## In this issue

This issue starts with the seventh part of series explaining MOV and PAD symbolism for new-strategical twomovers written by Juraj Brabec. It is dedicated to changes of functions in three phases with two black moves involved and its scope includes well known themes like Bannyj theme or Dombrovskis theme.

The second article is a selection of interesting selfmates with one common feature not related to their content. Antagonistic problems from older fairy award of Probleemblad 1996 are included in the last article.

Finally, I have an important announcement about the informal tourney, new idea for the next year. Kjell Widlert has agreed to judge the tourney Conflictio 2020.

Juraj Lörinc

## Explaining MOV \& PAD symbols (part 7)

Three-phase changes allow combination of two thematical elements also in way that two moves appearing in different phases change their function in the common third phase. Such changes are included in the calls ZF-3X-22 and there are 26 such changes (not counting reverse).
Of them, the most important 12 change are shown in the Table 17 in the form of refutations. The key new-strategical content of such themes is contained in two pairs of phases, while the third pair usually shows no change or only obscure and unintended relationships. E.g. in the table 17.2. the first and the third phases show key paradox A (taking into account
defence a) and antiparadox $B x$ (with defence b). The same kind of change is shown between the second and the third phases. The symbols are written in the order B, Bx, A, Ax, H, Hx, D, Dx. But there is only a alternation of defences and non-defences, when we compare phases one and two, actually tables 17.1, 17.5 and 17.9 show nothing at all between those phases. This fact is expressed by giving nothing after the last „"" in the PAD formula. That is why table 17.2 has the formula BxA-BxA-, while in the $Z F$-formula $Z F-3 X-22$ the symbol $X$ is replaced by number 4 - ZF-34-22.
Some of the themes have their well known names, BxA-BxA- is Azerbaijan theme (also known as Vladimirov theme), BAx-BAx- Banny theme, HxD-HxDDombrovskis theme and HDx-HDxHannelius theme.

BBx-BBx-
BxA-BxA-

| Table 17.3 |
| :--- |
|  |
| A  a |
| B |
|  |
|  |
|  |

BAx-BAx-

| Table 17.5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | a | b |
| A |  |  |
| B |  |  |
|  | A | B |

HHx-HHx-
Table 17.7

|  |  | a | b |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | I |  |
|  | B |  | $!$ |
|  |  | B | A |

HDx-HDx-
DDx-DDx-

| Table 17.9 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | a | b |
| A |  |  |  |
|  | B |  |  |
|  |  | A | B |

BBx-HHx-
BxA-HxD-


BAx-HDx-


AAx-DDx-

Table 17. Some themes of the class ZF-34-22

If we use ineffective defences (followed by variation mates) instead of refutations in the Table 17, the changes of functions are combined with changes of play (mates in twomovers). This is the most visible in themes 17.4, 17.8 and 17.12, where the content is enriched by change of two mates in three phases (so called Zagorujko).

The examples of ZF-34-22 class themes with two elements of change of move function are at diagrams 370-376. Besides the changes expressed by newstrategical symbols they have also other interesting content. In 370 it is the the change of motivation, with attack motifs of tries (unpinning) are replaced by harmful motifs of black defences in the solution.

The motivation is in the focus of 373 too, with Hannelius theme: the threats with direct attack on $f 5$ and g3 are refuted by unpinning of knight and queen, but when White selfpins the queen, the tries' threats become variation mates thanks to the unpinning of the queen, with dual avoidance.

The composition 374 became the cornerstone of the whole area of move function changes. It shows two pairs of antiparadox Hx combined with paradox $\mathbf{D}$ - Dombrovskis theme HxD-HxD.

376 adds change of two mates in three phases with one repetition (Z-32-25) to the combination of Dombrovskis and Hannelius themes.

370 - Jakov Rossomacho
3rd Prize Shakhmaty v SSSR 1981

1.Kb1? [2.Q×b5\# A]
1...Rd7!
1.Kc1? [2.Rb3\# B]
1...Bg8!
1.Bh4! [2.Be1\#]
1...Sc4 a 2.Q×b5\# A
$1 . . . \mathrm{Se} 4 \mathrm{~b}$ 2.Rb3\# B
1...B×d3+2.S×d3\#
1...R×c6+2.S×c6\#

HHx-HHx-
ZF-34-22


371 - Milan Velimirović
5th Honourable Mention
The Problemist 1978-II

1.Sg6? A [2.S6f4\#, S2f4\#]
1...Qf7! a
1.Sf5? B [2.Sf4\#]
1...Qd5! b
1.Qh7! [2.Sf4\#]
1...Qf7 a 2.Sg6\# A
1...Qd5 b 2.Sf5\# B
1...Q×h7 2.e4\#

## BxA-BxA-

ZF-34-22

|  | a | b |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $A$ |  | $!$ |
| $B$ |  |  |
|  |  | $A$ |


1.f3? A [2.d×c3,d4\#]
1...Bg5! a
1.f4? B [2.d×c3,d4\#]
1...Bg4! b
1.d3! [2.Qe2\#]
1...Bg5 a 2.f4\# B
1...Bg4 b 2.f3\# A
1...S×c5 2.Q×c3\#

BAx-BAx-
ZF-34-22

|  | a | b |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $!$ |  |
| B |  |  | $!$ |
|  |  | B | A |

373 - Jakov Rossomacho 3rd Prize L. Isaev 100 MT 1999-2000

1.Qh7? [2.Qf5\# A]
1...Rb2! b
1.Qh3? [2.Q×g3\# B]
1...Re2! a
1.Q×f3! [2.R×g5\#]
1...Re2 a 2.Qf5\# A
1...Rb2 b 2.Q×g3\# B
1...R×f3+ 2.S×f3\#
1...Sb2 2.R×e3\#

## HDx-HDx-

ZF-34-22

| $A$ | $b$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $A$ |  |
|  | $B$ | $!$ |
|  | $A$ | $B$ |


1.Bc1? [2.Sf4\# A]
1...Bd2! a
1.Sg3? [2.Rd4\# B]
1...Qe2! b
1.Se3! [2.Qc2\#]
1...Bd2 a 2.Sf4\# A
1...Qe2 b 2.Rd4\# B
1...Ke2 2.Qd1\#

HxD-HxD-
ZF-34-22

|  | a | b |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | $!$ |
|  | B |  |
|  |  | A |

375 - Andris Boitmanis
3rd Honourable Mention
Vechernij Baku 1977

1.B×d3? A [2.Bc4\#, Rg5\#]
1...S×d3 2.Q×d3\#
1...Sf4! a
1.Ra4? [2.Be4\# B]
1...c4! b
1.Qg5! [2.Qg8\#]
1...Sf4 a $2 . B \times d 3 \#$ A
$1 . . . c 4$ b 2.Be4\# B
1...Qe3 2.c4\#
1...Q×g5 2.c4\#

BxA-HxD-
ZF-34-22

|  | a | b |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $A$ |  | $!$ |  |
|  | $B$ |  | $!$ |
|  |  | $A$ | $B$ |

376 - Andrej Lobusov \& Sergej Shedej
1st Prize Shakhmaty 1976

1.Rf6? [2.Q×g5\# A]
1...Qd5 a 2.Sd3\# K
1...R×d6 b 2.Q×d6\# L
1...Qe4!
1.Sf6? [2.Qh2\# B]
1...Qd5 a $2 . Q \times d 5 \#$ M
$1 . . . R \times d 6$ b $2 . S d 3 \#$ K
1...Qe4 2.R×e4\#
1...f2!
1.Kc1! [2.Sd1\#]
1...Qd5 a 2.Qh2\# A
1...R×d6 b 2.Q×g5\# B
1...Qe4 2.R×e8\#
1...R×a4 2.S×a4\#

DDx-DDx-
ZF-34-22

|  | a | b |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | K | L |
|  | B | M | K |
|  |  | B | A |

(to be continued)
Juraj Brabec
(translation from SK to EN: Juraj Lörinc)

## Selfmates decorated with fifth prizes

377 has the black queen as a single active black piece making all 14 black moves during the solution.

377 - Sergej Bilyk
5th Prize Moscow Tourney 2010

1.Sd7! [2.Rc8+ Q×c8 3.Qa6+ Q×a6\#]
1... $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{h} 5$ 2. $\mathrm{Qa} 6+\mathrm{Qb5}+3 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{a} 3 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{\times a6} \#$
1...Qh6 2.Sd6+ Q×d6 3.Qb4+ Q×b4\#
1...Qh7 2.Rc2+ Q×c2+3.b3+Q×b3\#
1...Q×g7 2.Rc2+ Qc3 3.b×a3 Q×c2\#

There are almost three hundred orthodox $\mathrm{s} \# 3$ with bQ and no (bR, bB, bS) on the board. I would be interested in finding whether any reader has any favourite selfmate from this easily identifiable set.

378 blends two pairs of variations (including threat) with similar strategy.

1.b8=S! [2.Ba6+ Qb5 3.R×c3+S×c3\#]
1...R×c8 2.S×f4+S×f4 3.R×e3+S×e3\#
1...R×e6 2.B×e3+K×e3 3.Qd3+K×d3\#
1...a×b3 2.B×c3+K×c3 3.Qd4+K×d4\#

The threat and the first variation White causes unguard of c3/e3, so that the rook sacrifices on those squares can force mates by knight batteries.

The second and third variations are introduced by defences capturing white rooks, allowing White to force bK to squares e3/c3. These manoeuvres build the royal batteries that are fired after queen checks.

In total, wK is mated by batteries along three different lines.

379 uses familiar building of batteries on the first line by pawns promoting to knight and bishop.

1...a×b1=S 2.Qd2+S×d2\#
1...a×b1=B 2.Qd3+ B×d3\#

## 1.Qg8! zz

1...a×b1=S 2.Q×g5+ Kd4 3.Q×e5+ Ke3
4.Qc3+S×c3\#
1...a×b1=B 2.Q×b3+ Kd4 3.Qc4+ Ke3 4.Qd3+ B×d3\#
1...Kd4 2.Qc4+ Ke3 3.Qd5
3...a×b1=S 4.Qd2+S×d2\#
3...a×b1=B 4.Qd3+B×d3\#

The position is in the form of White to play - both promotions are provided for in 2 moves. White has to lose the tempo. It becomes possible in the variation $1 . . \mathrm{Kd} 4$, but if Black promotes pawn immediately, the play becomes changed, with the queen approaching sacrifice squares while checking.

In 380, the key actions happen on the bfile.

5th Prize Uralskij Problemist 25 JT 2018

1.Rd7! [2.Bb8+ e5 3.Ba7+ Rb6 4.Qb5+ Q×b5\#]
1...S×c3 2.Rc7+ Kd5 3.Qa8+ Rb7 4.Sb6+ Q×b6\#
1...B $\times \mathrm{c} 3+2 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{c} 3+\mathrm{e} 5$ 3.Qa7+ Rb6 4.Bb4+ Q×b4\#
1...Rb6 2.Bf6+ e5 3.Be7+ Rd6 4.Qb5+ Q×b5\#

White forces Black Bristols on the b-file. The rook is attracted by diagonal checks, leading to selfpins, the queen is forced to checkmate along the line by direct checks with captures. Visually strong theme with secondary theme of bishop battery playing in varying directions (SE direction missing).

Clearly, 381 is something different, with its line of pawns ready for promotions. Would you guess the types of promoted pieces?

381 - Michel Caillaud
5th Prize Zadachi i Etyudy 2010

1.c8=Q+! Kd6 2.d8=Q+ Ke5 3.e8=Q+ Kf4 4.f8=Q+ Kg3 5.g8=Q+ Kh2 6.Bb8+ Kh1 7.Qcc6+ b×c6 8.Qdd5+ c×d5 9.Qe4+ d×e4 10.Qf3+ exf3 11.Qg2+ f×g2\#

And the queens win! The promotions in the first and second moves are at the beginning used for guarding, effectively preparing the path for the bK. The promotions at e8, f8 and g8 are then motivated more purely, queens are used just for checking (first on the vertical lines and later on the long diagonal). Two queens promoted at the beginning are used in the same way. In any case, this selfmate could be interesting in the context of the 11th TT CCM. (However, there would be no section to place it anyway.)

Finally, $\mathbf{3 8 2}$ is a kind of trick from my side. It is not pure selfmate, it is not orthodox, but I wanted to include it anyway.

a) 1.c7! Ka6 2.Qd3 Kb6 3.ROd7+ Ka6 4.Kc8 Ka7 5.Qa3+ RO×a3\#
b) 1.ROh3! Ka6 2.ROf4+ Kb6 3.Ka8 Kc5 4.Qd5+ Kb6 5.ROb8 ROc7\#

The position shows very clearly the difference between selfmate and reflexmate. While reflexmate does not require forcing of the mating move (ROc7\# can be played by Black, but without reflex requirement he would have a lot of moves), White has to avoid possibility to checkmate Black (that is why the selfmate approach is impossible in b) position, as 4.c8Q\# would be forced).

By the way, the theme of the tourney were fives. How many could you count in this problem?
Juraj Lörinc

[^0]Selection from award: Probleemblad 1996 Fairies

Conflictio 6 contained the selection from old Probleemblad award. Recently I was studying another old Probleemblad issue (of November 1999) and I have found similarly interesting award there. Let's have a look at a few problems from these old days. ${ }^{1}$

a) Orthodox
b) Madrasi
a) 1.Qg5! [2.Qg1\#]
1...S×e4 a 2.Qe5\# A
1...Sc4 b 2.Qc5\# B
1...Bg4 2.Qd5\#, 1...Sf5 2.Qf6\#
b) 1.Qa5! [2.Bc3\#]
1...S×e4 a 2.Qc5\# B
1...Sc4 b 2.Qe5\# A
1...Sb5 2.Qb6\#

383 is a reciprocal change in the hybrid form. In all thematical variations, moves
of Sd6 pin Sd7 and thus potentially allow mates by wQ, namely Qe5\# and Qc5\#. Then the additional motifs are needed to specify the right plays: in the orthodox part the moving knight additionally guards squares c5 and e5, in Madrasi flights c4 and e4 appear. Differentiation of keys is surely a plus.

## 384 - Jacques Rotenberg

 \& Christian Poisson2nd Commendation Probleemblad 1996

1.Qdd2+? Qfd1!
1.Qde2+? Qdd1!
1.Qee2+? Qce1!
1.Qed2+? Qee1!
1.Bf2! [2.R×d7(Rh1)\#]
1...Qcc6 2.Qee2\#
1...Qh7 2.Qde2\#
1...Qh6 2.Qed2\#
1...Qfc6 2.Qdd2\#
(1...Kg1 2.R×d7(Rh1)\#
1...S~ 2.R×d3(Rh1)\#)

Battery Q-Q on the first rank is actually double battery: move of Qe1 opens check from Qd1, move of Qd1 opens check from Qe1. But both squares on the first
rank (e1, d1) are attacked by two black queens each. So White has to force black queens away. The flight-giving key ( g 1 is a new flight) opens line h1-f1, motivating the threat.

The threat involves capture of Sd 7 with potential switch of guard of e8 from Rd8 to Bb 5 . This motivates defences moving to c6, while defences on the h-file pin Rd8. Consequently, as Black abandons one of the guards to the first rank, White can checkmate by closing the remaining line from the original guarding pairs.

The role of Rc2 is worth commenting too. Apparently, it does nothing after the key, besides blocking the line Rb2-f2. The computer check reveals white pawn could serve the same purpose. But Rc2 also guards $\mathfrak{f} 2$ and thus makes the key flight-giving instead of give-and-take.

385 presents a complex single-phase play involving chameleons, nightriders and Andernach chess.

385 - Petko A. Petkov
2nd Honourable Mention
Probleemblad 1996

1.Nh7! [2.CHc5(S)\#]
1...Sdc5 2.CHd2(S)\#
1...Sec5 2.CHf6(S)\#
1...Rc5 2.CHg3(S)\#
1...CH×d6(wR) 2.CHd5(Q)\#
1...CH×d6(wB) 2.CHb4(R)\#
1...CHc5(Q) 2.Nc3\#
1...CHf6(Q) 2.Nf2\#
1...Nf6 2.Qf3\#
1...Sd4, Nd4 2.e×d4(bP)\#

The key guards d5, thus allowing doublecheck mate by Nd8 and CHd6. Three black pieces enter the threat square, defending by Andernach motif the threat, but open lines for CHd 6 to other doublechecks. Captures by CH c7 or CHf7 transform the battery to other two doublechecks. Two other specific mates follow defences by CHc 2 and CHf 2 , when black chameleon in queen shape cannot capture on f 2 and c 3 due to looming transformation to white knight phase.

Very modern approach with 3+2+2 easily identifiable variations.

386 - Alexandr Postnikov
4th Prize Probleemblad 1996

1.Ga3? [2.R×f3\# A] B×e4! a
1.Ra3? [2.B×e3\# B] R×e4! b
1.Kh6? [2.Rh4\# C] G×e4! c
1.c5! [2.Gd4\#]
1...B×e4 a 2.R×f3\# A
1...R×e4 b 2. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{e} 3$ \# B
1...G×e4 c 2.Rh4\# C

Dombrovskis theme in three variations uses two partially different mechanisms.

Mates $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ need guards of squares f3 and e3, respectively. In tries White adds guards directly, but Black defends by own guarding by captures on e4. In solution White prepares selfpin on the 4th rank, while black in fact opens grasshopper lines to f3 and e3.

Mate $\mathbf{C}$ is at the beginning prevented by guard on the $h$-file. So the try removes the hurdle for Gh7, that can reguard line h4-f4 by jump to e4. In solution there is again selfpin on the 4th rank.

It is worth noting that defences in the solution are well unified. The selfpin would be nullified by White's try to play the threat, allowing the hurdle to jump away from e4. This could be considered a non-standard form of Schiffmann defences, adding to the overall interest of the position.

387 - Petko A. Petkov
in memoriam J. Hartong
3rd Prize Probleemblad 1996


| 1.LEd3! | 2.LEc7+ | PAc5 | 3.LEdd6+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LE×c7\#] |  |  |  |
| 1...PAh1 | 2.LEce3+ | PAc5 | $3 . L E d e 4+$ |
| LE×e3\# |  |  |  |
| 1....dd6 | 2.LE $\times g 5+$ | PAc5 | $3 . L E d f 5+$ |
| LE $\times$ g5\# |  |  |  |
| 1...Bg1 |  |  |  |

Perfectly unified play in four variations of selfmate in 3 strongly using the Chinese pieces. In all lines of play, LEc1 opens the horizontal battery with black pao as rear mating piece and Bd 1 being the hurdle for pao as well as guarding c2. These line openings are forced by play of the pair of white leos:

- LEc5 opens battery on the 5th rank, forcing Black to parry the check on c5, and places itself as the rear piece of the future white antibattery,
- LEd3 (originally LEf3 making the key) places itself as the hurdle of the white antibattery, forcing LEc1 to capture the rear piece.

The motivation of the defences is the following:

- 1...PAh1 defends by placing the rear piece of black battery en prise from Ba 8 , but unguards directly e 3 , allowing white antibattery on the e-file (that cuts the lightsquared diagonal too, neutralizing the strong defence motif).
- 1 ...Sd6 defends by placing the hurdle on the c7-e5 line (making 2.LEc7\# immediate checkmate), but unguards directly g5.
- $1 . . . \mathrm{Bg} 1$ defends by placing additional guard on c5, providing Black with possibility to defend threat check by $2 \ldots \mathrm{Bc} 5$ and thus placing too much obstacles on the c-file. But White exploits exactly this second guard when makes 2.LEcc3+, disabling the other black defence.
In general, the motivation of all variations has some selfmate specificities, improving the impression of the work.

Needless to say, the construction is fantastic, with every unit on the board having active or passive function in the solution.

I was very happy to be placed even higher in the award containing such masterpieces ( 387 entered Album FIDE 1995-97) with my own 388 combining Patrol chess with 3 types of fairy pieces.


Both phases share the same Patrol chess typical strategy. In threat White places two camels on d6 and g7, checkmating the bK (with interchange of their places between phases). Black defends by any move to a6, activating the Ga7 observation of CAa5 that in turn could defend by capture of white observing CAd6. But moves of CAb3, Gle5 and Sb4 open lines of Qa3 and white grasshoppers, observing white pieces that can make checkmating captures.

There is correspondence between types of pieces playing in the variations: the same types play in the try, there is a cycle of types of pieces in the solution.

The main interest however lies in the relationship between phases. White camels depart from the intersections of white observation lines, switching them in a way allowing change of mates with keys involved in the change. When the dust settles, a pure Kiss cycle with 4 appears.

Juraj Lörinc

## Announcement of annual tourney Conflictio 2020

An annual tourney for originals published in Conflictio during year 2020 is announced. All kinds of antagonistic problems will be accepted for Originals column (orthodox and fairy direct, self-, reflex mates and other aims of any length, any fairy elements), the main criteria for publication being antagonistic stipulation and sufficient quality. Possible originals from other articles will be included in the competition as well. The tourney will be judged by Kjell Widlert (Sweden), multiple sections might be created based on the quality and quantity of entries. Please, send the originals to Juraj Lörinc (address below).

Conflictio is an e-zine dedicated to chess problems with antagonistic stipulations Editor: Juraj Lörinc, juraj.lorinc+Conflictio@gmail.com


[^0]:    ${ }^{1} 49$ reprinted in Conflictio 4 was included in this award too.

