn't actually mate in the other, it just performs the mating move). Another nice detail is the try 1.LEh6?, which seems to allow both solutions ... but Black saves himself with 3.LExc6(d6)!, which in itself doesn't parry the check, but T&M lets the bLE continue by moving out of the line, cancelling the check.



#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Honourable Mention: no 38 - Sven Trommler

An original treatment of the unpin motif. W1 unpins a bS by a move on the pin-line – but that is not the original feature I'm thinking of. The real point is in how this unpin is used: the bS doesn't move, but the unpin forces White to re-pin it in W2 (which is the reason for choosing that move over others that also

1...LIxa7 2.Qd1 (Qe1?) LIa1 3.Scb8 LIa5 # 1...LIxb7 2.Qe1 (Qd1?) LIh1 3.Sab8 LId5 #

unpin the other bS). So the thematic content is two unpins in each solution, one leading to a re-pin, the other leading to a move by the unpinned piece. But that isn't all: there is also a lovely dual avoidance mechanism: the bQ makes the mating moves unique (the shortest possible move across the re-pinned bS), but if the bQ makes the wrong choice in B2, there is no possible mating move at all! Very clean and elegant.

## 3rd Honourable Mention: no 28 - Ricardo de Mattos Vieira

There is a well-known orthodox mechanism that works like this: a black piece A is pinned; a white piece B unpins A by interposition on the pin-line; A self-pins by capturing a white battery front piece (so that it can't return); B gives a battery mate by leaving the pin-line. This problem shows an AntiCirce+Madrasi-specific version of



that mechanism: the original orthodox pin is replaced by an AntiCirce pin (Bb5 pins Rf1, Rb3 pins Bh1); the indirect unpin remains the same (White closes the line from the pinner to the bK); the black self-pin is replaced with a Madrasi self-paralysis (Rb1 and Bc6). But here something new and interesting happens:

1.Bg1 Bc3 2.Bc6 Be1 # 1.Bf2 Rc4 2.Rb1 Re4 # because Madrasi paralysis is mutual, the white pinner from the other solution is paralysed, unpinning

the thematic black piece from that solution, forcing the white unpinner to close a line for that piece so it can't paralyse the mating battery rear piece. In the first solution (Be1#) the last unpinned black piece (Rf1) also gets the opportunity to block the square of the first unpinned piece (h1), prevented by the initial

interference 1.Bg1. In the second solution (Re4#) almost the same happens, but with two exceptions. It isn't the last unpinned piece (Bh1) that gets the opportunity to block f1 (that is geometrically impossible), but instead a third piece (Rf7) has that possibility all the time and must be interfered with in B1 (1.Bf2). This is a pity, somewhat compensated by the try 1.Re7? leading to a later paralysis of wRe4 giving the bK flights. The second difference is more subtle: 2...Be1# is played just in order to interfere with Rf1 (otherwise, moves like 2...Ba5 would have sufficed), but 2...Re4# is necessary also in order to guard e3. So one could say that White guards e3, and then by a lucky accident finds that h1-c6 has also been closed; this is strategically not as convincing as the pure motivation in the first solution.

But despite these remarks, this setting of 2+2 unpins is complex and interesting.

## 4th Honourable Mention: no 43 - Georgy Evseev

This shows the most unexpected (to me!) unpin effect of the tourney. nRd4 and nBf5 are clearly pinned for White (for Black they are instead front pieces of a battery);



h#3 2 Sol. 1+8+3 Neutral Rook d4 Neutral Queen d3 Neutral Bishop f5 Camelrider e8, c7



1.nRd8+ and 1.nBc8+ unpin the nR or nB, simply by moving it away! These are true unpins, for White uses his new freedom to mate with that nR or nB a couple of moves later. The composer intended 2.nBd7+ and 2.nRd7+ to be similar unpins, after the K move in W1 has changed the pin-line (a camelrider is now the pinner) – but the unpin is just a formal one, as White never uses the unpinned state of the piece: he just captures it in the mate. The problem is appealing nonetheless: the Grimshaw interferences on d7 form a reciprocal Maslar, naturally with an exchange of functions between nR/nB and with orthogonal/diagonal correspondence plus a Zilahi, and W2 shows Umnov moves to the squares left in B2.

1.nBc8 + Ke1 2.nRd7 + nQd4 + 3.Ke6 nB×d7 # 1.nRd8 + Kg2 2.nBd7 + nQf5 + 3.Kd6 nR×d7 #

**5<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 14 - Juraj Lörinc** A very ambitious project, totally unlike other entries and largely successful. The intention is to have two unpins (of LIa6 and Nd1) in each of six twins, a

a) 1.LIa5+ LIa4 2.Qb5+ Nh3+ 3.Bf4 N×f4# b) 1.Nc4+ LIe2 2.Kd4+ Ka2 3.Qd5 Nb5# c) 1.Qc4+ Na7 2.LId8 LI×a8 3.Kd4 Nc6# d) 1.Nb5+ LIg6 2.Nd4+ LIc3 3.Qf5+ N×e3# e) 1.LIe4 LIg6 2.Bc5 LIg7 3.Qc4+ Nh3# f) 1.Ne5+ LIa3 2.Bb6 LIa7 3.Qb5+ Nc3#

demanding theme in itself, and have those twins show the striptease theme! But the implementation of the unpin theme has some flaws: 1.LIa5 in (a) and 1...Na7 (c) are not used as unpins, as the "unpinned" LIa6 then moves on the pin-line (the unpinning moves actually just provide hurdles for those moves); 1.Ne5+ (f) is not used as an unpin of LIa6 at all (the lion stays in place). Of course, there is no unifying strategy beside the unpin play, that would be asking too much. On the other hand, the variety of the play is

impressive and the economy is good – all twins except (b) and (d) end in models.

Hans Uitenbroek JF10JT - Section B - 6th HM



h#2.5 b) Pf4->e6 4 + 9Anti-Andernach Chess Grasshopper f3



6<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 16 - Hans Uitenbroek An intelligent way to use Anti-Andernach colour changes to show spectacular unpins by moves on the pin-line by the pinner! The mechanism works such that the bK has one flight stopping an immediate mate, so the one guard by a wG must be replaced by

a) 1...Rc5=b 2.Sc7=w Gd5=b 3.Rb5=w R×d5 # (1...R×d5+? 2.Ke6!)

b) 1...Bq7=b 2.Sh5=w Gf6=b 3.Bh8=w B×f6 #  $(1...B \times f6 + ? 2.Kf4!)$ 

two guards by a wS (!). To that end, a pinned bS must be unpinned and replaced with a bG. The unpins can only be done by a colour-changing move on the pinline, for Bh8 has nowhere else to go and any move by Rb5 on the b file is a self-check.

An original twist on the set theme: both white lions are double-pinned (=by two different black pieces), and each black move eliminates one double-pin by

> 1.ROg5 LIa4 2.Qce6 LIa3 # 1.ROc7 LIa3 2.Qhe6 LIa4 #

withdrawal and interference. The matrix works like a well-oiled machine, incredibly economical with at most one technical piece (if you regard the hurdle Pb4 - used in all white moves - as technical). This might be counted as 4+4=8 unpins in 2+2=4 unpinning moves. But the whole makes a schematic impression, especially as the mates are identical. (The two black queens are not a problem – anyone who thought to complain about those, but not about the two white lions, must think again!)

7<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 56 - Jacques Dupin

James Quah JF10JT - Section B - 8<sup>th</sup> HM



**8<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 15 - James Quah** Each B1 move unpins both Rd6 and Pd3, one directly, one indirectly. So the question is, who moves first and

> 1.Ne7 d×c4? 2.Re4 Rd5? 3.N×d5! 1.Qf2 Rd8? 2.Be4 d4? 3.Q×d4!

1.Ne7 Rd8 2.Be4 d4 # 1.Qf2 d×c4 2.Re4 Rd5 #

who mates? The question is answered by a clear dual avoidance mechanism: each B1 move guards one of the potential

mating squares. In addition, we have a self-blocking Grimshaw in B2. A very harmonious mechanism, fully justifying the use of a nightrider. I don't think the theme of reciprocal double unpin can be done in an orthodox h#2, but it has been done in h#3:



## 9th Honourable Mention: no 42 - Achim Schöneberg



A halfpin where the second white piece to move is unpinned by Black taking over the place where the first white piece once was. The play is somewhat schematic but uses the material perfectly – all pieces around the bK move in one solution, and mate comes from the corresponding direction. The front piece in

1.Bg6 LEd1 2.Bh5 LEe1 # 1.Bf6 LEd4 2.Bh4 LEe5 # 1.LEf7 LEa5 2.LEh5 + LEa4 # each mate is not only a hurdle, but is also used actively in all

solutions to prevent a black interposition on the mating line. It is a very economical aristocrat: if you accept the doubled black pinners on the h file as part of the matrix, no technical pieces at all were needed.



10<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 29 -N. Velmurugan, K. Seetharaman, N. Shankar Ram Two pinned white paos are unpinned simultaneously in each of four solutions, forming a HOTF (i.e., they are organised into two distinct pairs). There is an exchange of functions between wPA/PA in each pair, and an exchange of functions between bR/RL in the first pair. But the whole makes a rather schematic impression.

1.LEC1 PA×c1! (PA d1?) 2.RLb2 (Rb2? b2?) PAd1# 1.LEd1 PA×d1! (PA c1?) 2.Rb2 (PA b2? b2) PAc1# 1.LEf1 PAb6! (PA b5? PA a5+/a6+? repulsion) 2.LEa6+ PAa5 # (3.PAa6? blocked) 1.LEg1 PAb5! (PA b6? PA a5+/a6+? repulsion) 2.LEa7+ PAa6 # (3.PAa7? Blocked)

Theoretical question: are there two unpins in each B1 move, or only one? Clearly, the pao playing in W1 has been unpinned, but when the other pao plays in W2 it wouldn't have been pinned even if LEh1 were still there. So is the leo move in B1 really an unpin of that pao? (Similar situations can occur also with orthodox pieces, so this is not a question just for fairies.)

## 11th Honourable Mention: no 18 - Menachem Witztum & Paz Einat

I was hoping for some original interpretations of unpin in this tourney, and this is



certainly one: 2.Sd6/Sc5 are anticipatory unpins affecting the situation in the middle of a white move! For without those bS moves, 2...Sxg6 and 2...Qxd4 would be self-pins, making the intended "make" parts of the moves impossible (so 2...Sxg6 would be an illegal move, and 2...Qxd4 would force the make move Qc5 or Qxe3+... but this difference is unimportant). This central idea is introduced by two T&M moves leading a wP to promotion, not a new motif, but it is good to see T&M used throughout the solution.

1.Q×f1-f4 g×f4-f8=S 2.Sd6 S×g6-b1 # 1.Q×h1-h4 g×h4-d8=Q 2.Sc5 Q×d4-b4 # Menachem Witztum & Ricardo de Mattos Vieira JF10JT - Section B - 12<sup>th</sup> HM



h#2 b) Pb6->b4 5+10 Take&MakeChess

12<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 55 -Menachem Witztum & Ricardo de Mattos Vieira The twinning determines where the wK must go, which in turn determines which wP can mate on d4. That P, however, becomes pinned by the wK move (that the thematic pin arises dynamically in the play is a great advantage). As one black move is needed to provide T&M transport for the wK, Black must unpin the wP and open the line for Bh1 in a single move.

```
a) 1.Bg8 K×g8-b3 2.S×g2-e3 (Q×g2-?) d3-d4 #
b) 1.Se8 K×e8-c7 2.S×g2-f4 (Q×g2-?) e×f6-d4 #
```

That could be done by Qxg2, but wherever the bQ goes in the make part of the move, she guards the

mating square d4! So the solution is to play Sxg2 and let the bS unpin the wP indirectly in the make part. The dynamic pin and the try Qxg2? are the unique selling points of this setting.

## 13th Honourable Mention: no 27 - Ricardo de Mattos Vieira

This must be compared to no 28 above but is clearly independent. In this case, the related orthodox mechanism works like this: a black piece A is pinned; a white piece B unpins A by interposition on the pin-line; A moves away; B gives a battery mate



while closing a line so that A can't return (often a switchback mate). This problem shows an AntiCirce-specific version of that mechanism: the orthodox pin is replaced by an AntiCirce pin (Bc6 pins Qf1, Rf6

1.Rd8 Re4 2.Qa6 Re2 #
3.Q×c6? (Qd8?) 3.Rhf1? (Rh1 is pinned)
1.Rh8 Sf4 2.Rh6 Sh5 #
3.R×f6? (Rh8?) 3.Qh1? (Qf1 is pinned)

pins Rh1), and the switchback mates form a mixed-colour Klasinc. Luckily, that is not all: the critical hideaways by the unpinned pieces (Rh6, Qa6) don't put them completely out of play, they can still capture

their pinners to parry the mate. That is prevented by anticipatory selfblocks of their AntiCirce rebirth

squares in B1. We should also note that 2.Rh5? and 2.Qe2? are prevented ny AntiCirce effects: white captures don't work because of rebirth! Both mates use the remaining pin (2...Sh5# 3.Qh1??, 2...Re2# 3.Rf1??).

Comparing to no 28, we can see that the introduction of an extra fairy condition (Madrasi) has allowed greater complexity.

## 14th Honourable Mention: no 11 - Menachem Witztum & Emanuel Navon

A tricky case: is there an unpin in each solution, and if so, when does it take place? I am ready to agree that 1...Sxb6 (a) and Rxe5 (b) temporarily pin the other white piece, only to immediately (in the same move!) unpin it by a rebirth on f8. However,





h#3 b) +wBc8 7+8 **Circe** 

**Eugene Fomichev** JF10JT - Section B - 1<sup>st</sup> Comm.



b) Pd4->h6 ; c) Pd4->f5 Grasshopper e5, e2 Rook Hopper h5 this unpin is just formal as Re8 (a) and Bc8 (b) don't use their new freedom... until much later, when the unpinned piece has been captured by its former pinner (Rb8) and mates after rebirth. So is 3.Rxe8/Rxc8 the unpin? You can't really say that, as the white piece is

```
a) 1.Bb6 S×b6[+bBf8] 2.Q×b6[+wSg1]
Sf3 3.R×e8[+wRh1] Rc1 #
b) 1.Be5 R×e5[+bBf8] 2.Q×e5[+wRa1]
Rd1 3.R×c8[+wBf1] B×d3[+bPd7] #
```

not pinned at that moment, and nonpinned

pieces can't be unpinned. But if we go back to regarding Sxb6(Bf8)/Rxe5(Bf8) as the unpins, then we have the problem that the function on Bf8 isn't really to give Re8/Bc8 freedom, but rather to shield the wK from check when Rb8 captures. So perhaps it is the *combination* of W1 and B3 that produces the unpin?

Be that as it may, I say there really is an unpin in each solution, so the problem is thematic. And it is unusual and interesting, ending with Circe mates.

## 1<sup>st</sup> Commendation: no 8 - Eugene Fomichev

There are three pins in the diagram, and three twins, so one would expect completely cyclic play. That

a)	1.Q×e5	G×b2	2.R×c2 G×e5 #
b)	1.R×e2	RHh7	2.Rh5 RH×h5 #
c)	1.R×h5	Gg5	2.Qe5 G×e5 #

doesn't quite happen: there are two mates on the e5-h2 line and

none on the e2-h2 line. However, we do have autounpins in B1 and direct unpins in W1, forming a cyclic exchange of unpinned pieces, plus a cyclic white Zilahi. But all those unpins are just formal – the unpinned pieces don't use their new freedom.

Nonetheless, we really have thematic unpin motifs here in the virtual play: (a) 1.~? Gc3 2.Qe5 Gxe5# doesn't work as both possible tempo moves in B1 (Rxe2? Rxh5?) are harmful auto-unpins; instead, Ge2 has to do the work, giving Black a tempo Rf2xc2 (which uses a line-opening rather than the unpin), (b) Black needs a tempo, 1.Qxe5? is a harmful auto-unpin, while 1.Rxe2! is a harmless one, (c) Black again needs a tempo, 1.Rxe2? is a harmful auto-unpin, while 1.Rxh5! is a harmless one. These avoided auto-unpins make me classify the problem as thematic for this tourney, and the content is good although I keep dreaming of the full 3x3 cycle.

Ilija Serafimović JF10JT - Section  $B - 2^{nd}$  Comm. 5 A e a P Öt t **8** 1 \* R t h#2 2 Sol. 5+9 Take&MakeChess R. Phani Bhushan JF10JT - Section B – 3<sup>nd</sup> Comm. Þ Ś 兌 t 🖄 🛔 203 ١ h#2 2 Sol 4 + 8Lion e4. c2 S. Manikumar JF10JT - Section B – 4<sup>th</sup> Comm. P t t t t ŵ 1 20 👸 \$D t £0 £ (I)

h#2

2 Sol

Lion e5, c3, h2, c1

3 + 11

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Commendation: no 53 - Ilija Serafimović

The same idea as in no 18 above: an anticipatory unpin affecting the situation between the take part and the make part of a white T&M move. The unpins are made unique by the fact that Black needs not only to unpin, but also to give up a guard of the mating

1.Qh2 B×h2-c2 2.Sc7 S×b7-d6 #

1.R-a3 B×a3-a4 2.Rg4 S×e6-e5 #

square. No 18 has more intense T&M play, so I have preferred that one, but this has the advantage that the pinning piece in one solution is sacrificed for T&M transport in the other and vice versa. Also, there are model mates here.

## 3rd Commendation: no 34 – R. Phani Bhushan

This is amusing: lions have existed on the chessboard for 85 years, and helpmates for much longer – but only now do two different composers hit on (almost) exactly the same matrix with lions at exactly the same time! As this and no 31 are by different composers, I have left both in the award. They both show unpins of one white lion which in turn unpins the other one,

1.Sc4 LIg2 2.Bg3 LIh7 #

1.Sf3 LIc4 2.Bg5 LIh7 #

together with two B2 moves by the same black bishop. That both composers found that device is what makes this coincidence so striking. The difference between the two settings is that no 31 works with direct unpins by lions, while this no 34 uses orthodox R/B as pinners with indirect unpins, allowing greater economy. I find that the fairy pinners of no 31 don't add anything essential, so I prefer this more economical version.

## 4th Commendation: no 31 – S. Manikumar

See no 34 above and its commentary. This is practically the same, but with some added material to give Black's lions unique unpinning moves.

1.LIa3 LIg3 2.Bg4 LIh8 # 1.LIa2 LIC5 2.Bg6 LIh8 #



## 5<sup>th</sup> Commendation: no 47 - Anirudh Daga

Two white pieces are (double) pinned, and both are (perhaps) unpinned in the solutions. Both end in model mates, but they use quite different procedures. In the first solution (Rh1#), 2.LIb2 unpins both pieces, which the wN then uses to move, but the wR never leaves the h file so it uses a line-opening rather than an unpin. In the second solution (Rb1#), 1.LIh5+ unpins both white pieces, which the wN then uses to move, re-pinning the wR, which is then unpinned again by 2.LIe2. If something analogous had happened in the first solution, the problem would have been placed much higher. The economy is great, with six pieces and model mates.

1.Kc2 R×h3 2.LIb2 Nb4 + 3.Kb1 Rh1 # 1.LIh5 + Nf3 2.LIe2 + Rb4 3.LIc2 Rb1 #



**6<sup>th</sup> Commendation: no 36 - R. Phani Bhushan** A charming little helpmate centering around two unpins of LIc6, with anti-identical solutions. There is very neat dual avoidance: in the first solution (LIh6#), the bS must go to f3 to avoid giving a hurdle to LIh7; in the second solution, the bS must go to e4 for the subtle reason of leaving a tempo move for Bh1 (2.Bg2? doesn't work, which gives an important role to LIg1 in this solution too). We can also note that the wS serves as a hurdle for the wLI three times.

1.LIg7 Se6 2.Sf3 (Se4?) LIh6 # 1.Se4 (Sf3?) LIc8 2.Bf3 (g2?) Se8 #

## 7<sup>th</sup> Commendation: no 7 - Anatoly Skripnik

An ambitious plan: a bK star, unpinning the bG which then makes four self-blocks (this last point seems to be part of the composer's intention). Of course the unpins are not purely motivated (the main reason for the bK moves is to walk into the mating



h#2 4+9 b) Pc6->d7 ; c) Pc6->f7 d) Pc6->d4 Grasshopper c7, g7, b5, c5



net), but that isn't the real problem. The problem is that the plan isn't fully realised: c) 1.Kf6 isn't used as an unpin at all, since it is followed by Gc5-e5 on the old pin-line, and c) Ge5 and d) Ge3 are no self-blocks

a) 1.Kd6 Ge5	2.Gc7 Gd4 #
b) 1.Kd4 Ge7	2.Gc3 Ge5 #
c) 1.Kf6 Gd3	2.Ge5 Gd6 #
d) 1.Kf4 Gc3	2.Ge3 Ge5 #

for the bK as those squares are guarded by white grasshoppers (Ge5 is a square-obstruction for Pe6, and Ge3 provides a hurdle for Gc3). But although the unpin motif is not strong, the K star with four different bG moves together with lively wG play still make for a good problem.

#### 8<sup>th</sup> Commendation: no 25 -Dan-Constantin Gurgui

Unpin of Zf4 in both solutions, both featuring two colour-changing checks but otherwise with little in common. It is interesting to see the same position (apart from the bK) being used so differently. A pity that the wPc2 – which stops both the wK and the wZ from going to c2 in the first solution – destroys the model mate in the second one.

a) 1.g2 Kb2 2.g1=Q Zh7 3.Be3 Ze5 4.Bd4[g1=w][e5=b] + Qe3[d4=w][e5=w] #

b) 1.Bf8 Zd7 2.g2 Za5 3.g1=Q + Zd3[g1=w]+ 4.Ka1-a2 Qg1-g8[f8=w] #

## SECTION C (HS#2-4)

This section was in-between sections A and B in terms of numbers, with 17 entries, and it too has more than three worthy prize-winners.

The problems that didn't make it into the award are these:

**No 1 (Kh1-Kf3)** One solution is too little here, even if it has some points of interest. **No 24 (Ka1-Ka8)** There is no real unpin here: formally, the W2 moves unpin LIa7+Pa6, but their freedom is never used in any way.

**No 44 (Ka8-Kc6)** The play is essentially orthodox, and in fact the one fairy piece (NAa5) can simply be replaced with a wSg6 plus a wPa5. To save one pawn is not enough justification for introducing a fairy piece.

**No 48 (Ka1-Ka8)** There is no real unpin here. The unpinned pieces move on the former pinline, so they don't use their new freedom.

**No 50** (**Kb1-Kd6**) The play is orthodox: VAa8 + PAh5 + Pd7 can be replaced with a wSf6. And in fact, that has already been done: that position is by Petko Petkov, 1 HM Pat a Mat 2011 (reflected here).

**No 57 (Ke1-Kh6)** The problem uses fairy pieces from three different families, when at most two families were allowed in the tourney. So the problem cannot compete here.



## 1st Prize: no 17 - Hans Uitenbroek

A chain of three unpins in each solution, with great harmony and perfect analogy. B1 unpins the bQd5 directly; this bQ unpins the wR or wB indirectly; this wR/wB unpins its colleague indirectly on the other rose line from g5 (forming a RO/Q battery); finally the colleague forces the battery to fire and mate by a bQ switchback to d5. Beside the obvious exchange of functions between wR/wB there is also an exchange between bR/bB. And Pg2 plays in both solutions. In short, a perfect hs# and a clear winner.

a) 1...Ke6 2.g4 Qf3 3.Rd8 Be5 4.Bd5 + Q×d5 # b) 1...Ke5 2.g3 Qd8 3.Bf3 Re6 4.Rd5 + Q×d5 #

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Prize: no 39 - Sven Trommler

There is only one unpin in each solution, but the number of unpins is not decisive for me and this one is highly AntiCirce-specific and thematic. The wQ is specifically pinned by Sc2; that the purpose of W1 is just to unpin the wQb8 is made perfectly clear when the wK returns two moves later: the K would have preferred to stay put at a1 if only that were possible! After the unpin, an interesting series of events unfolds: the wK has walked into a specific battery with Ba7 or Rb7 as the rear piece and a bP as the front piece; in W2, the wQ captures the piece that is not serving as a battery rear



piece, in order to evacuate that square so a bP guard will be effective in the mate (and in order to get to d1); in B2, Black fires the battery while occupying b8 so a1 becomes available for the wK again; the switchback to a1 forms a new black battery with Sc2

1.Kb2 Rg7 2.Q×a7[wQa7->d1] Rb8 + 3.Ka1 Kf8 4.Qd8 + R×d8[bRd8->h8] #

1.Ka2 Rg8 2.Q×b7[wQb7->d1] Bb8 + 3.Ka1 Re8 4.Qd6 + B×d6[bBd6->f8] #

as the rear piece and bR/Bb8 as the front piece; W4 forces that battery to fire and mate. The fact that B3 isn't analogous in the two solutions is without importance - it is the thematic sequence that

motivates a high distinction. Note that all pieces are used in both solutions, there is no cook-stopper on the board!

## 3<sup>rd</sup> Prize: no 59 - Vlaicu Crișan

One thematic unpin in each solution, plus an incidental unpin in the first move of part b). But that thematic unpin is very Masand specific: Black in zugzwang has just one



Masand

move, a self-unpin of the bS by a check which recolours the pinning wQ – which produces a doublecheck mate of the wK. The end result is two mirrored echo-mates, shown in miniature form. And that's not

```
a) 1...Ka3 2.Qe7[e1=b][c7=w] + Ka4
3.Qe8[e1=w] + Sb5 4.Rg3 Sd6[e8=b] #
```

b) 1...Kb3 2.Qb7[g2=b][c7=w] + Ka3 3.Qa8[g2=w] + Sa4 4.Rb2 Sb6[a8=b] #

all: the wQ hesitates on the way to e8/a8, primarily to recolour c7, and this is made possible by clever play of the bK.

The fact that the bK is in check in the diagram is just a small blemish in such a problem where Black has few moves available anyway.

## 1st Honourable Mention: no 5 - Igor Kochulov

We see one thematic unpin in each solution, and that unpin is thoroughly prepared in the previous play: White creates an anti-battery check; the bNA parries by interference and thereby pins itself; White moves the hurdle to another anti-battery line, unpinning the bNA and creating a double-check; Black can only parry this by moving his NA from the old anti-battery line to the new one – mating over a hurdle that Black prepared in his first two moves. The construction of the anti-batteries is not completely analogous: in a), W2 puts the rear piece of anti-battery 1 in place (with the move-order determined by the need not to close d1-d7 too soon) while the rear piece



hs#3 b) -Sd4 5+4 PWC

of anti-battery 2 is already in place; in b), W2 puts the rear piece of anti-battery 2 in place while the rear piece of anti-battery 1 is already in place. Some other small weaknesses are that the bLE guards a flight for the wK in b) but not in a), and that the PAc3 is a passive hurdle in a). But on the other hand, there is a cyclic 2x3 exchange of functions between the three active white pieces (NA, PA, VA). A notable feature is that this is a Chinese aristocrat – there are no orthodox pieces at all, apart from the kings. This problem was a serious contender for a prize.

a) 1...LEd1 2.NAc8 LEd7 3.VAd6 + NAe4 4.VAf4 + NAf6 # b) 1...LEh1 2.VAb6 LEc6 3.NAf5 + NAf3 4.NAe3 + NAd4 #

**2<sup>nd</sup> Honourable Mention: no 58 - Sven Trommler** A not very complex problem which, however, fits our theme perfectly: there are two unpins in each solution, one a straight-forward direct unpin, the other a PWCspecific auto-unpin prepared by W3 (eliminating a pin created in B2). A very economical setting.

a) 1.Se2 Qf7 2.Qg6 + Q×g6[+wQf7]
3.Sg1 Q×g1[+wSg6] #
b) 1.Bb6 Qf5 2.Qg5 + Q×g5[+wQf5]
3.Bg1 Q×g1[+wBg5] #

## 3rd Honourable Mention: no 19 - Srećko Radović

From the point of view of the stipulated theme, we have one direct unpin in each solution, with the unusual property that the unpins are played once by White, once by Black. This lack of analogy (which is not necessarily a bad thing!) is compensated by the echoed mate positions, rotated by 90°, and by the cyclic exchange of functions between the three white leos together with an exchange of functions between the two black leos. In the first solution, 1...Nae6? is prevented dynamically by the later-to-appear wLEb3, a very nice detail. Unfortunately the same thing wasn't possible in the second solution, so Pg4 had to be added to rule out 2...NAf5? There are two reasons why this problem has a modest place in the award:

## $\label{eq:sector} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Srećko Radović} \\ \mbox{JF10JT - Section } C-3^{rd} \ HM \end{array}$



one is VAh7, which does nothing actively but is necessary in the first solution to force a unique move order (1.LEb8 LEb7 2.Kc2[??] LEhd5 3.LEb3 NAf8). The other reason is that the thematical unpins are not a prominent feature of the problem, but rather a technical detail: the unpinning moves would have to

1.LEb8! NAf8! 2.LEb3 LEb7+ Kc2 3.LEd5 4.LEc1+ Kd4 #

1.LEa3 Kd3! 2.LEh2 NAh6! 3.LEd2 LEg2+ 4.Kb3+ Kd4 #

be played anyway, but the need for unpinning fixes the move order. In an informal tourney this would have been without importance, but in a thematic tourney I must give extra weight to the implementation of the set theme.

By the way, there is an interesting theoretical question here: are there one or two unpins in the first solution? NAd4 and LEe4 are both pinned in the diagram and both unpinned by 1.LEb8; NAd4 moves immediately (thanks to the unpin), and LEe4 moves later – but once NAd4 has moved away, LEe4 wouldn't have been pinned anyway so its later move isn't influenced by the initial unpinning move. The composer claims just one unpin in each solution.

**R. Phani Bhushan, N. Shankar Ram, S. Manikumar** JF10JT - Section C – 4<sup>th</sup> HM



## 4<sup>th</sup> Honourable Mention: no 35 - R. Phani Bhushan, N. Shankar Ram, S. Manikumar

Indirect unpins on b7 of LIf3, forming a black Grimshaw and leading to a change of pin on the long diagonal. Perhaps you might talk about an exchange of functions between the bR/bB, even though they both do nothing (except being interfered) in one solution. The composer notes that both B1 moves open a line for the wR. I would like to add that Pd6 serves as a hurdle for both a white and a black lion in one solution, and Pd4 does the same in the other.

1.LIb8 Rb7 2.LIf4 LIf8 3.Ra3 + LI×a3 # 1.LIb6 Bb7 2.LIe3 LIc3 3.Rh8 + LI×h8 #

#### 1st Commendation: no 49 (Ka8-Kh1)

The solutions look analogous but are actually different strategically. Two lions are pinned on each thematic line (a1-h1, h8-h1). W1 captures one of them, unpinning the other one on the same line – which moves on to the other line, unpinning those two. This is where the two solutions deviate. In the second solution (LIxa1#), one of the unpinned lions then moves, leading to a zugzwang mate (formally an auto-unpin mate, but the freedom of the mating lion isn't used). In the first solution (LIxh8#), however,



the unpinning lion moves on by itself – so the unpin of the two lions on that line is never used for anything. This solution too ends with a zugzwang mate which is a formal auto-unpin. So I count only 1+2 thematic unpins. The treatment of the stipulated unpin motif is my only serious objection to the problem; a minor objection is that wLIg7 is unused in the second solution. Apart from that, it is a very appealing work with echoed mates and largely echoed play ending in zugzwang mates.

1.LI×g1 LIh3 2.LIg4 LIc8 3.LIg1 LI×h8 # 1.LI×h2 LI×b1 2.LIb2 LIa6 3.d4 LI×a1 #

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Commendation: no 22 - Andreas Thoma

This is quite a neat combination. In (a), the bS must go to d5 for the subtle reason that it must provide for 3...Sxf3-g2+! 4.Kxg2-e3,f4. In (b) we are able to lead a wR to f3 instead, making that refutation impossible. Note also that tries ending with 3.Qf4+ fail to 3...Sf3 4.Qxf3-h2! The disadvantage in this tourney is that the unpin motif isn't central to the problem, but in

a) 1.f8=Q + Sf6 2.Qa3 Sd5 3.Qf3 + S×f3-~ #

b) 1.f8=R + Sf7 2.Rg8 Sg5 3.R×g5-f3 + S×f3-~ #

both cases the unpinned bS moves (and in both cases the previous check determines which route the bS must take to d5 and g5, respectively), so the problem is certainly thematic here. – Popeye seems to indicate duals here, as Black can choose any "make" part for his mating T&M move. But those options are variations rather than duals (Black has several possible last moves, all of them mating). There may be something in the view of some judges that the solution is cleaner if Black has no choice at the end, but in this case, Black's choice is directly tied to the subtle play in part (a).

## 3rd Commendation: no 3 - Hiroaki Maeshima

a) 1.Rb5 L×b5-b6 + 2.Qd4 Rf2 3.Qf4 + R×f4 # b) 1.Rd5 L×d5-e6 + 2.Qe4 Be2 3.Qg4 + B×g4 # One thematic unpin in each solution, locust-specific in that the unpins occur behind the white K, used in the well-known dentist manner: the unpinned piece (wQ) gives a check forcing the unpinning piece to capture with a battery mate. It is a valuable feature that the thematic pins are wholly created in the play. Part a) has a non-thematic unpin of Rf5, but this is not matched in the other solution (which would have led to a higher place in the award).

#### 4th Commendation: no 51 - Jacques Dupin, Maryan Kerhuel

There are three unpins of ROg1, leading to three moves by the unpinned piece, combined with three moves by Bb7 preparing a Masand-specific pin of Pg2. That pin is not thematic for this tourney but fits in well with our unpin theme. All ends with typical Masand mates: Black must check in order to recolour a checking white piece, and thereby mates the white K. This all sounds very fine, but one desirable feature is missing: unified – and preferable Masand-specific – reasons for the moves of the RO. In (a), it has to cross f3 in order not to be able to return to g1. To go f3 itself will block that square, leaving Pg2 non-pinned in the end; d4 allows a return to g1 by the route



via e2; and b3 closes the mating line b1-b6; so only a1 remains. Luckily the disadvantage that ROa1 turns white by W3 is offset by the fact that it turns black again by B3; these colour changes don't determine why the rose goes to a1. In (b), the rose has to go to b3 (rather than e6 or g7) in order simply to guard the flight-square b7. And in (c), a switchback to g1 is prevented by a sacrifice on the square where the wR checks. But here at last we have a Masand motif: 2...ROa1 seems to also work, but the recoloured wROa1 has 4.ROxc6!

a) 1.Re2 ROa1 2.Rf2 Bf3 3.Rf1[a1=w][f3=w] + Qb1[a1=b][f1=b] # b) 1.R×e3 ROb3 2.d4 Be4 3.Re1[e4=w] + Qa5[e1=b][g5=w] # c) 1.Rc1 Bc6 2.R×c4 ROc1 3.R×c1[c6=w] + Q×c6[c1=b][g2=w] #

Stockholm, 10 April 2022 (the anniversary!)

## Kjell Widlert

Now that we celebrate together the 10 years of JF, I want to toast to all of you who contributed to its popularity. Thank you for the attractive articles, comments, suggestions ... and – on the top of all – for your generously accepted duties of JF judges!

Some awards manage to unite the qualities of different contributions: of the right comments, clever suggestions, interesting articles... When prepared on time, they add much to the excitement and motivation of composers.

This jubilee tournament was aimed to celebrate the best sides of the first JF decade. For such an ambitious goal a special judge was needed, and I was so lucky once again – I got a perfect one!

*Kjell Widlert is the soul of this jubilee tourney. He gave his time and good will to define the theme; to overcome all possible traps in interpretations of UNPIN,* 

and to make a just verdict in a very limited period of time.

More than that, with his huge experience and academic knowledge, Kjell made these three awards a valuable reading, adding so much to the contribution of the composers themselves. What he created, in coalition with composers from all around the world, is really a booklet on FAIRY UNPIN.

Thank you, Kjell, thank you, all the participants, for this anniversary gift!

Julia Vysotska, the editor of Julia's Fairies

#### **THE DEFINITIONS OF FAIRY ELEMENTS**

**Anti-Andernach**: A piece (excluding King) changes its color after any non-capturing move. After capture, the piece retains its color. Rooks on a1, h1, a8 and h8 can be used for castling, provided the usual other rules for that move are satisfied. After castling, Rooks do not change color, If White makes a non-capturing move with neutral or halfneutral piece, that piece becomes black and vice versa.

**Anti-Circe**: After a capture the capturing piece (Ks included) must immediately be removed to its game array square (necessarily vacant, else the capture is illegal). Captures on the rebirth square are allowed in Anti-Circe Calvet and not allowed in Anti-Circe Cheylan. Game array squares are determined as in Circe: R, B & S go to the square of the same colour as the capture; Ps stay on the file of capture; fairy pieces go to the promotion square of the file of capture.

**Circe**: Captured units (not Ks) reappear on their game-array squares, of the same colour in the case of pieces, on the file of capture in the case of pawns, and on the promotion square of the file of capture in the case of fairy pieces. If the rebirth square is occupied the capture is normal.

**Einstein Chess**: All units (Ks excluded) change their type when they move, according to a precise pattern. For non-capture moves: Q>R, R>B, B>S, S>P, P remains P. For capture-moves: R>Q, B>R, S>B, P>S, Qremains Q.

**Madrasi**: Units, other than Kings, are paralysed when they attack each other. Paralysed units cannot move, capture or give check, their only power being that of causing paralysis. Madrasi RI (rex inclusive): the rule applies to Kings as well, so the two Kings may stand next to each other.

**Masand**: When a piece X by its move gives direct check, all pieces of the same color which are controlled by X, and all pieces of opposite color which are attacked by X, change color (except kings). A Rook, changed color in a corner, can participate in castling.

**Take&Make Chess**: 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.

**PWC**: When a capture is made, the captured unit (except a King) is replaced on the square the capturing unit just leaves. A Pawn is immovable on its 1st rank.

**Neutral piece**: Belongs to whichever side chooses to use it. It can therefore be moved or captured by White or Black, and in Circe it is reborn according to capture. A King may not be moved onto a square controlled by a neutral piece, because of self-check.

Royal piece: Piece that executes a function of the King on the board.

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

**Rook-hopper**: Moves along Rook-lines over another unit of either color to the square immediately beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.

**Nightrider**: (1,2) Rider. Operates along straight lines with squares lying a Knight's move away from each other.

Camel: (1,3) Leaper.

Camelrider: (1,3) Rider. (Moves like a Nightrider but on Camel's lines only.)

**Lion**: Moves along Queen lines over another unit of either color to any square beyond that unit. A capture may be made on arrival, but the hurdle is not affected.

Bishop-Lion: Moves like Lion, but on Bishop-lines only.

Rook-Lion: Moves like Lion, but on Rook-lines only.

Nightrider-Lion: Moves like Lion, but on Nightrider-lines only.

**Locust**: Moves along Queen lines only by capturing an enemy unit, arriving on the square immediately beyond that unit, which must be vacant.

Bishop-Locust: Moves like Locust, but on Bishop-lines only.

Rook-Locust: Moves like Locust, but on Rook-lines only.

**Leo**: Chinese Queen. Moves as Queen, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.

**Pao**: Chinese piece operating along Rook lines: moves as Rook, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.

**Vao**: Chinese piece operating along Bishop lines: moves as Bishop, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.

**Nao**: Chinese piece operating along the lines of Nightrider: moves as Nightrider, but captures only by hopping over a hurdle to any square beyond.

**Rose**: (1,2) Octagonal Rider (extents the move of the Knight on a circular path e.g. a4-b6-d7-f6-g4-f2-d1-b2 or a4-c5-e4-f2).

Zebra: (2,3) Leaper.

#### THE DEFINITIONS OF THE THEMES MENTIONED IN THE COMMENTS

```
• Anti-Bristol (13)
```

A piece moves along the line toward another piece closing its line of action.

- **Dentist** (3) In a selfmate, Black unpins a white piece by interposition on the pin-line. The unpinned piece then checks, forcing the unpinning piece to capture, giving a battery mate.
- **Dombrovskis** (12, 52)

A thematic black defence, which was met by a thematic mate in one phase, is a defence against the same mate as a threat in another phase.

• **Gamage** (40)

Black closes the line of his pinned piece allowing White to unpin it directly on the mating move (by white pinning piece).

• Goethart (9)

Black closes the line of his pinned piece allowing White to unpin it indirectly on the mating move (it's normally a battery mate).

• **Grimshaw** (15, 35, 43)

Mutual interference of two line-pieces of the same colour with unlike motion. Most often a mutual interference between Rook and Bishop.

• Java (46)

After Black's defence White has an apparent possibility of two mates, each of which alternatively cuts one or another white line-mover which controls a square in the black King's field. Black closes one of these lines so that White cannot close another.

#### • Klasinc (27)

Switchback of the piece which previously opened the gate for a friendly or adversary line-mover.

• Maslar (43)

A white (or neutral) piece plays a critical move along the thematic line to be interfered by a black (or neutral) piece, and after subsequent arrival of the black King to the thematic line captures the interfering piece.

• Pelle move (13)

Move by a pinned piece.

• Sushkov (52)

Two first moves seem to allow the same two threats, but after one of them one threat is ruled out by some dual avoidance effect, and after the other first move, the other threat is similarly ruled out.

• Umnov (43)

A piece (other than a Pawn) plays to a square just vacated by an enemy piece, which however keeps the possibility of going back to that square with a capture.

Zilahi (8, 43, 54)
 A white piece which is captured in one phase plays the mating move in the other and vice versa.

 Provide Zilahi (54)

### • Pseudo-Zilahi (54)

A white piece which is captured in one phase plays the mating move in the other and vice versa.

(Definitions based on: Chess Problems Themes and Terms, by Kari Valtonen & Milan Velimirović)

With a gratitude to the judges of JF 2012-2022: Dirk Borst, Dmitri Turevski , Eric Huber, Franz Pachl, Hans Gruber, Juraj Brabec, Kjell Widlert, Kostas Prentos, Michal Dragoun, N Shankar Ram, Ofer Comay, Petko Petkov, Tadashi Wakashima, Thomas Brand, Vlaicu Crişan



# juliasfairies.com