## In this issue

Two articles in this issue. The first article is a return to the so far latest PAT A MAT issue, the second article is a brief overview of fairy twomovers related to one recently closed jubilee tourney. No originals this time, only short remark about one from the previous issue. But there are expected originals in the next issue, the last in 2021.

Stay safe and enjoy Conflictio!
Juraj Lörinc

Published not so recently: PAT A MAT 117

Issue No 117 of Slovak magazine appeared already in September. The content includes among other:

- preliminary award of PaM 2020 \#2 tourney,
- an article by Gerhard Maleika on stalemate twomovers,
- an article by Awani Kumar celebrating the 117th issue of PAT A MAT,
- more short articles on various themes, including solving tourneys,
- originals,
- regular Selections.

PDF selection from the issue can be downloaded on the dedicated page. 9 problems from the issue are reproduced here. 783-786 are originals in this issue, although 783 is selected from Gerhard's article.

783 - Gerhard Maleika PAT A MAT 2021

1.Qd7! [2.Qc6=]
1...c6 2.Q×c6=
$1 . . B \times a 52 . Q \times c 7=$
$1 . . B \times a 72 . K \times c 7=$
The threat is realized following exactly one black move (1...c6), the other two black moves defend by opening line of check to the bK and no other motivation plays any role here. Very specific stalemate.

784 - Vasil Markovcij
PAT A MAT 2021

1.S×f5? zz
1...Se×c5 a $2 . R \times g 4 \#$ A
1...Sed6 b 2.d×c3\# B
1...Sb×c5 c 2.Q×e4\# C
1...Sbd6 d 2.Qa5\# D
1...c3~2.a3\#
1...a3 2.Q×a3\#
$1 . . . S \times d 2$ !
1.R×f5! [2.R×b5\#]
1...Sec5 a 2.d×c3\# B
1...Se×d6 b 2.R×g4\# A
1...Sbc5 c 2.Qa5\# D
1...Sb×d6 d 2.Q×e4\# C

The current WCCT \#2 theme (defence on the square vacated by the key) in $2 \times 2$ variations of try and solution. The other defences capture non-moving key piece. The known mechanism is doubled to achieve double reciprocal change. Thematically strong, but... both keys capture bQ (!) and that's taboo not only for WCCT, but also for most composers. Well, we are ultraliberal here (in PaM and in Conflictio), but I can well understand that this is tough point. How different are help genres in this respect....

785 - Jozef Havran
PAT A MAT 2021

1.Qa6? zz
1...Q×d4 2.e7+ Qd6 3.Qd3+ Q×d3\#
1...Rb2 2.Sf7 [3.Rg4+ Bg5\#]
2...Bb1 3.e7+ Q×a6\#
1...b2!
1.e7! zz
1...Q×d4 2.Qa6+ Qd6 3.Qd3+ Q×d3\#
1...Rb2 2.Sf7 [3.Rg4+ Bg5\#]
2...Bb1 3.Qa6+ Q×a6\#
1...Qb2 2.Se4 [3.Rg4+ Bg5\#]
1...b2 2.e8=Q/B+ Bf7 3.Qa6+ Q×a6\#

Three defences on b2 include obstructions, but also opening of a2-f7. Among positives there is special doubling of reversal (1.Qa6 2.e7+ / 1.e7 2.Qa6+ as well as 1.Qa6 3.e7+ / 1.e7 3.Qa6+), but there is another controversial moment in the solution: dualistic promotion in the variation 1...b2 2.e8=Q/B+. The author asked if this is acceptable or not. Frankly speaking, s\#3 is very different from \#2 (where such separation is impossible) and in selfmate I see such dual as problem.

786 uses Breton adverse where capture of a piece must be accompanied by removal of the other piece of the same type and colour (if possible) decided by the capturing side.

786 - Hubert Gockel PAT A MAT 2021

1...Sa3 a 2.S×a3(xf2)\# A
$1 \ldots . \operatorname{sc} 3$ b $2 . S \times c 3(\times f 2) \# B$
1.Sa3? A [2.S×b1(×f2)\#]
1...S×a3(×g2) a 2.Qg2\# C
1...Sc3 b 2.Se3\# D
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 1=\mathrm{S}$ !
1.Sc3! B [2.S×b1(×f2)\#]
1...Sa3 a 2.Se3\# D
1...S×c3(×g2) b 2.Qg2\# C
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 1=\mathrm{S} 2 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 1(\times \mathrm{f} 2) \#$
White's main attack plan is to capture the queen's flank knight standing originally at b1 and as a consequence, to let Sf2 disappear. This mating mechanics is used in the set play as well as in the threats.

Of course, Black defends by moving Sb1, either without capture or capturing white knight. Captureless move leaves white knight unattacked and thus allows mate Se3\# as Black loses the possibility to make Se disappear. Capture of white knight, on the other hand, frees g2 for other mate.

Also the difference between try and solution is based on the fairy condition while promoted Sd1 guards g2, wSc3 can capture it as an alternative to threat, while wSa3 has no such possibility.

We see here classic change Z-32-24 with the set mates becoming keys and reciprocal change between two phases. I.e. table looks as follows:

|  |  | $\mathbf{a}$ | $\mathbf{b}$ | $1 \ldots$ d1S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| set |  | A | B |  |
| A |  | C | D | $!$ |
| B |  | D | C | $\#$ |

It is very economical position for such theme and moreover the motivation of the play relies heavily on the fairy condition. I like it a lot.

Diagrams 787-790 were included among selections ("Okienko do sveta"). The twomovers editor P. Gvozdják has pointed at the unusual publication place of 787 and praised its novelty as well as construction.

787 - Mihailo Stojnić
Google Sites 2018

1.Sc3? [2.Sb5\#]
1...B×c2 a 2.Rd5\# X
1...B×f4 b 2.Qd5\# C
1...Qf1!
1.Sb4? [2.c3\# A]
1...B×c2 a 2.Be5\# B
1...B×f4 b 2.Qd5\# C
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 1=\mathrm{S}$ !
1.Kf6! [2.Be5\# B]
1...B×c2 a 2.Qd5\# C
1...B×f4 b 2.c3\# A
1...Qh2,Qg3 2.B×e3\#

The mechanism for Shedej cycle (cyclic change of threat and two variation mates) seems to be completely new. Moreover, the first try adds another change - only one unchanged mate (after $1 \ldots . \mathrm{B} \times 4$ ) is missing to achieve synthesis of the Shedej cycle and Z-32-26.

788 - Nils Adrian Bakke \& Rolf G. Uppstrom
Die Schwalbe 2014

1.Qe1? [2.Qe8\#]
1...Re4!
1.Qb3! [2.Qb8\#] Rb4 2.Qc3 [3.Q×g7\#] d4 3.Qe1 [4.Qe8\#] Rb8 4.Qe5 [5.Q×g7\#] Rg8 5.Qh2\#

In this white minimal there is hidden an interesting theoretical question. The main plan 1.Qe1? is refuted in the try by 1 ...Re7!, but in the solution it works (with the same threat) following the preparatory plan consisting of moves 1.Qb3 Rb4 2.Qc3 d4 in spite of a new Black defence 3...Rb8. Is this a Roman theme (as bR makes move 1...Rb4 allowing it a new defence) or a Hamburg theme (as another unit Pd5 makes move 2...d4 disabling the original defence)?

789 - Josip Pernarić
1st Prize
214th TT Die Schwalbe 2014-2019

1.Rf8+! B×f8 2.Qf1 [3.Q×f8\#] Bb4 3.Qf8+ B×f8 4.0-0 [5.R×f8\#] Ba3 5.Ra1 [6.R×a3\#] b4 6.Rf1 [7.Rf8\#]

White must act decisively as wK stands in a vulnerable position (discovered check c2+ would ne particularly strong). The main attack square f8 is guarded by bB, but White has the luxury of enough material to be able to sacrifice a rook and a queen there. Once the squares f1 and g1 are free, White castles and suddenly has has available two attack vectors. Forcing bB to a 3 leads to its final interference by $5 \ldots \mathrm{~b} 4$, with mate from f 8 .

By the way, M. Degenkolbe has suggested in Die Schwalbe 2019 slightly more economical position with different position of the bB: Ke1 Qg1 Rf1 Rh1 Bc7 Pb6 Pd3 Pe3 Ph3 Pe2 Pg2 - Ka8 Ba3 Pb7 Pb5 Ph4 Pb3 Pc3 Pg3.

790 uses two fairy conditions, AMU is less known of them: the move achieving the goal can be played only by piece attacked by single opposite piece.

790 - Eugene Rosner \& Hubert Gockel Problem Paradise 2017

b) after the key
c) =b) after the key
d) $=$ c) after the key
a) 1.Qd3! zz
1...e3 2.Q×g6(Qd1) \#
1...c3 2.Qa6\#
1...exd3(d7), c×d3(d7) 2.S×g6(Sb1)\#
b) $1 . Q \times d 4(Q d 1)!\mathrm{zz}$
1...e3 2.d×e3(e2)\#
1...c3 2.d×c3(c2)\#
c) $1 . \mathrm{d} 3!\mathrm{zz}$
1...e3 2.d×c4(c2)\#
1...c3 2.d×e4(e2)\#
d) $1 . Q d 2$ ! $z z$
1...e3 2.Qb4\#
1...c3 2.Qf4\#

While the role of Anticirce is clearly important, contributing especially to the irreversible setup of battery by 1. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 4(\mathrm{Qd} 1)$, the role of AMU is more subtle as it e.g. avoids threats in c) and d). It is in any case a unique combination
of the form (continuing „after the key" positions) with Z-42-28.

791 from the award of annual tourney shows Brabec theme.

## 791 - Miguel Uris

 dedicated to Miroslav Svítek Honourable Mention PAT A MAT 2020
1.e $\times d 3$ ? [2.d4\#] d1=Q!
1...R×e7 A 2.Q×f6\#
1...Q×e3 B 2.Q×f5\#
1.b5? [2.Sd7\#] B×b5!
1...R×e7 B 2.Q×f6\#
1...Q×e3 C 2.Q×f5\#
1.c5! [2.B×d6\#]
1...R×e7 C 2.Q×f6\#
1...Q×e3 A 2.Q×f5\#

The motifs are:

- A - guarding by capture unpinning,
- $B$ - direct guarding,
- C - pinning of the threat unit.

Not all motifs are considered equally valuable. Among all usual defence motifs available to the Black, direct guarding is the most frequent and considered
easiest, motifs involving interference are considered more valuable than similar motifs involving capture. Alse pinning is one of the most complicated. In this sense 791 is somewhere in the middle as regards the value of used motifs.

Another point to consider is the pattern of the motivations change. The best-known cyclic theme in this area is the Mlynka theme in which three defences cyclically exchange motifs in two phases, denoted as OM-23-33 (in 2 phases there are 3 thematical variations in each, altogether there are 3 defences and 3 defence motifs). The Brabec theme shown here is a cyclic change of 3 defence motifs of two defences in 3 phases - OM-32-23. Brabec theme is in my view generally more difficult and valuable than Mlynka theme. (They are actually motivation analogues of two known cycles from the Cyclone system: Lačný cycle Z-23-33 and Rice cycle Z-32-23.)

Juraj Lörinc

## Duels of fairy promotions

The recent jubilee tourney "PIV-90" was announced with the following theme:

Direct two-movers with black promotions to fairy pieces leading to mates with white promotions to fairy pieces. The key and threat (if any) must not be promotions. The position has to be legal, i.e. possible in a game with $P$ promotions allowed to the fairy piece(s) used in the problem. Any fairy pieces allowed, but no fairy conditions

The deadline of the tourney (to be judged by Valeriu Petrovici and Kjell Widlert) has already passed (it was 30.11.2021).

Nevertheless, this article lists a few problems that would be either thematic or are at least close to fulfilling the requirements.

792 is non-thematical due to three different reasons (black berolina could not appear by promotion, there is a promotion in the key and black defences are promotions to knight). It does however show some possibilities how to approach the theme, because the most important part (in my view) is the motivation of black defences (why pawns should promote to specific fairy pieces?) and at the same time errors (why the mates by white fairy promotions are now possible?).

792 - Roméo Bedoni
Phénix 1988

1.f8=Q! [2.Qf2\#]
1...dd1=S 2.d8=AR\#
1...ed1=S 2.d×e8=LI\#

Both black defences directly guard $\mathfrak{f}$. Pawn promotion in the first variation opens bent line d8-a5-e1, allowing mate
by archbishop promotion with checks to bK using two paths (also d8-h4-e1). Berolina promotion opens e-file for possible mate by lion promotion.

793 - Yves Cheylan
3rd Commendation ex aequo
The Problemist 1996

1.Qd3! [2.Qb1\#]
$1 . . . e \times f 1=G 2 . a 8=G \#(2 . g 8=G ?)$
$1 . . \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{G} 2 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{G} \#$ (2.a8=G?)
1...S×d3 2.Ra1\#

Here both black grasshopper promotions guard b1. Pawn departure from the 2nd rank open Gg2 to Ka2, thereby preventing two possible black arrivals to b2 by repelling (Ba3, Pb3) and seemingly allowing mates by grasshopper promotions at a8 and g8 (with immobilized hurdles at a3 and b3). But there is also dual avoidance by additional guards of newly promoted black grasshoppers on the check lines g8-a2 and a8-a2. This is a successful rendering of the PIV-90 theme.

794 - Petko A. Petkov in memoriam Andon Petkov 5th Honourable Mention Phénix 1997

1.Qc7! [2.Sb5\#]
$1 . . e \mathrm{e} \times \mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{G} 2 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{h} 8=\mathrm{G} \#(2 . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{f} 8=\mathrm{N}$ ? $)$
$1 . . . e \times d 1=N 2 . g \times f 8=N \#(2 . g \times h 8=G ?)$
1...K×e5 2.Sf5\#
1...N×d6 2.Nf3\#
1...Nb6 2.Ne6\#

Give-and-take key brings into action a threat Sb5\#. Again, Black defends by direct guarding of the mating square by two fairy promotions. (Capture of Nd1 guarding two squares has no unguarding effect against threat, as Re1 is opened to e3 and Sb5 guards c3 in the threat $\rightarrow$ the defence motivation is pure.)

The error of both defences is opening of Re1 to e5, thus making any non-selfweakening check to bK checkmate. Both white fairy promotions are such checks but once again there is a dual avoidance in action, by direct guarding by the promoted pieces.

Additional unity is provided by matching the promoted piece to the opposite piece captured in both thematical defences and checkmates.

795 - Yves Cheylan 2nd Prize J.P. Boyer MT 1988

1...b1=Q 2.LEb8\#
1.LEc4! [2.Bd4\#]
1...b1=Q 2.LEf1\#
(2.b8=RO?, 2.b8=LE?)
1...b1=RO 2.b8=RO\#
(2.b8=LE?, 2.LEf1?)
1...b1=LE 2.b8=LE\#
(2.LEf1?, 2.b8=RO?)
1...K×g4 2.Be4\#
(1...exf2 2.b8=LE\#
1...b1=B 2.b8=LE,LEf1\#)

795 features two rather different fairy pieces, rose and leo. The key gives flight g 4 and provides antibattery threat on the 4th rank. Promotions of Pb 2 to queen, rose and leo all defend by direct guarding of the mate and they also share the error (opening of ROd1 to g4 via d1-b2-a4-b6-d7-f6-g4). Seemingly there are even
three equivalent mates available, but very nice geometry comes into spotlight, as promoted pieces on b1 additionally guard other squares, yielding triple avoidance. When the dust settles, we see that fairy promotions are exactly matched. Very well-conceived with one small change from the set play also thrown in.

The next two diagrams 796 and 797 are non-thematical for PIV 90 because of the use of magic pawns (that cannot appear from promotion), but are too interesting to skip in this overview.

796 is the original idea to show Babson in twomover. Magic unit changes colour of other units (except kings and other magic units) that it newly attacks or controls.


In the solution the magic knight promotion is actually a threat. It is important that the knight is the only piece that does not attack Ra8 and Rf6 after promotion.

Idea of the black defences (that are almost forced anyway) is to change colour of Ra8 and/or Rf6 in advance, thereby providing bK some flights. But White has the opportunity to return the colour of rooks to the White. It is just enough to choose the mPd7 promotion that is attacking the right rook(s) and as it happens, the promotions are matching to yield the Babson (if the knight promotions variation is considered). The whole idea is so straightforward that it allowed extremely economical construction...
... and also more complicated theme to be shown, with the 796 mechanism serving as the basis for multiphase change. 797 has a set play and three solutions.
1.Kh6!
1...a1=mQ+2.d8=mQ\#
$1 . . . a 1=m R 2 . d 8=m R \#$
1...a1=mB+2.d8=mB\#
1...a1=mS 2.d8=mS\#

797 - Reto Aschwanden dedicated to Kjell Widlert 1st Prize Springaren 2001

$1 . . . e 1=m Q$ a $2 . b 8=m S \#$ A
$1 . . . e 1=m R$ b $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mB} \# \mathrm{~B}$
$1 . . . e 1=m B$ c $2 . b 8=m R \# C$
$1 . . . \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{mS}$ d $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mQ} \mathrm{\#} \mathrm{D}$
1.mQg7! [2.Se5\#]

1 ...e $1=m Q$ a $2 . b 8=m B \# B$
$1 . . . \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{mR}$ b $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mS}$ \# A
$1 . . . e 1=m B$ c $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mQ} \mathrm{\#} \mathrm{D}$
$1 . . . e 1=m S$ d $2 . b 8=m R \# C$
1.mQh7! [2.Se5\#]
1...e1=mQ a $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mR} \# \mathrm{C}$
$1 . . . e 1=m R$ b $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mQ} \mathrm{\#} \mathrm{D}$
$1 . . . e 1=m B$ c $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mS} \# \mathrm{~A}$
$1 . . . e 1=m S$ d $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mB} \# \mathbf{B}$
(1...S×h1 2.b8=mB,b8=mS\#)
1.mQg6! [2.Se5\#]

1 ...e $1=m Q$ a $2 . b 8=m Q \# D$
$1 . . . e 1=m R$ b $2 . b 8=m R \# C$
$1 . . . e 1=m B$ c $2 . b 8=m B \# B$
$1 . . . \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{mS}$ d $2 . \mathrm{b} 8=\mathrm{mS}$ \# A
The set play is in a sense inverted compared to the 796. Depending on the
black promotion e1, White must ensure that both Bb 1 and Sg 3 are converted to white to be unable to intercept check from mBa . Then what is the error of mPe 2 promotions? It is opening of Ra 2 to f 2 , because a check from diagonal battery also provides bK a flight at f2 (e.g. 1.b8=mQ+? Kf2! and Sh1 becomes black thanks to a new attack from mBa8).

In all solutions White attacks by recolouring Sf7, threatening 2.Se5\#. Promotions of mPe 2 defend by prepared attack of e 5 (note that mR can attack from e3 as Pe3 becomes white). This additional motivation (use of $\mathrm{mBa} 8+\mathrm{Sh} 1$ trick and magic-motivated defences) is what turns all promotions into true variations without threat compromise as in the 796 knight promotions.

All three keys have other important effect: they change colours of Sg 3 or/and Bb 1 in varying ways. After $1 . \mathrm{mQg} 7$, the knight is white, 1.mQh7 inverts the bishop and 1.mQg6 affects both. This changes the initial situation in which mPe 2 defends and also crucially the situation after its promotion, when White has to choose the mating promotion. As result, all four white promotions permute between phases in a multi-reciprocal form, to yield the following table:

|  | a | b | C | d |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A | B | C |
| D | D |  |  |  |
|  |  | B | A | D |
| C |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | D | A |
| B |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | D | C | B |

## Excellent!

Now let's wait what PIV 90 will bring...
Juraj Lörinc

## Errata to Fresh clash 11

The original N019 was published in the previous issue. Everything is ok with the diagram as well as solution, but both the author and myself were not attentive enough in the commentary.

1.Se1+? Ke3!
1.Sf4+? G×f4!
1.Be2+? K×e4!
1.Ge8? [2.Se1\#]
1...Ge7!
1.Ga4! [2.Gf4 [3.Se1\#]]
1...f6 2.Ge8 [3.Se1\#] Ge6 3.Sf4\#
2...Ge5 3.Be2\#

Instead of doubled Hamburger the threemover shows the doubled Wechselform Dresdner. The rest of the comments is correct, so I dare to repeat them:

Author: " $2 x$ "Hilfsstein-Dresdner" or "Wechselform-Dresdner", introduced by the same single hurdle move."

Specific type of condensed double Wechselform of Dresden theme thanks to the minuscule pawn defending move 1 1...f6 changing completely the defending possibilities of grasshoppers.

Sorry for confusion!

Juraj Lörinc

## Annual tourney Conflictio 2021

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 Paz Einat (Israel), 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

