




“e4 e5” 2008 h#2 Informal Tourney Award  
**REVIEWED AWARD**

**Prize: 66 (S. TROMMLER & F.PACHL)** What first attracts in this problem is its elegance. The lack of captures is inherent to the author’s original idea. We can compare it with [Zivko JANEVSKI, 1<sup>st</sup> Prize Schach Aktiv 1992](#) which adds bSs self-pins, and with [C.J. FEATHER, 1<sup>st</sup> Prize StrateGems 1998](#), which does present the crossing of the critical square by both wR and wB, although with captures. As regards the aim of W1, it is not pure, since it both unpins wSd6 and interferes with bBh7/bRa4; the unity of motivations is however remarkable. The black moves offer less interest – both self-blocks, the move inversion being determined by the necessity to open a white thematic line. All in all, a very aesthetic problem that deserves its first place in the tourney.

**1<sup>st</sup> Honourable Mention: 57 (M.WITZTUM)** The bSs exchange their functions in interfering the same bBa7 and self-pinning. There is a minor inconsistency in strategy, in that only one interference is anticipatory (1.Sc5), while for instance in [C.J.FEATHER, Sinfonie Scacchistiche 1974](#) both interferences were. Besides, no twinning was used in that 1974 problem. The interference of the same line in both solutions remains original and earns this problem a mention.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Honourable Mention: 56 (V.VINOKUROV)** The double sacrifice of the same white pieces may not be exceedingly original, but the fact that they are in turn passive and active sacrifices is an attractive feature, as well as the excellent economy. Other problems have of course explored the paradoxical possibilities of white sacrifices, such as [Andrey FROLKIN, Thèmes 64 1984](#) but this work bears more resemblance to recent work by A.Pankratiev.




<p><b>Sven TROMMLER &amp; Franz PACHL</b> Prize “e4 e5” 2008</p>  <p>(6+10) H#2 b) wKe7 → b6</p> <p>a) 1. Se2 Rb4 2. Sf2 Sc4# b) 1. Sf2 Bg6 2. Se2 Sf5#</p>	<p><b>Menachem WITZTUM</b> 1<sup>st</sup> HM “e4 e5” 2008</p>  <p>(4+15) H#2 b) bPb5 → e6</p> <p>a) 1. Sb6 Qxb5 2. Ke3 Qc5# b) 1. Sc5 Qxe6 2. Kd3 Qd6#</p>	<p><b>Vadim VINOKUROV</b> 2<sup>nd</sup> HM “e4 e5” 2008</p>  <p>(6+7) H#2 b) bRd5 = bB</p> <p>a) 1. Rxc5 Bxc4 2. Kxc4 Qa4# b) 1. Bxe6 Rxe5 2. Kxe5 Qh8#</p>
---	---	--

The following commendations have a common defect: lack of interplay. This is why they were not ranked higher in the award.

**1<sup>st</sup> Commendation: 2 (V. CRIȘAN)** The two pairs of solutions (1.Bc8/1.Qe2; 1.Kc8/1.Kf1) are linked together by the white reciprocal batteries and black self-blocks. Black strategy is certainly not too deep and the twinning may seem mechanical; besides, it is a pity for the problem’s economy that the bQ plays the role of a mere bB. However, this is a very respectable piece of work and I have not found other presentations of this idea under the form of a HOTF: [Nicolae POPA, Phénix 2000](#) is a setting presenting only one pair of solutions (Bxd5 & Rxd5) with 12 units.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Commendation: 50 (V.ABROSIMOV & V.NEFYODOV)** After many hesitations, I finally included this problem in the award. There are several pros and cons. The main reproaches that can be addressed are the zero-position, the twinning that moves a thematic unit and the lack of interplay. But on the other hand, the strategic contents are extremely wealthy and the numerous changes of function within four (!) pairs of pieces (wRa5/wBa1, wRh4/wSb6, bRc3/bSc5 and bSe6/bPd6) definitely prove the authors’ ambition. The construction would certainly have deserved improvements and hopefully the authors will grant this work still deeper attention in order to find a perfect presentation of the idea.




**3<sup>rd</sup> Commendation: 21 (Á.RUSZ)** The author has obviously focused on stimulating and well-balanced strategy. The Pelle moves by the bQ and Leibovici interferences deserve attention. However in each solution one white piece is idle: either wBe5 or wRb3. They are certainly necessary for the mate, since they passively interfere bBa2 and bRh5, but each could be replaced by a wP in one solution.

Vlaicu CRIȘAN 1 <sup>st</sup> Comm. “e4 e5” 2008	V.ABROSIMOV & V.NEFYODOV 2 <sup>nd</sup> Comm. “e4 e5” 2008	Árpád RUSZ 3 <sup>rd</sup> Comm. “e4 e5” 2008
 <p>(3+10) H#2</p> <p>2.1.1.1. b) bKd8 → g2</p> <p>a) 1.Bc8 Bxd5 2.Kd7 Bc6# 1.Kc8 Rc3 2.Sd8 Bb7# b) 1.Kf1 Bb5 2.Qg2 Rd1# 1.Qe2 Rxd5 2.Kf3 Rd3#</p>	 <p>(5+13) H#2</p> <p>"Zero" position a) bPf4 → c4 b) wRh4 → h1</p> <p>a) 1.d5 Rb5 2.Sb3 Sxc4# b) 1.Sd4 Bb2 2.Rc4 Re1#</p>	 <p>(8+10) H#2</p> <p>b) Ra5→h5</p> <p>a) 1.Qxe2 Re3 2.Qc4 fxg3# b) 1.Qxf2 Bxg3 2.Qf5 e3#</p>

**4<sup>th</sup> Commendation: 48 (V.NEFYODOV)** Black active and white passive sacrifices – that is interesting, all the more so in good construction and good unity and in a setting that seems original. The half-pin on the 8th rank prevents cooks and the problem was not too easy to solve – all these are good reasons for awarding this work.

**5<sup>th</sup> Commendation: 16 (L.MAKARONEZ)** 3 model-mates with the three black pieces pinned in turn. The author's good technique allows him to improve [Sriram GANAPATHI, StrateGems 2002](#), which had only 2 solutions, but the price is 3 additional black units. Common sense would probably approve the additional mention "after S. Ganapathi".

**6<sup>th</sup> Commendation: 46 (A.ONKOU)** This work presents an impressive amount of strategy in the first black move: unpin of black and white unit as well as anticipatory interference. The change of black pin is a fairly well-known strategic theme and was the subject of an article by C. J. Feather in 'Orbit' several years ago. Choosing the simple self-block as a motivation for the 2<sup>nd</sup> black move is not the best strategic option. The twinning is not too brilliant, but the general impression is rather positive nonetheless.

Vladislav NEFYODOV 4 <sup>th</sup> Comm. "e4 e5" 2008	Leonid MAKARONEZ 5 <sup>th</sup> Comm. "e4 e5" 2008	Abdelaziz ONKOU 6 <sup>th</sup> Comm. "e4 e5" 2008
		
(5+9) H#2 b) - bBf4	(4+6) H#2 b) bRd6 → e5 c) bRd6 → e6	(6+8) H#2 b) bRe2→wPb4
a) 1.Rd7 Bxd7 2.Bxf5 Bc6# b) 1.Bd7 Rxd7 2.Rxd4 Re7#	a) 1.Bd3 Bb2 2.Bc4 Re5# b) 1.Ke6 Kg7 2.Bd5 Bh3# c) 1.Se5 Bd6 2.Sc4 Rd3#	a) 1.Be4 Rb3 2.Sb5 Bf7# b) 1.Qe4 Bc6 2.Sb3 Rc2#

My thanks to all the authors for their efforts and to Dan Gurgui for inviting me to judge this tourney, and congratulations to the winners.  
 Eric Huber  
 December 2009, Bucharest & Cluj-Napoca.

Thanks to Eric Huber for work done.  
 Dan Gurgui Suceava on December 24<sup>th</sup> 2009