Crowd sourced info from /tg/ about what worked in older editions.

The following are posts copied directly from /tg/ nostalgia threads with no alterations. They have only been organized to general rules that were enjoyed, and what faction they were specifically for.

General rules:

templates and scatter were cool and the game hasn't felt as fun without them. I could go without the "lose your entire squad to deep strike" scatter, but most of it was nice.

I miss stuff like animosity or stupid or berserk. It feels like intelligence of a unit isn't even remotely taken into account anymore. Everything is a perfectly disciplined unit that follows orders exactly, unless they see something scary. I want more units that are just thick.

4th edition 40k with 3rd edition codices (or 3rd for those who didn't get an update) was peak 40k and will never be topped.

Building the intro box around a thematic scenario involving actual objective models on the board instead of 'here's two armies go punch each other I guess' was genius and I have no idea why they never did it again.

The former, I feel that we've gone past the point where the people writing the stuff now got into Warhammer via Warhammer, rather than RPG's, and further via 'PUG/Tournament/Internet Warhammer' rather than more relaxed, less structured influences. You can't write what you don't know. Soapbox: even if they do know, it doesn't get the attention compared to "this wombo combo is so efficient"; unfortunately narrative style is not as noisy online - and perhaps at the checkout - as competitive.

Failed morale and tank shock forcing units to move involuntarily.

Cover being worth a damn.

Instant death. Game is fucking awful without it.

"LOOK OUT SIR!" chains are the funniest shit

5th edition is easily my favorite period. Perhaps with 4th ed codexes though. Modern 40k feels too much like a game and not like a cool battle

I miss 4th/5th ed the most. It was when warhammer was fun, stuff like the stompa coming out and continuing to shoot until it ran out of bullets (rolled a double).

Add to that armour facings and templates were awesome. Deep striking was dangerous but when it paid off it paid off well.

"Torrent of Fire" and the melee equivalent. If you scored more wounds than the unit had models you, as the active player, chose who rolled the first wound. I'll add in range/los sniping; you could only pull casualties from the range of the weapon so if you killed a guy with a meltagun and only the enemy sarge was within 12", only he could die. Los sniping worked similarly; only models in Los were viable casualties so using rhinos to limit a lascannon's los to just the sarge meant only he was a viable casualty.

Cities of death special terrain rules rocked. Giving everyone in a building fnp because it was a hospital felt so cool.

Punishing retreats from melee was a good rule.

Giant apocalypse-template blast zones for Titan weapons was a good rule.

Little cards for psykers warp storms like existed in 2nd edition was a good rule.

Plasma weapons overheating and melting their user was a fun rule.

Critical hits rolling on a table for special damage was a good rule.

My favorite rule was consolidating from one combat and straight into another.

PPM

I guess here are my thoughts on the subject:

Pro-premeasure
+ allows for easier pre-planning of actions so the important information such as ranges and distance to objectives can be mapped out prior to committing
+ helps avoid conflicts at the table since all information is checkable and discussable prior to it becoming an immediately issue
+ de-emphasizes secondary, "soft" skills like gauging distances and makes it easier for players to express their tactical acumen
- can slow down play to a crawl if you have someone who wants to measure everything
- can encourage analysis paralysis in player
- removes a sense of uncertainty from everything except dice rolls
- de-emphasizes secondary, "soft" skills like gauging distances

Anti-premeasure
+ Since range bands are set, discourages "footsies" where models stop exactly out of range or at optimal distances
+ adds more "error" to the game, specifically models are more likely to be mispositioned, so that the game is less mechanistic
+ encourages a "grip-it-and-rip-it", faster style of play since you can't spend 10 minutes measuring the position of every model on the board

- can create tension at the table, especially when models are just in or out of a range band or ZoC (part of this is PTSD from Warhammer fantasy on my part but I have seen it in Infinity as well)
- not everyone is a carpenter or great at gaging distance so adds a secondary skill not everyone is interested in acquiring to play the game at higher levels

I still prefer pre-measuring since the pace of play issue can be resolved with a chess clock or a gentle reminder of the time and slow players will still be slow even when they can't pre-measure. But regardless the rules of Infinity don't allow it and I am fine with that.

most people I've seen like either 3rd or 4th. It looked right, it felt right, the size of a game was usually smaller than nowadays. I miss this feeling. /yourdudes/ was encouraged more. I want my futuristic war game to feel like war, not a sport.

More on this- auras and rerolls were rare.Models acted as their codex stats suggested for the most part.

It was unusual for a character model to confer a benefit onto a unit, and when it happened it was an addition to the morale system built into the armies mechanics (Imperial Guard, Tyranids)
Or the character had to be leading that unit (chaplains and so on)

This meant that a unit of guardsmen standing beside their officer shot and fought exactly like a unit of guardsmen nowhere near their officer- they just were less likely to hold position because guard officers had a leadership aura.
Moreover, you could use vox to extend the officers leadership to every unit who had a vox on the table- because radios don't have a range of 12 inches.

In effect this gave you more freedom to place your models as you are trying to capitalise on combat stuff like LOS angles and cover and so on, rather than gamey things like buff auras.

It felt more immersive and drew you into the game- letting you use more of the table too.

This is one of the big issues about modern 40K for me: it no longer feels like "you're commanding an army in a battle, by way of a scifi action movie", it feels like fucking YuGiOh or whatever. There's no sense that what you're seeing on the table is an abstraction of "real" events, you're just clumping stuff together to get the maximum number of stacking buffs and overlapping auras so you can activate some farcical trap card doomstack ultimate ability combo where you stand there for five minutes describing the mechanics that are coming together to delete half your enemy's army in an attack.

40K obviously isn't and never was a "simulationist" wargame, but it at least felt like playing out a war movie, most armies moved and fought like...well, armies.
 TLDr: NO REROLLS< ELIMINATE AURAS

This, and it's also the problem I have with the retarded Objective and Scoring rules of modern editions. That's another thing that feels less like a war and more like a video game, you score points for standing on special circles and have this abstract OC stat, you aren't rewarded for using actual tactics and the

objectives are never tied into any kind of convincing or satisfying narrative that connects to the background of the armies.

I personally miss deep strike mishaps (scattered landings always punished me, but I liked them anyway), artillery using scatter dice and having minimum ranges, and vehicle facings. The Force Organisation Chart was limiting, but good because it forced your army to actually look like an army. Difficult and dangerous terrain was great as it made you consider your movement.

I also liked templates, but am coming around to them not being used (the micromanagement of model placement could be painful). I always argued for armour penetration, but it's turned into a grinder, where normal armour saves are hardly ever used because every weapon has at least AP-1 (again, this is a codex issue).

4th edition 1500p with a huge table, good scenary, and thematic scenarios.
Also with WD or IA great campaigns.
The more thematic you go the better the game gets. It's also cool to play games of gothic, aeronautica or KT that make small changes to 40k campaign scenarios depending of the outcome.

I would suggest to change rending to the wound roll, since it is a bit too strong as it is.
Additionally I'm not sure if allowing to consolidate in to another combat is positive for the game since it creates long boring melee balls.

4th was more like "3.5 ED" as it was mostly a cleaning up of the 3rd ED rules (but with some major nerfs to vehicle departation), so I just sort of roll it into the 3rd ed timeline. 5th edition was also very good, but power creep was pretty bad. I played Space Wolves since 3rd ed, and 5th ed our codex was very overpowered (to be fair however, Space Wolves hadn't made the top 20 in any tournament from RT to 4th edition, so it was due, but a lot of hate for SW probably came from this era).

4th Ed was 3rd, but rapid fire starts a turn early, because you can move and do it, instead of forcing your opponent to move into it.

I also liked the rule where if you deal as many wounds as a unit has models you can start forcing heavy weapons and sergeants to take a save (and see if you can pull them out early) rather than those minis being left to the end.

It gave msu a penalty while buffing big blocks of infantry who took the time and risk to get into rapid fire range. This is good because MSU is mostly all upside otherwise.

On Avs:

help me understand how anyone could like the way vehicles were damaged previous to 6'th - you could shoot a tank the entire game and unless you rolled a 6 on damage (or double 5's i think?), it would remain on the field until the end

Because in actual play that didn't tend to happen, and even when it did that was no different than any other aspect of play.

You rolled 1D6 and added it to the weapon strength. The result was compared against the target's armour: = was a glance, more was a penetrating hit. Glance gave you a 1 in 6 chance of destruction, but a pen gave you a 50% chance. And all the other results mattered too.

Sure, sometimes you just couldn't kill a damn vehicle, but that was absolutely no different than sometimes you just couldn't kill a damn model (what do you mean you made your save again?"). But with a vehicle you could "stun lock" it and immobilize it and blow up its weapons along the way, so vehicles broke down in a way models didn't. That made them weaker than models in some way.

So no one really cared because vehicles still broadly played out like regular models except for slowly breaking down if you didn't outright blow them up.

As someone else said that did not occur, unless you were shooting missile launchers at landraiders.

What happened in practice is that you needed to get into position to remove a troublesome tank. You would have a Landspeeder fly in from the flank to line up a side or rear armour shot with multimelta, or you would form overlapping fields of fire with 2 lascannons such that you can't present front armour to both of them.

Do you see how in both examples, use of terrain and positioning is crucial? That's very immersive, looking at a tank as a problem you solve with creative violence and angles rather than a health bar you need to drop to zero.

Missile launcher is the ground floor for antitank, and it glances armour 12 on a 4, pens it on a 5+. Side armour 12 is common on Russ tanks, it's lower for preds
A glancing hit has the potential to kill a vehicle, or immobilise/destroy a weapon, but in effect has a higher chance to shake (no shooting next turn) or stun(no shooting or move next turn) the vehicle.
All the permanent damage happens on 4,5,6 of the table, meaning , having just glanced a leman Russ on its side, you now have a 5 in six chance of stopping it from firing it's battlecannon next turn: Shake/Stun/weapon destroy/vehicle destroyed.

If you were shooting a transport, you have a 3 in 6 chance of preventing it from moving next turn:
Stun
Immobilise
Destroy

On a penetrating hit, 3 out of 6 results are Kill.

Sometimes the table got swingy and you managed to shake the vehicle you really wanted stunned, or immobilise a shooty tank that was already in the best position and tougher vehicles usually had some way of mitigating shake, or downgrading stunned to shaken.

But overall it was immersive and it felt like you were shooting at big machines rather than bigger infantry. Constantly engaging with angles of attack and defence made abilities like deep strike and outflank very powerful, as they could strike from a direction where the enemy was vulnerable.

>help me understand how anyone could like the way vehicles were damaged previous to 6'th

shrug Too many people had vehicle parking lots in their back lines where I played. Made it easy to infiltrate with my Space Wolf Scouts and melta bomb their ass.

Sometimes. It mainly happened with stuff like Land Raiders and Monoliths, and I think the skimmer math was fucked such that Falcons and Wave Serpents were in practice some of the toughest vehicles to take down.

I think if they were going to simplify it, simplifying it like Flames of War armor facings would have been better than giving tanks hit points.

I'll also concede that it could get clunky with lots of vehicles like Rhino Rush armies or Mech Guard. On the other, that's why I think 1000-1500 was the sweet spot.

bro, that sounds terrible
losing 500 pts of units to a SINGLE lascannon shot would feel horrible, makes the game swingy as fuck
I would probably seethe the entire evening if that happened to me

Idk, it was pretty lulzy when people would sink too many points into one thing.

My Uncle has a Dark Eldar army, he would sneak up on Land Raiders full of troops, and cover each exit while it was being destroyed, keeping all troops inside from exiting and end up being killed.

Idk, some people really just thought termies in a land raider was the way to go. I think 3rd edition through 7th, termies never once made sense to me, point cost wise.

Lascannons couldn't do it. It was ordinance exclusive - a 6 result on the ordinance Pen table.
To pen a landraiders on a 6, you needed strength 9, so this was actually reserved for weapons like the demolisher or earthshaker.

It was brutal and game changing when it happened, but again, considering the range of weapons that could do it, it happens rarely.

Deep striking in to fire heavy weapons at exposed rear armour, drop heavy flamer templates on hordes in cover, etc- claim some far flung objective that you had no hope of reaching- and having enough muscle to wreck any objectives like bunkers etc. Even having a chainfist or two to destroy an enemy landraider or similar.

Yes, that's why you used smoke launchers and the hull down rule to get cover for your 250 point tank. You couldn't just put something big down and assume it would weather an enemy shooting phase (why, it has 18 wounds!) You had to put a little thought and effort into it- screen it with a rhino, delay your charge for one turn to keep it out of line of sight, cost benefits analysis of shooting the twin lascannons rather than moving full speed.

You might even park for a turn to try kill two enemy tanks with your lascannons across the table before you advance.

If you could effectively control and destroy enemy firepower, your heavy tanks could be impossible to destroy. If you failed to do that then you were going to have a bad time.

you make vehicle combat sound SO much better than 10ED, which is literally just vehicles are invulnerable to everything not anti tank. It may sound degenerate but my current sisters of battle army is 5 rhinos and a knight. (i dont feel bad about it because its an inquisition themed meme list) if I table enough of the anti tank I just win. If they bring enough I lose

I play 4th from time to time and it's a lot faster than what I remember. It's easy to play a 1500p game in 2h.

4'th was fully compatible with 3'rd (was basically 3.75), and added a ton of customization for each army. It cleaned up some rules contradictions, simplified combat and is considered a definite improvement over 3.
Universal special rules are expanded, tanks are made more mobile (they can now move AND shoot). Transport rules are messy and lead to much debate.
On average, people's favorite edition, but that might be just nostalgia.

>Most FLGSes would operate on a 'you can stray outside the codex limits on faction wargear/vehicles provided you can bullshit a good enough fluff reason' policy for noncompetitive play, encouraging you to think about your army's fluff.

Chaos:

Random chaos rewards/mutations from RT and the fun times spent trying to model them

8e Hellforged Chaos Tanks that got better in melee as they took damage. It was just fun
I liked when the Hellforged Rapier Battery could go berserk and start moving on its on in an attempt to eat people (which was just a wholesale ripoff of the Hellcannon from Fantasy, but it's a damn fun thing to rip off)

Chaos 3.5 was the tits. The wargear options where sheer insanity. I once gave a normal ass champion the Kai Gun and had him stumble out of a rhino. Damn good times.
Unless you where deathguard which weren't allowed to run heavy weapons.

Chaos being Chaos and having near full access to a lengthy armory (but still having a gear budget cap) really helped you do what you wanted to do, while still having some (sometimes painfully bad) restrictions like marks of nurgle being unable to take heavy weapons and thus lacking in anti armor or for no sorcery with marks of khorne.

Though 4th edition was kind of funny since they opened up granting marks meaning you could give raptors the mark of khorne or obliterators the mark of nurgle. Shit got wild. At the massive expense of wargear/ customization.

Chaos 3.5 was the most "your dudes" open canvas I have ever seen in a codex/ tome and I loved it.

Craftworld/Dark eldar:

Harlequins also miss their looting, and dark eldar miss their harlequins. Truly, xenos life is suffering. Have a named Primaris Lieutenant.

 eldar had cool rules such as wraith sight and wraithlords were also untouchable to str 4 or less.

Also not sure how to nerf a bit the falcon survivability, the eldar codex is probably the strongest.

Another point is that 40k was a slower game than it is today. Eldar could run instead of shooting but most other armies could not.

Imperial Guard:

The Imperial Guard's old platoon system tickled my autism in the best way, made it feel like you were actually building an army instead of a collection of units.

3rd ed Imperial Guard - the rule where if a vehicle was destroyed, you could place the laspistol armed crew outside the hulk and they would continue to fight on an a mini squad.

Creed. "I have a Warlord Titan hiding behind this lampost. Surprise!"

Guard were proper platoons,

I also liked the rule where if you deal as many wounds as a unit has models you can start forcing heavy weapons and sergeants to take a save (and see if you can pull them out early) rather than those minis being left to the end.

It gave msu a penalty while buffing big blocks of infantry who took the time and risk to get into rapid fire range. This is good because MSU is mostly all upside otherwise.

Inquisition

Choosing an Inquisitor to summon a squad of Stormtroopers for 300 requisition was a good rule.

Orks:

For example, I think every ork player misses the proper looted vehicle rules from 3rd ed and before, allowing you to use any vehicle from another faction with a reduced BS score.

The game has long moved beyond the scale where the old roleplay-esque stuff would be feasible but I miss all the shit from 'Ere We Go and Freebooterz - what was it, 6 different Madboyz charts, Dok's jobs, the ability to roll up some kustomized shoota that would either vaporise a land raider or kill the firer with no in-between (Boss Hedkikka, your brief but eventful career will never be forgotten), all of it. One thing from there that sort of survived was the concept of an internal 'faction' system - if you were Goffs you got more Nobz, Evil Sunz, Meks, and so on, which is a form of skew and differentiation I wish was used more than simply granting a stat boost, reroll or strong (and inevitably rankable) ability that is the current fashion.

The clan rules for 3rd edition - Goffs using Skar Boys as troop choices, Badmoons having more Flashgitz, Bloodaxes able to field just Kommandos, Snakebites able to field primitive boys armed with bows, spears and other WHFB figures. It was fun and made clans different apart from being just different colours. Then 5th dropped and killled it all.

I miss 4th/5th ed the most. It was when warhammer was fun, stuff like the stompa coming out and continuing to shoot until it ran out of bullets (rolled a double).

Antagonism, where one orc would run over and punch another if he was doing better than him was a flavorful rule.

>Lootas can actually use weapons/wargear from other factions rather than effective-but-generic Deffguns
>Looted Vehicles can actually be from other factions rather than just generic shitty looted wagons

Was it shit for tournament play/optimisation/'the meta'? Sure. Was it pure sovlful kino? Absolutely.

Space Marines:

Terminators were actually good.

Terminators were great at what they do, and what they do is wreck one target and stick around to bother another.

Terminadors with 2 rending Ass cannons and tank hunters could deal with almost any profile in the game. Even more if you got them a librarian with fear and fury.

Melee terminators were great out of landraiders because it solved the problem deepstriking couldn't-actually getting you into combat. Once there, stuff got murdered pretty quickly. A great trick was to catch high initiative enemies like Eldar in cover- where the frag launchers would force them to fight at equal initiative.

They were less helpful against less elite opponents where more bodies and bolters would have been better, but they had some ideal matchups- expensive armoured squads without power weapons- or ones with a power weapon where you could have a character kill that guy immediately.

Something that skewed perception was that the good stuff like plasmaguns and lascannons came in metal blisters, so new marine players often had the flamer and missile launcher that came.in the plastic tactical box. This meant lots of your opponents simply wouldn't have any AP2 ranged tools to deal with your terminators unless they brought tanks, which themselves are vulnerable to terminators deepstriking and shooting rear or punching them to death

Deepstriking was limited to terminators and assault marines- who didn't have ranged weapons worth mentioning. Of these, Terminators came in the battle box.

Drop pod was an alternate deployment style, not a miniature you could buy in store (FW had one)

The old chapter creation rules from the 4th Ed book.

I liked how the 3E BAngles Codex handled Death Company
>For each of the squads listed below, roll a D6 at the start of the battle. On a 1, 2 or 3 the squad fights normally. On a 4 or 5, one model from the squad becomes a Death Company Space Marine (your choice). On a 6 one of the models in the unit joins the Death Company and you must roll again (it is possible for two or more models from the same unit to join the Death Company if you roll successive 6s). If you have insufficient models to represent every Blood Angel who joins the Death Company, any excess models are simply lost.
A nice effort to represent the Black Rage fluff in the rules, and the cost/benefit of losing models from your pre-planned list is an interesting angle; you might lose a Terminator in exchange for a Marine with a Terminator statline that now can't fail leadership checks, but then you might also lose an Attack Bike in exchange for a footslogger. Or maybe you're forced to choose a heavy weapon to give up from your Devastator Squad (rip those 35pts of plasma you're not getting back), but hey, you chose to give your Death Company jump packs, so now you've got some extra mobility which could end up being more useful in the long run depending on the other player's list
I get why they dropped it from their 'model kit & paint company first, games company second' perspective, where they want people to buy/paint the additional 'correct' models to represent the Death Company on the board, so are wary to disadvantage a player for not having enough of those specific models to hand. But obviously, in a non-GW controlled setting, there's no reason you can't just agree with the other player so long as they aren't painfully autistic at the start that, "these dudes from my Tac Squad are actually going to count as Death Company Marines." Maybe put a bit of blu-tac on their bases or something to easily mark them out for the game

P. D. If you play with or against space marines and things get boring, try swapping the points of the drop pod with the rino, since the first is way too cheap and the second is too expensive.

Tyranids:

Prime Raveners making tunnels for the tyrannids to travel around the map through was a good rule.

I was always enamoured with the Without Number rule for Tyranids. The basic idea being that a gaunt unit was part of an enormous horde and when the unit on the table was destroyed a fresh new one would immediately deploy to replace it.
Unfortunately it was very very weak and cost far too much.
>only counts once for VP, destroying replacements doesn't score
>can choose to disperse, killing the unit and triggering a respawn (some conditions needed to balance this)
>original and replacements can hold objectives as long as they are X distance or more from where they deployed (to stop the Nid player from having permanent control)
Something like that, but it'd be hard to make it properly balanced.
I really like the idea of a constantly recycling unit, and i think a lot of horde armies could use that while not being too overpowered. Cultist ambush kinda works similarly for GSC.

>only counts once for VP, destroying replacements doesn't score
>can choose to disperse, killing the unit and triggering a respawn (some conditions needed to balance this)
>original and replacements can hold objectives as long as they are X distance or more from where they deployed (to stop the Nid player from having permanent control)
Something like that, but it'd be hard to make it properly balanced.

If nids become boring, use the 3d and 5th edition characters without being cheesy. Or the codex approved monster creation rules / FW units.

Still mourning the loss of "equip it however the fuck you like" Carnifexes.

Tau:

I miss disruption pods on tau vehicles.

-No necron love posted in the threads I followed.