# ㄷNFLILTI口 

## In this issue

This year, WFCC assembly stood in memory to a large number of deceased composers during its Rhodes meeting. This number was unusually high due to pandemic that affected all of us and even prevented organization of WCCC 2020. The article in this issue is trying to recall creations of many of composers no longer with us, those that I knew (even personally) as much as those unknown to me until now. The research and selection of suitable problems has actually taken me much more time than writing comments, so I hope you will like their selected works. Then, as promised, there are the last originals of the year 2021.

Let me wish you a happy winter holiday season and the successful year 2022. Stay safe and enjoy Conflictio!

Juraj Lörinc

"Where is the chessboard? Am I white or black? Or neutral? Should I capture a hurdle or not? Am I a grasshopper or a locust? So many questions and no answers..."
(photo: Charles J. Sharp, edited, used under CC BY-SA 4.0)

## Gone yet not forgotten

The song is ended but the melody lingers on.

- Irving Berlin

The Rhodes meeting of WFCC was organized approximately two years after Vilnius. This unusually long gap was caused by pandemic of COVID-19. As a sad consequence, the list of deceased composers included in the meeting minutes is quite long. When I saw it, I was surprised to find there many names known from the magazines. Then I decided to return to works of some people who left us in this period, so that their creative output can be once more enjoyed by us.

Ian Shanahan
(13.6.1962-27.8.2021)

798 - Ian Shanahan dedicated to Gerhard Maleika Die Schwalbe 1994

1.Q×h5! [2.Qc5\# A
2.Qd5\# B
2.Qe5\# C]
1...R×a6 2.Qc5\# A
2.Qd5\# B
2.Qe5\# C
1...f6 2.Qc5\# A
2.Qd5\# B
1...Sac7 2.Qc5\# A
2.Qe5\# C
1...d5 2.Q×d5\# B
2.Qe5\# C
1...S×b6 2.Qc5\# A
1...d6 2.Qd5\# B
1...B×b7 2.Qe5\# C
1...Sb5~ 2.c3\# D
1...Sc3! 2.Be3\# E
1...f5 2.Qh8\# F

After the key there are three threats. Black has some defences defending all three queen mates along the 5th rank, among them random move of Sb 5 (opening Ra5) and a correction. Altogether there are 3 full defences with new mates.

And what about other black moves? There are seven other black moves and they actually show the combinative separation of three threats - all possible combinations of triple, dual and unique mates.

All in all, there are 10 variations, 7 of them providing the combinative separation and 3 having new mates. In this sense is it also a kind of Karlström-Fleck, an interesting blend.

Colin Russ
(19.3.1930-22.9.2021)

799 - Colin Russ
7th Honourable Mention
Die Schwalbe 1957

1...Sg5 2.Rgf6\#
1...Se5 2.Ref6\#
1...Rg4 2.f×g4\#
1...Be4 2.f×e4\#
1.f4! zz
1...Sg5 2.R×g5\#
1...Se5 2.R×e5\#
1...Rg4 2.Rgf6\#
1...Be4 2.Ref6\#
1...R~2.g4\#
1...Rh3 2.Q×h3\#
1...Bc~2.Q×b1\#
1...Bd3 2.Q×d3\#
1...Bc2 2.B×c2\#

Four set mates are changed in the zugzwang solution, with two of them also transferred to form so call ideal Ruchlis (Z-24-46). The mechanism with pawn key and alternating attacks on pairs of flights is nowadays well-known device for changes of play.

Raimo Sailas
(13.9.1945-17.7.2020)

800 - Raimo Sailas
1st Honourable Mention
2nd TT diagrammes 1975

1.c7? [2.Rd5\#]
1...Rbc6 2.c×b8=Q\#
1...Bf7 2.Q×d7\#
1...Sf5!
1.c×d7! [2.Rd5\#]
1...Rbc6 2.d×c8=S\#
1...Bf7 2.d8=Q\#
1...Sf5 2.d×e8=S\#
1...B×d7+2.Q×d7\#
1...Rcc6 2.Qh2\#
1...Rc5 2.d×c5\#
1...Se7 2.Be5\#

Two changed mates and one transferred (Q×d7\#), additionally altogether four different promotion mates. The underlying strategy includes pins and unpins and thus the content impresses quite well.

Edward Pałłasz
(30.8.1936-22.12.2019)

801 - Edward Pałłasz
\& Stefan Parzuch
3rd Prize Wola Gulowska 2014

1...Sb~ 2.Sd6\#
1...b2 2.Qc3\#
1...d2 2.Rc3\#
1...e3 2.Bd5\#
1.Sa6! zz
1...Sb~ 2.Qc5\#
1...b2 2.Qa2\#
1...d2 2.Q×b3\#
1...e3 2.Qc1\#
1...Sf~ 2.Se3\#
1...Kd5 2.Q×b3\#

Mutate with change strategy evolving around squares d5 (flight provided by the key) and b4 \& c5 (wQ is released from guarding them by the key). As a result, four mates are changed (Z-24-48).

Mark Basistyj
(31.8.1957-21.3.2021)

1.Qe8? [2.Qg6\#]
1...Qg5 2.Q×c8\#
1...Qd6!
1.Q×d4! [2.Se3\#]
1...Qg5 2.Qe4\#
1...Q×g8 2.Qf4\#
1...Q×c7 2.Qg4\#
$1 . . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 4+2 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 4 \#$

The selfpin key expects bQ to unpin wQ by defending against the threat 2.Se3\#. Random unpin would lead to three queen mates, but three specific defences bear additional motivation to ensure that unique mate follows.

There is also small try bringing in a change of mate and adding some spice to the duel of two queens.

## L’udovít Lačný

(8.12.1926-25.12.2019)

There was a long article dedicated to Mr. Lačný in Conflictio 22. 803 was not included, but it was included in another long article afterwards, namely in Phénix 313 (XII 2020) and Jean-Marc Loustau commented there in details 27 Lačny's works.

803 - L’udovít Lačný 1st Place 1st WCCT 1973-1975

1.f×e7? [2.B×f5\#]
1...d4 A 2.Q×b7\#
1...Bf6 B 2.S×f6\#
1...S×e7 C 2.5 Sd \#
1...R×h7 D 2.g×f3\#
1...d×e2 E 2.S×c3\#
1...fxe2!
1.R×e7! [2.R×e5\#]
1...d4 B 2.Q×b7\#
1...B×f6 C $2 . S \times f 6 \#$
1...S×e7 D 2.Sd6\#
1...R×h7 E 2.g×f3\#
1... $\mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{e} 2$ A 2.S×c3\#
1...d×c2 2.Q×c2\#

The letters ABCDE do not denote moves, but defence motifs as follows:

A = unblocking,
$B=$ unguarding by line closing,
C = direct guarding,
D = capture of the threat piece, $\mathrm{E}=$ guarding by capture unpinning.

There is no change of mates between try and solution, but the same five defences in two phases have the defence motifs cyclically shifted. Such cyclical change is known as Mlynka theme and with three defences only it is a basis of the whole area working with the changes of motivation ${ }^{1} .803$ is a prototype of the change in five variations. The unity between phases is upgraded by keys to the same square e7 and they also allow Black one thematical defence.

[^0]Matti Kokkonen
(23.7.1943-28.8.2019)

804 - Matti Kokkonen
5th Place Finland - Sweden 1968

1...d4 2.S×d6\#
1...d×e5 2.Qh4\#
1.Q×e6? zz
1...d4 2.Qf5\#
1...d×e5 2.Qg4\#
1...Kf4!
1.Sg4! zz
1...d4 2.Qf3\#
1...d×e5 2.Q×e5\#
1...Kd4 2.Qf4\#

Unexpected change of two mates in three phases (Z-32-26), with all mates prepared - mutate with very valuable try. Both pawn defences are usually exploited as selfblocks.

Odette Vollenweider
(30.7.1933-26.2.2021)

805 - Vasil Ďačuk \& Odette Vollenweider 1st Prize The Problemist 2002/II

1...Bf7 2.Qf6\#
1...Bd2 2.Bd6\#
1.Sc5? [2.Rd5\#]
1...Bf7 2.Sd7\#
1...Bd2 2.Scd3\#
1...Rd8!
1.Sd2! [2.Sc4\#]
1...Bf7 (Kd4) 2.S×f3\#
1...B×d2 2.Re4\#

Another change of two mates in three phases (Z-32-26), not as a mutate, but with much more interesting motivation. Note the excellent key giving two flights (d4, d6) and a beautiful variation 1...Bd2 2.Scd3\# in the try where both pieces move from the wB's line to the wR's line, opening the former in the process.

Mukkur Parthasarathy
（21．6．1929－3．1．2020）
806 －Mukkur Parthasarathy
2nd－3rd Prize ex aequo
The Problemist 1988－II


1．Se～？［2．Q×e4\＃］，1．．．Sf7！
1．S×c5？［2．Rc2\＃］
1．．． $\mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{c} 5$ 2． $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 4 \#$
1．．．K×c5 2．R×c6\＃
$1 . . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{e} 2$ ！

1．Sb～？［2．Rc2\＃］，1．．．d4！
1．S×d5！［2．Q×e4\＃］
1．．．c×d5 2．Rc2\＃
1．．．K×d5 2．Sf4\＃
The random tries by $\mathrm{Se} 6 / \mathrm{Sb} 4$ create threats by pin of Pd5 and guard on b3， respectively．The white corrections then have the threats reciprocally switched due to self－weakening（flight giving） combined with additional attacking motif （b3 guarding and Pd5 capture， respectively）．Self－block captures by pawns then complete pseudo－le Grand． Great example of white corrections by two different pieces．

## György Bakcsi

（6．4．1933－11．10．2019）
807 －György Bakcsi
3rd Prize TT Tipográfia 1972

b）+ 当 $b 8$
c）$=$ b）+ 営 $C 7$
d）$=\mathrm{c})+$ 宣 c 5
e）$=\mathrm{d})+\mathrm{b} 4$
a）1．Sb3！［2．Sc5\＃］
b） $1 . S \times g 2![2 . Q e 2, Q e 3 \#]$ Q×f4 2．Q×f4\＃
c） $1 . S d 1$ ！［2．Qe3\＃］$R \times c 32 . S \times c 3 \#$
d）1．Sf5！［2．Qe3\＃］B×d4 2．Sd6\＃
e） $1 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{g} 2!$［2．Qf3\＃］
I have found György Bakcsi＇s main strength in the ability to show very plastic themes in a creative and understandable way．That is why I have chosen 807 as an example from his very rich lifelong oeuvre．Adding new black pieces onto the board changes the way White attacks every time．Striptease theme（shown in the reverse form of dressing up）cannot be shown much more convincingly in orthodox twomover，even more so if all removed／added pieces are black．

## Holger Helledie

(24.10.1951-24.11.2019)

808 - Holger Helledie
1st Commendation
Thema Danicum 1992

1.Bc4! zz
1...Ke4 2.Qg4+ Ke5 3.Qf4\#
1...Kf5 2.Qf3+ Ke5/Kg6 3.Qf4\#/Qf7\#
1...Kf6 2.Qd6+ Kf5/Kg7 3.Qe6\#/Qh6\#
1...c5 2.Qd5+ Kf6 3.Qg5\#

While the echo model mates with material QBB-K are very well known, this position scores additional points thanks to the white baseline, even if the key is understandably flight-taking. The overall impression is very strong.

Do you know maximum number of echo mates of this kind shown in one problem?

Mirko Marković
(22.12.1944-26.9.2019)

1.Bf8! [2.Qf3 Ke5/Kc4 3.Qe3\#/Qd3\#]
1...Ke3 2.Bg7 d4/Kf4 3.Bh6\#/Qf3\#
1...Kc3 2.Qf2 d4/Kc4 3.Qc2\#/Qc5\#
1...Ke5 2.Qg4 [3.Sd3\#,Sf3\#] d4 3.Qf5\#
1...Kc4 2.Qb2 [3.Qb4\#] d4 3.Qb3\#

No model mates, but the first prize in a tourney nevertheless. The key prevents bK from running too far away in the NW direction, The threat is virtual as it never happens, then four bK moves are met by four different white moves and the further play is dual free, again a threat after the white's second move is virtual, as $1 . . . \mathrm{Ke} 5$ 2. Qg4 the pawn move self-blocking d4 is forced. Rather good content for a miniature.

Haji Mammadov
(23.5.1954-18.11.2020)

810 - Haji Mammadov
Shachmaty (Baku) 1990-1991

1.Qa1! [2.c4+ R×c4,B×c4 3.Qe5\#]
1...Bc4 2.f5 [3.Sf4\#]
1...c4 2.Qg1 [3.Qg5\#] Rg2 3.Qd4\#
1...Rc4 2.Sb5 [3.Sc7,Rd6\#]
2...a×b5 3.Qa8\#
1...Rd4 2.Sc2 [3.Se3\#]
2...Rd3/c4 3.c4\#/Qa5\#

Three main variations share the defence motivation (blocking the pawn moving in the 2nd white move), resulting in the unified play on the same square c4. White exploits interceptions in varied way:

- $1 . . . \mathrm{Bc} 4$ closes line Ra4-f4 and blocks Pc5 to allow lethal threat Sf4\#,
- 1...c4 closes line Ra4-d4 and unguards d4 directly, allowing mate after defence 2...Rg2
- 1...Rc4 closes line Be2-b5, blocks Pc5 and opens line Qa1-a1 too.
Even if the other unifying effect is not present, I find this motivation quite interesting.

Felix Rossomacho
(2.8.1937-13.8.2021)

811 - Felix Rossomacho 2nd Prize Zadachi i Etyudy 2011

1.Rh4! [2.Se7+ Kg5 3.S×f3\#]
1...Sf6~ 2.Qc2+e4 3.Q×e4\#
1...Se4! 2.Qe3 [3.Q×f3\#,Q×e4\#]
2...S×d2,Sg5/Sf6 3.Q(×)g5\#/Se7\#
1...Sg4! 2.Qg1 [3.Q×g4\#]
2...Sf6/Sg~ 3.Se7\#/Bd7\#,Qg5\#
1...S×d5! 2.Sd4+
2...B×d4/e×d4 3.Qc8\#/Q×d5\#
1...Kg5 2.S×f3+ Kf5 3.Se7\#
1...e4 2.Qe3 [3.Qf4\#]
2...Be5/S×d5 3.Se7\#/Q×e4\#

Good example of the black correction in the threemover. The random move of Sf6 defends by unblocking f6, but it also unguards e4. There are three correction moves with varied strategy, in a sense very fine. 1...Se4 and $1 . . . \mathrm{Sg} 4$ both allow quiet attacks of $w Q$, focusing on both knight and the square g5, 1...Sd5 activates the fifth rank for White.

Anatolij Bezgodkov
(20.3.1941-24.1.2019)

1.Qg5! [2.Bc3+K×c5 3.Sb7\#]
1...Bf4 2.S×f3+ A B×f3 3.Rbd3\# B
1...Rf4 2.Rbd3+ B B×d3 3.Q×e5\# C
1...Sf4 2.Q×e5+C K×e5 3.S×f3\# A

Three defences to f4 (like in 810) with anti-Somov A1 motivation (2.Bc3+? $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{e} 3$ !) lead to surprising rotation of the 2nd and 3rd white moves. While Grimshaw on f4 brings into action Rb3 and two different ways to take care of Be4 (1...Bf4 2.S×f3+ unguards d3, while 1...Rf4 2.Rbd3+ opens Re3-e5), knight defence leads to the exploitation of both interceptions and a pin mate. White king plays his role in this variation, preventing exchange of white moves.

Piet le Grand (8.6.1935-14.8.2021)

1.Sh5! [2.R×f4+ R×f4 3.Sg3\#]
1...Sg×f3 2.Sf7+
2...K×f5/Be6/Se5
3.Sh8\#/Sd6\#/Sg5\#
1...Sd×f3 2.Sc4+
2...Kd3/Be6,Se6/Se5
3.Sa3\#/Sd6\#/Sd2\#

Defences against the threat liquidate Rf3 and self-block, allowing checks by Se5. Then where should he go? The selection starts by considering potential black defence $2 \ldots$. Se5 against the knight check as it twice unblocks f3. Clearly white has to choose between Sf7+ and Sc4+. Then the other potential black defences come into consideration as these moves provide flight to the bK. As Sg5 guards f7 and Sd2 guards c4, wS clearly has to play to the unguarded square, to be able to follow with direct battery mates to h8 or a3. This leads to a beautiful choice of the second move with unified play in two forked variations.

## Sergej Rumjancev

(10.4.1956-2.7.2020)

## 814 - Sergej Rumjancev

1st-2nd Prize ex aequo
Šachové umění 1995

1...c2 2.B×c2 [3.B×f6\#]
1.Qh3! [2.Sd5 [3.B×f6\#] e3 3.Q×e3\#]
1...Sa3,Sc7 2.Sf5+ Ke5 3.B×d6\# MM
1...c×d2 2.B×f6+Kd3 3.Bc4\# MM
1...f5 2.Sg2 [3.Bf6\#]
2...e3/Ke5 3.Q×e3\#/Qh8\#
1...d5 2.Sg4 [3.Qe3\#,B×f6\#,Bc5\#]
1...c2 2.Qf1 [3.B×f6\#]
1...Bd7 2.Sg4 [3.Qe3\#,B×f6\#]
1...Ke5 2.Qg3+ Kd4 3.Sc2\#,Sf5\#
1...Kd3 2.Qf1+ K×d2/Kd4 3.Sc4\#/B×f6\#

A pair of a beautiful echo model mates with four white pieces and with a translation vector (1,2). I like the "passive" role of the $w Q$ acting from her outpost at h3.

Harri Hurme (2.6.1945-23.9.2019)
815 - Harri Hurme
1st Prize ex aequo
Summer Tourney
Suomen Tehtäväniekat 2001-2002

1.Qa8? [2.Kb7\#]
1...Qh8!
1.Bh1! [2.Rb2+
2...K×a1 3.Qa2\#
2...Ka3 3.Qa2\#, Qb3\#]
1...R×a1 2.Qa8 [3.Kb7\#] Qh8 3.Qg2\#
1...K×a1 2.Q×g7+Ka2 3.Qb2\#

The quick attack by $w Q$ to the NW corner fails due to bQ defence to the NE corner. That is why wB prepares the action by move to the SE corner. The rook defence to the SW corner is the main weakening of the black position, allowing the continuation from the try. Black queen defence is then followed by a new Bristol queen mate.

Beautiful blend of the Bristol and four corners themes.

## Djordje Petrović

(5.4.1946-30.12.2020)

816 - Djordje Petrović
The Problemist 2016

b) turn $90^{\circ}$ degrees clockwise
a) $1 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$ !
1...Kd4 2.Qe6 Kc5/d5 3.Q×d6\#/Qe3\#
1...Kc5 2.Qb5+ Kd4 3.Qc4\#
b) $1 . \mathrm{Kb} 3$ !
1...Kd5 2.Qf6 f4 3.Qd6\#
1...Ke6 2.Qe7+ Kd5 3.Qd6\#
1...f4 2.Qe7+ Kd4 3.Qe4\#

Turning the board by $90^{\circ}$ degrees only changes the direction of pawn moves, but this obviously results in the change of the key and partial changes of the play.

## Oleksandr Dashkovskij

(14.1.1956-11.10.2019)

## 817 - Olexandr Dashkovskij

4th Honourable Mention
Problemist Ukrainy 2017

1.Bg8? [2.R×b4\#], 1...b3!
1.Ra1? zz, 1...b×a3!
1.Rd1? zz
1...b×a3 2.Bc1+
2...Kb1/K×c3 3.B×a3\#/Rc4\#
$1 . . . b \times c 3$ !
1.Rf1! zz
1...b×a3 2.Se1 Ka1,Kb1 3.Sd3\#

1 ...b×c3 2.Be1 Kb1,Kc1 3.B×c3\#
The Black mobility and is limited. All possible moves of Pb 4 refute some try and the solution is after all a well-known Indian manoeuvre with a critical move by $w R$ and interference by other white piece allowing and also forcing bK to enter the battery line. The Indian manoeuvre is doubled with the decision about the interfering unit taken after the selfstalemating move of the bP.

Pál Benkő (15.7.1928-26.8.2019)
818 - Pál Benkő
2nd Honourable Mention
Sinfonie Scacchistiche 1976

1.Kd7! [2.c8=R+,Kc6]
1...Kb7 2.c8=R Kb6 3.a8=R Kb7 4.Rcb8\#
2...Ka6 3.a8=Q+ Kb6 4.Rc6\#
(2...K×a7 3.Kc6,Kc7)
1...K×a7 2.Kc6 Ka6,Ka8 3.c8=Q+ Ka5/Ka7 4.Qa8\#/Qb7\#

The fourmover with the endgame feeling by master of the endgame studies. Obviously, White could win easily, but the queen promotion at c8 does not lead to the quick mate, rather wK needs to be brought into action. Then the queen promotion even is not a threat due to looming stalemate and the rook promotion is doubled in the main variation. The impression is emphasized by very limited material used for showing two underpromotions

Ramutis Juozenas
(25.10.1936-20.1.2020)

819 - Ramutis Juozenas
19th Place 8th WCCT 2007-2008

1.Rc7? [2.Bf3+ Kd3 3.Sf4+ B×f4 4.Be2\#]
1...Bc6 2.Sg5+ Kf4 3.Bf3 [4.Sh3\#]
1...Bd1 2.Bd3+ K×d3 3.R×e5 [4.Sf4\#]
1...d3!
1.Rb6? [2.Rf6 [3.Sg5\#,Rf4\#]] Bd1,Bb5 2.Sg5+Kf4 3.Rf6+ B×f6 4.Sh3\#, 1...d6!
1.b3? [2.Sg5+ Kf4 3.Bf3 [4.Sh3\#]] B×b3 2.R×b3 [3.Sd2\#,S×g3\#,Bd3\#,Bf3\#] d3 3.Rb4+ d4 4.Bf3\#, 1...Bb5!
1.Rb4! [2.Sg5+ Kf4 $3 . R \times d 4+\quad B \times d 4$ 4.Sh3\#]
1...Bc2 2.Bf3+ Kd3 3.Sf4+ B×f4 4.Be2\#

The theme of the WCCT (switchbacks) is shown twice in the solution and especially Sweden (judging country) has praised also tries 1.Rc7? (with natural pseudo le Grand compared to solution) and 1.Rb6? with different decoys of Ba4.

Vladimir Sychov
(1.2.1939-21.9.2021)

1.Kg7! zz
1...b3 2.Sb2 [3.Sa4 [4.Sb6\#]] a×b2 3.Kh8 d2 4.Bf5 [5.Bc8 [6.Bb7\#]] b1=Q 5.Bc8 [6.Bb7\#] Qh7+ 6.K×h7 [7.Bb7\#]
1...a2 2.B×a2 [3.Sb2 [4.Sa4 [5.Sb6\#]]] d2 3.Sb2 [4.Sa4 [5.Sb6\#]] d1=Q 4.S×d1 [5.Sb2 [6.Sa4 [7.Sb6\#]]]

The idea of the White's attack is quite simple: he just needs to get with Bb1 or Sd1 somewhere close to the caged bK and the mate is easy. If only those two pieces were not needed to cope with the black pawn phalanx! Especially Pa 3 is dangerous as it threats to promote at a1 and capture Pa 6 , if Bb 1 moves too soon. This is where wK comes into consideration and actually his movement to the corner is the main attraction of the star variation - $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ b3 ... 3,Kh8!!

Yoav Ben-Zvi (3.6.1957-31.12.2020)
821 - Yoav Ben-Zvi
1st Honourable Mention
Probleemblad 1976

1.Rc4? [2.Rc8\#]
1...Rc3!
1.Rf4! [2.Rf8\#] Rf3 2.Rg4 [3.Rg8+ Rf8 4.R×f8\#] Rg3 3.Rh4 [4.Rh8+ Rg8 5.R×g8\#] Bh5 4.Rc4 [5.Rc8\#] Rc3 5.R×b4 [6.Rb8+ Rc8 7.R×c8\#] Rb3 6.R×b3 [7.Rb8\#] Bb4 7.R×b4 [8.Rb8\#] 5...Rc8 6.Rf4 [7.Rf8+ Be8 8.R×e8\#,Sf7\#,Sb7\#] Bf7 7.R×f7 [8.Rf8\#]

White knights hold the bK in the mating net and so wR is the active piece making all the work for White with mating threats along the 8th rank. The black counterplay is provided by bR that is initially well supported by friends on the 1st rank. So White manoeuvres his rook carefully to keep is shielded by bR, forcing the key weakening of the black position in 3...Bh5, losing control of b3. Then the black defence collapses, with mates coming from either side of the bK.

## Sergej Zacharov

(31.1.1952-14.9.2019)

1.Se2+! Kf1 2.Sf4+ Kg1 3.Qa1+ Qf1 4.Qd4+ Qf2 5.Se2+ Kf1 6.Sc3+ Kg1 7.Se4 g×h3 8.Qa1+ Qf1 9.Qa7+ Qf2 10.Sg5 Q×a7 11.S×h3\#
$7 . . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 4+\quad 8 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{d} 4 \mathrm{e}+9 . \mathrm{Ke} 3$ $g \times h 3$ 10.Sg5 e4 11.S×h3\#

The plan of White is to force capture $\mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{h} 3$ enabling mate $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{h} 3 \#$. It is conceivable in some zugzwang position as Black is limited in his movements, but still the mobility of bQ has to be further constrained by wQ transfer to d4 via a1. Quiet move 7.Se4 puts Black into desired zugzwang, forcing the capture on h3 in the 7th or in the 9th move. It is important that in the second variation wK manages to guard f2 while Black has just enough pawn moves so that White can escape stalemating him.

Vladimir Chekarkov
(5.1.1937-8.5.2020)

823 - Vladimir Chekarkov
Special Honourable Mention
Shachmaty v SSSR 1991

1.Sg5! [2.Sf7\#] Ke5 2.Sf7+ Kd4 3.Sd8 [4.Sc6\#] Ke5 4.Sc6+ Kd6 5.Sa5 [6.Sc4\#] Ke5 6.Bd2 [7.g×f4+ S×f4 8.Sc6+ Kd6 9.B×b4\#] Q×d2 7.Sc4+ Kd4 8.S×d2 [9.Sf3\#] Ke5 9.g×f4+ S×f4 10.Sf3+ Kd6 11.e5+ K×d5 12.e4\#
(8...Se1 9.Sb3+ Ke5 10.g×f4+ Kd6 11.Sa5,Sc5,e5+)

Beautiful round trip of the Sf3: f3-g5-f7-d8-c6-a5-c4-d2-f3.

Vazha Neidze (8.3.1937-11.2.2020)
824 - Vazha Neidze
1st-3rd Prize ex aequo
J. Van Reek 50 JT 1995


Only the main variation is given here, for more variation, please, refer to the ARVES website.
1.b6 Qa8+ 2.Kd7 (threats 3.Rc5\#) Ba2 3.b3 (getting rid of the pawn) $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{b} 3$ 4.Rc5+ Bd5 5.R×d5+ K×d5 6.Rf5+ Be5 7.Rf8 Qb8 (7...Q×f8= - the first stalemate) 8.R×b8 B×b8 9.Kc8 Bf4 10.K×b7 B×h6 11.K×a6 Kc6 12.b7 Bf4 13.b8=Q B×b8= (the second and a very different stalemate).

I liked the difference between two stalemates that appeared naturally in the flow of the play.

Included also in the FIDE Album 19951997 as E86.

Jan Lerch (14.9.1942 - 26.8.2020)

1.d6! Be8 (after 1...Be6 the fork 2.Sc5+ wins) 2.Sf6 Bc6! 3.Kc5 Bb5! (2...Bb5 would be bad because of $3 . \mathrm{Kc5}$ with zugzwang, but now it is White to move...) 4.Kb6! Kb4 5.Sd5+ Kc4 (5...Ka4 6.Sc3+ the second fork) 6.Se3+ Kb4 7.Sc2+ Ka4 (7...Kc4 8.Sa3+ - the third) 8.Kc7! (and the Black is lacking moves, 8...Kb3 allows the fourth fork 9.Sd4+, so only...) 8...Be8 9.Kd8 Bh5! (with d8 blocked, d7 need not be held; 9...Bg6 is met by 10.Sd4! Bh5 11.Ke7 Bg4 12.Se6) 10.Se3! (disables g4 for bB) 10...Be2! 11.Ke7 Bb5 (the round trip of bB is almost enough for a draw, but wK has improved his position) 12.Sc2 Bc6 13.Sd4! and White wins. ${ }^{2}$

Very light position and a skilful showing of the black bishop round trip without any capture.

[^1]Michail Zinar (9.5.1951-4.2.2021)
826-Michail Zinar Special Prize
A. Selivanov 50 JT 2017

1.b4 R×b4 2.c4 $R \times c 4$ 3.d4 $R \times d 4$ 4.e4 R×e4 5.f4 R×f4 6.g4 R×g4 7.Kg6 Rh4 8.Rb2 Rb4 9.R×a2 a4 10.Rh2 Rh4 11.Rb2 Rh7 12.Rb8\#

White wants to attack Black by opening the h-file to threat Rh8\#, but Black has a strong defence Rh4! ready. Therefore, White evacuates the 2nd rank, sacrificing six pawns in row. This opens the second line of attack for $w R$ by being able to threat Rb8\#. One more linear round trip Rh2-b2-a2-h2 is needed to force 9...a4 and after 11.Rb2 the $b R$ is unable to capture Pg 7 in time to avoid Rb8\#.

Tomislav Petrović
(19.11.1931-1.10.2019)

1.g5! zz
1...e3 2.d4+c×d3 e.p.\#
1...c3 2.d4+ exd3 e.p.\#
1...R×d1 2.b4+ c×b3 e.p.\#

While Tomislav Petrović was known mostly as an author of kindergarten problems (with only kings and pawns on the board), 827 is other type of problem emphasizing role of pawns in the chess. Namely, it shows three different en passant checkmates by Black in s\#2, possibly the record.

Roman Zalokockij
(3.5.1940-17.9.2021)

a) 1.Rg~? [2.Rc×c6+ B×c6\#], 1...c5!
1.Rc~? [2.Rg×c6+ B×c6\#], $1 \ldots \mathrm{~h} \times \mathrm{g} 6$ !
1.Sc5! zz
1...h×g6 2.Q×c6+ B×c6\#
1...f3 2.Rg×c6+ B×c6\#
b) $1 . \mathrm{Sc} 2$ ? zz
1... $\mathrm{h} \times \mathrm{g} 62 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{c} 6+\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{c} 6 \#$
1...f3 2.Rg×c6+ B×c6\#
1...c5!
1.Sde6? zz
1...f3 2.Rc×c6+B×c6\#
1...c5 2.Qc6+ B×c6\#
1...h×g6!
1.Sf3! zz
1...h×g6 2.Rc×c6+ B×c6\#
1...c5 2.Rgc6+ B×c6\#

828 is a selfmate that tries to mine as much as possible from the well-known
scheme of three vectors aimed at the focal square c6. The analysis might start from b) position showing the standard carousel change based on the known gradual zugzwang removal of three white attacks from c6 - one is removed by the 1st white move, the other by the 1st black move and the remaining one is used to check the bK, forcing the checkmate. This all works thanks to the wS standing somewhere outside the thematic lines and having access to $f 3$ where he can block one of the defending pawns, depriving Black of a possible refutation.

In the a) position, wS stands on one of the lines (diagonal Qh1-c6), thus White is able to threat captures on c6 if one of rooks leaves the thematical line. In the solution wS jumps from one line o another, this time blocking Pc6 and putting Black into zugzwang. Then the variations are the same as in the try 1.Sc2 in the b) position.

However, an interesting new-strategical theme emerges when one compares tries of the a) position and the solution of the b) position. It is actually the Hannelius theme.

Full points for the exploitation of the scheme possibilities.

## Sergej Chidemjan

(17.10.1949-24.6.2021)

1.Sc8! [2.B×d5+A B×d5
3.Qc4+ B B×c4\#]
1...Qe6 2.Qc4+ B S×c4
3.Sd6+ C S×d6\#
1...Rb7 2.Sd6+ C Q×d6
3.B×d5+ A Q×d5\#
1...S×b4 2.Qf3+ Kd3
3.Q×d5+ S×d5\#

The selfmate theme of the 6th WCCT asked for s\#3 or s\#4 with black moves having a defensive motive which White exploited to his own advantage. Here all three defences are of this kind:

- 1...Qe6 unpins Se5,
- 1 ...Rb7 closes Ba 8 line to d5,
- $1 . . . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{b} 4$ defends by attacking d 5 .

The rotation of the 2 nd and 3 rd white moves is a valuable addition to the required theme.

Roman Janko (13.9.1956-27.9.2019)
830 - Volodimir Chornous \& Roman Janko
Problemist Ukrainy 2019

1.Kd2! c5 2.Kc3 c4 3.Kb4 c3 4.Se6 fxe6 5.Q×e6+ Sf7 6.Kb3 Kh8 7.Q×f7 Bg8 8.Bg7+ Kh7 9.Ka2 B×f7\#

Manoeuvres on both sides of the board:

- wK replaces wQ on a2
- then wQ replaces bP on f7
- bK and bB swap their places.

Alain Biénabe (3.10.1958-22.2.2021)
831 - Alain Biénabe
3rd Prize Phénix 2015-2016

1.h8=B! Kh7 2.f8=R Kh6 3.Rf1 Kh7 4.Rh1+ Kg8 5.a8=S Kf8 6.b8=Q+ Ke7 7.Ra1 K×e6 8.Qe8+ Kd5 9.Ra4 K×c5 10.Sb6 c×b6\#

The situation around wK hints the possible sacrifice on b6 and this requires guarding (or possible blocking) of b6, a4 and b4. But this should be preceded by getting hold of the bK's movement. This is achieved by AUW that first limits bK movements ( $w B$, wR), promoted rook then heads for self-block at a4, while, wQ is used to steer bK to c5 and wS is finally sacrificed at b6 (while guarding d5 beforehand).

The use of all 4 corners as arrival squares of white moves is somewhat accidental, but underlines good use of the whole board.

Yoel Aloni (30.9.1937-9.9.2019)
832 - Yoel Aloni
2nd Honourable Mention
H. Kost MT 1993-1995

1.Be3? [2. $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{h} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{h} 6$ ]
1...Sg1! 2.B×g1\#
1.Bc3? [2.S $\times h 4 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{h} 4 \#$ ]
1...f4+2.Be5 R×e5\#
1...Se5! 2.B×e5\#
1.Bb6! [2.S×h4 R×h4\#]
1...Sf6+2.K×h6 Q×f8\#
1...f4+2.Qd5 R×d5\#
1...f6 2.Se6 Qe8\#

A random move of Bd4 creates threat 2.S×h4 R×h4\# (sometimes also other threat). Moving into the NE corner (h8, g7) or to c5 prevents prepared variation 1...Sf6+ $2 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{h6} \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{f} 8 \#$, moves to e5 and g1 prepare white mate $\mathrm{Q} \times f 3$ \#, moves to f 6 or f2 negate the threat. Two unpins on the third rank lead to reflex mates with capture of the unpinned Sf3. The only remaining bishop move to b6 is the key.

Yves Tallec (9.12.1927-22.4.2020)
833 - Yves Tallec
dedicated to K. De Regneville
Phénix 1989

1.AMg1! zz
1...S~2.AMg3\#
1...d3 2.AMg4\#
1...Kd3 2.AMe1\#
1...Kf5,Kf4 2.AMg5\#
1...Ke5 2.AMg6\#

While Yves Tallec was known as an expert in the orthodox field, I could not resist quoting this nice twomover with five model mates using single amazone $(Q+S)$. Even the key gives three flights!

Zdeněk Zach (5.5.1944-22.5.2020)
834 - Zdeněk Zach
3rd Commendation
J. Brabec 80 JT 2018-2019


## 1.Rb1! zz

1...b4 2.SWb3\#
1...K×a3 2.Ra1\#
1.SWb3! zz
1...b4 2.Rb1\#
1...Ka3 2.Ra1\#

As the editor of PaM fairy section, I have received many fairies from Zdeněk Zach, but these were largely of the helpmate nature. 834 is his rare twomover employing two bent hoppers (eagle being grasshopper turning $90^{\circ}$ over the hurdle and sparrow turning $135^{\circ}$ ).

Yves Cheylan (14.11.1938-1.5.2021)
835 - Yves Cheylan
2nd Prize 7th TT Phénix 1993-1994

1.Ga3! [2.Qe1\#]
1...S×g6(g2) 2.Q×g5(Gg1)\#
1...G×b6(b2) 2.Q×c7(Gc1)\#
1...G×d5(Bf1) 2.Qe3\#
1...Gc6 2.Qf4\#

In the initial position and after the key, wQ is pinned by Gh1. In two star variations Black defends by paralyzing white pieces guarding squares around bK:

- $\mathrm{Sg} 6 \rightarrow \mathrm{Se} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 5, \mathrm{f} 5$,
- Gb6 $\rightarrow$ Gb8 $\rightarrow$ d6.

Defences however capture pawns that are reborn on the 2nd rank and provide hurdles for white Gs paralyzing black Gs reborn in the mating moves featuring selfunpin by wQ::

- Gg4 $\rightarrow$ (Pg2) $\rightarrow \mathrm{Gg} 1$,
- $\mathrm{Ga} 3 \rightarrow(\mathrm{~Pb} 2) \rightarrow \mathrm{Gc} 1$.

In the other two variations $w Q$ is unpinned in simpler way.

Yves Cheylan was a master of fairy direct mate discovering many ideas.

Jaroslav Štúň (26.2.1951-24.2.2021)

1.Bg5! Rg7 2.Ke5 Rg6 3.Bf6 Kf4+ 4.Kd6 Rg3 5.Ke6 Rg7 6.Be7 Rg3 7.Kf5+ Rg6\#
1.Kg5! Rh7 2.Gh5 Kf4+ 3.Kg6 Rf7 4.Bg5 Rh7 5.Bf6 Re7 6.Bg7 Re3 7.Kf5+ Re6\#
1.Ke5! Rh7 2.Gf5 Kd4+ 3.Ke6 Rd7 4.Kd6 Rh7 5.Bg5 Rc7 6.Be7 Rc3 7.Kd5+ Rc6\#

Combination of fairy conditions Köko + Maximum is very suitable for creation of long problems with limited materials as on one hand Maximummer restricts the Black's movement possibilities and on the other hand Köko allows easy reshaping of the available longest moves by providing suitable contact points. 836 demonstrates this by showing three echo mates (not model) with five pieces only in s\#7.

Don Smedley
(31.12.1933-12.10.2020)

837 - Don Smedley \& Eric Hassberg Commendation Die Schwalbe 1987

1.Sd8! [2.Kg3 R×b8\#]
1...Rc5+ 2.Rg5 Bd6\#
1...Rc6+ 2.Bh5 Rd6\#
1...Rc7+ 2.Rg4 Qd6\#
1...Sf5+ 2.Kg5 Sd6\#
1...R×b8+2.Rg4 Qd6\#
1...g1=Q 2.Bh5 Sf5\#
1...Sg4 2.Sc7 Sf6\#
1...R×d8 2.Be8 Rd6\#

There are 4 pairs of mutually paralyzed line pieces on the diagram: $\mathrm{Rg} 8 \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Rc} 8$, $\mathrm{Qb} 8 \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Qf4} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 6 \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Rh} 6, \mathrm{Ba} 3 \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Be} 7$. The key cuts the first pair and threats to employ the capture of Qb 8 for queen mate. Three defences by Rc8 along file cut one of other three lines intersecting at d6, leading to three mates with cyclic double antibatteries on the same square. Further check by Se 3 leads to the fourth mate on the same square with activation of all three lines at the same time.

## Fantastic!

Günther Weeth
(13.8.1935-28.12.2020)

838 - Günther Weeth
2nd Commendation
Die Schwalbe 2014 (v)


The idea of the White attack in this Anticirce Proca retractor is to bring about the self-blocks of $f 3$ and e8, to be able to checkmate with lone king from g5. While the final uncapture of Bd 7 blocking e8 is ready, the uncapture of Qf1 has to be prepared first so that Qf3-f1+ is the only retraction possible. I.e. White has to deprive Ba5 of the access to d8. Also, the choice of piece captured by wP on c5 is unique - bP would be illegal and other black pieces except bB would be attacking e6 or g5.

## Sergej Volobujev

(18.11.1958-4.8.2020)

839 - Sergej Volobujev
Thémes-64 1986


If it is White's move now, then the question is how the position can be unknotted. Balance of captures shows all white pieces were captured by black pawns b-e, while two black pieces (B, Q) were captured by Pe7 and Pg6 (this due to Pg 4 doing no capture).

The only remaining black unit for easy uncapture is h-pawn, on h3 it would provide one tempo to Black. Otherwise Black can only move Bb8. Obviously White cannot take back g2-g3 due to Bh5, so only queen moves remain.

Now it is necessary to allow the last possible black capture $a 7 \times b 6$, preceded earlier by b6-b7, b7×c6 and c6-c7, however already $a 7 \times b 6$ lets wK out of the cage. This black capture should be preceded by a-pawn promotion at a8 (as this pawn cannot be captured by black pawns).

As taking back -1...Ba7-b8 closes wQ on top of the board, wQ travels to the h-file, triangulates to lose a tempo and then goes out for uncapture at h3. Then it returns to the top of the board and triangulates once more to arrive at a8 followed by unpromotion $\mathrm{a} 7-\mathrm{a} 8=\mathrm{Q}$ with crucial black tempo used now.

Retro: -1...Ba7-b8 -2.Qc8-a8 -3.Qd7-c8 -4.Qe8-d7-5.Qf8-e8-6.Qg7-f8-7.Qh7-g7 -8.Qh8-h7 -9.Qg7-h8 -10.Qf8-g7 -11.Qe8-f8 -12.Qd7-e8 -13.Qc8-d7 Ba7-b8 -14.Qa8-c8 Bb8-a7 -15.Qa1-a8 -16.Qf1-a1 -17.Qh3-f1 -18.Qf1×Ph3 ... -21.Qa8-a1 Ba7-b8 -22.Qc8-a8 ... -33.Qc8-d7 Ba7-b8 -34.Qa8-c8 Bb8-a7 -35.a7-a8=Q h4-h3...

## 1.S×h6\#!

Understandable retro problem fitting into Conflictio thanks to the stipulation.

> Juraj Lörinc

## Fresh clash 12

Four new originals in this issue. The first is orthodox selfmate, N025 and N026 use Breton and Breton adverse, defined as follows: In Breton, in a case of capture, one opposite unit of the same type as the captured unit (if present on the board) is removed at the same time. If needed, the choice of the removed unit is made by the capturing side. In Breton adverse, the additionally removed unit should be exactly the same (i.e. of the noncapturing side).

Fairy elements used in the last original N027 are explained along the problems 834 and 836 above.

N024 - Peter Gvozdják
dedicated to my brother Janko-50

1...S×a6 2.Sd4+ A Kf6 3.Sd5+ B×d5\#
1...R×a1 2.Sd6+ B Kf6 3.Sd5+ B×d5\#
1.Ra5? [2.Sd4+ A Kf6 3.Sd5+ B×d5\#]
1...Sc3 a 2.Sd6+ B Kf6 3.Sd5+ B×d5\#
1...Sb6 b 2.Qc5+ C Sd5 3.Q×d5+ B×d5\#
1...Sd7!
1.Bf6! [2.Sd6+ B K×f6 3.Sd5+B×d5\#]
1...Sc3 a 2.Qc5+C Sd5 3.Q×d5+ B×d5\#
1...Sb6 b 2.Sd4+ A K×f6 3.Sd5+ B×d5\#

Author: "Shedey cycle in non-trivial diagonal-orthogonal analogy.
Set play variations capture the key units and W2 moves are transferred into threats of the cyclic phases.
Happy jubilee, bro?'

N025 - Hubert Gockel

1...Se5 a 2.Se3\# A

1 ...Sd4 b 2.Sc7\# B
1...Ke4 2.B×c6(×b7)\# C
1.Bc8? [2.B×b7(×c6)\#], 1...Rh7! emphasizes set play.
1.Se6~? [2.Se3\# A], 1...Kd4!
1.Sd4? [2.B×c6(×b7)\# C], 1...Rh6!
(threat correction
2.Se3+? S×d4(×e3)!,1...K×d4(×c4)??)
1...Se5 a 2.R×e5\# K
1...S×d4(×c4) b 2.c4\# L
1.Sc4~? [2.Sc7\# B], 1...Ke5!
1.Se5! [2.B×c6(×b7)\# C]
(threat correction
2.Sc7+? S×e5(×c7)!, .- K×e5(×e6)??)
1...S×e5(×e6) a 2.Be6\# M
$1 . . . S d 4$ b 2.R×d4\# N

Author: "3x2 Zagorujko, leveraging the set mates in tries and solution, threat correction, give and take / pseudo give and take."

N026 - Hubert Gockel

1.g4? [2. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 4(\times \mathrm{c} 6)$ \# A
2.Q×c5(×c6)\# B]
1...Sc5~ 2.Q×d4(×c6)\# A
1...Sd4~2.Q×c5(×c6)\# B
$1 . . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{h} 3(\times b 4), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{g} 4(\times b 4) 2 . B \times e 5(\times \mathrm{g} 6) \#$ (defence in the spirit of Finnish Novotny)
$1 . . . S \times c 6(\times c 5)$ !
1.S×a7(×g3)? [2.Q×d4(×a7)\# A 2.Q×c5(×a7)\# B]
1...Sc6 2.Sb5\#
1...Q×h3(×b4)! (refutation in the spirit of Finnish Novotny)
1.S×b4(×g3)! [2.Qd5\# C] (and not 2.Q×d4(×b4)+R×d4(×h5)!! nor 2.Q×c5(×b4)+B×c5(×h5)!!)
1...B×b4(×d4) 2.Qd4\# A
1...R×b4(×d4) 2.Q×c5\# B
1...Q×g6(×a4) 2.Rc6\#
(2...d×c6(×e5)??, $S \times c 6(\times e 5) ? ?-$ selfcheck, also $2 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 4(\times \mathrm{b} 4)+$, Qd5+? B(×)d5!)

Author: "The expected mates 2.QxS after the key fail to -new- defences but are transferred to -likewise new- defences.

Secondary Finnish Novotny Threat correction and return

The term Finnish Novotny 4 which I apply here is perhaps not quite correct because in its core definition a black obstacle actively leaves the cutting point (in the phase where Black is successful). Here the clearance happens due to a collateral effect which is owed to the condition. There are so many differently named Novotnys - why not call this one (Secondary) Breton Novotny?
(I published a pioneer example called Breton Novotny this year in The Macedonian Problemist)."

One my chess problem friend, when presented with the novel idea from the chess composition, often reacts in style: "This would be worth an article." As now already many interesting effects were shown in the Breton and its variants and many good problems were composed, perhaps an article would be a good idea. Or does it already exist?

1.Rd7! Qd4+ 2.Rc6 Qd8 3.Rb6 Qd3 4.EAd4 Qb3 5.EAc3 Qb5 6.Ra5 Qb2 7.EAb4 Qd4 8.Ra4 (new symmetry!)
8...Qc3 9.EAa3+ Qa5\#
8....Qc5 9.EAa5+ Qa3\#
1...Qb4 2.EAd8 Qe7+ 3.Re6 Qb4 4.Rd5+ Qe7 5.EAf8 Qe4+ 6.Rc5 Qe8 7.Rb4 Qa4+ 8.Ra3 Qe8 9.EAb2 Qa4\#

The initial position is symmetrical, with vertical axis. The solution is thus asymmetrical - the board edge proximity is the deciding factor.

The position after the White's 8th move is also symmetrical, but with horizontal axis. It is followed by two symmetrical subvariations.

Juraj Lörinc

## Annual tourney Conflictio 2022

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 Narayan Shankar Ram (India), 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]:    ${ }^{1}$ Read more here:in the dedicated publication by K. Mlynka and J. Golha..

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Comments translated from Technické noviny,

