## In this issue

This issue starts with the eighth (and final) part of series explaining MOV and PAD symbolism for new-strategical twomovers written by Juraj Brabec. It is dedicated to changes of functions in multiple phases with three or more black moves involved. Naturally, it just touches on this vast area available for exploration.

The second article is a usual selection of diagrams from the most recent issue of PAT A MAT, that was published in December 2019.

Finally, I have made a selection of a few problems from recent awards, with some other related problems.

Juraj Lörinc

## Explaining MOV \& PAD symbols (part 8)

The class ZF-34-22 can be extended if the ineffective defences are followed by thematical mates from the change of function. But this is only possible in themes in tables 17.2, 17.6 and 17.10 (see Conflictio 20, page 2). The number of thematical elements is thus increased to six ZF-36-22 and the original newstrategical symbol would be amended by relevant cross change. Diagram 389 thus shows in three phases the combination of Dombrovskis and Hannelius themes extended by cross change of two threat paradoxes - /DD/. As the changes with higher number of repetitions are shown first, the full symbol for 389 is /DD/-DDxDDx.

If two added thematical moves do not act as variation mates, reciprocal exchange of key and threat (PP) is added and the number of thematical elements becomes 10. The composition 390 thus shows besides exchange (PP) also Dombrovskis HxD-HxD- and Banny BAx-BAx-. There is also a pendant of this change - combination of Hannelius and Azerbaijan themes, with symbol (PP)-ABxHDx-AbxHDx - and finally in case of non-defences $a, b$ the symbol is (PP)-BBxHHx-BBxHHx. This exhausts all possible function changes with two defences and two mates.

Increasing the number of defences to three means that themes from table 17 are extended by reciprocal change of thematical elements, increasing it to four means adding relevant cross change. In 391 it is reciprocal change of threat and mate (le Grand), in 392 it is the cross change of two threat antiparadoxes.

Additionally, synthesis of dual avoidance in mates and dual avoidance in threats can be found here, based on the white lines openings and closings. The fact that the move $1 . . . f \times e 5$ ! is additionally refuting the thematical try 1.Bd4? results in the change of one of the thematical elements to HDx (not HHx as it would be without this refutation), for total formula $/ \mathrm{HH} /-$ HHx-HDx.

Number of white thematical moves can be increased to three for ZF-36-23 in two ways. It results in either double reciprocal or cross change of two move functions, always in combination with rather flat cross change of relevant x-elements. 393 shows doubled reciprocal key paradox, 394 contains two cross threat paradoxes. Then three white and three black moves ZF-36-33 are already close to cyclical changes. 395 shows cyclical changes of move function from threat to mate with different defences - pseudo-Ukrainian theme - or also cyclical change of three cross changes /HHx/. Diagram 396 contains similar change, with cyclical change of three cross changes /HxD/ and besides pseudo-Ukrainian theme there is a cyclical change of three functions of black moves: non-defence, ineffective defence with threat paradox $D$ and other defence ( $2 x$ refuting and once followed by a totally new mate), Vasilenko combination.

Finally, fairy twomover 397 in four phases with threefold Dombrovskis theme with antibattery mates on the same square in all variations.

389 - Jevgenij Bogdanov
Komsomolec Zaporozhia 1972

1.Sc8? [2.Qd6\# A]
1...Kc5 a 2.Qe5\# B
1...Kd4! b
1.Re1? [2.Qe5\# B]
1...Kd4 b 2.Qd6\# A
1...Kc5! a
1.Bg3! [2.Qe5,Qd6\#]
1...Kc5 a 2.Qd6\# A
1...Kd4 b 2.Qe5\# B
/DD/-DDx-DDx
ZF-36-22


390 - Kazimierz Strzala
1st Prize Szachy 1983

1.Be4? A [2.Rc1\# B]
1...e×d5! a
1.Rc1? B [2.Be4\# A]
$1 . . K \times d 5$ ! $b$
1.Bd3! [2.Bb5\#]
1...e×d5 a 2.Rc1\# B
$1 . . K \times d 5$ b 2.Be4\# A
1...B×d3 2.Q×e6\#
1...S×a6 2.Qa8\#
(PP)-BAxHxD-BAxHxD
ZF-3.10-22

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

391 - Alfreds Dombrovskis \& Jurij Sushkov
1st-2nd Prize 641977

1.Bb1? [2.R×c4\# A]
1...c×d3 a $2 . B \times c 5 \#$ B
$1 \ldots e \times d 5!b$
1.Se4? [2.B×c5\# B]
1...c×d3 a 2.Rc4\# A
$1 . . . R \times d 5$ ! $c$
1.Qa3! [2.Q×c5\#]
$1 . . . e \times d 5$ b 2.B×c5\# B
$1 . . . R \times d 5$ c $2 . R \times c 4 \# A$
(DD)-HDx-HDx
ZF-36-32


392 - Jozef Taraba
1st Prize L. Lačný 60 JT 1986-87

$1 . . \mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{e} 5 \mathrm{c}$ 2.Be6\# $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{B}$ ?)
1...fxe5 d 2.Se7\# B (A?)
1.Bd4? [2.Be6\# A (B?)]
1...Bc3 a 2.Se7\# B
1...e3 2.Qf3\#
1...fxe5! d
1.Sc4! [2.Se7\# B (A?)]
1...Sc6 b 2.Be6\# A
1...Q×e3 2.Sc×e3\#
$1 . . . S \times c 42 . b \times c 4 \#$
/HH/-HHx-HDx
ZF-36-42

|  | a | b | c | d |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | A | B |
|  | A | B |  |  | ! |
|  | B |  | A |  |  |

393 - Juraj Brabec
\& L'udovít Lehen 1st-2nd Prize e.a. Šahs 1979-II

1.Bd5? A [2.Qd2\#]
1...e3 a 2.Rc8\# C
1...K×d4 2.Qc4\#
1...Bh6! b
1.Bf7? B [2.Qd2\#]
1...Bh6 b 2.Rc8\# C
1...K×d4 2.Qc4\#
1...e3! a
1.Rc8! C [2.Qd2\#]
1...e3 a 2.Bd5\# A
1...Bh6 b 2.Bf7\# B
1...K×d4 2.Qb2\#
(AA)-(AA)-/AxAx/
ZF-36-23

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

394 - Viacheslav Pilchenko
4th Prize V. Chepizhnij 70 JT 2004

1.f4? [2.Qe5\# A]
1...Sge3 b 2.Sc6\# C
1...Sfe3! a
1.f3? [2.Qe4\# B]
1...Sfe3 a 2.Sc6\# C
1...Sge3! b
1.Qe6! [2.Sc6\# C]
1...Sfe3,S×g3 a 2.Qe5\# A
1...Sge3 b 2.Qe4\# B
1...Ra6 2.S×c2\#
/DD/-/DD/-/DxDx/
ZF-36-23


395 - Tapani Tikkanen
3rd Prize Suomen Shakki 1979

1.Se3? [2.Qd5\# A]
1...Qe5 a 2.Qc4\# B
1...Qg8!
1.Sb2? [2.Qc4\# B]
1...d5 b 2.Qe3\# C
1...Rec1!
1.Sb6! [2.Qe3\# C]
1...Rc3 c 2.Qd5\# A
1...Re5 2.Qc4\#
1...Q×f3 2.S×f3\#
1...Q×g1,Qg5,Qe5,Qf4,Qf2 2.Rd3\#
1...f4 2.Qe4\#
1...R×e2 2.S×e2\#
\{/HHx/-/HHx/-/HHx/\}
ZF-36-33

|  | a | b | c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B |  |  |
|  | B |  | C |  |
|  | C |  |  | A |

396 - Anatolij Vasilenko
3rd Prize L. Loshinskij MT 64 1981-82

1.S×e7? [2.Sdc6\# A]
1...B×d4 a 2.f4\# B
1...f5! c
1.B×c5? [2.f4\# B]
1...d5 b 2.Q×e6\# C
$1 \ldots B \times d 4$ ! a
1.Qa2! [2.Q×e6\# C]
1...f5 c 2.Sc6\# A
1...d5 b 2.Bc7\# K
1...c4 2.f4\#
1...R×a2,Re4 2.Re4\#
1...Bb3 2.Q×e2\#
\{/HxD/-/HxD/-/HxD/\}
ZF-36-33

|  | a | b | c |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B |  | $!$ |
|  | B | $!$ | C |  |
|  | C |  | K | A |

397 - Juraj Brabec \& L’udovít Lehen 5th Place III. WCCT 1986-88

1.PAc2? [2.VAb6\# A] c×b2! a
1.PAe4? [2.Sb6\# B] f2! b
1.PAe6? [2.Gb6\# C] f5! c
1.PAee7! [2.Bb6\#]
1...c×b2 a 2.VAb6\# A
1...f2 b 2.Sb6\# B
1...f5 c 2.Gb6\# C
1...Rc8 2.B×b5\#

HxHxD-HxHxD-HxHxD-
ZF-49-33


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

## Published recently: PAT A MAT 110

Issue No 110 of Slovak magazine appeared in December. You can download selection from it on the dedicated webpage. The selection includes 18 pages out of 36 and contains:

- photos,
- originals,
- one preliminary award,
- announcements.

Other content is exclusive for PaM subscribers in the printed magazine only:

- information about Vilnius congress by Peter Gvozdják,
- selection from Vilnius awards prepared by Juraj Brabec,
- information about top solving tournaments by Marek Kolčák,
- article by Peter Gvozdják on ocassion of GM title award to Juraj Lörinc
- two short articles by Ladislav Packa, on Vasil Ďačuk's win in WCCI and about economical Zilahis.

398 was chosen from among Vilnius winners, as a successful s\#2. Obviously, nowadays it is not easy to show something new in s\#2, with number of available schemes limited more than let's say in \#2. So the whole mechanism of change is based on the twinning that changes the firing piece of black diagonal battery (such twinning was a theme of the Vodka tourney).

398 - Waldemar Tura
1st Prize Vodka, Vilnius 2019

a) $1 . g 8=S![2 . S e 7+R \times e 7 \#]$
1...b4 2.Qd5+ R×d5\#
1...d×c3 2.Rd6+ R×d6\#
b) $1 . g 8=R![2 . R g 6+S f 6 \#]$
1...b4 2.Qc5+S×c5\#
$1 . . . d \times c 32 . R \times c 3+S c 5 \#$
Keys are nicely matched in reciprocal manner (twinned piece vs. white promotee), but they serve only to provoke the defences as all $2 \times 2$ variations are ready before the keys.

Both $1 . . . b 4$ and $1 . . . d \times c 3$ open white lines aimed at the battery line, that the defence motivation. Black errors aren't so nicely matched. Three of them mimic the defence motifs as White exploits opening of the very same lines to his advantage (s\#-specific idea), however in b) the defence $1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} \times \mathrm{c} 3$ rather unblocks c3 for white rook. This is a pity, but still 398 managed to win in Vilnius.

399 can be found among original twomovers. It is a new version of the 1st Prize PAT A MAT 2016.

## 399 - Emil Klemanič <br> \& Pavel Murashev


1.Rf8? [2.Qc6\# A, 2.Qd5\# B] Sb4! a
1.Rf7? [2.Qd5\# B, 2.Qf5\# C] Se3! b
1.Se3? [2.Qf5\# C, 2.Qc6\# A] Sd4! c
1.d4! [2.d5\#]
1...Sb4 a 2.Qf5\# C (Qc6?, Qd5?)

1 ...Se3 b 2.Qc6\# A (Qd5?, Qf5?)
1...S×d4 c 2.Qd5\# B (Qf5?, Qc6?)
1...Qd2 2.Q×e5\#

The tries show the cycle of double threats grounded in the cyclic Sushkov. All tries guard $f 5$, but at the same time unguard one potential flight each: Rf8 - d6, Rf7 $\mathrm{f} 7, \mathrm{Se} 3-\mathrm{f} 5$. In this way always one of mates by $w Q$ is disabled, yielding the cycle of threats. Black knight then has enough power to defend against two remaining mates, in the well known geometry. The key then does not change anything, just forces Sc 2 to move, to
defend against a new threat, with dual avoidance and cyclical Hannelius almost for free.

From the moremover section I have chosen two originals 400 and 401.

a) $1 . S \times g 7!\mathrm{A}[2 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 8 \#] \mathrm{Sac} 72 . f 6 \mathrm{~B}$ [3.Qe7\#] d5 3.Sg5 C [4.Sf7\#] d6 4.Qe7\#
b) 1.Sg5! C [2.Sf7\#] Bb3 2.S×g7 A [3.Q×e8\#] Sac7 3.f6 B [4.Qe7\#] d5 4.Sf7\#

White moves S×g7, f6 and Sg5 are all quiet, even if clearly creating pressure on the bK by mating threats. White has to play them in the correct order to avoid succesful black defences. This order differs between two twin positions with only the position of the black rook slightly changed. Thus we get the rotation of the $1 \mathrm{st}-3 \mathrm{rd}$ white moves. Can this be done in the twinless position (and without checks as with them it is much easier)?

1.Sd7! [2.Sf8 [3.Bd7\#]]
1...Bc7 2.Sf8 [3.Bd7\#] B×g3 3.Bd7+ Kf4
4.Se6+ Kf5 5.Sg7+ Kg6 6.Be8+ K×h6 7.Sf5\#
1...Be7 2.Sb6 [3.Sc4 [4.S×e3\#]] Bd6 3.Sc4 [4.S×e3\#, S×d6\#] Bf4 4.b6 zz B×g3 5.S×e3+ Kf4 6.Sg2+ Kf5 7.e4\#

Two model mates with the bK chased around. I have found amusing that in the second variation after 4.b6! suddenly the position turns into zugzwang with the bB in focal position. Only capture on g3 allows Black to continue, but White is able to exploit that as a selfblock. While the overall strategy isn't particularly deep, having such combination hidden in problem with two very different model mates in 7 moves is rather rare.

Next two problems 401 and 402 were chosen from the fairy section. No surprise in names as Hubert is nowadays one of the most prolific authors of fairy twomovers and then there is a bit of selfpromotion.

402 - Hubert Gockel
PAT A MAT 2019

1.d4? zz
1...a×b4(×e3) 2.f4\#
1...a×b4(×d4) $2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{b} 4(\times \mathrm{b} 5) \#$
1...a×b4(×f3) 2.e4\#
1...Se5 2.d×e5(×b2)\#
1...Sg5!
1.f4! zz
1...a×b4(×e3) 2.d4\#
1...a×b4(×d3) 2.e4\#
1...a×b4(×f4) 2.R×b4(×b5)\#
1...Se5 2.fxe5(×b2)\#
1...Sg5 2.fxg5(×b2)\#
1...Sd6 2.K×d6(×b2)\#
1...Sh8 2.R×h8(×b2)\#
1...Sd8 2.K×d8(×b2)\#
1...Sh6 2.R×h6(×b2)\#

401 raises anew the question about move identity for the purpose of determining the new-strategical content. Old version of the question is: are moves by the same piece played to the same arrival square, but from different departure squares the same? Various authors differ in the answer, but e.g. for the purpose of

Cyclone classification such moves were considered same.

Here the question touches moves $1 \ldots \mathrm{axb} 4(\times \mathrm{d} 4)$ vs. $1 \ldots \mathrm{a} \times \mathrm{b} 4(\times \mathrm{d} 3)$ and moves $1 \ldots \mathrm{a} \times \mathrm{b} 4(\times f 3)$ vs. $1 \ldots \mathrm{a}$ b $4(\times \mathrm{f} 4)$. They are played by the same black pawn from a5, capture the same white pawn at b4 and even remove the same white pawns $d$ and $f$, just on two different squares. Are two and two moves the same or not? If yes, then we have here the reciprocal change of moves with very Adverse Breton specific motivation. If not, this is just a transference of two mates, still with Adverse Breton specific motivation.

Then, taking into account two other changed mates (following 1...a×b4(×e3) with Salazar and $1 \ldots \mathrm{Se} 5$ ), we have the change Z-24-36 or Z-24-66. Not bad, even if the mechanism is not complicated. In any case, if you want to try your abilities in various Breton variants, you are welcome to participate in the 17th TT Phénix C 1.4.2020.

1...LO×h3 a 2.Fe6+ A Kb4 3.Fe4\#
1...LO×h8 b 2.Ff6+ B Kb4 3.Ff4\#
1...AN×d7 c 2.Fg6+ C Kb4 3.Fg4\#
1.a3! zz
1...LO×h3 a 2.Ff6+ B Kb3 3.Ff3\#
$1 . . . \mathrm{LO} \times \mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{~b} 2 . \mathrm{Fg} 6+\mathrm{C}$ Kb3 3.Fg3\#
1...AN×d7 c 2.Fe6+ A Kb3 3.Fe3\#

403 shows rather standard mechanism of Lačný cycle also shown in the orthodox form, for the first time by V . Rudenko in the 1st Prize Problemisten 1961. The key changes the square to which the bK moves after the Siers battery activation. Thanks to the use of the rook-like firing piece, non-standard configuration of squares can be achieved. But I am not really satisfied with the role of ANh8 - this could be probably improved.

Next three diagrams are included in this issue's Okienko do sveta (literally "Window into world"). 404 is in moremover selection, 405 among fairies, 406 among selfmates.

404 - Stefan Felber
1st Prize J. Kupper MT 2019


The idea 1.Bb8?? [2.B×a7\#] fails due to a Pd6 mass. Therefore, White provokes the departure of Pd6 in the following way.
1.Bf4! [2.Be3+ d4 3.B×d4\#]
1...Re6 2.Bg3! [3.Bf2+ Re3 4.B×e3+ d4
5.B×d4\#]
2...d4 3.Bf4! [4.Bd2 [5.Bb4\#]]
3...d3 4.Bg3! [5.Bf2+ Re3 6.B×e3\#]
4...d5 5.Bb8! [6.B×a7\#] Re7 6.Bd6\#

In the main variation all White moves of the main variation are made by Bh2 along the diagonal h2-b8. The alternation of moves to f 4 and g3 provoke movement of black d-pawns that finally mean the way to b8 is open and the main plan can be executed.

Very nice Schwalbe!
Royal dynasty condition used in the 405 gained some popularity recently. While a side has more than one king on the board, no royal properties are assigned to anyone of them. But as soon as single king remains, he becomes normal king. Promotion to king is allowed.

405 - Terho Marlo
3rd Prize Finland - Netherlands 2018


Royal dynasty

## 1.Bc7! zz

1...e5 2.Khg1 e4 3.Bh2 e3 4.Qc2 Ke1 5.Re8 e2 6.K2f1 exf1=K\#
1...exf5 2.Rf1 f4 3.Kgh1 f3 4.Qd2 K×f1 5.Rf8 f2 6.K2g1 fxg1=K\#

Two variations show similar finale. Black has only one king and thus it cannot expose him to checks. Pe6 is forced to march forward and White can in the meantime arrange the mating nets with the pin trick. In the 6th white move, white king moves to the vicinity of the black king and attacks him. Black pawn is pinned and almost cannot move. Almost. It can capture the white king if it promotes immediately to king! This promotions is forced as it makes threat of a white rook to the original black king powerless.

It is not necessary to introduce the author of 406, his thoroughbred selfmates of medium lengths (5-8 moves) are well known.

406 - Camillo Gamnitzer
1st Prize Die Schwalbe 2017

1.Q×c4+? $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{c} 4$ ! $2 . \mathrm{Se} 3+\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{e} 3+3 . \mathrm{Ke} 2$

The first try presents the main plan leading to the seemingly standard battery mate on the first rank. But White has to take care of e2. The immediate try to lure the black rook to the 2nd rank by 1.Qc7 Rg1 2. Qc6 Rg2 fails to possible defences by Qh8 (but the defence has to be precise $-1 \ldots$ Qh4 is not enough). Therefore, bQ has to be pulled away by additional foreplan where the checkmate along the 1st rank is really standard. Moves of wQ on the c-file are well motivated.

407 is chosen from the award of the PAT A MAT annual tourney.

407-Štefan Sovik
1st-2nd Prize e.a. PAT A MAT 2017

1.K×b5? zz
1...Sa3+ a 2.B×a3\# A
1...Sc3+ b 2.B×c3\# B
1...Sd2 c 2.Ba3\# A
2.Bc3\# B
$1 . . . b \times c 2$ !
1.Sc3? C zz
1...Sa3 a 2.S×a3\# D
$1 . . . S \times c 3$ b 2.Ba3\# A
$1 . . . b \times a 4$ d $2 . S \times a 4 \#$ E
1...b×c2 2.Q×c2\#
$1 . . . S d 2!$ c
1.Sa3! D zz
1...S×a3 a 2.Bc3\# B
1...Sc3 b 2.S×c3\# C
1...Sd2 c 2.Q×g7\# F
1...b×a4 d 2.Sc4\# G

Beautiful cooperation between white knights, white bishop and black knight leads to difficult new-strategical theme.

Juraj Lörinc

## From recent awards

Gaudium is an electronic magazine very regularly published by Gunter Jordan in the pdf format. 408 has won its biannual tourney for twomovers.

408 - Daniel Papack
Prize Gaudium 2017-2018

1...B×a4 2.R×d6\#
1... $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{d} 5+2 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{d} 5 \#$
1...R×d4 2.Re3\#
1.K×d6? [2.Sc5\#]
1...R×d4 2.R×d4\#
1...B×e5+2.R×e5\#
1...B×a4!
1.e×d6? [2.Sc5\#]
1...B×a4 2.Re5\#
1...B×d6!
1.Q×d6! [2.Sc5\#]
1...B×a4 2.Rc5\#
1... $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{d} 5+2 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 5 \#$
1...R×d4 2.Re3\#
1...Rc3 2.S×c3\#

The changes following three thematical defences $1 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{a} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{d} 5+$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{d} 4$ are
very understandable, with the cross od Rd5 woven between multiple phases. Additionally, the internal unity of play is improved by three keys to the same square d6 (with White correction almost hidden). This feature has reminded me of almost orthodox 409 that has even 5 pieces playing to the same square.

409 - Jorma Paavilainen
dedicated to H . Hurme 70
Tehtäväniekka 2015

1...G~2.Kh7\#
1.Qh7? [2.Kg8\#] Gd8!
1.h7? [2.Kh6\#] Gh3!
1.Sh7? [2.Kf8\#] Sbd5!
1.Bh7? [2.Kg6\#] S×c4!
1.Gh7! [2.Kf7\#]
1...Scd5,Se4 2.R(×)e4\#
1...Sbd5 2.S×d7\#
1...Be8 2.Q×e6\#

The mechanism of the royal battery is in fact orthodox, but use of grasshopper allowed very reasonable construction without compromise in the content.

410 has won the annual tourney of another (nowaydays) purely electronic periodical.

410 - Chris Handloser
1st Prize harmonie-aktiv 2016

1...Bf2 $2 . B \times e 2 \#$
1...Rf2 2.R×e3\#
1...Kf2 2.Q×e2\#
1.Sd3! [2.Sf2 [3.Q×e2\#] B×f2 3.B×e2\#
2...R×f2 3.R×e3\#]
1...Bf2 2.Se5+ Q×e5 3.B×e2\#
1...Rf2 2.Se1+ d×e1=Q 3.R×e3\#
1...Qe5 2.S×e5+ Kf2 3.Q×e2\#

Black moves to f 2 in the initial position lead to mates in two, selfblock Grimshaw and additional interception by bK.

The key takes flight f2 (!) but also cuts the lines Qc4-e2 and Rb3-e3. The threat is quiet, with the 2nd move Nowotny to f2. This allows Black to defend to threat square as both $1 \ldots \mathrm{Bf} 2$ and $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rf} 2$ prepare checks in the Black's 2nd moves. White can exploit the black interference after line opening checks with choice of the check.

The configuration of black pieces Rg2, Bg1, Ph2, Pg3, Xe3, Xe2 with defences to the threat square is not new and perhaps 411 is one of the most interesting examples.

411 - Gennadij Ignatenko 2nf Honourable Mention Shakhmatnaya Kompozicia 2012


```
1.f5! [2.Sf2+ B\timesf2 3.Rh4#
    2...R×f2 3.Q×g3#]
1...Rf2 2.S×e3 [3.Rh4#, Q×g3#] Bg4
3.Q\timesg4#
1...Bf2 2.R×d5 [3.Sf4#]
1...Sf2 2.Qg5 [3.Qh4#] Sf6, Se7 3.Sf4#
1...Sf6 2.Sf4+ Kh4 3.B×f6#
1...Se7 2.Sf4+ Kh4 3.B\timese7#
```

Here there is no Nowotny in the threat, but White is similarly able to exploit opening of two different lines Rd4-h4 and Qg8-g3. There are even three defences to threat square, 1...Rf2 unblocking g2 for bK, 1...Bf2 and $1 . . . \mathrm{Sf} 2$ blocking knight and bishop on the first rank, respectively. All of them are answered by quiet moves and that makes odd inversion compared to 410:

- in 410, quiet threat, checking attacks, - in 411 checking threat, quiet attacks.

412 is a small piece showing possibilities of Lortap condition (a unit observed by a friendly unit cannot capture and check) in twomover.

412 - Hubert Gockel
Commendation Probleemblad 2008

1.Bg5! [2.Se1\#]
1...e1=R 2.Rf2\#
1...e1=B 2.B×e4\#
1...e1=Q 2.Sd4\#
1...e1=S 2.B×g4\#

In the key, Bf4 moves so that it guards e3 and the threat appears. Moving Pe2 to e1 defends as Rh2 observes Sc2 and the wS cannot capture on e1. But the pawn has to promote and each promotion means observation of some black guardian(s), weakening it (them), and allowing White to checkmate. The light construction hints it should be possible to make interesting change twomovers as well.

413 has placed well in the theme tourney dedicated to Glasgow chess (in which pawns promote on the 2nd and 7th rank instead of the 1st and 8th).

413 - Juraj Lörinc \& Paul Raican 1st Honourable Mention 11th TT Quartz 2018-2019

1.g7=Q+? Ke8 2.d7=B+ Kd8 3.Qf8+ Kc7
4.a7=R+Kb65.Qd6+Ka5 6.b7=B+f2=B
7.Qc5+ B×c5\#
4...f2=B!
1.h7=S+Kg8 2.g7=R+Kh8 3.Rg6+K×h7
4.a7=R+f2=B5.e3+B×e36.b7=R+g2=B
7.d7=R+ Bc6 8.e7=R+ Bc5\#

Position around wK hints the checkate will be given along diagonal $f 8$-a3, but it is not immediately clear how this will be orchestrated. The try shows it is possible to push bK to a5 with bishop promotion forced by fairy condition (the only way to parry one of checks is to paralyze wR by newly promoted bB). But Black can anticipate the maneuvre already in the 4th move.

So in the solution White avoids promoting queen and rather manoeuvers Black to promote two bishop and place them in the desired position by series of five rook promotions.

413 is Paul's original rendering of my older very successful selfmate 414, making the idea more interesting, even if there is a cost of the additional condition and fairy pawns (berolinas).

1.Qh5! (prepares sacrifice of wQ on the 8th move) gxh2 2.Bc1 (unpins pawn) exd6 3.g4 d5 $4 . g 5$ (closes h5-d5 and also e1-h4-e7 in anticipation) d4 5.Sc5! (Sf2? ... 8...Qb4+!, e1-b4-e7 must be closed too to allow safe sacrifice of white Queen) d3 6.gxf8=S! (guards in anticipation now very well guarded d7) d2 7.e7+ dxe1=Q 8.Qe2+ Qxe2 9.c7+! Qe5 10.a8=R+! h1=B 11.Se4+ Bxe4\#

AUW and excelsior. More importantly, bQ is attracted to e5 by play of pawns e6 and c6, while bB is forced to e4 similarly to the try of 413.

Juraj Lörinc

## Announcement of tourney Conflictio 2020

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).
(Already received originals allow me to start with their publication in the issue 22.)

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

