## In this issue

For some time, I have neglected looking into PAT A MAT issues. It was possible thanks to the fact that I have been receiving a lot of input from other authors of articles. Now the time has come to review three PAT A MAT issues at once 123-125.

A few originals follow in the originals column Fresh Clash.
As the brutal Russian aggression against Ukraine still continues, I would like to recall ongoing initiative of Peter Gvozdják and Vasil Ďačuk in support of Ukrainian chess composers. Peter not only directs collected money to suffering Ukrainian friends, but also informs the donors about the details of the distribution. With winter coming soon, any help will be the most appreciated.

Stay safe and enjoy Conflictio!
Juraj Lörinc

## Published during 2023: PAT A MAT 123-125

Issue No 123 of Slovak magazine appeared in March 2023. Usual 32 pages included among other:

- 2nd part of P. Gvozdják series about 11th WCCT,
- obituary of Bohuslav Sivák,
- Juraj Brabec's reflections on Cyclone themes,
- originals.

PDF selection from the issue can be downloaded on the dedicated page. 3 originals from the issue 1136-1138 are reproduced here.


1.S×f7? [2.Qg2\# A], 1...Rg8!
1...S×d4 a 2.R×e5\# B
1...S×c5 b 2.R×d6\# C
1.S×e6! [2.Sf4\#]
1...S×d4 a $2 . R \times d 6 \#$ C
1...S×c5 b 2.R×e5\# B
1...fxe6 c 2.Qg2\# A
1...K×e6 2.Q×f7\#

Sg 5 allows two potential checkmates R×e5\# and R×d6\#, that could happen if one of two black knights would leave their position too. Any departure of Sg 5 allows threat $2 . \mathrm{Qg} 2 \#$ defended by $1 . . . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{d} 4$ or $1 . . . S \times c 5$ with additional flights given.

The try $1 . \mathrm{Sff}$ ? guards d 6 and e5, giving one possible order of white mates. The solution 1 . $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{e} 6$ ! gives up original threat by queen due to new flight, but a new threat appears, with black knight moves defending again. A reciprocal change ensues and the threat corrected away reappears after self-block on e6.

Reciprocal change with double-pin mates and change of function of Qg 2 .

1.Kh6! [2.Qg7+ K×d6 3.Qc7\#]
1...Sf2 2.Qg7+ Kf4 3.Bh2\#
1...Sf3 2.Qg7+ Kf4 3.R×f3\#
1...Sc6 2.Qg7+K×d6 3.S×b7\#
1...f4 2.Qg7+ Kf5 3.Qg5\#
1...c×d3 2.Qg7+ Ke4 3.Q×d4\#

The authors claim that 1137 shows Lincoln theme in 6 variations (including threat). My understanding is that while 2.Qg7+ is repeated in threat and every variation, there are always different mating moves. Well, threat sub-variation 2...K×d6 3.Qc7\# is there in most cases, but the new second moves by bK provide also new mates.

Perhaps it would be interesting to look at some other executions of this theme. Either tasks with maximum number of variations or other with rich strategy of sub-variations. Any suggestions?

1.Qa2? zz
1...S×e2 2.Qd2+ Sd4 3.Ref6 K×e5 4.Qb2 Kd5 5.Rf5+ Sxf5 6.Se3+ S×e3\#
1...S×h3 2.Rd6+ K×e5 3.Sd3+Kf5 4.e4+ Kg5 5.Rhg6+ Kh5 6.Sf4+ S×f4\#
1...S×f3!
1.Qb1! zz
1...S×e2 2.Qd1+ Sd4 3.Ref6 K×e5 4.Qa1 Kd5 5.Rf5+ S×f5 6.Se3+ S×e3\# (MM) 1...S×h3 2.Rd6+ K×e5 3.Sd3+ Kf5 4.e4+ Kg5 5.Rhg6+ Kh5 6.Sf4+ S×f4\# (MM) 1...S×f3 2.Rd6+ K×e5 3.Sd7+ Kf4 4.Rdf6+ Kg5 5.Rfg6+ Kf4 6.R×h4+ S×h4\#

It is not easy to decide between two possible first moves - 1.Qa2? allows two variations, only $1 . . . S \times f 3$ refutes, 1.Qb1! is the key. There are two model mates.

Issue No 124 of Slovak magazine appeared in June 2023. 40 pages included among other:

- 3rd part of P. Gvozdják series about 11th WCCT,
- small article about B. Formánek's 90th jubilee,
- S. Vokál's look on A. Galickij,
- originals,
- selections,
- information about Slovak solving championship,
- review of Slovak successes.

PDF selection from the issue can be downloaded on the dedicated page. For this article I have chosen 18 compositions 1139-1156 from various columns and articles.

1139 - Bedrich Formánek 1st Prize Szachy 1962

\#3
(6+9) C+
1...c2 2.Q×a1+ Kf4 3.Be3\# MM
1...Kf4 2.Be3+ Ke5 3.f4\#
1.Sf2! [2.Sg4+ Kf4 3.Be3\#]
1...c2 2.Q×a1+ Kf4 3.Sh3\# MM
1...Kf4 2.Sh3+ Ke5 3.f4\# MM
1...g×f2 2.Bh2+ Kd4 3.Qb6\# MM
1...d5 2.Qb8+ Kd4 3.Sd1\#

Model mate after $1 \ldots \mathrm{c} 2$ is changed between set play and solution. Also flight variation 1...Kf4 acquires model mate after change of the 2nd move and to fulfill

Bohemian canonical requirements, there is the third model mate after $1 \ldots \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{f}$. In spite of rough $\mathrm{Q} \times$ a1 moves quite elegant Bohemian threemover, with touch of modernism due to changed set play. Included in relevant FIDE Album.


The set variation $1 . . \mathrm{Kg} 5$ with model mate on the edge of the board is kept in the solution. But a good key adds another flight to the bK. This lead to forked play with two middle-board model mates, one of them similar to the kept set mate - only wK replaces the edge of the board. Quite good miniature (116 years old).

1141 - Miguel Uris
\& Luis Gómez Palazón
PAT A MAT 2023

1.Se8? [2.Qa1\# A], 1...b3!
1...R×f7+ 2.S×f7\# B
1.Bf7~? [2.Sf7\# B], 1...R×c7!
1...K×d6 a $2 . \mathrm{Bf} 4 \# \mathrm{C}$
1...S×d6 2.Qa1\# A
1.Se6? [2.Bf4\# C], 1...h×g5!
1...K×d6 a $2 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{C} 5 \# \mathrm{D}$

```
1.Sd5! [2.B\timesc5# D]
1...K×d6 a 2.Bf4# C
1...S×d6 2.Qa1# A
1...R\timesf7+ 2.S×f7# B
1...Sf5 2.Re6#
1...B\timesd5 2.R×d5#
```

The position of wQ suggests that her majesty will need to move in the key, but instead white Sc 7 and $\mathrm{Bf7}$ make all the first moves in three tries and solution. 2.Qa1\# is once a threat and in the solution it is single movement of the queen. Still, the problem shows 4 -fold cyclic pseudo le Grand AB/BC/CD/DA, also le Grand CD/DC.

1142 - Leonid Makaronez
\& Rauf Aliovsadzade
PAT A MAT 2023

1.Be2? [2.Ra4\#]
1...S×e2 2.Rd1 [3.Ra4\#] Sc3 3.b×c3\#
1...R×e2!
1.Rh4! [2.R×e4+ fxe4 3.Qd5\#]
1...Rf4 2.Be2 [3.Ra4\#] S×e2 3.S×e2\#
1...e2 2.Qd2 [3.Ra4\#] e×d1=Q 3.Q×f2\#
1...Q×h4 2.Bc2 [3.Ra4\#] R×c2 3.S×f5\#
1...Qh5 2.S×f5+ R×f5 3.R×e4\#
1...e6, e5 2.B×c5+ d×c5 3.Qd8\#

The point of the threemover is in the fight for the square d3. As soon as it is guarded, Ra3 is free for Ra4\#. But the fight is fierce. In the logical try, guarding by bishop is refuted by bR, even if Rh1 can support d3 if Sg 1 moves.

In the solution, 1...Rf4 allows try move to pass. Two other guards of d3 are allowed by defences $1 \ldots$..e2 and $1 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{h} 4$.

Another pair of by-variations increase workload for white pieces, including Ba7 and Qg5 checkmating even from d8.

1143 - Jurij Gordian \& Michajlo Marandyuk PAT A MAT 2023


1. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{f} 3+$ ? $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{f} 3$ !
1.Qd3+? S×d3!
1.Qb3! [2.R×d5+ Kf4 3.Rf5+ Ke4 4.Qe6\#]
1...R×h5 2.Qd3+ S×d3 3.Rg5+ Kf4
4.R3×g4\#
1...Q×f1 2.Q×f3+ g×f3 3.Rf6+ Ke5 4.Rg5\#, 3...Ke3 4.Rf×f3\#

In the diagram position or after the key, Bh2 obviously cannot capture Rg3 with check due to Sxg3\#. On the other hand, White cannot utilize rook outright due to the pin.

Two tries by wQ are just showing that there is enough black defence power against immediate action.

That is why White first provokes weakening moves by Rh4 or Qh1 by threat with wQ checkmating on e-file. As a consequence, White can utilize wQ sacrifices and battery checks by Rf5 forcing bK to unpin Rg3 who then can checkmate on g4/g5.

1144 - Daniel Novomeský
PAT A MAT 2023

1.b8=Q Kf1 2.Rc5 Ke1 3.Qb1+ Kd2 4.Qc1+ Kd3 5.e8=B Kd4 6.Ke2 Ke4 7.Bc6+ Kd4 8.Ke1 Kd3 9.Qd1+ Ke3 10.Bg2 f3 11.Bf1 f2\#

Although promoting black pawn is always a distant possibility, most often it is black pawn checkmating wK in similar minimal positions. As there are only 4 possible White blockers, middle-board checkmate is ruled out. Thus, only mates with wK on the edge remain.

Solution of the miniature is open by queen promotion and later there is also bishop promotion. Black king is driven to the third rank, white king marches to the first rank and f2\# is just expected.

In 1145 the condition Adverse Breton is utilized, It adds a new twist to the captures: when a side captures opposite unit of type Y , it also removes other unit of type $Y$ from the board, choice being with capturing side.

Yet there are no captures in the whole solution of 1145.

1145 - Hubert Gockel
PAT A MAT 2023


Adverse Breton
高 $=$ nightrider, 屝 $=$ grasshopper
1.e5? A [2.f7\# B]
1...g5 a 2.Nab6\# C
1...f2 b 2.c3\# D
$1 . . . \operatorname{Rg} 4$ !
1.f7! B [2.e5\# A]
1...g5 a 2.c3\# D
1...f2 b 2.Nab6\# C
1...Rg4 2.Nf1\#

The mechanism alternating key and threat is simple, it is just a half-battery aimed at the bK. However, the reciprocal change is quite fairy specific. Defence motivation of pawn moves is opening lines of Rh6/Bh1 to the battery line. The error of defences is common - adding a guard on e2, either by opening Nh8 or by providing hurdle to Gh2. This potentially allows two mates giving up original guard by Na4-2.c3\# and 2.Nab6\#. But...

Black pawns open black lines. In the try, 1 ...g5 allows $\mathrm{R} \times f 6$, disabling mate c3\# and $1 \ldots \mathrm{f} 2$ allows $B \times \mathrm{d} 5$, disabling mate by nightrider. Also in the solution: 1...g5
allows $R \times b 6$ and $1 \ldots \mathrm{f} 2$ allows $B \times e 4$, disabling antibattery mate.

As a result we get synthesis of key-threat reversal and reciprocal change that for me will be always represented by orthodox twomover by Daniel Papack, 1st Prize Hlas ludu 1995. Here there is also a dual avoidance.

1146-Gerhard Maleika
Probleemblad 2021

1.Bf3! [2.Re6\# A 2.Rd4\# C]
1...Sfxd6 2.Re6\# A
2.Qd5\# B
1...Sd4 2.Qd5\# B 2.R×d4\# C
1...Rd3 2.Rd4\# C
2.b5\# D
1...R×e3 2.b5\# D
2.R×e3\# E
1...S×e3 2.R×e3\# E
2.Qb5\# F
1...Sfxe7 2.Qb5\# F
2.R×e7\# G
1...Sc×e7 2.R×e7\# G
2.R×b6\# H
1...Sc×d6 2.R×b6\# H
2.Re6\# A

1146 has double threat, but more importantly it features eight variations with exactly two mates following. Some are the threats, some are not, but when the dust after analysis of the variations settles, the pattern is clear: 8-fold cycle of duals ABCDEFGH.

## 1147 - Daniil Yakimovich

1st-2nd Prize ex aequo
StrateGems 2022

1.Rc7? [2.Rc5\#], 1...Bg1!
1.Ra6? [2.Se7\#], 1...Re3!
1.Bf6! [2.Se7+ K×d6 3.Se4\#]
1...Re3 2.Rc7 [3.Rc5\#] B×d6 3.Sb6\# Hamburg
1...Rg4 2.Ra6 [3.Se7\#] B×d6 3.R×d6\# -Palitzsch-Dresden

## 2...Re4 3.d×e4\# - Roman

Logical threemover utilizes two tries and two variations to show three basic themes:

- Hamburg, in which after strong defence (refutation) by piece $A$, in the variation the move by piece $B$ switches defence to other weaker defence by piece A,
- Roman, in which strong defence,
variation move and new weaker defence are played by the same piece A
- Palitzsch-Dresden, in which after strong defence (refutation) by piece A, in the variation the move by the same piece A switches defence to other weaker defence by a new piece B.
Moreover, in the solution the white rook anti-imitates moves of the black rook.

1.Qb7! [2.Q×e7\#]
1...Bc7 2.Sd7+ Ke4 3.S×d6+ Ke3 4.Sf5+ Ke4 5.S×c5\#
1...Rc7 2.Se8+ Ke4 3.S×e7+ Ke3 4.Sf5+ Ke4 5.Sexd6\#

Two white diagonal batteries, with bishops as rear pieces and knights as front pieces, are brought into action. The key provokes Grimshaw on c7. The interferences are utilized in the checkmates, but for that guarding pawns must be annihilated as well. This is ensured by moving bK to e4 in the second move (and Bh8 guards d4) then switchback of the Sf5. Nice analogy of two variations.

1149 - Volker Gülke \& Frank Richter 2nd Prize Die Schwalbe 2017

1.Bh3! [2.Rh5+ K×f6 3.Qg5+ B×g5\#]
1...S77~
2.Rf4+ Ke5 3.Rh4+ Bf4\#
1...Sh6,Sd6,Se5!
2.R×f3+Sf5,Sg4 3.Re3+B×e3\#
1...Sg5!!
2.Qd6+ c×d6 3.Rd5+ S×h3\#

Any move by Sf7 guards against the primary threat, as Rf8 adds an additional guard to $f 6$. White utilizes this guard after random defence (represented by 1...Sh8) when Rf5 moves to h4 via $\mathfrak{f 4}$ Then black knight can attack the battery line h3-e6 by more precise jumps, but this allows $w R$ attack via $\ddagger 3-\mathrm{e} 3+$. This defence can be further corrected by third degree 1 ...Sg5!! attacks h3 and thus prevents White's third move (forcing $3 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{h} 3$ instead of 3.Re3+). However White can exploit that by queen sacrifice and then 3.Rd5+ still guarding e5.

Very convincing black correction.

1.Bb7? zz
1...Rh1 2.Qf6+ Kd7 3.Bc8+ Kc7 4.Sb5+ Kb8 5.Bh3+ Kb7 6.B×g2+ B×g2\#
$1 . . . c \times b 3!$
1.Rh6? zz
1...c×b3 2.Qf7+ K×e5 3.g7 [4.Sg6+ Kd6 5.Sf4+ Kc5,Ke5 6.S×d3+ B×d3\#]
1...Rh1!
1.Rh7! zz
1...Rh1 2.Qd7+ K×e5 3.Qd4+ Ke6 4.Bd5+ Kd6 5.B×g2+ Ke6 6.Bh3+ B×h3\# 1...c×b3 2.Qf7+K×e5 3.Qf4+Ke6 4.Bf5+ Kf6 5.B×d3+Ke6 6.Bc4+ B×c4\#

Zugzwang character of 1150 is quite clear with only two reasonable moves available to Black, $1 \ldots$ Rh1 and $1 \ldots c \times b 3$.

White has to provide continuations to both. Two tries are vicious for solvers as they provide one precise variation each, failing to offer selfmate in the other. The solution provides for both and moreover in a very analogous fashion, with critical moves by queen as well as creation and firing of the bishop Siers batteries.

1151 - Michael Barth
Commendation Olympic Tourney 2009-2010


Anticircé
1.Se5! [2.Sg6+ Q×g6(Qd8)\#]
1...Rf7 2.Sf3 [3.S×e1(Sg1)+ Qe1\#]
2...Re7 3.Sh4 Rf7 4.Sg2 Re7 5.Sf4 Rf7
6.b8=S [7.Se6+ d×e6(e7) 8.Sd7+

Q×d7(Qd8)\#]
White's attack has the following idea. Se1 is pinned so that wKg8 does not attack bKf8. On the other hand, Kf8 does not attack Kg8 due to presence of bQ at e8. So White is trying to force bQ away, either by direct check from g6 or by annihilation of Se1. Black obviously defends by alternating closing of e8-g6 and e8-e1 lines by bR.

White manoeuvres with knight lead to crucial improvement of his position to f 4 . There the knight can check also via e6, with Pd6 intervening, but knight promotion add decisive power to white's efforts. Nice utilization of Anticirce specificities.

1...R×g5 2.Sc3\#,Sf4\#
1.Qd1? [2.Sc3\#,Sf4\#],1...a×b5!
1.b×a6? [2.Qb5\#],1...Rc7!
1...R×g5 2.Qb7\#
1.Rh4? [2.Sc3\# A], 1...Rd7!
1...R×g5 a 2.Sf4\# B
1.Qb2! [2.Sf4\# B]
1...R×g5 a 2.Sc3\# A
1...Sg2,Sd3 2.B(×)g2\#
1...c3 2.Qb3\#
1... 44 2.Be6\#
1...a×b5 2.Q×b5\#
1...R×g5 2.Sc3,Sf4\#

The judge Bogusz Piliczewski wrote in the award:
"The main idea of the composition is the combination of le Grand and Sushkov themes, utilizing the Somov B1 theme as the mechanism. I found only four twomovers with such a combination (yacpdb.org)\#21151 and \#469595, WinChloe: 570581 and 833166). In spite
of that the author harmoniously extended the problem with Barnes and Mäkihovi themes. I must confess that it was the only composition I failed to solve. I decided for 1.Rh4?. Z-31-13."

1153 - Ladislav Salai jr. \& Emil Klemanič
2nd Prize The Problemist 2020

1.e3! [2.Bd4+ Kd6 3.R×c6\#]
1...R×e3 2.d4+Ke4 3.B×c6\#
1...Shf3 2.B×c6 [3.Sg6\#] Sh4 3.d4\#
2...f4 3.e×f4\#
1...Sgf3 2.R×c6 [3.Sf7\#] Sg5 3.Bd4\#

In the threat and the $1 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times 3$ variation White forces bK away by check from d4 and checkmates from c6. In the second pair of variations the squares c 6 and d4 exchange their roles - White utilizes unguards of $\mathrm{g} 6 / \mathrm{f7}$ by black knights for quiet moves to $c 6$ and after switchbacks mates from d4. From the strategical point of view, it is important that wRc6 attacks d 6 and e6, while wBc6 attacks d5 and e4.

Quite convincing example of Adabashev synthesis (analogue of HOTF).

1...R×c5 2.S×d6+S×d6\#
1... $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{c} 52 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{d} 5+\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{d} 5 \#$
1.Qc6! [2.Qd7+ B×d7\#]
1...B×c6 2.S×d6+S×d6\#
1... $R \times c 62 . B \times d 5+Q \times d 5 \#$

Mere notation of the solution (including set play) hints transference of 2nd moves, but what is really present? In both phases White cannot force selfmate by captures S×d6+ or B×d5+ with wQ attacking d 5 and d 6 . That is why noncapturing moves to 66 (in set play) or to c5 (in solution) do not lead to selfmates and the transference is pure.

But there is more. In the solution, any theoretical capture on c6 allows both White continuations. However specific captures additionally guarding d5 and d6 disables one of them, giving dual avoidance. And in the set play, there is Black arrival correction, when any capture allows $2.5 \times \mathrm{d} 6+$, while queen capture gives bQ access to d5.

1155 - Jozef Havran \& Peter Gvozdják 1st Prize League
of the Macedonian Problemist 2022

1...R×e6 2.Q×e6+ Kc5+3.Qd5+ B×d5\#
1.Rd1? [2.Sed8+ X Kc5+ 3.Rd5+ B×d5\#]
1...R~ x 2.Sfd8+ Y B×d8 3.Rd6+ K×d6\#
1...R×e6 a $2 . d 8=S+A$ Kc5+ 3.Rd5+ B×d5\#
1...R×f7 b 2.d8=B+ B Rd7 3.Rd6+K×d6\#
1...Sd3!
1.Rb5! [2.Sfd8+ Y Kd6+ 3.Rd5+ B×d5\#]
1...R~x 2.Sed8+X B $\times$ d8 3.Rc5+K×c5\#
1...R×e6 a $2 . d 8=B+B R \times e 83 . R c 5+K \times c 5 \#$
1...R×f7 b 2.d8=S+A Kd6+ 3.Rd5+ B×d5\#

Very rare combination of le Grand theme XxY-YxX and reciprocal change aAbBaBbA. The motivation is far from trivial, even if all the mates are given on the diagonal a8-e4, with emphases especially on d 5 . This prevents other possible promotions $(Q, R)$ on $d 8$, then bishop and knight promotions are differentiated by need to force bK away from c6 or by need to avoid guarding of the bB line.

The authors also did maximum to remove possible symmetrical feeling with regard to the long diagonal a8-h1.


## 1.VAh3?

[2.NAc5 (zz) LE~ 3.NAd7\#
2.NAe2 [3.NAb8\#]]
1...LEa3! (2.NAc5? LE×c5!, 2.NAe2? LE×d3!)
1.VAe8! [2.NAc5 (zz) LE~ 3.NAd7\#] (single threat with zugzwang)
1...LEa3 2.NAe2 [3.NAb8\#, NAg6\#] (defence by gaining tempo 2.NAc5? LEa4!, error in giving up attack on e8, now with two threats Black is unable to defend both, also Dombrovskis paradox compared to try)

The following three defences defend in various ways and have common main error - unpin of NAa5. However, there is also triple avoidance in action:

## 1...LE×c2 2.NAc6 [3.NAb8\#]

(defence by gaining access to d-file, 2.NAc5? LEd~!, dual avoidance 2.NAc4? LE(attacks f4)!, 2.NAe3? LEc4!)
1...LE×e8 2.NAc4 [3.NAb2\#]
(defence by gaining access to d7, 2.NAc5? LEd7!, dual avoidance 2.NAe3? LExe3! or LEf~!, 2.NAc6? LE already attacks d7)
1...LE×a6 2.NAe3 [3.NAef1\#]
(defence by check preparation 2.NAc5? LE×a2+!, dual avoidance 2.NAc6 LE(attacks d7)!, 2. NAc4? LE×c4!)

From the mechanism point of view, it is important that immediate switchback after capturing \& unpinning moves by LEa4 is impossible.

Also, from constructional point of view, Nb3 is a price to be paid for 15 pieces used (tourney requirement), as almost all pieces are needed in the basic scheme, serving either as hurdles or as food for bLE, still some more needed to close important lines, with almost all utilized multipurpose.

The judge of the tourney Kjell Widlert wrote about 1156 in the award:
„The key sets up both a zugzwang position and a threat - by which I mean that there is no black move leading to the threat. Three of Black's moves are unpins of NAa5 (similar to orthodox unpins, not very fairy specific as in the 1st Prize - but that was not required in the tourney). The main point is in the triple avoidance in these variations: the unpinned NAa5 has three possible attacks, but each of these three black moves rules out three of these four continuations by a mixture of effects. To be exact, there is even quadruple avoidance, as each thematic defence also rules out the threat. The point is not in the unity of the tripleavoidance effects, for there is no clear unity, but in the fact that they all work quite naturally without extra force on the board. And in addition, there is the by-
variation 1...LEa3, defending the threat by replacing zugzwang with a switchback (2.NAc5? LEa4!), but allowing 2.NAe2 by loss of access to e8.

To quote the composer, it is a small miracle this this works within the limit of 15 pieces. The price for this result is the technical Nb3 (guarding h6 and serving as a hurdle), its properties unused in the play. That is a price I am easily willing to pay."

Issue No 125 of PAT A MAT appeared in September 2023. 32 pages included among other:

- 4th part of P. Gvozdják series about 11th WCCT,
- information about European solving championship,
- another small article about B. Formánek's 90th jubilee,
- originals,
- selections,
- short chess mathematics article by Awani Kumar.

PDF selection from the issue can be downloaded on the dedicated page. For this article I have chosen 10 compositions 1157-1166 from various columns and articles.

1157 - Juraj Brabec PAT A MAT 2023

$1 . . . d \times c 32 . R \times d 5 \#$
1.e×d5? [2.Sf7\#], 1...B×d5!
1...d×c6 2.Qe6\#
1.B×d4? [2.B×c5\#],1...Be3!
1...c×d4 2.Sf7\#
1...d×c4 2.Be3\#
1.B×b4? [2.B×c5\#],1...Bd2!
1...c×b4 2.Sf7\#
$1 . . . \mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{c} 42 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{d} 4 \#$

1. $R \times c 5$ ? [2.R×d5\#], 1...B×e4!
$1 . . K \times c 52 . B \times b 4 \#$
$1 . . . d \times c 62 . R \times c 6 \#$
1.Rc×d4! [2.R×d5\#]
1...d×c6 2.Sc4\#
$1 . . . c \times d 42 . B \times b 4 \#$
$1 . . . B \times e 42 . S \times e 4 \#$
The author wrote about 1157: "Composition with a over-used scheme, but it would surely give some joy to Zagorujko. It shows his theme in four phases, Z-42-66, adding some more variations and function changes."

1158 - Sergij I. Tkachenko
PAT A MAT 2023

1.Qe3! [2.Qd3+ Q×d3 3.e×d3\# MM]
1...c4 2.Qd4+ Q×d4 3.e4\# MM
1...Sb4 2.Q×b3+ Q×b3 3.e3\# MM
2...Sc2 3.Q×c2\#
1...Sc3 2.Q×c3 [3.Se3\#]
2...Qd2,Qf3,Qe4 3.Q×d2\#
2...Qg5 3.Q×b3\#

Three model mates by pawn battery following wQ sacrifices.

1.Ra7??
1.Rd7+!
1...Ke5 2.Re7+ Kd5 3.Be6+ Ke5 4.Bg4+ Kd5 5.Rd7+ Ke5 6.Bd6+ Kd5 7.Bf8+ Ke5 8.Re7+ Kd5 9.Ra7 c5 10.Rc7 f5 11.R×c5+ Ke6 12.B×f5\#
9...c3 10.Ra5+ Kc4 11.Be6\#
1...Ke6 2.Bf8 c3 3.Ra7+ Ke5 4.R×a2 c5
5.Ra5 f3 6.R×c5+ Kf4 7.Bd6\#

The quick action by 1.Ra7 does not work as moving Pc5 to c6 can switch Ba3 out of action, letting bK into space. That is why White has to rearrange positions of the bishops on diagonals they control. Bc8 must pass d7 and f5 to g4 in order to avoid bK escape via g5 when Ba3 passes via d6 to f8. Then 9.Ra7 is already strong enough to force checkmate.

Of course, there are many possible shorter variations, only two main variations are listed.

1160 - Marcel Tribowski
PAT A MAT 2023

1.c4? Ka8 2.Sc5+ S×a5 3.Q×a5+ Kb8 4.Qd8+ Ka7 5.Qc7+ Ka8 6.Qc8+ Ka7 7.Sb3 Kb6 8.c5+ Ka7 9.c6 Kb6 10.c7 Ka7 11.Sa5 Kb6 12.Sc6 Kc5 13.Qe6 Kb6 14.c8=Q Kc5 15.Sb4+ Kd4 16.Sa2 Kd3 17.Qec4+ Ke3 18.Q4g4 Kd3 19.Qcc4+ Ke3 20.Qcf4+ Kd3 21.Qd1+ Rd2 22.Kf1 R×d1\#
22...Sf2!
1.Kd1! Ka8 2.Qc8+ Ka7 3.Qb8+ Kb6 4.Qc7+ Ka7 5.Kc1 Ka8 6.Qc8+ Ka7 7.Qb8+ Kb6 8.Qc7+ Ka7 9.Kb2 Ka8 10.Qc8+ Ka7 11.Qb8+ Kb6 12.Qc7+ Ka7 13.Kb3 Ka8 14.Qc8+ Ka7 15.Qb8+ Kb6 16.Qc7+ Ka7 17.c3 Ka8 18.Qc8+ Ka7 19.Qb8+ Kb6 20.Qc7+ Ka7 21.b6+ Ka8 22.Sb4+S×a5\#

The selfmates editor writes about 1160: „The longest selfmate of this issue shows 2 equivalent phases. In the try White fails with zugzwang position even with the newly promoted queen as the Black can utilize his Sh1 able to move. The solution is then standard, with transfer of wK to the final position, for which the necessary tempi are provided by three-move
manoeuvre of the wQ. Only the existence of $b S$ in the solution does not provide me a good feeling."

1.Gd1? A [2.Gfxd2\# B]
1...Gc4 a 2.Gb4\# C
1...Se7 b 2.G×b3\# D
1...e2 2.Gc1\#
1...Ga4!
1.Gfxd2! B [2.Gd1\# A]
1...Gc4 a 2.G×b3\# D
1...Se7 b 2.Gb4\# C
1...Ga4 2.Ga2\#
1...Gd3 2.Gd4\#

Compare this to 1145. The same newstrategical theme, also the utilization of the same fairy pieces, but the mechanism of the reciprocal change is quite different, based on access of wGs to the b-file and guard of Sf8 to b4.

1162- Olivier Schmitt
1st-2nd Prize ex aequo
StrateGems 2020

1.Rf4? [2.R×f5\#]
1...Se3 2.Bf6 Rd1 3.R×f5+ S×f5 4.e4\#
1...R×e2!
1.Bf6? [2.Rd4\#]
1...Rd1 2.Rf4 Se3 3.R×f5+ S×f5 4.e4\#
$1 . . . \mathrm{g} 1=\mathrm{Q}$ !
1.Rc3? [2.Rd3\#]
1...Rd1!
1.Rd4+! Ke5 2.R×g4+ Kd5 3.Rd4+ Ke5 4.Rc4+ Kd5 5.Rc3 g1=Q 6.Rd3+ Qd4 7.R×d4+ Ke5 8.Rc4+ Kd5 9.Bf6 Rd1 10.Rf4 Se3 11.R×f5+S×f5 12.e4\#

The main plan is to remove Pf5 and checkmate by e4\#. Re1 and Pg2 can defend direct attacks, thus it is necessary to increase strength of the attack Rc3 by removing Pg 4 and then Black is forced to promote queen in a way that does not prevent White from carrying out the main plan. 1162 received very high points in WCCI 2019-2021.

1163 - Sven Trommler 2nd Prize 10th World Cup FIDE 2022

1.Ba1! [2.Rb2+ Kc3 3.Qb3+ Kd4 4.Qd5+ Kc3 5.Rb5+ Kc2 6.Qb3+Kc1 7.Bb2+Kb1 8.Be4+ B×e4\#]
1...d×c6 2.Rd3+ Kb4 3.Qa3+ Kc4 4.Rd4+ cxd4 5.S×e3+dxe3 6.Qc3+Kd5 7.Qe5+ Kc4 8.Qb5+ c×b5\#
1...R×c6 2.Ra3+ Kb4 3.Qb2+ Kc4 4.Qc3+ Kd5 5.Qe5+ Kc4 6.Rc3+ Kb4 7.Qe4+ c4 8.Q×c4+ R×c4\#

Full-length threat and two variations show the difficult content. In the threat White forces bK to move to b1 and then selfmates by $8 . \mathrm{Be} 4+\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{e} 4 \#$. Captures of the Bc6 create black battery on the long diagonal and White wants to exploit that by forcing the opening of the battery, but with limited range of Pc6/Rc6 it is necessary to re-arrange the position of Qa2, Rb3 and Kc4.

Very impressive!

1164 - Michel Caillaud
Sinfonie Scacchistiche 2016

a) $1 . f \times g 8=R(b)![2 . R d e 8 \#]$
b) $1 . f \times \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{b})$ ! [2.d6\#]
c) $1 . f \times g 8=Q(b)$ ! [2.Bf6\#] Qf7 2.Rfe8\#
d) $1 . f \times g 8=B(b)![2 . B g 5 \#]$

There are many variations on the idea of opposite-colour promotions using various tricks, like joke problems, Volages, Andernach chess, magic pieces and so on. 1164 is not exactly fantastic from pure twomovers point of view (all keys are opening Rf8 to f6, thereby taking a flight), but the combination of black AUW in keys with four different positions of wB on the c-file is simply magical.

1165 utilizes two fairy pieces (camel and equihopper) and achieves 3 complete super-AUWs. Some white moves are repeated between phases, but with 18 different black first moves this is quite irrelevant. Very good achievement in the area already much researched (s\#2 Maximum with AUW).

1165 - Nils Adrian Bakke
Springaren 2017 (v)


Maximum
$\leqslant=$ camel, ${ }^{\mathbb{~}} \sqrt{ }=$ equihopper
b) 亶 $a 7 \rightarrow e 1$
c) ${ }^{\square \sqcap} \mathrm{C}$ $2 \rightarrow \mathrm{c} 1$
a) 1.Bg1! zz
1...h×g1=S 2.Qf3+ S×f3\#
1...h×g1=B 2.Qd4 B×d4\#
1...hgg1=R 2.Qe1 Rg5\#
1...h×g1=Q 2.Qe3+ Q×e3\#
1...h×g1=CA 2.Qh4+ CA×h4\#
1...h×g1=EQ 2.Qf4 EQe7\#
b) 1.Qe2! zz
1...d×e1=S 2.Qf3+ S×f3\#
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} \times \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{B} 2 . \operatorname{Sg} 3 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{g} 3, \mathrm{Bc} 3 \#$
$1 . . . d \times e 1=R 2 . Q e 3+R \times e 3 \#$
$1 . . . \mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{e} 1=\mathrm{Q} 2 . \mathrm{Sg} 3$ Qa1\#
$1 . . . d \times e 1=C A 2 . B \times e 6+R \times e 6 \#$
1...d×e1=EQ 2.Qc4 EQa7\#
c) $1 . \mathrm{Bb} 8$ ! zz
1...d×c1=S 2.Qd3+S×d3\#
$1 . . . d \times c 1=B 2 . Q f 4 B \times f 4 \#$
$1 . . . d \times c 1=R 2 . Q e 1$ Rc5\#
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} \times \mathrm{c} 1=\mathrm{Q} 2 . \mathrm{Qe} 3+\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 3 \#$
$1 . . . d \times c 1=C A 2 . S f 2+C A \times f 2 \#$
$1 . . . d \times c 1=E Q 2 . B a 7 E Q \times a 7 \#$

$-9(9 \mathrm{~B}, 8 \mathrm{~N}) \& \# 1$ Pacific retractor (3+12) Shatranj corl fers
-1.Kg2-g1! f2-f1FE+ -2.Kf3-g2 e5-e4+ -3.Kf4-f3 e6-e5+ -4.Ke5-f4 Rd2-e2+ -5.Kd6-e5 FEb6-c7+ -6.Kc5-d6 FEc7-b6+ -7.Kb4-c5 FEb6-a5+ -8.Kb3-b4 c5-c4+ -9.FEc3-d4 \& 1.FEc3-b2\#

Jubilee tourney of Bedrich Formánek was dedicated to Shatranj, an old form of chess, where queens are replaced by ferses, bishops by alfils, there is no castling, no pawn double-step and promotion is only allowed to fers. Besides checkmate, also stalemate wins...

But this all is quite irrelevant in the selected 1166, that is Pacific retractor, i.e. both sides are retracting legal moves without captures. As usual in current retractors, white king makes series of moves forcing Black pieces to uncheck and slowly moves towards b3, allowing model mate by two ferses with bR selfblock on d2.

Juraj Lörinc

## Fresh clash 23

There are 4 originals in this issue thanks to their authors for supporting Conflictio with valuable submissions.

N049 is a welcome orthodox twomover.

1...e6 2.Qe3\#
1.Qe3+? A Kd6!
1.Qd4+? B K×d4!
1.Qf4+? C K×f4!
1.Sf5? [2.Qe3\# A] (and not 2.Qd4+? B Ke6! as White have given the flight square d6)
1...Sd5 2.Qd4\# B
1...Ke6 2.Qd5\#
1...Bd5!
1.Se2? [2.Qd4\# B] (and not 2.Qf4+? C Ke4! as White have given the flight square e4)
1...Bd5 2.Qf4\# C
1...Ke4 2.Qd4\#
1...c5!
1.R×f6! [2.Qf4\# C] (and not 2.Qe3+? A Kxf6! as White have given the flight square f6)
1...exf6 2.Qe3\# A - transferred
1...Sd5 2.Rf5\# - changed, B1
1...K×f6 2.Qg5\#

Author:

- Complete Cyclic Sushkov with a new and homogeneous scheme (all white moves give a flight square!): this involves a cycle of threats dual avoidance linked with a cyclic Pseudo-Le Grand AB-BC-CA
- Without white pawn

Twomover N050 utilizes a new fairy condition Series Capture that was successfully tried in Batumi Saké tourney for $\mathrm{h} \# 2$ genre. It is defined as follows.

Series Capture: At the end of capturing moves, the moving piece can optionally make another movement (possibly capturing) according to its type; if this added movement captures a piece as well, the moving piece can make another such movement, and so on. Each step of a series has to be legal. Only the last step of a series may give check to the opposite king. Series Capture does not modify the meaning of "check" : a king is not in check if he could only be captured by a Series Capture specific series of captures.

Even without fairy checks the condition is wild enough, allowing various tricks, as is documented also by N050.

N050 - Hiroaki Maeshima

1...Ke4 2.Qb7×e7×e4\#
1.Sd7! [2.Sd7×e5-c4\#
1...Rf5 (R~) 2.Sc8×e7×f5\#
1...Re4! 2.Sd7×c5×e4×f2-d1\#
1...Re6! 2.Sd7×c5×e6×f4-g2\#
1...Rd5! 2.Qb7×d5-d3\#
1...e7×d6-d5 2.Qb7×d5-d3\#

The author writes:
After 1.Sd7!, moving bRe5 so as not to be captured can be Black's defense.

However, random move of bRe5 opens the line e8-e3, and allows Sxe7xf5\#.

The corrections are 1...Re4/Re6/Rd5, but they have the same error: The arrival to the square to be captured.

Themes: Series-capture specific defense and arrival errors,
Rook's cross,
N051 uses Adverse Breton, where, in a case of capture, one unit of the noncapturing side 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.

N051 - Hubert Gockel

1.B×e3(×e6)? [2.Bd5\#]
1...S×b7(×f3) a 2.Qf1\# A
2. $Q \times f 7(\times c 5) \# B$
$1 \ldots S \times c 6(\times e 3)$ b 2.Q×f7(×c3)\# C
1...c2!
1.R×e3(×e6)! [2.Bd5\#]
1...S×b7(×e3) a 2.Q×f7(×c5)\# B
$1 . . . S \times c 6(\times f 2)$ b $2 . Q \times f 7(\times c 3) \#$ C
2.Qf1\# A
1...Rb2 2.Q×c3(×b4)\#

## Author: Unusual pattern for $\mathbf{A B C}-\boldsymbol{B C A}$

The pattern in my view deserves some consideration. The checkmates B and C differ only by place of Breton-removed black pawn (c5 vs. c3). They follow not exactly the same black moves, as the places of the Breton-removed white pieces in defences $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ changes between phases, But one can argue that the removed White piece is the same...
so that the question of the identity of moves gets a new twist here.

And when we consider Black defences as the same, then we see that defence $\mathbf{a}$ is always followed by mate B and defence $\mathbf{b}$ is always followed by mate $\mathbf{C}$, while mate $\mathbf{A}$ is transferred from defence a to defence b. Surely unusual.

The last original N052 further develops idea of N048 from the previous issue, but in different direction. Again, there are four pairs of mutually paralyzed pieces on the board, with intersections of paralysis lines utilized for White moves. This time all thematical paralyzed pieces are bishops and thus also the stipulation is different (\#3 instead of \#5) and there is different checking mechanism: battery checks by wazir from e4 to intersections. Diagram Circe then ensures that capture of wazir by Black return it to the square where it stood in the diagram position.


```
1.WAe3+? A
1...Bh\timese3(WAe4) y 2.WAe5+C
Bb\timese5(WAe4) q 3.WAf4# D
    2...Ba\timese5(WAe4) w 3.WAd4# B
    3.WAf4# D
1...Bg\timese3(WAe4)! s
1.WAd4+? B
1...Bg×d4(WAe4) z 2.WAf4+ D
Bh\timesf4(WAe4) r 3.WAe3# A
    2...Bb×f4(WAe4) x 3.WAe5# C
    3.WAe3# A
1...Ba\timesd4(WAe4)! p
1.WAe5+? C
1...Ba\timese5(WAe4) w 2.WAe3+ A
Bg\timese3(WAe4) s 3.WAd4# B
    2...Bh\timese3(WAe4) y 3.WAf4# D
    3.WAd4# B
1...Bb\timese5(WAe4)! q
1.WAf4+? D
1...Bbxf4(WAe4) x 2.WAd4+ B
Ba×d4(WAe4) p 3.WAe5# C
    2...Bg×d4(WAe4) z 3.WAe3# A
    3.WAe5# C
```

1...Bh×f4(WAe4)! r
1.Bb1! zz
1...b2 a 2.WAe3+ A Bh×e3(WAe4) y 3.WAd4\# B
2...Bg×e3(WAe4) s 3.WAd4\# B NOT
2.B×b2(b3)? f2 d 3.WAd4\# B
2...Sc7 b 3.WAe5\# C
2...g5! c
1...Sc7 b 2.WAd4+ B Bg×d4(WAe4) z 3.WAe5\# C
2...Ba×d4(WAe4) p 3.WAe5\# C NOT
2.B×c7(Sa8)? b2 a 3.WAe5\# C
2...g5 c 3.WAf4\# D
2...f2! d
2...S×c7(Bg3)!
1...g5 c 2.WAe5+C Bb×e5(WAe4) q 3.WAf4\# D
2...Ba×e5(WAe4) w 3.WAf4\# D NOT
2.B×g5(g6)? Sc7 b 3.WAf4\# D
2...f2 d 3.WAe3\# A
2...b2! a
1...f2 d 2.WAf4+ D Bh×f4(WAe4) r 3.WAe3\# A
2...Bb×f4(WAe4) x 3.WAe3\# A NOT
2.B×f2(f3)? g5 c 3.WAe3\# A
2...b2 a 3.WAd4\# B
2...Sc7! b
1.Bc2? zz
1...b2 2.Ba4 [3.Bd7\#] Sc7 3.WAe5\#
$1 . . . b \times c 2(B d 3)$ !
The author's remarks include:

- $4 x$ cycle of $W 2 / W 3$ moves ( $A B / B C / C D / D A$ ): in tries after 1...Baxe5/Bbxf4/Bhxe3/Bgxd4 and transferred in actual play to 1...b2/Sc7/g5/f2.
- $4 x$ Carousel like cycle of White mates (B/C, C/D, D/A, A/B) and double reciprocal change of Black defences (d/b, a/c, b/d, c/a) in 2nd move tries after key.
- Various other reciprocal and cyclic patterns involving White 1st and 2nd move tries, changed and transferred
mates，and Black refutations．
－Black critical moves，interferences and Self－Paralysis．
－Cross by White Wazir e4．
－Additional change for 1．．．b2 after try 1．Bc2？
－Quiet hideaway key．
Shankar Ram also provided the following colourful table：

|  | W1 | B1 | W2 | B2 | W3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A？ | y | C | q | D |
|  |  |  |  | w | B／D |
|  |  | s！ | ？ |  |  |
|  | B？ | z | D | $r$ | A |
| A＝WAe3＋ |  |  |  | x | C／A |
| B＝WAd4＋ |  | $\mathrm{p}!$ | ？ |  |  |
| C＝WAe5＋ | C？ | w | A | s | B |
| D＝WAf4＋ |  |  |  | y | D／B |
| $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{b} 2$ |  | q！ | ？ |  |  |
| b $=$ Sc7 | D？ | x | B | p | C |
| $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{g} 5$ |  |  |  | z | A／C |
| $\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{f} 2$ |  | r！ | ？ |  |  |
| p＝Baxd4 | 1．Bb1！ | a | A | s／y | B |
| q＝Bbxe5 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bxb2? } \\ \text { (b3) } \end{gathered}$ | d | B |
| r＝Bhxf4 |  |  |  | b | C |
| s＝Bgxe3 |  |  |  | c！ | ？ |
| w＝Baxe5 |  | b | B | p／z | C |
| x＝Bbxf4 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Bxc7? } \\ \text { (Sa8) } \end{array}$ | a | C |
| $y=B h x e 3$ |  |  |  | c | D |
| $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{Bgxd} 4$ |  |  |  | d／b！ | ？ |
| 4） |  | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | C | q／w | D |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Bxg5? } \\ \text { (g6) } \end{array}$ | b | D |
| $\pm$ | $\pm$ |  |  | d | A |
| $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | ¢ |  |  | a！ | ？ |
| 只 |  | 合 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ | D | r／x | A |
| $\pm$ 遂 | $\pm$ \％ |  | Bxf2？ <br> （f3） | c | A |
|  |  |  |  | a | B |
| 1－8 | 鱼 |  |  | b！ | ？ |

Juraj Lörinc

## Annual tourney Conflictio 2023

All kinds of antagonistic problems will be accepted for originals column（Fresh clash－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 Peter Gvozdják，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

