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## EDITORIAL

This year the PCCC took us for the first time across the Atlantic. I was excited with the opportunity to see the fascinating city of Rio de Janeiro for the first and probably last time in my life. On the other hand, there we had a much smaller Congress than usual and, as most subscriptions are collected at meetings in cash, the consequence was a deficit in the budget of the magazine. Because of that the whole financial construction for 2010 has had to be - reconstructed. Some savings are necessary, and the least painful way I could find was to have two double issues next year which will cut the postage costs in half. Nevertheless, an effort will be made so it is not done at the expense of the quantity (and hopefully quality - but it's up to the writers) of the published material.

I regret to inform you that Mat Plus is not in charge of Liga Problemista any more. Three years ago Liga was made more international that it had ever been. Still, the main intention was to give Serbian composers a chance to compare their work with the work of world prominent masters and use that experience to master their composing technique. However, a good intention doesn't necessarily lead to a good outcome. The unwanted effect was a notoriously increasing absence of domestic participants. My countrymen noticed that and I was asked to "return" the Liga back to whom(ever) it belongs. I could do nothing other than to comply.

I must admit that so far Mat Plus hasn't been paying enough attention to Serbian problemists. It was expected that this would be in the scope of the revived "Bilten" which, unfortunately, ingloriously ended after only three faceless issues. A sad truth is that we have only one under- 30 composer here - Darko Hlebec who already has made some impact in the endgame studies field. Since it is obvious that the Serbian Chess Problemists Society has neither the intention nor potential to do anything in that direction, I feel a moral duty to make some effort myself. For that reason, from the next issue Mat Plus will change its course and dedicate most of its contents to the education of less experienced and the recruitment of new problemists. Naturally, the language will be Serbian, while Mat Plus Review will retain the English language.
For the time being Mat Plus will retain the same form of the "Originals" column as it has now (hoping that potential newcomers will not be frightened and repulsed by eccentric fairy types), but in 2011 I will realize an idea which I have had in my mind for some time: to run the informal tourneys on the Web site and print only the best, i.e. only rewarded problems.

As I mentioned the Web site, I plan its major reconstruction - virtually from scratch - during 2010. Currently the site is powered by a version which was planned to serve just a few months until a new one was created. Now, three and a half years later, this "temporary" version is still running, and it is high time to move forward.

## LIGA PROBLEMISTA 2009 4th Round: Selfmate Twomovers

Theme: In at least two variations of a s\#2 black closes the line of a black piece which mates in a threat. It can be either a line along which the black piece moves on mating move, or a line along which it attacks the white king. A double-check threat is acceptable. (Proposed by Živko Janevski, but again judged collectively.)
There was 30 entries bz 14 authors: Boško Milošeski (Macedonia) 1995, 1996, 1997; Emanuel Navon (Israel) 1961, 1962, 1963; Frank Richter (Germany) 1942, 1943, 1944; Gábor Tar (Hungary) 1934, 1936, 1937; Georgi Hadži-Vaskov (Macedonia) 2012, 2013, 2014; Ilija-Iko Hadži-Vaskov (Macedonia) 2015; Ivan Denkovski (Macedonia) 1954; Michel Caillaud (France) 2003; Mihajlo Milanović (Serbia) 1990; Radomir Nikitović (Serbia) 2004, 2005, 2006; Ralf Krätschmer (Germany) 1947, 1948; Ricardo de Mattos Vieira (Brazil): 1982; Slavko Radovanović (Serbia) 1999, 2000, 2001; Živko Janevski (Macedonia) 1964, 1965. The common judges' opinion was that 6 entries had to be excluded: 1934 (illegal position); 1982 (anticipated); 1964, 1997, 2012 and 2014 (non-thematic). MV

## 1st Place: 1944 - Frank Richter (Germany).

- 3 thematic variations with thematic ambush tries, all tries fail because of a genre-specific effect (harmful white force). (Author)
- The place of this problem before the rest is due to quantity. The three thematic defenses are refutations to the three WR tries. However, the unity in the variations themselves is lacking. (PE)
- Three thematic variations and three tries with variations as refutations. (ŽJ)
- White combinations in three variations with different mates. (GE)
- Very nice ! (JR)
- Enjoyable play. (VS)
- Very good problem with all what you can wish for the theme - three tries and the solution by the same white piece with harmful ambushes in each try. Also, good construction since most of the pieces on board have at least a double role. (AT)


## 2nd Place: 1954 - Ivan Denkovski (Macedonia)

- Rich content, 4 them. variations and 2 them. tries, but the play is not very genre-specific. Deserves nevertheless a high rank. (FR)
- Two black batteries are used here, each one twice. There is no dual avoidance since BSa 7 guards c6 but still there is good distinction between white's replies. (PE)
- I Appreciate the try play here the most. (SD)
- Four variations, partial antidual effect. Some subtleties in key (GE)
- Very good (JR)
- Did me an impression. Charming problem with cuning and rich variety, but only with two tries. $1 . \mathrm{Bg} 1$ is out of play. Distant kings is also black swan in this genre and very remarkable feature. (VS)
- Four variations in a heavy setting. Unfortunately only two of the thematic defenses work in the tryplay. Anyhow, a good challenge for solvers! (AT)


3rd Place: 2003 - Michel Caillaud (France)

- 4 thematical variations; black half-battery. (Author)
- One of only two problems mastering this task with 4 line closings in combination with a black halfbattery. A good construction, but I prefer multi-phase play to "old-fashioned" problems. (FR)
- Like 1943 , there are four variations by the two halfbattery rooks. White's replies must be carefully chosen and the closing of the line of WRc1 is in the center. While in 1943 there is a nice visual effect of the two rooks covering 4 consecutive squares, here the fact that the two rooks reach c6 calls for a distinction between the two moves. The transfer and change that result is an important element in this problem and a part of the reason for the key move to e6. (PE)
- Very impressive especially the underpromotion. (SD)
- 4 thematic variations with using of a black halfbattery, but mechanism is not new. E. Vaulin 8-9.Pl Volga - Volga 2003. A nice changed continuatuions. (ŽJ)
- Very similar to ACHAEUS, but with some small change of play and somewhat heavier position. This receives higher place for better key. (GE)
- Very good, but less good than achaeus (JR)
- Good halfbattery play, nice setting, interesting key. (VS)
- Thematically similar to Achaeus with the addition of the changed white move. (AT)

3.pl: *1... Rcc6 2.h8=B+Rf6\#
1.Be6! ~ 2.Rxe4+ Qxe4\#, 1... Rcc6 2.Qd5+

Rxd5\# (changed), 1... Rb7 2.Sc6+ Rxc6\#, 1...
Rdc6 2.h8=B+ Rg7\# (transfered), 1... Rd5
2.Qc3+Rxc3\#
4.pl: 1.Qe8? ~ 2.Qxc6+ Qxc6\#, 1... Rd5!
1.Rec7! ~ 2.Rxc6+ Qxc6\#, 1... Rd5 2.Qf6+

Rxf6\#, 1... Re4 2.Sf5 + Rxf5\#, 1... Rf3 2.Se4+
Rxe4\#, 1... Rg2 2.Qf4 + Rxf4\#
4th Place: 1943 - Frank Richter (Germany)

- Task with 4 thematic variations using a black halfbattery. (Author)
- There are four variations by the two half-battery rooks. In these variations the two rooks cover 4 consecutive squares on the h1-a8 diagonal making a pleasing visual effect. White's replies must be carefully chosen and the closing of the line of WQf7 by black and white is central to this. The distinction between this and 2003 is slight and, as usual, there is some subjectivity in my decision. (PE)
- This is my first attempt trying judging, and I rank this highly based on the overall aesthetic appeal, good construction and excellent implementation. (SD)
- 4 thematic variations with using of a black halfbattery mechanism. Same remark as previous problem (3.Pl). (ŽJ)
- Four variations with good anti-dual choice on defenses of same rook (GE)
- Very nice! (JR)
- Interesting halfbattery play. (VS)
- Four harmonic variations with the bi-valve effect created by the half-battery. (AT)

5th Place: 1962 - Emanuel Navon (Israel)

- 2 changes of the white play. (Author)
- Two phases with two changed mates, an ambitious concept. The non-thematic defence 1.- Se 3 and the heavy position are a high price for the content, so I rank this relatively low (especially in this award I would like to have the possibility of shared places).
Nevertheless a good selfmate. (FR)
- Two changes of continuations which are difficult to see among the many pieces on board. The nonthematic defense $1 \ldots \mathrm{Se} 3$ is somewhat disturbing. The prevention of 2.Qe4+ in the solution is a nice trick to enforce the change. (PE)
- Two changed white continuations and mates, and defences on a same square. (ŽJ)
- Simple exchange in two variations. The refutation is too obvious. Parasitic (non-thematic) defense 1...Se3 (GE)
- A complex construction The black dual $1 . . . \mathrm{Se} 3$ seems unavoidable (JR)
- Very heavy setting, a huge price for two changes. (VS)
- Heavy setting with two good changes. The additional refutation 1... Se3 is unfortunate. (AT)

Emanuel Navon


## Frank Richter

6.pl LP 4/2009

5.pl: 1.Qc6? ~ 2.Qxd5+ Rxd5\#, 1... Sd4(a),Se3 2.Qxd6+(A) Bxd6\#, 1... d4(b) 2.Qe4+(B) Sxe4\#, 1... a4!
1.Bb7! ~ 2.Bxd5 + Rxd5\#, 1...Sd4(a),Se3
2.Re3+(C) Se4\#, 1... d4(b) 2.Qc4+(D) Sxc4\#
6.pl: 1.Rf8? Sd5!, 1.Rf7? Be5!
1.Rf6! ~ 2.Sg5+ Rxg5\#, 1... Sd5 2.Qc8+Bf5\#, 1...

Be5 2.Qe6 + Bf5\#, (1... Rg5 + 2.Sxg5+ Qxg5\#)
6th Place: 1942 - Frank Richter (Germany)

- 2 variations, in which White uses the line closing as useful effect, 2 thematic tries. (Author)
- Good tries with the WR which emphasize the use of the two WQ lines in the variations. Good distinction between the replies. (PE)
- White combinations, but the same mate after thematic defenses (GE)
- The author lost and interesting feature of this matrix, in the fact that the choice of the 2 nd white move may be done by the need of using the column closed by the 1st black move. That's why I would prefer a version like that :
8/6PS/3b1Pp1/rr1Q4/5p1p/5P1k/5P1s/qb4KR
1.Qb7? [2.Sg5+R×g5 $\ddagger$
1...Bc5 2.Qc8+ Bf5\$ but 1...Be5!
1.Qf7? [2. $\mathrm{Sg} 5+\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{g} 5 \ddagger$ ]
1...Be5 2.Qe6+ Bf5\$ but 1...Bc5!
1.Qg8! [2.Sg5+ R $\times \mathrm{g} 5 \ddagger$ ]
1...Be5 2.Qe6+ Bf5 $\ddagger$
$1 . . . \mathrm{Bc} 52 . \mathrm{Qc} 8+\mathrm{Bf} 5 \ddagger$ (JR)
- Nice setting, excellent relations between tries and key, refutations and variations. (VS)
- The try-play fits well, since it is also connected with (white-white) interferences. It is a pity that the lineclosing effect for the white queen is missing in the first black defense. (AT)

7.pl: 1.Rb7? ~ 2.Qxf5 + Rxf5\#, 1... Sb5! 2.Rxf3? (mate!) Qxf3?; 1.R5b4? ~ 2.Qxf5 + Rxf5\#, 1... Sb5 2.Rxf3 + Qxf3\#, 1... Sd5! 2.Sxf4+? Sxf4+? 3.Rxf4!, (1.Rb6? hxg6+!)
1.Rb8! ~ 2.Qxf5 + Rxf5\#, 1... Sb5 2.Rxf3 + Qxf3\#
(primary defence), 1... Sd5! 2.Sxf4+ Sxf4\# (2.Rxf3? (mate!) Qxf3?)
8.pl: 1.Bd3?(Bc2?,Bb1?) ~ 2.Qxf4+Bxf4\#, 1... Sg3! 1.Bxg6! ~ 2.Qxf4+ Bxf4\#, 1... g3 2.Sxf3 + Sxf3\#, 1... Rg3 2.Sxg4+ Rxg4\#, 1... Sg3 2.Qe4+ Sxe4\#


## 7th Place: 1965 - Živko Janevski (Macedonia)

- Primary and secondary form of the theme! (Author)
- Looks light, but shows very fine effects - the tries fail because of selfmate-specific harmful effects, and 1.- Sd5! can be viewed as black correction. wQ is underused, so I cannot rank the problem on top - but I like the idea. (FR)
- WRb5 must find a good landing square and only one of the four possibilities work. In two cases the refutations are thematic. The BS play is of corrective nature and the distinction between this and 1942 is rather subjective. (PE)
- Correction with doubled thematic effect. Still the contents seems quite small. (GE)
- Black correction showing the theme also with the "secondary threat". A very nice thematic idea. I would prefer a thing like that: $q 7 / 3 \mathrm{Q} 2 \mathrm{pb} / \mathrm{p} 5 \mathrm{~S} 1 /$ rR3p1K/p4p2/1Rs2p1k/6rp/5B1S (JR)
- Lovely problem with white correction. (VS)
- Well-integrated try-play. The white officers are not well used, the queen just for the threat. (AT)

8th Place: 1961 - Emanuel Navon (Israel)

- This problems leads my group of middle quality. Comparing with 1963 the defences on the same field and the try of the wB add a little more value. (FR)
- Reserve, no comments (PE)
- Three simple variations. Good defenses on the same square. (GE)
- Well done (JR)
- No white pawns is excellent and striking feature. The key and the defence g3 did me an impression, the try is very sick. (VS)
- Three nice mates but not much strategy. (AT)

9.pl: *1... Bxg2 2.Rxd5+Bxd5\#
1.Q~? f3!(a),e4!(b), 1.Qe4+? dxe4!, 1.Qd5+?

Bxd5+!; 1.Qf1? ~ 2.Rxd5 + Bxd5\#, 1... e4(b)
2.Qd3+ exd3\#, 1..f3!(a); 1.Qh2? ~ 2.Rxd5+

Bxd5\#, 1..f3(a) 2.Qxe5+ Qxe5\#, 1... e4!(b)
1.Qg3! ~ 2.Rxd5+ Bxd5\#, 1...f3(a) 2.Qxe5+

Qxe5\#, 1... e4(b) 2.Qd3+ exd3\#
10.pl: 1.Sxa2? ~ 2.Qxe3+ Rxe3\#, 1... Sc3 2.Qxg3+ Bxg3\#, 1... c3 2.Qf6+ exf6\#, 1... Rxa2!
1.Se2? ~ 2.Qxe3+ Rxe3\#, 1... c3 2.Qf6 + exf6\#, 1... Sc3!
1.Sb1! ~2.Qxe3 + Rxe3\#, 1... c3 2.Qf6+ exf6\#,
1... Sc3 2.Qxg3+ Bxg3\#

9th Place: 1996 - Boško Milošeski (Macedonia)

- Two interesting variants with battery creation and line opening, completed by full try play. The pawn's cloud is not very nice, I'd prefer positions like bRf7,Sh6 (without PPf7,f5,g7), but this is a matter of taste. (FR)
- Nice WQ tries but lacks unity. (PE)
- I find this matrix and implementation most interesting. (SD)
- Choice of key, but not very valuable (white must make the strongest of moves). Two variations. (GE)
- Much too havy for the result
for example :
8/2RPp1r1/4K1p1/2Rpp1b1/3k1p2/8/2B2PQ1/4q2b or, better:
2R2b2/3Pprp1/4K3/2Rppr2/3k4/8/2B2PQ1/4q2b

1. Qg 3 ! $[2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{d} 5+\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{d} 5 \ddagger], 1 \ldots \mathrm{Rf} 32 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 5+\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 5 \ddagger$,
$1 . . \mathrm{e} 42 . \mathrm{Qd} 3+\mathrm{e} \times \mathrm{d} 3 \ddagger, 1 . \mathrm{Qh} 3$ ? but $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rf} 3!$; 1.Qh2?
$1 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{f} 22 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 5+\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{e} 5 \ddagger$, but $1 \ldots \mathrm{e}$ !; 1.Qe4+? but $1 . . \mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{e} 4$ ! (JR)

- Good key and tries. Corrected WQ moves. (VS)

LIGA PROBLEMISTA 4/2009-CALCULATED RESULTS

| Resılı |  |  | Ju Igements* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Rank | Problem | Pt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. | 1944. Frank Richter | $\mathbf{1 5 1}$ | 2 | (A) | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 2. | 1954. Ivan Denkovski | $\mathbf{1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 3. | 2003. Michel Caillaud | $\mathbf{1 3 9}$ | 3 | 3 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 3 | $\mathbf{1}$ | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| 4. | 1943. Frank Richter | $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ | 5 | (A) | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 3 |
| 5. | 1962. Emanuel Navon | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | 11 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 |
| 6. | 1942. Frank Richter | $\mathbf{8 6}$ | 4 | (A) | 5 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 4 |
| 7. | 1965. Živko Janevski | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | 6 | 2 | 8 |  | 8 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| 8. | 1961. Emanuel Navon | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | 7 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 9 |
| 9. | 1996. Boško Milošeski | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |  | 4 | 11 | 7 | 9 |  | 4 | 8 |
| 10. | 1947. Ralf Krätschmer | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | (A) | 9 | 7 | 11 |  |  | 7 | 11 |
| 11. | 1995. Boško Milošeski | $\mathbf{3 7}$ |  | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 |  |  | 10 |
| 12. | 1999. Slavko Radovanović | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 8 | 10 |  |  |  | 10 |  | 12 |
| 13. | 1948. Ralf Krätschmer | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | (A) |  | 9 | 8 | 12 |  |  |  |
| 14. | 1963. Emanuel Navon | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |  | 8 |  | 12 | 10 |  |  |  |
| 15. | 1990. Mihajlo Milanović | $\mathbf{9}$ | 12 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| 16. | 2015. Ilija-Iko Hadži-Vaskov | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| 17. | 2006. Radomir Nikitović | $\mathbf{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| 18. | 1936. Gábor Tar | $\mathbf{7}$ | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. | 1937. Gábor Tar | $\mathbf{6}$ | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20. | 2001. Slavko Radovanović | $\mathbf{5}$ |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. | 2004. Radomir Nikitović | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| 22. | 2000. Slavko Radovanović | $\mathbf{4}$ |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Judgements: 1 = Ralf Krätschmer, 2 = Frank Richter, 3 = Paz Einat, 4 = Živko Janevski, 5 = Georgy Evseev, 6 = Jacques Rotenberg, 7 = Vilimantas Satkus, 8 = Arno Tungler. $(A)=$ Judge is the author
- The theme description says only: "Thematic are only defenses which close either the line between its departure and arrival square, or between its arrival square and the white king." It does not say that this needs to be the ONLY motive of the defense. So, I would not agree that this is "non-thematic". However, this fact obviously make the defense 1... c3 less valid.
The try-play is not very convincing since a try that is refuted by $1 \ldots \mathrm{c} 3$ is missing and there are no changes. (AT)


## 11th Place: 1995 - Boško Milošeski (Macedonia)

- Similar to 1961, here full thematic tries or at least two seems to be possible (f.ex. wBb8 to d6, +wSc7: 1.Sc5/Sb6?, but still some work is open to avoid $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 8 / \mathrm{Sf} 8$ !). (FR)
- The two defenses on d4 lead to nice BK battery mates. (PE)
- The try is not significant. Three variations. King battery is interesting. (GE)
- Not exciting; could be built in a better way: 1B2b3/3SPp1r/5K1p/3pp3/4pkp1/ 6b1/ p1s1Q3/ qs3r2 (JR)
- White S must go for 2.Bxe5+, and the only proper move is the key. (VS)
- The author could probably have done more with this matrix. Especially the white rook on b 4 is poorly motivated and the try play is not convincing since the knight obviously needs to care for 1...Sc3. (AT)
- Two nice variants after a good selective key, but too many white pawns on board. (AT)

10th Place: 1947 - Ralf Krätschmer (Germany)

- Two variations, but only one thematic try. But it is very simple to achieve full try play: $\mathrm{wBc} 3, \mathrm{wPb} 2$ (8+12) - 1.Be1/Bb4? Sc3/c3! 1.Ba5! - such a version would be placed higher by me. (FR)
- A "random" guard of e4 leads to both white's replies. Both black's defenses guard e4 but the two replies are nicely separated, so we have clear dual avoidance here. The use of two different effect types for the prevention is the reason for the placing of this problem. The WS tries add some interest. (PE)
- This problem is similar as no MPID: 1948. If the author of both problems is the same I don't rank both problems!! (ŽJ)
- Antidual effect. Tries are not really significant. Two variations. (GE)
- the variation 1..c3 is not fully thematic, because the way it parries the threat is also the opening of the bRa4. (JR)
- White correction. The key is good, but the tries and refutations is not well enaugh. (VS)


## Boško Milošeski

11.pl LP 4/2009


Slavko Radovanović 12.pl LP 4/2009

11.pl:1.Bxe5+? Qxe5+!
1.S~?(=Sf8) ~ 2.Bxe5+ Qxe5\#, 1... Sd4 2.Qe3+ Kxe3\#, 1... d4 2.Qxe4+ Kxe4\#, 1... Sc3!
1.Sb6! ~2.Bxe5+Qxe5\#, 1...Sc3 2.Sxd5+Sxd5\#,
1... Sd4 2.Qe3+ Kxe3\#, 1...d4 2.Qxe4+Kxe4\#
12.pl: 1.Sf5? Rg5!
1.Sf1! ~ 2.Sxe3+ Bxe3\#, 1...Sc5 2.Ra4+ Sxa4\#,
1... Rc5/Rg5 2.Qb5+ Rxb5\#

12th Place: 1999 - Slavko Radovanović (Serbia)

- Nice try with anticipatory line-closing and the variant 1.- $\mathrm{Rg} 6+2 . \mathrm{Sd} 6+$. I don't like the same play
after 1.- Rc5/Rg5, so I'd prefer the bRc7 on b8. In generally the content of 1999 isn't very impressive. (FR)
- Two simple variations. No value. (GE)
- 1.Sf5? is a good try (JR)
- Setting is nice but play is simple. (VS)
- Unfortunate that both rook variations have the same white response. (AT)

Commentators: Arno Tungler (AT), Frank Richter (FR), Georgy Evseev (GE), Jacques Rotenberg (JR), Paz Einat (PE), Steven Dowd (SD), Vilimantas Satkus (VS), Živko Janevski (ŽJ).

LP 2009: Final Table

| Place | Composer / Group | Round 1 | Round 2 | Round 3 | Round 4 | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Michel Caillaud (FRA) | 20.0 | 25.0 (10.0) | 20.0 | 16.0 | 81.0 (10.0) |
| 2. | Frank Richter (DEU) | 25.0 | - | 11.0 (10.0) | 25.0 (23.0) | 61.0 (33.0) |
| 3. | Emanuel Navon (ISR) | 16.0 (9.0) | 13.0 (6.0) | - | 11.0 (8.0) | 40.0 (23.0) |
| 4. | Ricardo de Mattos Vieira (BRA) | 5.0 | 9.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 39.0 |
| 5. | Boško Milošeski (MKD) | 8.0 (6.0) | 1.0 | 6.0 (4.0) | 7.0 (5.0) | 22.0 (15.0) |
| 6-7. | Zdravko Maslar (SRB) | - | 20.0 | - | - | 20.0 |
| 6-7. | Ivan Denkovski (MKD) | - | - | - | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| 8. | Menachem Witztum (ISR) | - | 4.0 | 13.0 (15.0) | - | 17.0 (15.0) |
| 9-10. | Aleksandr Semenenko (UKR) | - | - | 16.0 | - | 16.0 |
| 9-10. | Juraj Lörinc (SVK) \& Michal Dragoun (CZE) | - | 16.0 | - | - | 16.0 |
| 11-12. | Georgi Hadži-Vaskov (MKD) | 7.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 13.0 |
| 11-12. | Emanuel Navon (ISR) \& Yoel Aloni (ISR) | 13.0 | - | - | - | 13.0 |
| 13. | Aaron Hirschenson (ISR) | 11.0 (10.0) | - | - | - | 11.0 (10.0) |
| 14. | Pietro Pitton (ITA) | - | 11.0 (8.0) | - | - | 11.0 (8.0) |
| 15. | Mihajlo Milanović (SRB) | - | 3.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 11.0 |
| 16-17. | Živko Janevski (MKD) | - | - | - | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 16-17. | Jorma Paavilainen (FIN) | - | - | 9.0 | - | 9.0 |
| 18. | Nikola Predrag (HRV) | - | 7.0 (5.0) | - | - | 7.0 (5.0) |
| 19. | Radomir Nikitović (SRB) | - | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 |
| 20. | Ralf Krätschmer (DEU) | - | - | - | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| 21-22. | Slavko Radovanović (SRB) | - | 1.0 | - | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| 21-22. | Gábor Tar (HUN) | - | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| 23. | Ilija-Iko Hadži-Vaskov (MKD) | - | - | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| 24. | Juraj Lörinc (SVK) | - | - | 3.0 | - | 3.0 |
| 25-32. | Mihail Croitor (MDA) | - | - | 1.0 | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Dušan Tadić (HRV) | - | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Živa Tomić (SRB) | - | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Christer Jonsson (SWE) | - | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Milun M. Mitrović (SRB) | 1.0 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Nikola Živanović (SRB) | 1.0 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Ivan Antonov (RUS) | - | 1.0 | - | - | 1.0 |
| 25-32. | Borislav Vitanovski (USA) | - | - | 1.0 | - | 1.0 |

Our congratulations to Michel Caillaud for winning yet another cycle of Liga Problemista and thanks to all composers who took part. This was the last cycle of Liga Problemista administered by Mat Plus(.Net). Liga now goes back under the tutorship of its founder(s) for reasons too complicated to be briefly explained. Nevertheless, Mat Plus remains willing to continue giving Liga logistic support should any kind be needed in the future.

## ORIGINAL PROBLEMS

Judges 2009:
\#2: Dragan Stojnić, Serbia; \#3: Stefan Sovik, Slovakia; \#n: Evgeny Bourd, Israel;
EG: Mirko Miljanić, Serbia; S\#: Andrey Selivanov, Russia; H\#2: Borislav Gađanski, Serbia; H\#n: Guy Sobrecases, France; Fairy: Michal Dragoun, Czech Republic;

Retro\&Math: Thierry le Gleuher, France.

## Solutions in this issue from page 88

1412. 


1416.

Youness Benjelloun

1420.

1413. Valery Kopyl

Ukraine

1417.

Marjan Kovačević

1421.

Pavel Murashev

1414.

1418.

Arieh Grinblat
Israel

1419.

Aaron Hirschenson

1422.

Tony Lewis
Great Britain
after S. Zlatić, Problem
1955

1423.

Aaron Hirschenson



1455. (C?)
1454.

Zoran Sibinović
Serbia

1453.

Ivan Soroka
Ukraine

1452.

Paul Raican
Romania


b) ㅆ⽊ㅊ $f 7 \rightarrow b 1$
+c) $\mathrm{h} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 6$
$+\mathrm{d})-\boldsymbol{t} \mathrm{c} 2$
1457.

György Bakcsi

b) 曾e $8 \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 8$
1458.

1459. Živko Janevski

Macedonia

1463.

Ricardo de Mattos
Vieira

b) 요 $\mathrm{g} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{~g} 3$
1464.

Dmitry Alexandrov

b) $\mathrm{f} \mathrm{c} 4 \rightarrow \mathrm{~g} 4$
c) $\boldsymbol{\pm} \mathrm{g} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 4$
1465.

Misha Shapiro

1466.

Abdelaziz Onkoud

1467. Viktor Chepizhny

b) $\boldsymbol{\pm} \mathrm{h} 4 \rightarrow \mathrm{~h} 3$

b) $\boldsymbol{\pm} \mathrm{d} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 3$
1469.

Christer Jonsson

b) $\mathbf{\pm} \mathrm{b} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{~b} 6$
1470.

Aleksandr Maksimov

1471.

Dmitry Alexandrov

1475.

Kenneth Solja
Finland
Dedicated to my wife Ina

b) 森 $\mathrm{e} 6 \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 6$

1477.

Luis Miguel Martín

1478.

Ján Dučák
Czech Republic

1479.

Anatoly Styopochkin


1484.

Vlaicu Crisan


Take \& Make
1485. Vadim Vinokurov

b) 朆c $6 \leftrightarrows$ t 3
c) $\mathrm{c} 6 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 1$


1491. Kevin Begley


No promotions
( nP on 8 th rank
promotes back to nP )


|  | $\begin{gathered} 1497 . \\ \text { Chris J. Feather } \end{gathered}$ Great Britain |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | 迺 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | W/1/ |
| sh $\neq 9$ | $\neq 9 \quad 3+1$ |
| PlatzWechselCirce <br> b) White Berolina Pawn e5 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1493. Yoshikazu Ueda
Japan

1494. 

György Bakesi

b) ${ }_{6}^{6} \mathrm{a} \leftrightarrows \leftrightarrows{ }^{6} \mathrm{e} 8$
$\rightarrow$ ser-h $\neq 8$
1499.
Václav Kotěšovec

1501. (C?)

Henryk Grudzinski
Poland
Correction of 1186
(Mat Plus 32/2008)


PG 7.5
Take\&Make


1505. (C?)

Kevin Begley
Kostas Prentos
USA / Greece
Dedicated to Gerd Wilts
Correction of 953
(Mat Plus 29/2008)



Solutions in this issue from page 88

## DEFINITIONS OF FAIRY CONDITIONS AND PIECES

AndernachChess: On making a capture, a unit (except a King) changes colour (more exactly, it takes the colour of the opposite side); a neutral piece moved by White becomes black...). A "new" white Rook appearing on al or h1, or a black Rook on a8 or h8, can castle.
Anticirce: When a capture is made, the capturing unit (including King) must come back to its rebirth square: if this square is occupied, the capture is forbidden. A Pawn capturing on its promotion rank promotes before it is reborn. Unless otherwise stated, captures on the rebirth square are forbidden.
Anti-Köko: A move is possible only if the piece moved does not arrive on a square next to another unit.
AntiSuperCirce: When a capture is made, the capturing unit can be replaced on any empty square. A Pawn is immovable on its 1 st rank. Unless otherwise stated, captures on the rebirth square are forbidden. A Pawn is immovable on its 1st rank.
Berolina Pawn: a sort of inverted Pawn, that moves forward diagonally and captures on the square right in front of it. Equivalent en-passant rule apply.
Chameleon Chess: Officers change after their move, they become another officer, according to the cycle: $\mathrm{Q} \rightarrow \mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{R} \rightarrow \mathrm{Q}$
Circe: When a capture is made, the captured unit (except a King) is replaced on its rebirth square if it is empty; otherwise, the captured unit vanishes.
Einstein Chess: A unit that moves without capturing changes according to the following scheme: $\mathrm{Q} \rightarrow \mathrm{R} \rightarrow \mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{P}$.
If there are fairy pieces, a Pawn which moves without capturing becomes one of these fairy pieces, otherwise it remains a Pawn. A unit that captures changes according to the following scheme: $\mathrm{P} \rightarrow \mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{R} \rightarrow \mathrm{Q}$. If there are fairy pieces, a Queen which captures becomes one of these fairy pieces, otherwise it remains a Queen.
Exceptions to the default rules :

- A pawn on its 1 st rank can move 1,2 or 3 steps forward.
- No promotions (unless otherwise stated).

EquipollentsCirce: When a capture is made, the captured unit (except a King) is immediately reborn equipollent (same distance, same direction) to the capturing move. Example: if
wRh1xbSh3, then the bS is reborn on h5 (same distance h3-h5 as h1-h3). If the equipollent square is not empty, the captured unit vanishes.
Functionary Chess: A piece (Kings and pawns included) may not move unless attacked by an opposing piece.
Grasshopper: Moves along queen-lines, but must hop over another piece of either colour and land on the mext square beyond.
Isardam: Any move leading to a Madrasi paralysis is illegal.
Köko: A move is possible only if the piece moved arrives on a square next to another unit.
Locust: The move is along queen-lines, but can only move by capturing an enemy unit, and this it does by hopping over the unit to the next square beyond, capturing as it goes.
Losing Chess: Captures are obligatory; the first player that loses all his pieces wins.
Madrasi: A piece of the side to move is paralysed if it is threatened by an opposite unit of the same kind. This rule applies to King in Madrasi Rex Inclusiv but not in Madrasi.
MarsCirce: A piece can capture only such pieces as it could capture if it was standing on its normal Circe rebirth square, and it may capture any such piece regardless of where it is in fact standing, provided that the rebirth square is not occupied by any other piece.
Maximummer: The colour to whom the condition is applied is obliged to make the longest possible move, where the length is measured from the center of the starting square to the arriving square. The Castle's length is the sum of the two movements (therefore $0-0$ is 4 and $0-0-0$ is 5 ). When the length is the same, the choice is free. The condition can also be applied to White or to both colors (Double Maximummer).
Pao: Moves like a Rook but captures an enemy unit by hopping along rook-lines over another unit of either colour. Check is therefore given over another unit.
ParrainCirce: A piece captured on square X will be reborn on a square $Y$ such that the geometric relation between $X$ and $Y$ is the same as that between the starting and finishing squares of the next move after the capture. If Y is occupied, or would be outside the board, the captured piece disappears.

PWC: (Platzwechselcirce or Interchange Circe): When a capture is made, the captured unit (except a King) is replaced on the square the capturing unit just leaves. A Pawn reborn on its 1 st rank cannot move.
Rose or Octogonal Rider $(1,2)$ : piece which can make several successive Knight leaps on octagonal lines isometrical to d2-b3-a5-b7-d8-f7-g5-f3-d2. A Rose moves in the same way to capture or not to capture, the taken unit being on the arrival square.
Siren: Moves like a Queen and captures like a Locust.
Supercirce: When a capture is made, the captured unit (except a King) can be replaced on any empty square. A Pawn is immovable on its 1st rank.

Take\&Make: When a piece captures, it must make immediately a new move, according to the captured piece's movement. Legality is checked only at the end of both moves. Pawns move differently depending on the color (white upwards, black downwards). Promotion is done when a pawn ends its move on the eighth rank. If it's not possible to make the second part of the move, then the move is illegal. Capture of the king is orthodox (i.e. there's no need to make the second part of the move).
Triton: Moves like a Rook and captures like a Rook-Locust.
Ultraschachzwang: Black must give check, when he can. If Black can't give check, he's stalemated.

# Solutions - Mat Plus No. 35 

## Twomovers

## 1324. Delia-Monica Duca

1.Sd6! ~ 2.Rxe4\#, 1...Rc1+,Rc4,Kxd4,Bb7/Bf5 2.Qxc1,Sxc4, Sf5,Sc4,S(x)f5\#.
Theme: The key-move creates an indirect white battery (Subotica Quick composing Tourney 2009) (Author) • Pretty twomover! (MC) • This work shows promise. Keep it going! (HR) • A fine key with plenty of good play in a nice open position. (GF) • Good key and enjoyable battery play (VS)

## 1325. Islam Kazimov, Paz Einat

1.d6? ~ 2.Qa1\#(A), 1...Ke5(a) 2.Se6\#(B), 1...Sd3,d5 etc. 2.Qd5\#,
1...Sf7!; 1.Sd6! ~ 2.Se6\#(B), 1...Ke5(a) 2.Qa1\#(A), 1...Kxc5 2.Qa7\#.

Give 2 and take 1 keys with two diagonal mates: any theme may be realized in problem, I'm not so good specialist in that. But tries (1.d6?! and 1.d3?!) with taking the c 4 -square are not so good. (MC) - The unprovided flight makes the key (and refutation of the only alternative) rather obvious. OK, this guarantees even an idiot like me sees the LeGrand :-) (HR) - The le Grand theme, with try and key being give-and-take moves to the same square. The key grants a second flight and is less obvious than the try. An interesting problem. (GF) - Excellent key that takes one but gives two flights and pretty change play. (VS)

## 1326. Arie Grinblat

1.Bc7? ~ 2.Qe5,Qf4\#(A,B), 1...e5(a),g5(b)2.Qxe5, Qd3\#, 1..d6!(c); 1.Sd3? ~ 2.Qe5,Qf4\#(A,B), 1...d6(c), e5(a) 2.Qf4, Qxe5\#, 1...g5!(b); 1.Sf3? ~ 2.Qe5,Qg5\# (A,C), 1...e5(a), d6(c)/ g5(b) 2.Qxe5,Q(x)g5\#, 1...Sxf2!; 1.Bd2! ~ 2.Qf4,Qg5\# (B,C), 1... e5(a),g5,Rh5 2.Qh3, Qxg5,Qf4\#.
Again, White uses rather unsophisticated attacks, 1.Sd3/h3? running into self-obstruction. (HR) • White aristocrat against tricky setting of black pawns. (VS)

## 1327. David Shire

1...gxf3 2.Re1\#; 1.Kg2? ~ 2.Re1\#, 1...gxf3+ 2.Rxf3\#, 1...Bd1!; 1.Sc3? ~ 2.Re1\#, 1...Bd1 2.Sxd1\#, 1...Qxd3, Sd4 2.Qg5, Qxd4\#, 1...gxf3!; 1.Sf2! ~ 2.Re1\#, 1...Bd1,Qxd3,gxf3, Sd4 2.Sxd1,Qxd3, Qg5,Bxd4\#, 1...Qe4 2. Qxe4\#, 1...Ba5 2.Bg5\#.
This is the Subotica theme "in spirit" if not in the letter of the definition. It is not very complex but I hope that the construction is OK (forgiving the WPc5 plug!). (Author) • Light construction, the author shouldn't worry about a mere Pc5. (HR)
1328. Valerio Agostini, Stefano Mariani
1.Qh5? ~ 2.Rxd5\#, 1...Se3,Sxe5(a,b) 2.fxe3,Qxe5\#(A,B), 1...e6!; 1.Qa8? ~ 2.Q/Rxd5\#, 1...Se3,Sxe5(a,b) 2.fxe3, Qa8\#(A,G)\#, 1...e6!; 1.Sf4? ~ 2.Rxd5\#, 1...Se3,Sxe5, Kxe5(a,b,c) 2.Sxf3, Se6,Kg6\#(C,D,X), 1...e6!; 1.Sxe7! ~ 2.Rxd5\#, 1...Se3,Sxe5, Kxe5(a,b,c) 2.Sc6,Sf5,Kf7\#(E,F,Y).
Sorry to repeat myself, but obvious refutations don't do any try good. (HR) - Try and key by the wSg6 give the black king a second flight, leading to a delightful changed Royal battery mate. There are other excellent changed mates after $1 \ldots$ Sxe5 and $1 \ldots$ Se3. The white queen could be a bishop, but a queen has been used because it gives the additional try 1.Qh5, with a third set of changed mates after the black knight defences, making the problem $a$ Zagoruiko. However this extra try has the same refutation, and the problem is already very fine without it. (GF)
1329. Velrij Kirilov, Boris Maslov
1..fxe4 2.Qg8\#; 1.Sd2? ~ 2.Qg8\#, 1...Ke6,Sg6 2.Sc4, Bf3\#, 1...c4!; 1.Bh5? ~ 2.Qg8/Bf7\#, 1...Kc4,Ke6 2.Qb3,Sc3\#, 1...Sg6!; 1.Bf3! ~ 2.Qg8\#, 1...Ke6,Kc4,Sg6 2.Sg5,Sd2,Sd2\#

Well, the Pa3 is wearing a T-Shirt "Grant the king the flight c4!" Constructing away such traitors is an art for itself (e.g. a Kb1 is badly needed for preventing $\mathrm{Bc} 4+$ ). (HR) - 3phase change after $1 \ldots$ Ke6 using an indirect half-battery. There are other changed mates after $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 4, \mathrm{Sg} 6$. (GF)

## 1330. Valery Kopyl, Vasyl Dyachuk

1...Bxe4,Sxe4(a,b) 2. Qa1(Sf3?),Sf3(Qa1?)\#(A,B), 1...Sc6+(c) 2.dxc6\#; 1. Sd6! ~ 2. Sf3/Qa1\#(A/B), 1...Bxe4,Sxe4(a,b) 2.Sb5, Sf5\#, 1...Sc6+(c),Kxe5 2.Sxc6, Qh8\#
Rudenko tema, 2 x Dombrovskis paradox, change of mates. (Authors) - The stipulation desperately misses a set star (*). Otherwise it's easy to miss the content. (HR) - There are set dual-avoidance mates after self-blocks on e4: 1...Bxe4 2.Qa1; 1...Sxe4 2.Sf3. The key $1 . S d 6$ ! closes 2 white lines, giving the black king a flight on e5, but it also guards e4, so that the set mates 2.Qa1 and 2.Sf3 now occur as a double threat. These threats are separated by $1 \ldots$ Bxe 2 and $1 \ldots$ Sxe2. The defences $1 \ldots$ Bxe4 and $1 \ldots$ Sxe4 defeat the threat by removing White's only guard of d 5 , but they lead to new mates $2 . \mathrm{Sb} 5$ and $2 . \mathrm{Sf5}$ respectively. The problem is therefore a complete Rukhlis. There is another nice longrange mate by $1 \ldots$ Kxe5 $2 . \mathrm{Qh} 8$. All this is very good, but there is much more! The defence $1 \ldots$ Sc6+ is met by 2 .Sxc6, instead of the set battery mate $2 . d x c 6$ ! This extra changed
mate is the finishing touch which makes this a truly splendid problem. Other subtracted set play is 1 ...Se6 2.dxe6 and 1...Bxc4 2.Rxc4. (GF)

## Threemovers

## 1331. Alena Kozhakina

*1...c5 2.Ke4 ~,e6 3.Qb6,Qd8\#; 1.Ke4! (~), 1...Ke6 2.Qd2 Kf6 3.Qh6\#, 1...e6 2.Qa7 c5 3.Qd7\#; (1.Kd4? Ke6!).

## 1332. Vladimir Kozhakin

1.Sc4? dxc5!; 1.Sa4! (~), 1...dxc5+ 2.Sxc5 Ka7 3.Qb7\#, 1...d5 2.Sb6 Ka7 3.Qa8\#, 1...Ka7 2.Qc7+ Ka6,Ka8 3.Qb6,Sb6\#.

## 1333. Vladimir Kozhakin

1.Kc5? Kc8!, 1.Bb6? Kd6!; 1.Kb6! (~), 1...Kxd8 2.Kc6 Kc8 3.Re8\#, 1...Kd6 2.Bc7+ Kd5,Kd7 3.c4,Bh3\#, 1...Kc8 2.Bc7 Kd7 3.Bh3\#.

## 1334. Mihail Croitor

1...f3 2.Qe5+; 1.Qh1? f3!; 1.Rh1! (~), 1...f3 2.Qh2+ Kf2 3.g3\#, 1...Kxg2 2.Qh2+ Kf3 3.Rf1\#, 1...Kf2 2.Qxg4 f3 3.Qf3\#.
1335. Valery Rezinkin, V. V. Kraschenok
1.Rb7! ~ 2.Qc7+ Kf6 3.Qg7\#, 1...Ba5 2.Qxc5+ Kf6 3.Qg5\#, 1...Kf6 2.Qd8+ Kg6/Ke5 3.Qg5\#, 1...B77 2.Qd8.

## 1336. Dragan Stojnić

1.Rg3?(A) ~ 2.Qc3(B) ~ 3.Sd6\#, 1...e3 2.d4(C) ~ 3.Sd6\#, 1...b4!; 1.d4!(C) ~ 2.Rg3(A) ~ 3.Sd6\#, 1...e3 2.Qc3(B) ~ 3.Qd3\#, 1... dxe3(ep) 2.Qd2 ~ 3.Qxd3\#.
Ideal form of Djurasevic theme; a new way to implement the ingenious Janez Nastran's invention of utilizing the potential en passant capture. (Author)

## 1337. Evgeni Bourd, Paz Einat

1...Be7(a) 2.Se2+(A) Kxe5 3.Qe6\#, 1...Re7(b) 2.Sb3+(B) Kxd5 3.Sxf6\#; 1.Qg7! ~ 2.Qa7+ Bb6 3.Qxb6\#, 1...Be7(a) 2.Sb3+(B) Kxd5 3.Qf7\#, 1...Re7(b) 2.Se2+(A) Kxe5 3.Qxf6\#, 1...Be4 2.Rxe4+ Sxe4 3.Se2\#, 1...Bb6/Bc7 2.Se2+.

Reciprocal changes, Grimshaw. (Authors)

## Moremovers

## 1338. Dmitri Turevski

1.Bb7! (~); 1...f6 2.Bf3 d5 3.Bh5 d4 4.Bf7\#, 2...d6 3.Bb7 d5 4. Bxa6\#; 1...d6 2.Bc6 d5 3.Ba4 ~ 4.Bb3\#, 2...f6 3.Bb7 d5 4.Bxa6\#.
Fantastic switchbacks in a Meridith. A composition you can show in your chess club with much pride. (GR)

## 1339. Leonid Makaronez, Viktor Volchek

1.Qe2! ~ 2.Qxe3+ Kxc4 3.Rxe4+ Kd5 4.Qd4\#; 1...Kc3 2.Rxe4+ Kb3 3.Qd1+ Ka2 4.Qc2\#, 2...Rxf6 3.Qb2+ Kd3 4.Rd4\#, 2...Se5 3.Qb2+ Kd3 4.Rd4\#; 1...Rxc4 2.Qd1+ Kc3 3.Rc5+ Se5 4.Bxe5\#; 1...Sxe5 2.Bxe5+ Kd5 3.Qd1+ Kc5,Kxc4 4.Rxc6/Qd4,Rxc6\#, 2...Kc5 3.Rxc6+ Kd5 4.Qd1\#; 1...Bxc4 2.Qb2+ Kd3 3.Rd5+ Bxd5 4.Qe2\#; 1...Bd5 2.Qb2+ Kxc4 3.Qc2+ Kd4 4.Rxe4\#, 2...Kd3 3.Re6, 2...Kc5 3.Rxe4.

## 1340. Leonid Makaronez

1.f6! ~ 2.Qd7+ Kxe5 3.Qd5+ Kxf6 4.Qe6\#, 1...c6 2.Sf3+ Kxc4 3.Qe4+ Kxc5 4.Qd4\#, 1...cxb6 2.Sc6+ Kxc4 3.Qe6+ Kxc5 4.d4\#, 1...bxc4 2.Sed7 Kd5 3.Qe4+/Qe6+.

## 1341. Dragoslav Marjanović

1.c8=B! Kg1 2.Bh3 Kh1 3.a7 Kg1 4.a8=R! Kh1 5.Ra1\#.

Minor promotions in Kings\&Pawns setting. (Author)

## 1342. Valery Rezinkin

1.Ra1! Rxa1 2.Sc1 Ra3 3.Ka7 Rxd8 4.Sxb3+ Rxb3 5.Ra4\#.
1343. Dragoslav Marjanović
1.e7! Sxd8+ 2.exd8=B Bxc7 4.bxc7 Ka7 5.c8=R Ka6 6.Ra8\#,
1...Sa5+2.Kb5 Sc6 3.e8=Q Sxd8 4.Qe4+ Sb7 5.Ka6.

Different promotion in a classic miniature. (Author)

## 1344. Dragoslav Marjanović

1.g6 Kg5 2.g7 Kh6 3.g8=R! Kh7 4.Rg5 Kh6 5.f4 Kh7 6.f5 Kh6 7.f4 Kh7 8.f6 Kh6/Kh8 9.f7 Kh7 10.f8=R! Kh6 11.Rh8\#.
Two R promotions in a Kings\&Pawns miniature. (Author)

## 1345. Steven Dowd, Mirko Degenkolbe

1.g4! (1.Kxa5??) Ke7 2.Ka5 Kf8 3-16.Ka4-a3-a2-b1-c1-d1-e1-f1-g1-h2-g3-f3-e4-d5 Kf8 17.Kd6 Kg7 18. Ke7 Kh6 19.Kf6 Kh7 20.f8=R Kh6 21.Rh8\#, 18...Kh7 19.Kf6 Kh6 20.f8=Q+ Kh7 21.Dg7\#.

This is a record attempt for longest "dual-free" Kings +Pawns mate. We know the problem of Miloseski and Mihajlovski is given as the longest $\mathrm{C}+$ kings and pawns problem in WinChloe, it is $\mathrm{C}+$, and does contain some amazingly accurate play, but there are small duals, as many as three on some continuations. We've checked other kings and pawns problems and found that in all testable ones, there were duals, often significant ones.
We also think that, in addition to length, there is an interesting nuance here. After the 18th white move (18. Ke7) there is an interesting constellation. The black king has now now absolutely equal defenses, so that after the 19th white move of Kxf6, there is in actuality a reciprocal change of threat (Drohwechsel). One could go so far as to say, that in this moremover we find at the end a theme known from two-movers "Pseudo-LeGrand" which as you know, runs by the following scheme: 1.? (threatens 2.A\#) ...a 2.B\#; 1.! (threatens 2.B\#) ...b 2.A\#. In our case this looks like this: 18...Kh6 19.Kxf6 (Threatens 20.f8Q+ [A]) 19...Kh7 [a] 20.f8R! [B], then 18. ...Kh7 19.Kxf6 (Threatens 20.f8R! [B]) ...Kh6 [b] 20.f8Q+ [A]. (Authors)

## Endgames

## 1346. Siegfried Hornecker

1.Kc4! Rc1+! 2.Kb5 Rb1+ 3.Ka5!/i Rc1 4.d5 Rc5+ 5.Kb4! Rxd5 6.c7 (A) Rd4+ 7.Kb3/ii Rd3+8.Kc2 Rd4!! 9.c8R!!/iii Ra4! 10.Kb3! and white wins.
i) 3.Ka6 is a loss-of-time-dual: 3...Rc1 4.d5 Rc5! 5.Kb6! Rxd5 6.c7 Rd6+ 7.Kb5 Rd5+ 8.Kb4 (A) and we're in the main variation; ii) or 7.Kc3 Rc1! 8.Kc2!; iii) Threatens 10.Ra8+. 9.c8Q? Rc4+ 10.Qxc4 stalemate
(A) - Barbier \& Saavedra after 3.Kb4 in Glasgow Weekly Citizen, 4th/18th May 1895, see http:// www.xs4all.nl/ $\sim$ timkr/chess/saavedra.htm for a reprint of the original column in Glasgow Weekly Citizen. (Author) - A good improvement. (MC)
1347. János Mikitovics

Solution A: WTM, win
1.Ke4!!/i Kg2 2.Se3+!//i Kf2 3.Ra2+!/iii Se2 4.Sd1+!!/iv Kg2/v 5.Ke3 Kh3/vi 6.Kxf3/vii Sd4+ 7.Kf4 g2/viii 8.Sf2+ Kh4/ix 9.Ra8!!/x Se6+(Se2+) squaring of wK (e3-e4-f3-f4) 10.Kf3 g1Q 11.Rh8+ wins.
i) 1.Kf4!? Kg2 (1...f2? 2.Kxg3+-) 2.Se3+ Kf2 3.Sd1+ Kg2 4.Kg4 Se2 5.Ra2 f2! (5...Kh1? 6.Kxf3 g2 7.Sf2+ Kh2 8.Ra4 Sg1+ 9.Kg4 Se2 10.Sh3! g1Q+ 11.Sxg1 Kxg1 12.Kf3+-) 6.Rxe2 Kg1 7.Se3 g2=; 1.Rg8!? f2 (1...Kg2? 2.Sf2+-) 2.Kd2 Sf3+ (2...Kg2? 3.Se3+ Kf3 4.Rf8+ Ke4 5.Sg2 Sf3+ 6.Ke2 Sd4+ 7.Kf1+-) 3.Kd1 Kg1=; 1.Ra1+? Kg2 2.Se5 f2=; ii) 2.Rf8? Kf1 3.Ra8 Kg2 4.Se3+ Kf2 5.Ra2+ loss of time; iii) 3.Sd1+? Kg2 (3...Ke2 4.Sc3+ Kf2 5.Ra2+ Se2 6.Sd1+) 4.Rf8 Kh2 5.Rh8+ Kg2 6.Se3+ Kf2 7.Sg4+ Kg2 8.Rf8 Kf1 9.Ra8 Kg2 10.Se3+ Kf2 11.Ra2+ loss of time; iv) $4 . \mathrm{Sg} 4+$ !? Kg 2 5.Ke3 Kh3!! (5...Kh1? 6.Kxf3 g2 7.Sf2+ Kh2 8.Ra4 Sg1+ 9.Kg4 Se2 10.Sh3 g1Q+ 11.Sxg1 Kxg1 12.Kf3+-) 6.Se5 Sc3!! 7.Ra1 Kg2 8.Sxf3 Sd5+ 9.Ke2 Sf4+! (9...Sc3+? 10.Ke1+-) 10.Ke3 Sd5+
11.Ke2 Sf4+ 12.Ke3 Sd5+ perpetual check; v) 4...Ke1 5.Ra1! (5.Kxf3? Sc1!! 6.Rg2 Kxd1 7.Ke3 Sb3=) 5...g2 (5...f2 6.Se3++-) 6.Ke3! g1Q+ 7.Sf2+ Sc1 8.Rxc1\#; vi) 5...Kh1 6.Kxf3 g2 7.Sf2+ Kh2 8.Ra4+-; vii) 6.Ra8? Kg2 7.Rf8 Sg1 8.Ke4 Kf1 9.Se3+ Kf2 10.Sg4+ Kg2 11.Rf6 Kf1 12.Rb6 Kg2 13.Se3+ Kf2 14.Rb2+ Se2 15.Sd1+ loss of time; viii) 7...Se6+ 8.Ke3 g2 9.Sf2+ Kh2 10.Se4! Kh3 11.Kf2 Kh2 12.Kf3+-; ix) 8...Kh2 9.Se4! Kh3 10.Sg5+ Kh2 11.Kg4+-; x) 9.Ra6? Se2+=.

Solution B: WTM, Black win
1.Sb6/i f2! 2.Sc4/ii Ke1!/iii 3.Sd2/iv Sh3! 4.Sf3+/v Kd1!!/vi 5.Ke4/vii Kc1!!/viii 6.Sxf2 gxf2! 7.Sh2 Kd2!/ix 8.Kf3 Ke1 9.Kg3 Sg5!/x 10.Kg2 Ke2 wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Kf4}$ g2-+ (1...Kg2? 2.Se3+ Kh3 3.Sc7! g2 4.Se6! Se2+ (4...f2 5.Sg5+ Kh4 6.Sxg2+ Kh5 7.Se3=; 4...Kh2 5.Sg4+ Kh1 6.Sf2+=) 5.Kxf3 g1Q 6.Kxe2 Qg6 7.Sf4+=(7.Sd4? Kg3!--) ); ii) 2.Sxf2 gxf2+; 2.Sd5 Ke1 3.Sxf2 gxf2-+; iii) 2...Kg2? 3.Ke4!= (3.Sd2? Sf3-+); iv) 3.Sxf2 gxf2 4.Sd2 Sh3!--; v) 4.Se5 Kd1! (4...f1S+? 5.Kf3!! Sg5+ 6.Kg2=) 5.Sg4 f1Q (5...f1S+? 6.Kf3 Sg5+ 7.Kg2=) 6.Sxf1 g2-+; 4.Sxf2 gxf2-+; vi) 4...Kf1!? 5.Kd3=; vii) 5.Sxf2+ gxf2! 6.Sh2 (Sd2) 6...Ke1 7.Sf3+ Kf1-+; viii) 5...Ke2? 6.Sd4+ Kd2 7.Sf3+ Kc1 loss of time; 5...Sg5+? 6.Sxg5! (6.Kf4? Ke2 7.Sxg5 f1Q+-+) 6...Ke2 7.Se3 g2 8.Sxg2 f1Q 9.Sf4+=; 5...f1Q? 6.Se3+=; ix) 7...Kd1? 8.Sg4=; x) 9...Sg1? 10.Kg2 Ke2 11.Sf1 Sf3 12.Sg3+=.

## 1348. János Mikitovics

1.d4!/i Kd8/ii 2.d6! Qh2+ 3.Kf3 (Ke3)/iii Qh3+ 4.Kf4/iv Qxe6 5.d5!/v Qh3 6.Sg5! Qf1+ 7.Ke5! Qe2+ 8.Kf5!/vi Qf2+ 9.Ke6! Qe3+ 10.Sfe4! Qb6/vii 11.Sf7+/viii Kc8! 12.Sc5!!/ix Qxc5 13.d7+ wins.
i) 1.Kd1? Qh2! (1...Qf3+? 2.Kd2 Qg2+ (2...Qf4+ 3.Ke2+-) 3.Ke3+-) 2.Ke1 Qg2=; 1.Sg8+? Kf8 2.e7+ Kf7=; ii) main 1...Kf8 2.Sd7+! (2.Sh7+? Ke8 3.Shg5 Qg4+ 4.Ke3 Qg1+ 5.Kf4 Qxd4 6.d6 Kf8=) 2...Ke7 3.Sdc5 Qh2+ 4.Kd3+-; iii) 3.Kd3? Qh3+ 4.Kc4 Qxe6+=; 3.Sf2? Qxd6=; iv) 4.Sg3? Qxe6=; v) 5.Kg5? Kc8? 6.Kg6 Qc4! 7.d7+ (7.Sc5 Qxd4=) 7...Kd8=; vi) 8.Ke4?, or 8.Kf3?, or 8.Kg4? $\rightarrow$ loss of time; vii) main 10...Qf4 11.Sf7+ (11.d7? Qg4+=) 11...Kc8 12.d7++-; main 10...Qa7 11.Sc5! Qb6(11...Qxc5 12.Sf7++-) 12.Sd7 Qb3 13.Se5 Kc8 14.d7+ Kc7 15.Sgf7+-; viii) 11.Sc5? Ke8(11...Qa7? 12.Kf5!! Ke8 13.d7+ Ke7 14.Sge6+-) 12.Sf7 Qa7 13.d7+ Qxd7+ 14.Sxd7 stalemate; ix) 12.Se5!? Kb7! 13.Sd7 (13.Sf6 Qe3! 14.d7 Kc7 15.Se8+ Kd8 16.Sf6 Kc7 positional draw, or 17.d6+ Kd8=) 13...Qg1!! (13... Qa7? 14.Sef6 Qa3 15.Sf8 Kc8 (15...Kb6 16.Sg6+-) 16.Ke7+-) 14.Sdc5+! (14.Kf7? Kc8! 15.Sf8 Kd8!! (15...Qa7+? 16.Ke8!! Qb8 17.Ke7 Qb4 18.Sf6 Qc5 19.Se6+-) 16.Sf6 Qa7+ 17.d7 Kc7 18.Ke7 Qa3+ 19.Ke8 Qa8+=) 14...Ka7!! (14...Kb6? 15.Kf7 Qh2 16.Sd7+ Kb7 17.Sdf6+-) 15.d7 Qg4+! 16.Kf6 Qh4+ 17.Kg6 Qg4+ 18.Sg5 Qd4! 19.d8Q (19.d8R Qxc5=)19...Qg7+ 20.Kxg7 stalemate.

## 1349. Lubos Kekely, Michal Hlinka

1.Rd6 /i Be6+ 2.Kc5 /ii Qc3+ 3.Kb6 Sd7+! /iii 4.Rxd7 liv Qb4+ 5.Kc6 Qc4+ 6.Kb7! /v Qb5+ 7.Ka8 Qc6+ 8.Rb7 Qxd7 9.Sd6! Qxd6 10.c8Q! Bxc8 11.Rb4+! Ka5 /vi 12.Rb5+ Kxb5 stalemate, or 12...Kxa6 13.Rb6+Kxb6 stalemate
i) 1.c8Q? Bxe6+ 2.Qxe6 Sxe6 3.Rd8 Qc2+ 4.Kd5 Sxd8 5.a8Q Qg2+-+; ii) 2.Rxe6? Sxe6 3.Rd8 Qc2+ 4.Kd5 Sxc7+ 5.Kd6 Sb5+ 6.Ke6 Sxa7-+; iii) 3...Qb4+ 4.Kc6 Qe4+ 5.Kb6 Sd7+ 6.Rxd7 Qb4+ 7.Kc6 Qc4+ etc..as main line, black only waste time; iv) 4.Kb7? Qf3+ 5.Rc6 Sc5+ 6.Ka8 Qxc6+ 7.Rb7 Sxa6 8.Sd8 Sxc7+ 9.Kb8 Sa6+-+; v) 6.Kd6? Qd5+ 7.Ke7 Qxd7+ 8.Kf6 Qxf7+ 9.Ke5 Qxc7+ 10.Kxe6 Qxa7-+; vi) 11...Ka3 12.Rb3+ alebo(12.Ra4+=.

## 1350. Siegfried Hornecker

1.Bd2+ Kb6 2.Be3 Ka5! 3.b4+!/i Qxb4 4.Bd2 Kb6! 5.c5+!/i Qxc5 6.Be3 wins
i) $3 . B \times c 5$ and $5 . B \times b 4$ would be stalemate.

Simple but pretty play! I think, need an introduction for masking the idea. (MC)

## 1351. J. Mikitovics, G. Josten, I. Akobia

1.Rg8+!/i Bxg8/ii 2.Qg6+/iii Kh3 3.Qxd3/iv Qb7+ 4.Kc1!/v Bf4+!/vi 5.Sc2 Rxc2+/vii 6.Kxc2 Bh7! 7.Rg6!/viii Bxg6 8.Qxg6 Bb8!/ix 9.Qe6+!/x Kh2 10.Bg1+!! and main lines: 10...Kxg1 11.Qg8+-; 10...Kh1! 11.Qe1 Kg2 12.Qf2+ Kh1 13.Qf1+-, or 11...Bxa7 12. Bf2+ Kg2 13.Qg1+ Kf3 14.Qh1+ wins.
i) 1.Qh6!? d2+! Bristol-theme (1..Qb7+? 2.Ka2!+-) 2.Rg6+ Qg4! (2...Bxg6+? 3.Qxg6++-) 3.Qxh7 d1Q+!=; 1.Bf4+? Bxf4!=;1.a8Q? Bxb6 2.Qxc8 d2+=; ii) 1...Rxg8 2.Qxc7++-; iii) 2.a8Q? Bxb6! 3.Qxc8 Bxe3 4.Qxg8+ Kf2 5.Ra2+ d2=; iv) 3.Qh6+? Kg2 4.Qg7+ (Rg6+) 4...Bg3=; v) 4.Bb6+? Bg3! 5.Qf5+ Kh2= ; 4.Rb6? Bxb6=; 4.Sb3? Qxb3+=; vi) 4...Bg3+ 5.Sc2 Qh1+ 6.Kb2+-; vii) $5 . . . B h 7$ 6.Qf1++- (6.a8Q? Rxc2+ 7.Kd1 (7.Kxc2 Bxd3+=; 7.Qxc2 Bxe3+=) 7...Qb1+! 8.Bc1+ Bxd3 9.Qf3+ Kh2= (9...Bg3? 10.Rh6\#); 5...Qh1+ 6.Kb2+- (6.Kd2? Qg2+ 7.Kc1 Qh1+ 8.Kb2 loss of time); viii) 7.a8Q? Bxd3+=; ix) 8...Bxe3 9.Qe6++-; x) 9.Qf5+? Kg3=.

## 1352. Dragoslav Marjanović

1.Bb5+ Kxb5 2.c4+ Qxc4 3.Rxb4+ axb4 4.a4+ Kc5 5.Bxb4+ Kxd5 6.a8Q+ Qc6 7.Qg8+ Qe6 8.Qg2+ Kc4 9.Qa2+ +-

Catching the black queen with promoted white queen. (Author)

## 1353. S. B. Preuss

1.Kg2 Kg8 2.Kf3 Kf7 3.Kxe3 Kg6 4.Ke4 Kxh6 5.f5 Kg7! 6.fxe6 Kf8 7.Kd5 h5 8.Kc6! Ke7 9.Kb7 h4 10.Kxa7 h3 11.Kb8 h2 12.a7 h1Q 13.a8Q Qh8+ 14.Ka7 Qxa8+ 15.Kxa8 Kxe6 16.Kb7 Kxe5 17.Kc6 Kd4 18.Kb5 Kc3 19.Kxc5 Kb3 20.Kd4! Kxa3 21.Kc3 Ka2 22.Kc2 a3 23.c5 a4 24.c6 Ka1 25.c7 a2 26.c8Q a3 27.Qc3/Qh8 mate

## 1354. Mihai Neghina

1.Sd4 /i Qg7+ 2.Kh3 Qxh6 3.Sf4 Kd7 4.Sde6 \{Completing the fortress\} 4...Qxe6+ /ii 5.Sxe6 Kxe6 6.Kg4 Kxe5 7.Kg5 and the easy technical win: 7...c5 8.Kh6 Kf6 9.Kxh7 Kf7 10.b4 a6 11.bxc5 bxc5 12.c4 a5 13.h5 Kf6 14.Kg8 Kg5 15.Kf7 Kxh5 16.Ke6 Kg5 17.Kd5 Kf6 18.Kxc5
i) $1 . K f 3$ ? Qxd3 =; ii) 4 ...c5 5.Kg4 Kc6 $6 . b 4$ b5 $7 . a 5$ cxb4 8.cxb4 a6 9.h5 Kb7 10.Kf5 Kb8 11.Ke4 Ka7 12.Kd5 Kb7 13.Kd6 Kb8 14.Kc6 Ka7 15.Kc7+-; or 4...a5 5.h5 c6 6.Kg4+-, or 4...c6 5.h5 Kc8 6.Kg4 a5+-;
Author's comment: The study found its way into the Rybka forum [http://www.rybkaforum.net/cgi-bin/rybkaforum/ topic_show.pl?tid=12580], where (unfort-unately) a drawing variation has been found:

1. Sd4 Qg7+ 2. Kh3 Qxh6 3. Sf4 Kc8 4. Sde6 c5 5. b3 (5. h5 c4 6. Kg4 Kb7 7. Kf3 Ka6 8. Ke4 Ka5 9. Kd4 Kxa4 10. Kxc4 a5) (5. b4 cxb4 6. cxb4 a5 7. bxa5 Kb7 8. h5 Ka6) 5...Kb7 6. h5 Ka6 7. b4 (7. Kg4 Ka5 8. Kf3 c4) 7...cxb4 8.cxb4 Kb7 9. Kg4 a5 10. b5 Kc8 11. Kf3 Kd7 12. Ke4 Ke7 13. Kd5 Kd7 1/2-1/2.

Therefore, a correction is needed in the original position: $\mathrm{Pa} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{~Pa} 6$. The Study in its new form has been subject of a small article [in German]: http://glareanverlag.wordpress. com/2009/10/01/studie_glarean_martan_neghina/:
The full story of the study and its adventures in the forums is given here:
http://www.chichitza.com/sah/constrictor.html (MN)

## 1355. Darko Hlebec

1...Qxe6+ 2.c6 /i 2...Rxe4 /ii 3.Ra4+ Kxa4 4.Sc5+ Kb4 5.Sxe6 Rxe6 /iii 6.Sd5+ Kc5 7.h8Q Rxc6+ /iv 8.Ka5 Bxd5 /v 9.Qd4+ Sxd4 10.Ba3\#
i) 2.Qxe6? Bxe6 3.Ra5 c3=; ii) 2...Sxa3 3.Sd5+ Qxd5 4.Qxe7++-; iii) 5 ...Rh4 6.Sd5+ Ka4 7.Sc5\#; iv) 7...Kxd5 8.Kb5+-; v) 8...Kxd5 9.Qe5\#

## Selfmates

## 1356. Joza Tucakov

1.Sg6+? Bxg6+ 2.Bxa1!, 1.Be7? Qxe7!; 1.Bd8! ~ 2.Sg6+ Bxg6\#, 1...Qa6,Qxg2,Qe4+,Qc6,Qb4,Qb6,Qh7,Qg7,Qf7,Qe7
2.Bxa6,Bxg2,Qxe4,Sxc6,Qxb4,axb6,Rxh7,Sxg7,Sxf7,Bxe7.

Ten captures of the black queen. (Author)
1357. Zoran Gavrilovski
1.Se7! ~ 2.Sg6+(A) Rxg6+ 3.Qf4+(B) Bxf4\#, 1...Rxf5+ 2.Qf4+(B) Rxf4 3.d4+(C) Rxd4\#, 1...bxc5 2.d4+(C) cxd4+ 3.Qxd4+(D) Qxd4\#, 1...Se2 2.Qd4+(D) Sxd4 3.Sg6+(A) Rxg6\#; (1...Sf2/Sg3 2.Qe4+ Sxe4 3.Sg6+ Rxg6\#).
1358. Valery Kopyl, Gennadi Koziura
*1...fxe3+ 2.Kd3 c4+ 3.Kxe3 Bc5\#; 1.Bd1! fxe3+ 2.Kb3 e2 3.Sxe2 c4\#.

## 1359. Stephan Dietrich

1.Qd7 Kc5 2.Bd4+ Kc4 3.Qe8 Kd5 4.Bb6+ Kc4 5.Ka3 Kc3 6.Qc6+ Rc5 7.Qf3+ Kc2 8.Qe2+ Kc3 9.Ba5+ Rxa5\#.
1360. Andrey Dikusarov
1.Ra8+ Kb1 2.Qxb5+ Kc1 3.Rc8+ Kd1 4.Qxd3+ Kxf2 5.Qe2+ Kg1 6.Rxh8 g4+ 7.Kg3 g5 8.Rxh2 Rxh2 9.Qg2+ Rxg2\#.
1361. Jacob Mintz
1.c8=Q+ Ka7 2.Qca6+ Kb8 3.Qe5+ Sd6 4.d8=R+ Kc7 5.Ra8 Kd7 6.f8=S+ Kc7 7.Sh7 Kd7 8.Qd5 Kc7 9.Qaa5+ Kd7 10.f7 Ke7 11.Qac5 Kd7 12.Kh8 Ke7 13.f8=B+ Kd7 14.Bg7 Ke7 15.Rg8 Kd6 16.Qf7+ Sxf7\#

Four promotion pieces on chess-board! (Author)

## Helpmates

## 1362. Almiro Zarur

1.Bb6 Bg4! (Be6?) 2.Bc5 Kxg7\#, 1.Ba5 Be6! (Bg4?) 2.Bc3 Kxe7\#. Good puzzle with interesting interferences. (VS) - Very nice but too easy play. Wanted more complicated solutions, these are too straight forward solutions. (KS)
1363. Valerio Agostini, Antonio Garofalo
a) 1.Bh3 Bg4+ 2.Kd6 Be5\#, b) 1.Bg6 Be5+ 2.Kh3 Bg4\#.

Charming self-interferences with good activity of unpined pieces. (VS) - To little for the material, would need at least other solution for both a) and b). (KS)

## 1364. Christer Jonsson

1.Qd8 cxd8=Q+ 2.Rf6+ Qxf6\#, 1.Rd8 cxd8=S 2.Bf4 Sf7\#, 1.Bxc7 bxc8=Q 2.Bd8 Qc1\#.
Somehow typical problem for Jonsson. Black opens lines for white to mate. bR and bL switch jobs between in first two solutions and after that bL had an ace in his pocket. Excellent and enjoyable! (KS)

## 1365. Christer Jonsson

1.Sxd3 dxe7 2.Sxc5 Se5\#, 1.Bxg4 Sb7 2.Bxd7 Be4\#.

Do we have here some kind of double Zilahi? Two really execellent solutions. Perhaps one of the best Christer's problems which I have ever seen. Master's work! (KS)

## 1366. Vitaly Medintsev

1.Qxd6 Rh5 2.Qxf4 d6\#, 1.Qxf5 Bc8 2.Qxd5 f5\#, 1.Qe5 Kb6 2.Kd4 fxe5\#, 1.fxe2 Bd4 2.Kf3 dxe6\#.

Nice battery play in elegant "HOTF" style (HF) - Nice idea, but somehow I would wanted one solution more because bQ has four possible captures out which he uses only three and in the fifth bQ are captured herself. Author had still got a quite achievement in here. Well done. (KS)

## 1367. Emanuel Navon, Menachem Witztum

1.Qxf3 Sc6 2.Sf4 Re5\#, 1.Qxe5 Rf5 2.Qd4 Sg5\#, 1.Qxg5 Sd2+ 2.Kd4 Sef3\#.

A very fine achievement, which seems to be the unique example of the combination of cyclic Zilahi and cyclic follow-my-leader play with this white material (RSS). I checked in WinChloe for any forerunners and I only found a recent problem featuring similar cyclic FML sequences (1367a), but with plain square blocks instead of Zilahi. (HF) • Nice performance of triple Zilahi. Economical position. (KS)

1367a. Živko Janevski
1.cm Chess Leopolis 2007

1.c2 Sg6 2.Rd3 Re5 $\neq$
1.Rb4 Rf5 2.Rd4 Sg5 $\neq$
1.Sd3 Sd2+ 2.Kd4 Sef3 $=$

## 1368. Boris Shorokhov

1.Bf5 Kg1 2.Qxe6 Rxf5\#, 1.Bd2 Kh2 2.Sxe6 Rxd2\#.

Double AZE (white pin and black unpin) in a single move (Bf5 or Bd2). Double-pin mates. (Author)
1369. Vitaly Medintsev
1.Sf7 Qxg4 2.bxc2 Sd4\#, 1.Sg6 Rxb3 2.gxf3 Be4\#.

Passive Zilahi, neutralization of black batteries, exchange of functions between WQh3/WRb1. (Author)

## 1370. Abdelaziz Onkoud

1...Rd8 2.Sd6 Sfd2+ 3.Kd5 e4\#, 1...Rd6 2.Sd5 Sbd2+ 3.Kd4 e3\#.

Black anticipatory self-pins after white critical moves nicely combined with neutralisation of the black batteries. (HF)

## 1371. Luis Miguel Martín

1.Qc6 Kg4 2.Qc1 Kf3 3.Ke1 Qxc1\#, 1.Ke2 Kh4 2.Qd1 Kg3 3.Kf1 Qxd1\#
A cute "Tanagra" with chameleon echo model mates. (HF)

- Nice little problem, but nothing earthstriking or excellent.

Nice though...(KS)

## 1372. Dmitry Zhilko

a) 1.Kxf4 Sxg4 2.Kg5 Se5 3.Kh6 Sf7\#, b) 1.Kxf3 Sd1 2.Kg3 Se3 3.Kh4 Sxf5\#, c) 1.Kxf2 Bxg4 2.Kg1 Se2+ 3.Kh1 Bf3\#.
1373. Christopher J.A. Jones
a) 1.d5 Re8 2.Bg1 Bxa4 3.Rf2 Rc8\#, b) 1.Bd4 Re5 2.Qg3 Rb5 3.Sf3 Bxe2\#.

Black critical moves followed by self-interferences yield two model mates. (HF) - It seems that the solutions have nothing incommon although they are nice. A lot of helpmates have composed with this material. Not the best Jones problem...(KS)

## 1374. Ioannis Kalkavouras

a) 1.Rb3 (Bb3?) dxc6+ 2.Kc3 Rd1 3.Rc2 Bd4\#, b) 1.Bb3 (Rb3?) f3+ 2.Kc4 Bb6 3.Rb5 Rd4\#.

## 1375. Mike Prcic

a) 1.Rcc2 Rd4+ 2.Kc5 Rd5+ 3.Kc4 Rc5\#, b) 1.Be1 Bd4 2.Kc4 Bc5+ 3.Kc3 Bb4\#.
Critical moves by $b R$ and $b B$ unpinning white rook and bishop, creation and play of reciprocal white batteries after a Grimshaw, orthogonal-diagonal echo (Author) - This mechanism of mutual Siers batteries is known, but as far as I can tell, the striking effect of the B1 moves is a novel and very pleasant addition. (HF) - If I compare this to 1373 (Jones), thinking about the same white material in both.

Mike Prcic has done well and caught something inspiring to the board. I like ...! (KS)

## 1376. Menachem Witztum

1.Rb5 b3 2.Kc3 Bxg3 3.Kb4 Be1\#, 1.Be5 g4 2.Ke3 Rxb3+ 3.Kf4 Rf3\#.
Menachem has done some really good problems and I think this is also one of those good ones. Please continue in this road, your problems are enjoyable and original. (KS)

## 1377. Borislav Gađanski, Zdravko Maslar

1.Sf1 c4+? 2.Kxd4 ?? 3.Q~ Sf3\#, 1.Sf1 Bh8 2.Qxh8 c4+ 3.Kd4

Sf3\#, 1.Sc4 dxc4+? 2.Kxe4 ?? 3.Q~ f3\#, 1.Sc4 Sg5 2.Qxg5 $\mathrm{dxc} 4+3 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{f} 3 \#$.
W1: tempo sacrifices, W2: moves to c 4 , W3: model mates on f3. (Authors) - Well finished and through thought problem! Authors give headache with two tries in helpmate and what makes it even harder these tries stays tries. Enjoyable and refreshing ...(KS)

## 1378. Gennady Chumakov

a) 1.Rd4 Bf2 2.Rd6 Ba7 3.Bd4 Sxb4\#, b) 1.Bd4 Bh4 2.Bb6 Be7 3.Rd4 Sxe5\#.

## 1379. Vladislav Buňka

a) $1 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{dxc} 52 . \mathrm{Kxc} 8 \mathrm{c} 63 . \mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{c} 7+4 . \mathrm{Ka} 8 \mathrm{c} 8=\mathrm{Q} \#$, b) $1 . \mathrm{d} 3 \mathrm{cxb} 6$ 2.d2 b7 3.d1=R bxc8=Q 4.Rg1 Qh3\#.

## 1380. Dmitry Zhilko

a) 1.Bh4 Kc3 2.Kf7 Kd3 3.Kg6 Ke4 4.Kh5 Kf5 5.Be8 Bd1\#, b) 1.Bb3 Kxb3 2.Bb4 Kc4 3.Bf8 Kd5 4.Rd2+ Ke6 5.Rd8 Bg6\#.

## 1381. Christophe Préchac

1...b4 2.Kd6 b5 3.Sc5 b6 4.Rd5 b7 5.Bc3 b8=R 6.Be5 Rb6\#, 1...g4 2.Kd6 gxf5 3.Se5 f6 4.Rd5 f7 5.Bb4 f8=R 6.Bc5 Rf6\#.

Symmetric mates, white Excelsior theme doubled. A construction exercise, I tried to keep Black's material to a minimum against the various possible cooks based on a Qpromotion (Author) - Two solutions in 5,5 helpmate is great, but the solutions are too symmectrical, no difficulty at all. I hope that there would be a possibility to drop this to fivemover to start with Kd6. (KS)

## 1382. Steven Dowd, Mirko Degenkolbe

a) 1.Sc2 a3 2.Sb4 axb4 3.Ba6 b5 $4 . f 2$ b6 5.f1=R bxc7 6.Rf6 c8=Q 7.Rd6 Qf5\#, b) 1.Be1 Kg1 2.Ba5 Kf2 3.Bb6 Ke1 4.Ka6 Kd2 5.Ka5 Kc1 6.Kb4 Kb2 7.Ba5 a3\# (model mate).
In part (a), the black knight should unguard the eventual mate square, so the equivalent sacrificial manoeuvre 1.Be1, 2. Bb 4 can be considered as a try. In part (b), the manouevre 1.Sc2, 2.Sa1, 3.Sb3, 4.Sa5, etc., using the knight for the square block, fails as the white king cannot access the "e" file to reach b2. Even if the moves are not unique, we deem such a try important, as each solution requires the correct use of either the knight or the bishop, which provides the necessary interplay. - White's first move in (a) becomes a mate in (b), mate by a promoted queen after Excelsior in (a) with the same pawn giving the mate in (b), hiding (Versteck) of the bishop with switchback to the block square and zig-zag play by the white king in (b). White minimal. (Authors) - Great Excelsior and king zig-zag. Atypical for this duo, but quite refreshing. (GR)

## Fairies

## 1383. Milan Velimirović

(set: 1...Ke8 2.Rg8\#); 1.h8=Q? stalemate!, 1.h8=R? Kf6 2.Rf8+ Kh6!, 1.h8=B? Ke8 2.Rg8+ Kxg8!, 1.h8=S+? self-check!; 1.Rh1! (~), 1...Ke8 2.h8=R\#, 1...Kf6 2.h8=B\#, 1...Kg6 2.h8=S\#.

AUW "tries"; flight-giving key changes one mate; promotion mates. Enough for 5 pieces? (Author) - Yes, fair enough for 5 pieces ! (EH) • Nice tanagra indeed. (JL)
1384. Dmitri Turevski
a) Orthodox: 1. f4! Rxf4 2. Bc3\#, 1...Bxf4 2. Bf2\#; b) Kamikaze: 1. f4! Rxf4 2. Bf2\#, 1...Bxf4 2. Bc3\#.

Reciprocally changed variations after the same key. A trifle, but maybe a source of inspiration for twomover specialists. (EH) • It is possible to compare to No. 711 by Laco Packa and myself, where Anticirce acts partly as Kamikaze chess. Set play lacks defence motivation there and thanks to absence of piece on f 4 it is like orthodox phase here. There are even some Lačný cycles in existence on similar motives.

1384a. Jean-Marc Loustau
5th HM Phenix 1991
 E.g. 1384a: set play $+1 . \mathrm{Bd} 3$ ! with triple threat. (JL)

## 1385. Semion Shifrin

1.Qg2? ~ 2.Nh5\#(A), 1...RLf3 2.Qe2\#(B), 1...RLf8 2.Nb4\#, 1...c2 2.Qd2\#, 1...RLh1!; 1.Ge6 ? ~ 2.Qe2\#(B), 1...CAd5 2.Nc1\#(C), 1...Sd4 2. Nh5\#(A) (2.Nb4?), 1...Ge7!; 1. Qa2? ~ 2.Nc1\#(C), 1...RLb3 2.Qc2\#(D), 1...RLh1 2.Nb7 \#, 1...RLb2!; 1.Gc6! ~ 2.Qc2\#(D), 1...CAd5 2.Nh5\#(A), 1...Sd4 2. Nc1\#(C) (2.Nb7?), 1...c2 2. Qd2\#.

Themes without changes. (Author) - There are some change themes after all - reciprocal change between 1.Ge6? and 1.Gc6! is the most pronounced, based on the changes of grasshopper guarding lines. (JL)

## 1386. Raffi Ruppin

The main plan 1.Ba7? 2.Bb8 3.Bc7\# fails to 1...h1=Q! and 1....g1=Q!. First white forces promotions to Grasshoppers: 1.Bf2! (2.Bh4\#) h1=G 2.Be3 (3.Bg5\#) g1=G 3.Ba7 ...4.Bb8 ...5.Bc7\#. Why not the different order of moves: 1.Be3? $\mathrm{g} 1=\mathrm{G} 2 . \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{Gg} 5$ ! 3.Bh4 Gb3-g3! (Author)

Evergreen Holst promotions. (JL)

## 1387. Frantisek Sabol

1.e8=B (~). 1...f6 2.b8=B f5 3.Bf4 K~\#, 1...f5 2.Bh5 f4 3.Bf3 K~\#.
$\mathrm{C}+$ in WinChloe with stipulation Circé maléfique martien $=$ in english Mars Mirror Circe. (Author) - Also C+ by Popeye (EH) - It is not easy to adjust to the peculiarities of Mars Circe, and Mirror Mars Circe adds some new effects into mix. White Kel cannot move due to possible capture by bK from el, on the other hand, any move of bK here allows capture by black f-pawn from f2, therefore white wants to stop any possible pawn moves. But it is necessary to prevent quick check action by bK (1...K~+ 2.K(e8)xf7!). That is why promotion on e8 in the first move is necessary. Queen promotion anywhere during solutions would be a mistake due to $1 \ldots \mathrm{ff}, 2 \ldots \mathrm{~K} \sim+3 . \mathrm{D}(-\mathrm{d} 8) \mathrm{xf6}$ ! Knight promotions are ruled out due to short reach of knights and finally rook promotion 1.e8R! with blocks by 2.-3.Re3-f3 or Re4-f4 fails to possible check defence 4.Rf2! Convincing problem in spite of seemingly dry solution. (JL)

1388. György Bakcsi<br>1. Ra8! Rf8+ 2. Ke6 Re8+ 3. Kd7 Rd8+ 4. Kc7 Rc8+ 5. Kb7 Rb8+ 6. Ka6 Rxa8+ 7. Kb5 Ra5\#

## 1389. Dmitri Turevski

1.Je4 Rbg1 2.Je6 Re1\#, 1.Jh7 Rgg1 2.Jb7 Rg7\#, 1.Sc6 Rgg1 2.Jb4 Rg4\#, 1.Sf7 Rbg1 2.Jh6 Rh1\#.

I enjoyed solving Guy's problem (MP33-34, No.1286) and thought that having another pair of variations would be nice. Not sure if it should be called "after" or "version". (Author) • Well done Dmitri! (GS) • Definitely 'after'. Adding whole pair of new solutions, even with active play of a piece guarding bK in all mating pictures, is worth of self-standing publication. A co-authorship with Guy might have been asked, but mating picture is not copyrighted. Actually this is one of the best tanagras I have seen this year. Well done! (JL)

## 1390. Ivan Antonov, Guy Sobrecases

1.Ra7(=wR) Rd7(=bR)! 2.Bc6(=wB) Ba8(=bB) 3.Ra7(=wR) Rxa8\#; 1.Kf8 Kf6 2.Bd7(=wB) Bc8(=bB)! 3.Rb8(=wR) Rxc8\#.
It is easily seen that White can mate only by capture of rook by bishop As both part are initially aimed at bK, some shielding manoeuvres are necessary for colour changing, resulting in exact echo $(1,0)$ of the second most banal mate possible. (JL)

## 1391. Vito Rallo

1.Rh3 Kd2 2.b1=Q Be5 3.Qd3[wRh3]+ Re3[wQd3]\#
1.Ra6 Kc3 2.bxa1=Q[wRa6]+ Kc4 3.Qf6 Re6[wQf6]\#

## 1392. Vaclav Kotesovec

1...Bc4 2.Kd3 Kc5 3.Kc3 Bb3 4.Kc2 Bd5 5.Bb6+ Kc4 6.Kc3+ Kb5 7.Bc5 Kb6 8.Kb4 Ka5+ 9.Ka4 Bc6\#; 1...Kd4 2.Kc2 Bc4 3.Kb3 Kd5 4.Kb4 Bb5 5.Ka4 Kc6 6.Ka5 Ba6 7.Bc7 Bc8 8.Kb5+ Kb7 9.Ka6+ Ka7\#; 1...Bc2 2.Kd3 Kc4+ 3.Kd4 Be4+ 4.Kc5 Bc6+5.Kb6 Be8 6.Bc7 Kb5+ 7.Kb7 Ka6+ 8.Kb8 Ka7+ 9.Ka8 Bc6\#; 1...Be4 2.Kd3 Ke5 3.Ke3 Bd5 4.Kf4+ Kf5 5.Kg4 Ke6 6.Be7 Kf7 7.Bf6 Kg7 8.Kg5 Kh6+ 9.Kh5 Bf7\#.
Another worthy tanagra, even Wenigsteiner, with four thematic solutions. (JL)

## 1393. Gunter Jordan

1.0-0 0-0-0 2.Kf7 Kc2 3.Ke8 Rd7 4.Kd8 Rd3 5.Ke7 Kc3 6.Rf6 Kc4 7.Rd6 Kc5 8.Rb6 Kc6 9.Rb7 Kc7 10.Rb6 Kd7 11.Kd8 Kc8\#

Impressive march of the wK on the c file, from c 1 to c 8 ! (EH) - While black castling is forced, white one is a beginning of the plan involving Köko specific battery mate at the end. (JL)

## 1394. Alan McCormick

1.e1=R e8=Q $2 . \operatorname{Re} 7 \mathrm{~d} 8=\mathrm{S} 3 . \operatorname{Ra} 7$ Qe1 4.h1=B Qa5 5.Ba8 Sb7=. Initial position is not achievable via legal game. (Author) In this version of atomic there is no check, unlike some other versions which include check. Positions in which your king can be captured or blown up by direct or indirect capture are legal. Therefore, a stalemate position can only be achieved with a king completely surrounded by pieces. (EH) - In spite of hinting AUW the content of this problem and fairy conditions used are all Greek to me. (JL)

## 1395. N. Shankar Ram

Try 1.g5? pKd3+! 2.Bg4 Rxg4\#= stalemate! White has no legal next move and this is not a valid checkmate according to paralysing pieces usage.
Key 1.gxh5! (2.Be8, pkd3\#), 1...pK~+, 2.Sc4 Rxc4\#, 1...pKe3+! 2. c4 Rxc4\#, 1...pKc3+!! 2. e4 Rxe4\#, 1...pKd3+!!! 2.Bg4 Rxg4\#. White has a legal move 3.h6

## 1...pB~2.Kc3 b4\#; 1...Rxh5 2.Bxb5 Rxb5\#.

Composed a long time back: ~199? Quaternary(4th degree) correction by Black King in meredith. The successive weaknesses being: opening of line h4-b4, paralysis of d 2 ,
paralysis of c2 and paralysis of e2. 2 additional by-play variations. (Author) - There are two interesting theoretical points here to discuss. The first one is about corrections degree. In my opinion, black corrections $1 \ldots$...pKc3 and $1 \ldots \mathrm{pKe} 3$ are of the same degree. Both improve on random defence by king as they immobilize Sd2 and error is in both cases additional immobilization of pawns - c2 and e2 respectively. Then $1 \ldots \mathrm{pKd} 3$ is one degree further to both of them. But their mutual relationship is not "correction" in any direction. The second one is about paralysing pieces and specificities of mating by them. There has to be at least one physically possible move, even if illegal due to checks, by any piece of mated side. This is something highly counterintuitive and unheard of in the mate definition. E.g. position $\mathrm{Sa} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 1-\mathrm{Pa} 2 \mathrm{~Pb} 2 \mathrm{Pc} 2 \mathrm{Pe} 2 \mathrm{Ba} 1 \mathrm{~Kb} 1 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 1$ is \#1 by White (1.Sc3\#), but if we turn bPb 2 into paralysing pawn, suddenly there is no mate in 1 . While Popeye treats the positions exactly in this way, WinChloe has take in my view much better approach - checkmate is checkmate for WinChloe (i.e. mate in both above mentioned positions) and checkmate with at least one physically possible move (specifically used in paralysing pieces problems) is named "absolute mate". What do you think about this irregularity? (JL) • Author (again):
My reply to Juraj Lorinc's comments:
1..pKc3 and 1..pKe3 are NOT of the same degree. 1..pKc3 contains weakness of paralysis of wSd2 + paralysis/block of $w P c 2$. Whereas 1..pKe3 contains weakness of ONLY paralysis of wSd2. The apparent "weakness" of paralysis/ block of wPe2 by 1..pKe3 is NOT significant because even if it were NOT present it does not change the outcome: 2.c4, Rxc3\#. In other words, wPe2 has no control over 2..Rxc4\#, whereas wPc2 can stop 2..Rxe4\#. Hope that is clear and I can rest my case for 4th degree correction! However, I do agree that the additional though nonsignificant weakness of $1 . . p K e 3$ in blocking/paralysing $w P e 2$ is a distraction which may confuse others similarly! Coming now to the "no mate if stalemate" condition. Well, it is the inventor - Yves Cheylan's prerogative! Us poor composers only utilise such things to brighten our humble offerings! Seriously, I too felt the same when I first came across this in the 1980s. This was just before the madrasi era. I thought Mr Cheylan had thrown in the addition to improve the "fruitfulness" of the condition. But, again, as a composer who got quite a few prizes with paralysing pieces problems, I can't really complain!

## 1396. Christophe Préchac

1.g8=B a5 2.Bxh7 a4 3.Bd3 a3 4.h7 Qg8+ 5.hxg8=B a2 6.h6 a1=B $7 . \mathrm{h} 7 \mathrm{~K} \sim \#$.
This problem is not fully tested, only the hs\#6 truncation after the first two half-moves $1 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{B}$ a5 is $\mathrm{C}+$. This is my first submission to MatPlus, I hope you find this problem of some interest. (Author) - Three bishop promotions. Questioned multiple mating move is present again, this is the example of acceptable use, in my view. (JL)

## 1397. Luis Miguel Martin

a) 1.Sc5 2.Kd5 3.Kd6 4.Se6 fxe5\#, b) 1.Se5 2.Kf5 3.Kf6 4.Sg6 fxg5\#.
Total echo of the play, not very exciting. (JL)

## 1398. Peter Harris

1.f1=B 2.e1=S 3.Bc4=R 4.Rh4=Q 5.Qa4=S 6.Sc5=B 7.Bg1=R 8. $\mathrm{Sf3}=\mathrm{B}[\mathrm{wPg} 2]+\mathrm{gxf3} 9 . \mathrm{Rg} 8=\mathrm{Q} \#$.

## 1399. Gunter Jordan

1.Kd7 Kb7 2.Kd6 Kxb6 3.Kd5 Kc7 4.Kc5 a6 5.Kb4 Kc6 6.Ka5 Kb5\#.
Funny. I had to refresh my memory as regards the definition of Brunner Chess and in the meantime I have forgotten about the other condition. Then I have been lost - why Black has to mate? Well, you know, memory, both short term and long term... Anyway, excellent find of combination of two fairy conditions in the classic position. (JL)
1400. Yoshikazu Ueda
1.AMe4 Gh6 2.AMd6 AMe3\#, 1.AMd2 Gc2 2.AMc4 AMf6\#, 1.AMb2 Ga2 2.AMb3 AMc4\#, 1.AMe2 Gd2 2.AMd3 AMd4\#, 1.Kc5 Gf2 2.AMe3 AMd4\#.
$2+2$ echo mates with one additional mating picture, orthogonal version of one of echos. If only $2+2+2$ version was possible...(JL)

## 1401. Yoshikazu Ueda

1.35f6 2.35c1 3.35h4 4.35c7 5.35f2 6.35a5 7.35f8 8.35c3 9.35h6 10.35e1 11.35b6 12.35xg3[+wLRb6] 13.35d8 14.35a3 $15.35 f 616$. 35c1 17.35h4 18.35c7 19.35f2 20.35a5 21.35f8 22.35c3 23.35h6 $4.35 \mathrm{e} 125.35 \mathrm{xb} 6[+w L R e 1] 26.35 \mathrm{~g} 327.35 \mathrm{~d} 828.35 \mathrm{a} 329.35 f 630$. $35 \mathrm{c} 131.35 \mathrm{~h} 432.35 \mathrm{c} 733.35 \mathrm{f} 234.35 \mathrm{a} 535.35 f 836.35 \mathrm{c} 337.35 \mathrm{~h} 6$ $38.35 x \mathrm{xe} 1[+w L R h 6] 39.35 \mathrm{~b} 640.35 \mathrm{~g} 341.35 \mathrm{~d} 842.35 \mathrm{a} 343.35 f 6$ 44.35 c 145.35 h 446.35 c 747.35 f 248.35 a 549.35 f 850.35 c 3 $51.35 \mathrm{xh} 6[+\mathrm{wLRc} 3] 52.35 \mathrm{e} 153.35 \mathrm{~b} 654.35 \mathrm{~g} 355.35 \mathrm{~d} 856.35 \mathrm{a} 3$ $57.35 f 658.35 \mathrm{c} 159.35 \mathrm{~h} 460.35 \mathrm{c} 761.35 f 262.35 \mathrm{a} 563.35 f 8$ $64.35 \mathrm{xc} 3[+\mathrm{wLRf8}] 65.35 \mathrm{~h} 666.35 \mathrm{e} 167.35 \mathrm{~b} 668.35 \mathrm{~g} 369.35 \mathrm{~d} 8$ 70.35a3 71.35f6 72.35c1 73.35h4 74.35c7 75.35f2 76.35a5 77.35xf8[+wLRa5] 78.35c3 79.35h6 80.35e1 81.35b6 82.35g3 83.35d8 84.35a3 85.35f6 86.35c1 87.35h4 88.35c7 89.35f2 90.35xa5[+wLRf2] 91.35f8 92.35c3 93.35h6 94.35e1 95.35b6 96.35 g 3 97.35d8 98.35a3 99.35f6 100.35c1 101.35h4 102.35c7 103.35xf2[+wLRc7] 104.35a5 105.35f8 106.35c3 107. 35h6 $108.35 \mathrm{e} 1109.35 \mathrm{~b} 6110.35 \mathrm{~g} 3111.35 \mathrm{~d} 8112.35 \mathrm{a} 3113.35 f 6114$. 35c1 115.35h4 116.35xc7[+wLRh4] 117. 35f2 118.35a5 119.35f8 120.35c3 121.35h6 122.35e1 123.35b6 124.35g3 125.35d8 126. 35a3 127.35f6 128. 35c1 129. 35xh4[+wLRc1] 130.35c7 131.35f2 132.35a5 133.35f8 134.35c3 135.35h6 136.35e1 137.35b6 138. 35g3 139.35d8 140.35a3 141.35f6 142.35xc1[+wLRf6] 143.35h4 144.35 c 7145.35 f 2 146. 35 a 5147.35 f 8 148. 35c3 149.35h6 $150.35 \mathrm{e} 1 \quad 151.35 \mathrm{~b} 6 \quad 152.35 \mathrm{~g} 3 \quad 153.35 \mathrm{~d} 8 \quad 154.35 \mathrm{a} 3 \quad 155$. 35xf6[+wLRa3] 156.35c1 157.35h4 158. 35c7 159.35f2 160.35a5 $161.35 f 8162.35 \mathrm{c} 3$ LRa3xc3-d3[+b35a3]\#.
Is mr. Ueda surely from Japan? Not from Switzerland? So many clockworks made by him raise suspicions :-) (JL)

## Retro/Math

## 1402. Gunter Jordan

1.e4 Sf6 2.Qh5 Sxe4 [Pe2] 3.Qxh7 Sf6 4.Qg8 Sxg8 [Qd1].

Three switchbacks. (Author) • Funny solving (GR) • Very surprising that this is unique, and harder to find than I initially expected (but still not too hard....) (JdeH)

## 1403. Bernd Gräfrath, Thomas Brand

1.a4 Sc6 2.a5 Sxa5 3.Rxa5 h5 4.Rg5 e5 5.e3 Qf6 6.Se2 Qf3 7.gxf3 h4 8.Rg2 h3 9.Sg3 hxg2 10.h3 gxh1=Q 11.Bg2 f6 12.Bxh1. Schnoebelen promotion (queen)

Co-author Thomas Brand writes (Oct 18th, 2009):
"Attached you'll find the correction of Mat Plus 1403, which was cooked by Joost de Heer. The correction is 1403v. Now the authors are: Bernd Gräfrath, Thomas Brand, and Joost de Heer. Solution: 1.a4 Sc6 2.a5 Sxa5 3.Rxa5 h5 4.Rg5 d5 5.e3 Bg4 6.Se2 Bf3 7.gxf3 h4 8. Rg2 h3 9.Sg3 hxg2 10.h3 gxh1Q 11.Bg2 a6 12.Bxh1. We hope that the correction can still participate in the 2009 informal tourney." (HG)


- COOK: 1.e3 Sc6 2.Bd3 Se5 3.Se2 Sf3 4.gf3 e5 5.Bh7 Qe7 6. a3 Qa3 7.Bf5 Qa1 8.Bh3 Qa6 9.Sg3 Qf1 10.Bg2 Qh1 11.Bh1 f6 12.h3. A shame about the very nice queen Schnoebelen, which was quite hard to find. (JdeH)


## 1404. Itamar Faybish

1.Sf3 Sc6 2.Sd4 Se5 3.Sc6 bxc6 4.f4 Ba6 5.fxe5 Qb8 6.e6 Qb3 7.axb3 0-0-0 8.exf7 Re8 9.fxg8=R Kd8 10.Rxh8 Bc8 11.Rxf8 a6 12.Rf7 Rh8 13.Ra5 Ke8 14.Rb5 axb5.

The mysterious rook at h 8 . (EH) - Rh 8 is a surprising sibling unit. (JdeH)

## 1405. Paul Raican

1.h4 d5 2.h5 Bg4 3.Rh4 Bf3 4.Rc4 dxc4 5.exf3 Qxd2+ 6.Ke4 Qb4 7.Qd8+ Kb5 8.Se2 c3+ 9.Kxb7 c6 10. Sd4++ Kxf1+ 11.Kc7 Sa6+ 12.Ke8 Kg1 13.Kxf7 Sh6+ 14.Ke5 Qb5+ 15.Ke1.

7-move wK circuit. (EH) - Popeye checked the first ten and the last nine moves. COOK: 1.h4 d5 2.h5 Bg4 3.Rh4 Bf3 4.Rc4 dxc4 5.exf3 c3 6.Ba6 Sxa6 7.d3 Qxd3 8.Se2 Qb5 9.Qd5 Sh6 10.Qxf7+ Kd7 11.Sd4 Kd6 12.Qd5+ Kh2 13.Qxb7 Kg1 14.Qc8 c6 15.Qd8 (JdeH)

## 1406. Paul Raican

1.h4 a5 2.h5 a4 3.h6 Ra5 4.hxg7 h5 5.Rh3 h4 6.Rb3 h3 7.g4 h2 8.g5 Rh3 9.g6 Sh6 10.g8=S h1=B 11.Sf6 exf6 12.g7 Bc5 13.g8=Q+ Ke7 14.Qg2 Kd6 15.Qc6 dxc6 16.e4 Bf5 17.e5+ Kd5 18.e6 Bg6 19.e7 f5 20.e8=Q Qh4 21.Qee2 Be4 22.Qa6 bxa6 23.Rb7 Rb3 24.d3 Qh3 25.dxe4+.

Ceriani-Frolkin theme SQQb. (EH) • Not too hard to solve. (JdeH)

## 1407. Dragan Lj. Petrović

R: 1.Rf5xSe5 [Sb8]+ Sh6-g8 2.Kf8-e8 Sg4-h6 3.K~ Se3-g4 4.K~ Sc2-e3 5.K~ Sa3-c2 6.K~ Sb1,c2xPa3 [Pa2] 7.a2-a3! Sa3-b1,c2 8.K~ Sc2xPa3 [Pa2] 9.K~ Se3-c2 10.Kg8-f8 Sg4-e3 11.Kh7-g8 Sh6-g4 12.a2-a3 Sg8-h6 13.Kg8xSh7 [Sg8] Sf8-h7 14.Kh7-g8 Sd7-f8+ 15.Kg8-h7 Sb8-d7 16.Sd7xSc5 [Sb8] Sg4-e5 17.Se5-d7+ Se3-g4 18.K~ Sc2-e3 19.K~ Sa3-c2 20.K~ Sb1,c2xPa3 [Pa2] 21.a2-a3! Sa3-b1,c2 22.K~ Sc2xPa3 [Pa2] 23.K~ Se3-c2 24.Kg8~ Sg4-e3 25.Kh7-g8 Sh6-g4 26.a2-a3 Sg8-h6 27.Kg8xSh7 [Sg8] Sf8-h7 28.Kh7-g8 Sd7-f8+ 29.Kg8-h7 Sb8-d7 30.Sg4xSe5 [Sb8] Sd7-e5 31.Se5xPg4 [Pg7]+ Sb8-d7 32.Sd7xSe5 [Sb8] \& v: 1.Sxf6\#.

Tempo play by Circe uncapture. Consecutive replacement of knights. (EH) - The position 63 halfmoves ago was (see diagram!). Forward play: 1. Sxf6\#


Game to diagram: 1. Sxe5(Sb8) Sbd7 2. Sxg4(Pg7)+ Se5 3. Sxe5(Sb8) Sbd7 4. Kh7 Sf8+ 5. Kg8 Sh7 6. Kxh7(Sg8) Sh6 7. a3 Sg4 8. Kg8 Se3 9. Kh7 Sc2 10. Kg8 Sxa3(Pa2) 11. Kh7 Sc2 12. a3 Sxa3(Pa2) 13. Kg8 Sc2 14. Kh7 Se3 15. Kg8 Sg4 16. Sd7+ Se5 17. Sxc5(Sb8) Sbd7 18. Kh7 Sf8+ 19. Kg8 Sh7 20. Kxh7(Sg8) Sh6 21. a3 Shg4 22. Kg8 Se3 23. Kh7 Sc2 24. Kg8 Sxa3(Pa2) 25. Kh7 Sc2 26. a3 Sxa3(Pa2) 27. Kg8 Sc2 28. Kf8 Se3 29. Ke8 S3g4 30. Kf8 Sh6 31. Ke8 Sg8 32. Rxe5(Sb8)+.
At the beginning I was constantly having problems with parity, until I realised the maneuver a2-a3 $\mathrm{Sc} 2 \mathrm{xa} 3(\mathrm{~Pa} 2)$ could be repeated to lose a tempo. After that, it was just a matter of finding a mating move. The retraction play isn't completely unique (the white king has some freedom), which lowers the value of this composition. (JdeH)

## 1408. Itamar Faybish

Given the irregular grid, no piece can advance vertically. This is a quite strong condition.
In the diagram we can first trivially notice that both kings are seemingly, but not actually, in check by the queens. A second important point is the pawn e4.
As pawns cannot advance, they must capture; thus this pawn came from e2, and it captured two pieces on white squares.
Looking at the missing black pieces, we have one pawn, one bishop, and a knight. Both the pawn and the bishop are on black squares, and so could not have been captured by the e2 pawn as such. Only the knight could have.
Consequently, the pawn e7 promoted, to either a queen or a knight.
There are 6 missing white pieces, which is the exact count for the e7 pawn to capture. But how could it capture both the b 2 and d 2 pawns? This is where the black bishop comes into play, and must have been captured on c3.
With these informations, we can determine the minimum number of moves for the game by Black: 2 (bishop moves to c3) +6 (captures by pawn e7) +1 (assuming CerianiFrolkin by knight to d3) +2 (knight moves to e4) +2 $($ queen $)=13$.
With this analysis, the SPG is now relatively easy to find:
1.Sc3 Sf6 2.Sd5 Se4 3.Sf6+ exf6 4.Sf3 Bb4 5.Se5 Bc3 6.dxc3 fxe5 7.Be3 Qg5 8.Bd4 exd4 9.Qc1 dxc3 10.Qf4 cxb2 11.Rc1 bxc1=S 12.Qe5 Sd3+ 13.exd3 Qe3 14.dxe4. (Author)
Ceriani-Frolkin theme. (EH)
Pe 4 requires two captures on white squares. This requires Pe 7 to promote, capturing all missing white men. This includes both Pb 2 and Pd 2 , so white had to capture b2xc3 or d 2 xc 3 to get the white pawns on the route of the black pawn.
Shortest sequence needs at least 7 (black pawn promotes to knight on c1, and sacrifices on d3)+2 (black queen) +2 (black bishop to c3) +2 (black knight to e4)=13 black
moves. After dxc3 it takes two moves to get the white bishop on a square where it can be captured by the pawn. One of these moves can be fxe5, but the second must be a queen move. So after exd3, black only has one queen move left, his 13th, so white needs at least 14 moves, because dxe4 must happen after black's 13th.
Minimal length proofgame therefore requires at least 13.5 moves, and this can be reached:
1.Sc3 Sf6 2. Sd5 Se4 3. Sf6 exf6 4. Sf3 Bb4 5. Se5 Bc3 6. dxc3 fxe5 7. Be3 Qg5 8. Bd4 exd4 9. Qc1 dxc3 10. Qf4 cxb2 11. Rc1 bxc1=S 12. Qe5 Sd3 13. exd3 Qe3 14. dxe4 (JdeH)

## 1409. Joaquim Crusats, Steven B. Dowd

Hauptplan: R 1.e4xBd5? Ke8-f8 (1.- Ke8xRf8 is illegal) 2.e2-e4 (2.e3-e4 does not prevent the check to the WK by the BR in the forward play) threatening 1.Qxd5 Kf8 2.Qd8\#, but Black has regained its castling rights, so 1.- $0-0$ ! defends, being the unique reason why the Hauptplan fails.
Vorplan: R 1.g2-g4! (threatens 2.Qh5-f3 and \#2) h5-h4 (unique defense) and now the Hauptplan works: 2.e4xBd5 Ke8-f8 (Black regains its castling rights) 3.e2-e4 (and Black looses again its castling rights: One of the WRs is promoted, as the original one on h 1 was taken on h 2 by the BP originally on g7. The promoted WR had to escape from the northwest corner via Rd8+, Black thus looses its castling rights. Notice that the promoted WR could have not escaped via b6 because two promotions took place on the a - and b -files).
On the Zweckreinheit: The Vorplan should rule out Black castling (the sole reason why the Hauptplan failed) without providing any additional advantage. Notice that in this case R 1.g2-g4! also prevents the check to the WK by the BR in the forward play, but this is something that was already accounted for in the Hauptplan. And in any case, then White also needs to retract 3.e2-e4, not 3.e3-e4.
The new theme "Black retracts a move to regain its castling rights as its unique defense but looses them again with White's next retraction" is shown in a logical problem.

## 1410. Wolfgang Dittmann

Main plan: Conquer square f7 for wSe3 (=mate) via zugzwang.
Part One: R 1.Ke2xPf3 [Ke1]! f4-f3+2.Kf3-e2 (start of pendulum) $\mathrm{Bf} 1-\mathrm{g} 2+3 . \mathrm{Ke} 2-\mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2-\mathrm{f} 1+4 . \mathrm{Kf3}-\mathrm{e} 2 \mathrm{Bf} 1-\mathrm{g} 2+5 . \mathrm{Ke} 2-\mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{f} 2-\mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{B}+$ (forced) 6.Ke1-e2 f3-f2+
Part Two: 7.Kc2xBb1 [Ke1]! (7.Sf5-e3? Bd4-a1!) Ba2-b1+ 8.Bb6c7 b4-b3+ 9.Kb3-c2 (start of pendulum) Bb1-a2+ 10.Kc2-b3 Ba2b1+ 11.Kb3-c2 Bb1-a2+ 12.Kc2-b3 b2-b1=B+ (forced)
Part Three: 13.Sf5-e3! (13.Sg4-f3? allows the black pawns on the f-file tempo moves, eventually even threatening to block square f7). Now we have two variations in moves 13-18, depending on Black's reply:
a) 13.- a7-a6 14.Kb3-c2 (start of pendulum; not 14.d5-d6? Sd6-f7 and it is White who has to interrupt the pendulum: 15.Kb3-c2 Sf7d6 16.Kc2-b3 Sd6-f7 17.Kb3-c2 Sf7-d6 18.Kc2-b3?? illegal; White retracts d5-d6 only with BSd8!) 14.- Ra6-a5 (14.- b7xXa6?? illegal because of number of captures) 15.Kc2-b3 Ra5-a6 16.Kb3-c2 Ra6-a5 17.Kc2-b3 Sd8-f7 (forced) 18.d5-d6! (threatens mate) Sf7-d8
b) 13.- Sd8-f7 14.d5-d6! Sf7-d8 15.Kb3-c2 Sd6-f7 16.Kc2-b3 Sf7d6 17.Kb3-c2 Sd6-f7 18.Kc2-b3 a7-a6 (forced)
Part Four: 19.Kb3-c2 (start of fourth pendulum; the two black pieces involved in the pendulum are - depending on the variations a) or b) - either BRa6/BSf7 or BRa5/BSd6; they can interchange their moves, but may continue the pendula a5/a6 and d6/f7 no more than 7 times, e.g.:) 19.- Ra5-a6 20.Kc2-b3 Ra6-a5 21.Kb3c2 Ra5-a6 22.Kc2-b3 Sd6-f7 23.Kb3-c2 Ra6-a5 24.Kc2-b3 Ra5-
a6 25.Kb3-c2 Ra6-a5 26.Kc2-b3 S any (except 26.- Sf7-d6??/Sd6-f7?? = illegal; forced) 27.Sd6-f5 \& v: 1.Sf7\#
Four draw pendula with four different black pieces involved. Two pendula end with unpromotion of a black pendulum piece (one of which has to be uncaptured before), two pendula work without self-check. No white en passant capture involved in starting the pendula.
Klaus Wenda writes:
"Hier hat Wolfgang Dittmann das Tor zu einer neuen Dimension des Remispendels im VRZ Anticirce Proca aufgestoßen. Ich schildere meine Impression des Stückes und seiner äußerst komplexen Lösung, die ich ohne unterstützende Hinweise durch den Komponisten wohl kaum gefunden hätte:
Man kann das Geschehen gleich einer klassischen Symphonie in 4 Sätze untergliedern:
1.Satz - Allegro. 1.Ke2xBf3! f4-f3+ 2.Kf3-e2 Lf1-g2+ 3.Ke2-f3 Lg2-f1+ [das Leitmotiv des Pendels]...5.Ke2-f3 f2-f1=L+ [erzwungene Entwandlung] 6.Ke1-e2 f3-f2+ [der wK ist wieder im heimatlichen Schloss und zu neuen Taten bereit]
2.Satz - 7.Kc2xLb1 La2-b1+ 8.Lb6-c7 b4-b3+ 9.Kb3-c2 Lb1-a2+ [das Pendelmotiv kehrt unter Einsatz der 2.Geigen wieder] ...12.Kc2-b3 b2-b1=L+!
[die zweite Entwandlung leitet über in den ...]
3.Satz - Im sanften Adagio begegnet uns das Pendelmotiv erneut 13.Sf5-e3! a7-a6 14.Kb3-c2 Ta6-a5 ...17.Kc2-b3 Sd8-f7! 18.d5-d6! [der Vorbote des Finales] Sf7-d8!
4.Satz - Im furiosen Crescendo kulminiert das Werk in einem Doppelpendel. Presto. 19.Kb3-c2! Ta5-a6 20.Kc2-b3 Ta6-a5 ...22.Kc2-b3 Sd6-f7! 23.Kb3-c2 Ta6-a5 24.Kc2-b3 Ta5-a6 ...eine Kadenz führt zum Schluß 26.Kc3-b2 S~ 27.Sd6-f5 \& 1.Sf7\#

Analyse. Dem Hauptplan 1.Sd6-x? \& v: 1.Sf7\# stehen 3 Hindernisse entgegen:

- der wSe3 steht noch zu weit von d6 entfernt
- d6 ist durch einen w Stein besetzt
- f7 ist durch einen s Stein besetzt.

Mit den beiden ersten Pendeln wird durch Entwandlung bzw. Immobilisierung der beiden s Läufer g2 und al eine überraschende Zugzwangstellung aufgebaut, worauf mit dem 13. Zug der inhaltlich gänzlich neue Teil des Spielverlaufes startet.
Mittels 3 (selbstschachlosen!) Remispendeln gewinnt Weiß Zeit, seinen S auf das bessere Feld f 5 zu führen, den störenden wBd6 nach d5 zurück zu ziehen und schliesslich den sS von f7 wegzulenken. Wahrhaft imposant!"
Günther Weeth writes:
"Solvers should carefully analyse the monumental architecture in no. 1410 with a view to precise logic. In doing so, we can fully enjoy Dittmann's artistry by means of which he starts 5 (!) manoeuvres known as the 'draw pendulum' in defensive retractors. For reaching his final goal of zugzwang for Black, White must deprive 5 black units of their ability to move and he must gain two tempi for the wS moving to f 5 and for unblocking the square d 6 (basic plan). The logical preparation is based on the implementation of no less than 4 foreplans, each of them including at least one pendulum with the result of doing away with one obstacle after the other. Yet in the course of second and third foreplans, we see 3 secondary obstacles emerge as a result of White's and Black's thematic moves: an uncaptured mobile Bb 1 , and a bRa5 becoming mobile
twice in due time. Compensation for such secondary obstacles must therefore be created: a highly demanding task for the composer who makes ample use of the pendulum for this purpose. The principle of purity of purpose is hereby strictly observed as can be proved by socalled control play.
The final adoption of an unobtrusive double pendulum (no self-checks!) for simultaneously outruling two black units (bRa5 and bSf7) with the white king as the starter throughout and with the black moves being exchangeable) shows off what we might call the fabulous plot of a masterly conceived drama of modern fairy retro.
It is worthwhile looking at the following try: 1.Ke1xPf2 [Ke1]?! f3-f2+ 2.Kd1xPc2 [Ke1] c3-c2+ 3.Sc4-e3 Bb2-a1 (the best way of complying with Black's desire of gaining control of g1) 4.e4-e5 Bc1-b2 5.e3-e4 f4-f3 (the Bg2 wants to achieve the control of f7) 6.d5-d6 Be4-g2 7.Ke1-d1 Bf5e4 (too late) 8.big surprise Kg4xQh5 [Ke1]!! Sd8-f7 (what else?) 9.Sd6/Se5-c4 \& v: 1.Sf7\#
(5.- b6,b7-b5 6.d5-d6 Rc5-a5 7.Ke1-d1 Rc6-c5 (too late) 8.Kg4xQh5 [Kel] etc.).

There are various other possibilities of uncapturing the bQ elsewhere depending on the position reached at any given time. (If 5.- any?: shorter mate after analogous moves!).
But the account of pawn uncaptures gives evidence of the fact that the uncapture of a bQ resulting from promotion would be illegal. Needless to say that a correction would turn out quite simple: $\mathrm{wSe} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{~g} 3$.
Brilliant fireworks in Berlins's firmament of logical retro art!" (HG)

## 1411. Dmitrij Baibikov

The last move was Rc3xc2+. Checking the total of black units, we have 11 in the diagram + 5 captured (bxcxd, cxd, d2xPe3, Rc3xc2) $=16$, which means that we must consider the $f$ - and $g$ pawns: these pawns promoted after cross captures $\mathrm{fxg} \rightarrow \mathrm{g} 1$ and $\mathrm{gxf} \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 1$. A check of white units gives 13 in the diagram + captured (a7xb6, fxg, gxf)=16.
The critical position is: (see diagram) After 1.- Bc5-b4+ 2.Ka5-b5 and before 2.- axb Genesis:
2.- axb (After this move the retro knot on the squares a2, a3, b1, b2, b3, b4, b5, b6, b7, c1, c2, c3, c4, d2, d3, d4, d 5 , e2, e3 is tightened. It
 includes two Knight batteries: WSb2+WBa3 and WSc2+WRc3. Now tempo play starts.) 3.a7 f6 4.a8=Q! (A rook could not get to g2, the BPb7 prevents a bishop getting there and a knight would not reach g2 in time.) 4.- f5 5.Qc8 (a8-c8-h3-g2 is the shortest path.) 5.- f4 6.Qh3 f3 7.Qg2 fxg! (The promoted WQ has left the board and there has been a transformation between tempo play by one side and active play by the other side. Now in the second phase of tempo play a WP makes tempo moves and a black piece plays actively.) 8.f3 g1(black Excelsior!) $=$ S! (Only a knight can reach b2.) 9.f4 Sh3 (g1-h3-f2-d1 is the shortest path.) 10.f5 Sf2 11.f6 Sd1 (Now the white $\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{B}$ battery fires.) 12.Sa4(check!) (Black protects against the check using the promoted knight.) 12.- Sd1-b2 (Now the promoted BSb 2 is pinned, the WSa4 is free, the second transformation has happened and the third tempo play phase has started.) $\mathbf{1 3 . S c 5} \mathbf{g 6}$ 14.Sd7 (c5-d7-e5-f3 is
the shortest path, and the path via c5-e6-g5-f3 is of no use because of the capture of the BP on g5.) 14.- g5 15.Se5 g4 16.Sf3 gxf (With the capture of the WS the third transformation has happened and the fourth tempo play phase has started.) 17.g4 f2 18.g5 f1(second black Excelsior!)=Q! (Neither a rook nor a bishop could reach c2, and a knight could not do it in time.) 19.g6 Qd1 (Now the white $\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{R}$ battery fires.) 20.Se1(check!) (Black counters the check using the promoted Queen.) 20.- Qd1c2 (Now the promoted BQ is pinned, the WSel is free, the fourth transformation has happened and the fifth tempo play phase has started.) 21.Sf3 (e1-f3-e5-c6 is the shortest path) 21.- h6 22.Se5 h5 23.Sc6 h4 24.Sa5 h3 and the last move is $25 . R c 3 x Q c 2+!$ (The promoted BQ has left the board and we see the diagrammed position.)
Five alternating transformation phases, with 3 or 4 pawn tempo moves in each phase and two Excelsiors (f7-f6-f5-
$\mathrm{f} 4-\mathrm{f} 3 \mathrm{xQg} 2-\mathrm{fl}=\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{~g} 7-\mathrm{g} 6-\mathrm{g} 5-\mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{xSf} 3-\mathrm{f} 2-\mathrm{fl}=\mathrm{Q})$. Two captures of promoted pieces, the WQ \& BQ (Ceriani-Frolkin theme), and play by two batteries (WS+WB, WS+WR), all in exact retro play, with the last 48 single moves being determined. Finally, the position constitutes a new length record in the "Last single moves?" category. Previous steps towards the establishment of this record were taken by Thomas Rayner Dawson (P0001847 in the PDB database: 38 single moves), Michel Caillaud (P0000021: 39 single moves), Mechislav Palevich (P0005421: 43 single moves) and Gerd Wilts (P0001672: 45 single moves). [My problem P1080645, with 49 single moves, is cooked and is therefore removed from the list.]. (Author)
Very nice. The additional two retromoves after retracting a7xQb6 are a nice bonus. The current record of 'Last $n$ moves' is still not broken though, it's still n=55 (A version of Pascal Wassong's ‘Babette': P0006113). (JdeH)

# Solutions - Mat Plus No. 36 (this issue) 

## Twomovers

## 1412. Arie Grinblat

1.Bxh7? ~ 2.Qf5(A),Qe4(B)\#, 1...Bc2!; 1.Sc3? ~ 2.Qe4(B), Qd5(C)\#, 1...Bc6!; (1.Sb6? ~ 2.Qd5,Sc4\# but 1...Sxe3!); 1.Se7! ~ 2.Qd5(B),Qf5(A)\#, 1...Sd4,Sxe3 2.Qxd4,Qxe3\#.

This is a version of No.1326, saving 4 pieces and making a much better impression. (PE)

## 1413. Valery Kopyl

1.e8=Q? ~ 2.Bxh7\#(A), 1...Rxe6(a) 2.Qxe6\#, 1...Sxf6(b) 2.Re5\#(B), 1...Sf4 2.e4\#, 1...Rc7!; 1.e8=S! ~ 2.Re5\#(B), 1... Rxe6(a) 2.Bxh7\#(A), 1...Sxf6(b) 2.Sg7\#, 1...Rc5 2.Sd6\#.
Nice changes and change of function following $W$ promotion keys. (PE)

## 1414. Michael Lipton, Tony Lewis

1.Qb8! ~ 2.Bg8/Bh6\#, 1..Rxa2 2.Bh6\#, 1...g2 2.Bg8\#, 1...Rf8, Re8,Rd8 2.Bf4,Be3,Bd2\#, 1...Rh5,Rh4 2.Bd5, Bc4\#; 1.Qh6? g2!, 1.Kc4? Rxa2!; 1.Rd1(e1,g1)? Rh1!

An earlier version (by ML) had moves by the BR to the critical squares (W:Kg3,Qf5,Rh8,Bb6,Bc8,Sa7,Pc6 B:Kb8, Ra8,Rh8,Pa6,Pc7). (Authors) - Gladly, it was possible to find a setting showing this idea with a good key. (PE)

## 1415. Rolf Kohring

*1...Rg5(a)/Rg3(b) 2.Bxe8\#(A); 1.Bf3! ~ 2.Sd6,Sf6,Sc5, Sg5(B),Sc3,Sg3(C),Sd2,Sf2\#, 1...Sd6 2.Sxd6\#, 1...Sf6 2.Sxf6\#, 1...Rg5(a) 2.Sxg5\#(B), 1...Rg3(b) 2.Sxg3\#(C), 1... Ra3,Ra5,Rd1, Rf1 2.Sc3,Sc5,Sd2,Sf2\#.
Fleck theme with eightfold threat, knight's tour. (Author) • Many predecessors but the changes add some interest. (PE)

- Can easily be done with knights defending only against rook lines like in this original I composed almost two years ago (but Paz seemed to have had enough of that theme from me so I didn't send it): 2B4r/1Pk1P3/2N5/2P1N1P1/ 5B2/4p3/1r5p/6bK, SH, original; 1.Sa7! (SH)


## 1416. Youness Benjelloun

1...Be5 2.Qe3\#, 1...Sd4 2.Qb8\#; 1.Qd5! ~ 2.Qxf5\#, 1...Be5 2.Qd2\#, 1...Sd4 2.g3\#, 1...Sg3 2.hxg3\#.

Two nice mate changes, a good start for a newcomer. (PE)
1417. Marjan Kovačević
1.Sf4?(A) ~ 2.Qh4\#(B), 1...Kg4(a) 2.Qh5\#(C), 1...fg6(b)
2.Qxg6\#(X), (1...Rxf4 2.gxf4\#), 1...Sf5!; 1.g4!(Y) ~ 2.Qh5\#(C),
1...Kxg4(a) 2.Sf4\#(A), 1...fxg6(b) 2.Qh4\#(B), (1...Bxg4: 2.Qh6\#).

Mixed cycle with 2 Dombrovskis effects and 1 original (?)
Vladimirov effect. (Author) - Some very interesting features in this problem: the surprising Vladimirov effect (2.Sf4\# appears after $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kxg} 4$ in the solution) and the "bivalve" by the BK. (PE)

## 1418. Arie Grinblat

1.Qc2? ~ 2.Qe4\#, 1...Sdf5(a),Sdxc2 2.Sxf3\#, 1...Sef5 (b),Sexc2 2.Sg4\# , 1...Bxc6!(c); 1.Qb2? ~ 2.Sxf3\#(A), 1...Bxc6(c) 2.Sxc6\#(C), 1...Sf5!(b); 1.Qe1? ~ 2.Sg4\# (B), 1...Se2 2.Sxf3\#(A), 1...S~55!(a); 1.Qa2! ~ 2.Sd7, Bd6\#, 1...Sf5(a) 2.Qe6\#, 1...Sb3 2.Sxf3\#(A), 1...Sef5(b) 2.Qd5\# , 1...Sc4 2.Sg4\#(B)\#, 1...Bxc6(c) 2.Bd6\#, 1...Bxc7,Bc5 2.Sd7\#.

## 1419. Aaron Hirschenson

1...e3(a) 2.Rxf1\#(A), 1...Sxb6 2.Qxd6\#; 1.S~(b7,b3)? ~ 2.Rxf1\#(A), 1...Sxb6 2.Qxd6\#, 1...Sf~ 2.Be3\#, 1...e3!(a); 1.Sd7? ~ 2.Rxf1\#(A), 1...e3(a) 2.Ba6\#, 1...Sf~ 2.Be3\#, 1...Sxb6!; 1.Sa6! ~ 2.Rxf1\#(A), 1...e3(a) 2.Bb5\#, 1...Sxb6 2.Qxd6\#, 1...Sf~ 2.Be3\#.
1420. Milan Velimirović
1.Qxg5! ~ 2.Rf4\#, 1...Kxd4 2.Qxd5\#, 1...Be5 2.Qxe5\#, 1...Rxc2 2.Qf5\# (set: 2.Qxh7\#), 1...e5 2.Qxg4\#.

Flight giving self-pin key and four mates by the pinned white queen. (Author) - The thematic and entertaining key leads to a task of mates by a pinned piece. (PE)
A joy to solve. (KB)

## 1421. Pavel Murashev

1.Qxd3?(X) ~ 2.Qd5\#, 1...Bf4 2.Re5\#(A), 1...Bxf6 2.Qxf3\#, 1...fxe6 2.Rf4\#(B), 1...Bxe4 2.Qxe4\#, 1...Sxf6 2.Sg7\#(C), 1...Rd1!; 1.Qa2? ~ 2.Qd5\#, 1...Bf4 2.Rxf4\#(B), 1...Bxf6 2.Rf4\#(B), 1...fxe6 2.Qxe6\#, 1...Bxe4 2.Bxe4\#, 1...Sxf6 2.Sg7\#(C), 1...Rc4!; 1.Sd5! ~ 2.Re5\#(A), 1...Bf4 2.Se7\#, 1...Bxf6 2.Se3\#, 1...Bxe4 2.Sg7\#(C), 1...Kxe4 2.Qxd3\#(X); (1.Bh2? ~ 2.Re5\#(A), 1...Bf4!; 1.Sg8? 2.Sg7\#(D), 1...Bxh4!).

A complex Zagoruiko with a lot of action and a nice key. (PE)
1422. Tony Lewis
1...Bc3/Bd4/Be5/Bxf6 2.Ra2\#, 1...Rb~ 2.Qxb2\#, 1...Rxg1 2.Qxb2/Qxg1\#; 1.Se2! (~), 1... Bc3,Bd4,Be5 2.QxB\#, 1...Bf6: 2.Bxf6\#, 1...Rc1,Rd1,Re1,Rf1, Rg1,Rxh1 2.RxR\#.
2 to 8 changes and one added mate. Dual after Rxg1 eliminated. (Author) • Improvement of the problem by Savo Zlatić (see diagram 1422a). (MV)

1423. Aaron Hirschenson
1...Sf6(a) 2.exd4\#(A), 1...Sc3(b) 2.Sd3\#(B); 1.Se4! ~ 2.Qxd5\#, 1...Sf6(a) 2.Sd3\#(B), 1...Sc3(b) 2.exd4\#(A), 1...dxe4,fxe4, Sxe3 2.Sd3\#, 1...Rd7,Be6,Bb7 2.Qe6\#.

Reciprocal changes based pn switch of battery. (Author) • Amazing reciprocal changes mechanism! Very complex but still harmonious, essentially based on the changes in white batteries from direct to indirect and vice versa. (PE)

## 1424. Siegfried Hornecker

1.Rd5! Kxd5/Rexd5/Rdxd5/exd5 2.Rc5/Rxe6/f3/Sd6\#, 1... Qd7, Rfh5,Rc4,Rb4(Bxb6,Bc3) 2.Sxf6,Qf3,Qxd3,Sc3\#
Hopefully this is not anticipated. (Author) • Such a combination calls for anticipations, but all I was able to find is partial and symmetric. The most notable is 1424 . However, it must clearly noted that the black correction by both BR's is innovative and makes a fresh and entertaining composition. (PE) • Old trick with some new twists. Probably anticipated
 since ages, regardless what the author hopes : $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{HR})$

## 1425. Givi Mosiashvili

1.Qb4? ~ 2.Qd6\#, 1...Sdxe7 2.Sc7\#, 1...Sgxe7 2.f8S\#, 1...c5!; 1.Qxg5? ~ 2.Qf5\#, 1...Sdxe7 2.Qf6\#, 1...Sgxe7 2.Qxe5\#, 1...g3!; 1.Bc4? ~ 2.Sc7\#, 1...Sgxe7 2.Rh6\#, 1...B~!; 1.Rh6! ~ 2.f8S\#, 1...Sdxe7 2.Bc4\#, 1...Sf6 2.Sc7\#, 1...Rxg8+2.fxg8Q\#.

Zagoruiko, Banny, Hannelius. (Author) - The position of the WQ suggests it should be activated, but this is restricted to tries and surprisingly to the indirect guard of d 6 in the solution. Elegant combination! (PE)

## 1426. Christopher Reeves

1.Bc3? ~ 2.Qc4\#, 1...Rf6 2.Sg5\#, 1...Bf6!; 1.Rc3? ~ 2.Qc4\#,
1...Bf6 2.Bc6\#, 1...Rf6!; 1.Rf6? ~ 2.Bc6\#, 1...Rxf6 2.Sg5\#, 1...Bg8!; 1.e6? ~ 2.Bc6\#, 1...Rxe6 2.Qxe6\#, 1...Rg5!; 1.Bc4! ~ 2.Bd5\#, 1...Qxc4 2.Qxc4\#, 1...Qc3 2.Sxc3\#, 1...Sf4 2.Rxf4\#, 1...Rd6 2.Sxc5\#.

B/W Grimshaws were shown many times before but here the further BR interferences tries, in which the refutations take advantage of the line openings, are very nice. (PE) This problem we had to solve in Rio (WCSC). (MV)

## Threemovers

## 1427. Dragoslav Marjanović

1.d8=S! (~), 1...Kb6 2.Qxc6+ Ka5 3.Sb7\#, 2...Ka7 3.Qb7\#, 1...c5 2.Kc4 Ka4 3.Qa6\#.

## 1428. Vladimir Kozhakin

1.S3d5? Ke5 2.Kc7 ~ 3.Qe3\#, 1...Kd3!; 1.S3f5? Ke5 2.Qd6+ Ke4 3.Qd4\#, 1...Kf4 2.Qd4+ Kg5 3.Qh4\#, 1...Kd3!; 1.S7f5! ~ 2.Qd4\#, 1...f2 2.Qd4+ Kf3 3.Qg4\#, 1...Kd3 2.Qb2 Ke4 3.Qd4\#, 1...Ke5 2.Qd6+ Ke4 3.Qd4\#, 1...Kf4 2.Qd6+ Ke4,Kg5 3.Qd4,Qh6\#.
1429. Valentin Rudenko, Viktor Chepizhny
1...dxc6 2.Bc7+ Kxd5 3.Bb3\#, 1...dxe6 2.Bb3 ~,exd5 3.Bc7,Rxe7\#; 1.Sd2! ~ 2.Bf3 ~ 3.Sc4\# \& 2.Bb3 ~ 3.Sf3\#, 1..g5 2.Bf3 ~ 3.Sc4\#, 1...dxc6 2.Sf3+ Kxd5 3.Bb3\#, 1...dxe6 2.Sc4+ Kxd5 3.Bf3\#, 1...Kxd5 2.Bb3+ Ke5,Kxc6 3.Sf3,a8=Q\#.

## 1430. Miodrag Mladenović

1.Qxd7! [2.Se7+ Ke5 3.f4\#], 1...B~!? 2.Sxc4+ Ke4 3.Sd2\# (a), 1...Be5!!? 2.Kxg7 ~ 3.Qxe6\# (ab), 1...Be3!!!? 2.Bxg7 ~ 3.Qxe6\# (abc), 1...Bc3!!!!? 2.Bb1 ~ 3.Sd~/Be4\# (abcd), 1...Bxc5 2.Rxb5 ~ 3.Rxc5/Bxc4\#, 1...Rf3 2.Sd~+ Ke4 3.Qxd4\#.

Black errors: (a) opening of line d7-d3, (b) closing of breaked line a3-e3-e6, (c) closing of breaked line a3-h3-h8, (d) closing of line a3-d3. Quaternary black correction shown for the first time in the matrix where black bishop interferes with black rook. Unfortunately there are some duals in side variations and I could not find some better key but I worked on this matrix for few years and could not find better position. Actually I do have a version without duals but with promoted white rook and by my problem standards it's not acceptable. There is also a black bishop star formed by black defenses. (Author)

## 1431. Miodrag Mladenović

1.Sb4! ~ 2.Sxd5(A) ~ 3.Bf3\#(B), 2...Bxe5(x) 3.dxe5\#(C), 2...dxe5 3.dxe5\#; 1...dxe5 2.dxe5(C) ~ 3.Sxd5\#(A), 2...Bxe5(x) 3.Bf3\#(B), 2...Bd3,d4 3.Bxd3,Qa8\#, 1...Sg3 2.Bf3+(B) Kxf4 3.Sxd5\#(A).

Djurasevic theme in the threat and variation. 2 x Urania theme (Sxd5 \& Bf3, both moves are coming as key, threat and mating move). (Author)

## Moremovers

## 1432. Vladimir Kozhakin

1.Be1? Kd6!; 1.Kg2! Kd6 2.Qe5+ Kxd7 3.Ba5(~) Kc8 4.Qc7\#, 1...Kc4 2.Be1! Kxb5 3.Qc5+ Ka4,Ka6 4.Qb4,Qb6\#, 2...Kd5 3.Sb6+ Kd6 4.Bxg3\#.

## 1433. Yuri Gordian, Aleksandr Bulavka

1.Se2! ~ 2.Sd8+ Ke5 3.Re7+ Sxe7+ 4.Rxe7\#, 1...d4 2.Sf4+ Rxf4 3.Bxc4+ d5 4.Bxd5\#, 1...f4 2.Sd4+ Rxd4 3.Qxg4+ f5 4.Qxg6\#.
1434. Emmanuel Manolas, Ioannis Kalkavouras
1.bxc3? Sxc3!; 1.h7! ~ 2.h8=Q/B+ Bg7 3.Qxg7\#, 1...Bg7 2.Se7 (3.Sc6\#) Ke5! 3.Sfg6+ Kd4 4.Rd1 Sd2! 5.Sf4 (6.Sc6\#) Ke5 6.Seg6+ Kd4 7.bxc3\#, 4...Bf6 5.h8=Q (6.Qxf6\#) Bxh8 6.Sc6+ Kd5 7.Sge7\#, 5...Sd2 6.Qd8+ Sd5 7.Qxd5\#, 5...Se8 6.Qh4+ f4 7.Qxf4\#.

Problem is in logical style and presents double white Umnov on g6, plus double switchback. (Authors)

## 1435. Dmitry Zhilko

(*)1...Kd1 2.Kb1 Ke1 3.Kc1 Kf1 4.Kd1 Kg1 5.Ke1 Kh1(h2) 6.Kf1 Kh2(h1) 7.Rb8 8.Rh8\#; 1.Bb1! Kd1 2. Bd3 Kc1 3.Bf1 Kd1 4.Kb1 Ke1 5.Kc1 Kxf1 6.Kd1 Kg1 7.Ke1 Kh1(h2) 8.Kf1 Kh2(h1) 9.Rb8 Kh1(h2) 10.Rh8\#, 2...Ke1! (3.Bf1? Kxf1! 4.Kb1 Kg1 5.Kc1 Kh1 (h2) 6.Kd1 Kh2(h1) 7.Ke1 Kg1!) 3.Kb1! Kd1 4.Bf1 Ke1 5.Kc1 Kxf1 6.Kd1 Kg1 7.Ke1 Kh1(h2) 8.Kf1 Kh2(h1) 9.Rb8 Kh1 (h2) 10.Rh8\#.

## Endgames

## 1436. János Mikitovics

1.b7 c2 2.b8Q+ Kd4/i 3.Qa7+!/ii Kc3 4.Qa1+!/iii 4...Kb3! 5.Kg4!/iv Sce5+ 6.Kh5! Sg6!/v 7.Qf1!!/vi c1Q/vii 8.Qxd3+!/viii Qc3
9.Qd5+/ix 9...Kc2 10.Qg2+/x Qd2 11.Qd5 Kd1 12.Qh1+ Qe1 13.Qd5+/xi Qd2 14.Qh1+ pepetual check.
i) 2...Ke4 3.Qb7+!= (3.Qe8+? Kd4 4.Qd7+ Kc3-+) ; 2...Sd6 3.Qh8+! Ke4 4.Qa8+ (4.Qxh7+? Sf5+-+) 4...Ke3 5.Qa7+=; ii) 3.Qd8+? Kc3-+; iii) 4.Qxh7? c1Q-+; iv) Thematic try 5.Kh4!? Sd2! (5...Sce5? 6.Kh5= main line) 6.Kh5 Sf4+ 7.Kh6 (7.Kg4 Sb1-+ (7...Se2? 8.Kh5 Sg3+ 9.Kg4! Sb1 10.Qe5 c1Q 11.Qxg3+ Ka4! 12.Qg2!! Qc8+ (12...Qd1+ 13.Kg5=) 13.Kh5= (13.Kh4? Qf5-+) )) 7...Sb1-+; v) 6...c1Q 7.Qxc1 Sxc1 8.Kh6=; vi) Thematic try 7.Kh6!? Sf8! 8.Kg7 c1Q-+ (8...h5?! 9.Kh6!! (9.Kf6? h4! 10.Kg5 Sg6 11.Qf1 c1Q+-+) 9...h4 10.Kh5! (10. Kg5? Sg6 11.Kxg6 c1Q+) 10...Sg6 11.Qf1!! see the main line); vii) 7...Kb4 8.Kh6!!--; viii) 8.Qxc1? Sxc1 9.Kh6 Sf8-+; ix) 9.Qb5+? Kc2-+; 9.Qf5? Qg3!!-(9...Qc4? 10.Qb1+=; 9...Qe3? 10.Qf7+=); x) 10.Kh6? Sf8 11.Qf5+ Qd3 12.Qxf8 Qg6\#; xi) 13.Qf3+? Qe2-+.

## 1437. Siegfried Hornecker, János Mikitovics

1.b7 Sb6+ 2.Ka7 Sd7 3.f6!!// 3...Kd6 4.Se3 Bd3 5.Sd5!! Kxd5 (5...Be4 6.f7+-) 6.f7+-; 3...Bc4 4.Se3!ii/ Bf7! 5.g4!/iii 5...Kc7 $6 . g 5$ Sb8 7.Sg2!!/iv Sc6+ 8.Ka8/v Bd5 9.Sf4 Be4 (9...Bc4 10.g6+-) 10.Se6+ Kd6 11.f7!+-/vi 5...Kd6 6.g5 Ke5 7.Sg4+ Ke6 8.Sh6+-; 7...Kf4 8.g6!/vii 8...Bxg6 9.f7! Bxf7 10.Sf6 wins.
i) 3.Se3!? Ba6 4.Kха6 Sc5+=; 3.Sd4+? Kd6 4.Se6 Bg2= (4...Be2? 5.Sf8!+-); ii) 4.g4? Kd6!= (4...Bf7? 5.Se3 Kd6 6.g5+- main line); iii) $5 . \mathrm{Sff}$ ? Kd5 6.Se7+ Ke6= (6...Ke5? 7.Sc8 Kxf6 8.Sb6 Se5 9.Kb8 Sc6+ 10.Kc7+-) 5.Sd1? Kc5 6.Sc3 Kd4=; iv) 7.Sd1? Bd5! 8.Sc3 Bxb7 (8...Sc6+? 9.Ka8 Bf3 10.Sb5++-) 9.Sb5+ Kc8 10.Sd6+ (10.f7 Sd7 11.g6 Bd5 12.Sd6+ Kc7 13.g7 Bxf7 14.Sxf7 Sf6=) 10...Kc7 11.Se8+ Kc8 12.Sd6+ Kc7 13.Sb5+ Kc8 positional draw; v) 8.Ka6?? Bc4\#; vi) 11.Sc5? Bg6 (11...Bf5? 12.b8Q+ Sxb8 13.Kxb8 Bg6 14.Kc8!+-) 12.Sa6 (12.Sa4 Bf7!= (12...Ke6? 13.Sc3 Bh5 14.Sb5 Bf3 15.Sc7+ Kd7 16.b8Q!+-) ) 12...Be4=; vii) 8.Sh6? Bd5 9.f7 Bxb7 10.g6 Bd5=.
János Mikitovics made this study alone after seeing my 1057 but decided to give me credit. So he persuaded me to take co-authorship. :-) (SH)

## 1438. János Mikitovics

1.Kc7!

Main A 1... b2! 2.Sdc8+!/i Ka6/ii 3.Sc6!!/iii Kb5!/iv 4.Sb6! thr. Be2+ and \#1/v] 4...c1S!/vi 5.Sa4!!/vii 5...Kxa4/viii 6.Bd1+! Sb3 (Ka3,Kb5) 7.Bc2 wins.
Main B 1...c1Q + 2.Sc6+Ka8 3.Bc8 Qxc6+ 4.Kxc6 b2 5.Kc7! b1Q 6.Bb7+ Ka7 7.Sc8\#
i) 2.Sc6+? Ka8=; ii) 2...Ka8 3.Sb6+ (3.Bd7? c1Q+=) 3...Ka7 4.Sc6+ and \#1; iii) 3.Be2+? Ka5 4.Sc6+ Ka4=; iv) 3...b1Q 4.Be2+ Qb5 5.Bxb5+ Kxb5 6.Sd4++-; v) 4.Be2+? Ka4= (4...Kc5? 5.Sb6 and \#1); vi) 4...c1Q 5.Be2+ Kc5 and \#1; vii) 5.Sa7+? Kb4! 6.Sd5+ Kc4! 7.Sb5 Kxb5!-+ (7...b1Q? 8.Sa3++-); 5.Sd4+? Kb4 6.Sc2+ Kb3 (6...Kc3? 7.Sa3+-) 7.Sa3 Kxa3 8.Sc4+ Kb3= (8...Ka2 9.Be6 Sd3 10.Sd2+ Ka1=) ; 5.Sd5? Kc4 6.Sb6+ Kb5 7.Sa4 loss of time; 5.Bd7? b1Q=; viii) 5...b1Q 6.Sc3++-.

## 1439. Gerhard Josten

1.Sb4 /i Qxg7 2.Rc5/ii Qg3/iii 3.Sd7+ Kb7 4.b6 /iv Qb3+ 5.Kc1 Qa3+ /v 6.Kd1 Qa4+ 7.Kc1 Qxb4 8.Rc7+ Ka6 9.b7 =
i) 1.Sc1 Bxb5 2.g8Q Bc4+-+; ii) 2.Sa6+? Ka8 3.Rc5 Bd3+ -+; iii) 2...Qg4 3.Sd7+ Kb7 4.b6 Qd1+ 5.Kb2 Qb3+ 6.Kc1 =; iv) 4.Sc6? Bxb5 5.Sa5+ Ka6 -+, 4.Rxc4? Qb3+ 5.Ka1 Qxc4 -+; v) 5...Qxb4 6.Rc7+ Ka6 7.b7 =.

## 1440. Borislav Ilinčić

1.f7! /i Qg4+ /ii 2.Kf2! Qh4+ /iii 3.Kg2! Qg5+ 4.Kf1! /iv Ba6+ 5.Kf2 Qh4+ 6.Kg2! Qg5+ 7.Kh3+-
i) 1.Se3+? Kg6! 2.Qg1+ Bg4+!=; ii) 1...Qc5 2.Qd3+ Ke6 3.Qg6+ Kxd5 (3...Kd7 4.Qf5++-) 4.Qe4++-; 1...Kg6 2.f8Q Bg4+ (2...Qg4+)
3.Kf2 Bxd1 4.Qg8+ Kf5 5.Se3++-; 1...Ke6 2.f8Q Qg4+ 3.Kf2 Qxd1 4.Qe7++-; iii) 2...Qxd1 3.f8Q+ Ke4 (3...Ke5 4.Qf6+; 3...Ke6 4.Qe7+) 4.Sc3+; iv) 4.Kh3? Kg6+!

## 1441. Borislav Ilinčić

1.Se6 /ii Qe5+ /i 2.Kh3! Qf6 /iii 3.Sf8+ Kh8 4.Sg6+ Kh7 5.Qd7! c2/iv 6.Qc8! Qxf5+ 7.Qxf5 c1Q 8.Se7+ +-
i) 1.Qg6+? Kg8! 2.Se6 Qd7! $3 . f 6 \mathrm{c} 2-+$; ii) 1...Qb8+ 2.f4! /iv Qg8 3.Qg6+ Kh8 4.f6! gxf6 5.Qxf6+ Kh7 6.Sf8+ Qxf8 7.Qxf8+-; iii) 2...c2 3.Sf8+Kh8 4.Sg6+Kh7 5.Qf8 Qc3+ 6.Kg2 Qc6+ 7.f3!+-; iv) 5...Qg5 6.Qc8! Qh5+ 7.Kg3 Qg5+ 8.Kf3 Qh5+ 9.Kf4!+-; 5...Qa6 6.Kg3! Qa8 (6...Qf1 7.Qc8!) 7.f6! Qg8 8.f7+-.

## 1442. Eduard Eilazyan

1.e7! /i Se6 2.Sd3+! /ii Kg1! 3.Qxe6! /iii Qd1! 4.Qg6+ Bg5+ 5.Kxb2 Qd2+ 6.Kb3 Qd1+ 7.Kc3 Qa1+ 8.Kc4!/iv Qa6+ 9.Kb3! Qb7+ 10.Sb4! Qxe7 11.Sxc6 Qb7+ 12.Kc3! There is no checks, and black Bishop is pinning! 12...Kf2 13.Qf5+!/v Ke1 14.Qxg5 Qxc6+ 15.Kd4 Qd7+ 16.Ke4 and wins.
i) 1.Sd3+? Ke2 2.e7 Sd7! 3.Qc2+ Ke3 ...is OK for Black; ii) 2.Qxe6? Qd1! 3.e8Q Be3+ 4.Kxb2 Bd4+ 5.Ka3 Qc1+ =; iii) The thematic try: 3.Qb6+? in anticipation of 3...Kh2(?) 4.Qxc6 Qd1 5.e8Q Qxd3+6.Qc2+ Qxc2+ 7.Kxc2 Sd4+ 8.Kb1 Sf3 9.Qh5+ Kg3 10.Qg6+ Kf4 11.e6 Sd2+ 12.Ka2 b1Q+ 13.Qxb1 Sxb1 14.e7 Sc3+ 15.Kb3! Se4 16.e8Q and wins. But 3...c5! 4.Qxe6. Here black pawn is on c5 (see main line). And this leads to draw. 4...Qd1! 5.Qg6+ Bg5+ 6.Kxb2 Qd2+ 7.Kb3 Qd1+! 8.Kc3 Qa1+ 9.Kc2 Qa4+! 10.Kb2 Qb5+! 11.Ka3 Qa5+ 12.Kb3 Qb5+ 13.Kc3 Qa5+ 14.Kc4 Qa4+ 15.Kxc5 Qa7+ 16.Kc4 (or 16.Kd5 Qd7+ 17.Ke4 Qg4+ 18.Kd5 Qd7+ 19.Kc4 Qxe7) 16...Qxe7 ... =; iv) 8.Kc2? Qa4+! 9.Kb2 Qb5+ 10.Kc3 Qa5+ 11.Kb3 Qd5+ 12.Ka4 Qb5+ 13.Ka3 Qa5+ 14.Kb2 Qb5+ =, or 9.Kb1 Qb5+ 10.Sb2 Qf1+ 11.Ka2 Qa6+ 12.Kb1 Qf1+ =; v) 13.Qxg5? Qxc6+ with a continuation like 14.Kd4 Qd7+ 15.Ke4 Qb7+ 16.Kf5 Qf7+ 17.Kg4 Qf3+ 18.Kh4 Qh1+ 19.Kg4 Qf3+ =.

## 1443. Mirko Marković

1.b8S+/i Kxa7/ii 2.Bxd4+! Qxd4/iii 3.c8S+!/iv Kxb8/v 4.Sd6+! Bxe8/vi $5 . \mathrm{c} 7+\mathrm{Kxc} 7 / \mathrm{vii} 6 . \mathrm{Sb} 5+\mathrm{Bxb} 5=$
i) 1.b8Q? Qg1+ 2.Kd2 Qd1\#; 1.Bxd4? Qd1+ 2.Kf2 Qxd4+ -+; ii) 1...Kb6 2.Sd7+ -+; iii) 2...Ka8 3.Sd7+ Bxe8 4.c8Q\#; iv) 3.c8Q? Sf3+ 4.Ke2 Qd2+ 5.Kf1 Qd1+ 6.Kf2 Qg1+ 7.Ke2 Qe1+ 8.Kd3 Qd2+ 9.Kc4 Bf7+ 10.Kb5 Qb2+ 11.Ka4 Qb3+ 12.Ka5 Qa3+ 13.Kb5 Sd4\#; v) 3...Ka8 4.Sb6+ Qxb6 5.Sd7+ Bxe8 6.Sxb6+ =; vi) $4 \ldots . . K c 75 . S b 5+=$; vii) $5 . . . K a 76 . c 8 Q=$.

## 1444. Mirko Marković

1.b3+! Kc5/i 2.Rxe5+!//i Kd6 3.Sc8+!/iii Qxc8 4.Sf7+ Ke7 5.Bh4+ Ke8 6.Sd6+!/iv Rxd6 7.exd7+ Kxd7 8.Re7+ Kd8+ 9.Re6+ Kd7 10.Re7+=
i) 1...Kd4?? 2.Rf3\#; ii) 2.Rc3+? Kd6-+; iii) 3.Sf7+? Ke7 4.Sc8+ (4.Bh4+ Ke8 5.Sd6+ Rxd6 6.exd7+ Kf7-+) 4...Ke8 5.Scd6+ Rxd6 6.Sxd6+ Ke7 7.Bh4+ Kxd6=; iv) 6.exd7+? Kxd7.

## 1445. Darko Hlebec

1.Bf2+ Rxf2 2.Sxf2 Bf4+ 3.Kxf4 Kxf2 4.h7 Sd8 5.Se5 fi Sxe5 6.Kxe5 /ii a3 7.Kf6 a2 8.e5 /iii a1Q liv 9.h8Q Qxe5+ 10.Kxg6 Qxh8=
i) 5.Sxd8? e5\#; 5.h8Q? e5+ 6.Qxe5 (6.Sxe5 Se6\#) 6...Sxe5 7.Sxe5 Se6\#; ii) 6.h8Q? Sd3\#; iii) 8.h8Q? a1B+ 9.e5 Bxe5+ 10.Kxe5 Sf7+ -+; iv) 8...a1B 9.h8S=.

Although black does not take queen on h8, he draws nevertheless because black cannot at the same time advance with e pawn, prevent white pawn and prevent perpetual check by white queen.
10.Qe4+ 11.Kg7 Sc6 12.Qh2+ Ke3 13.Qg3+ Kd4 14. g6 Kd5 15.Qf2 Qxg4 16. Kf6 e5 17.Qd2+Kc5 18.g7 Qh4+ 19.Kg6 Qg3+=,
or: 10.Qd5 11.Qf6+ Kg3 12.Kh7 Qd7+ 13.Qg7 Qd6 14. Qc3+ Kxg4 15.g6 Qh2+ 16.Kg7 Qf4 17.Qc5 e5 18.Qc8+ Kg3 19.Qxd8 e4 20.Kh7 e3 21. Qe7=, or: 10.Qd6 11. Kh7 Qh2+ (Qe7+ 12.Qg7 Sc6 13.Qxe7 Sxe7 =) 12.Kg8 Qxh8+ 13.Kxh8 e5 =, or: 10.Qa5 11.Qh2+ Kf3 12.Kf6 Kxg4 13.Qe2+ Kf4 14.Qc4+ Kf3 15.Qd3+ Kf2 16.Qd4+ Ke2 17.Qe5+ = ...

Black has a small advantage in all variations, but insufficient to win. (Author)

## 1446. Darko Hlebec

1.f7+ Kxh8 li 2.Bg7+ Kxg7 3.f8Q+ Rxf8 4.exf8Q+ /ii Kxf8 5.Sxe6+ Ke7 6.b7 fxe2 7.Qxe2 Bg6+ 8.Kxh6 Rxe2 9.bxc8Q Rxe6 10.Kg7 Be8 11.Qd8+ /iii Sxd8 12.c8S\#
i) 1...Rxf7 2.Sxe6 S6xe7 3.Sxf7 Bg6+ 4.Kxh6 Rxa6 5.Bxa6+-; ii) 4.Sxe6+? Kf6 5.exf8Q+ Bxf8 6.Qxc8 Ra5+ 7.Bb5 Rxb5+ 8.Kh4 Se7 9.Qxf8+ Kxe6 10.Qxf3 Rxb6 11.Qe2+ Kf7 12.Qxc2 Rc6=; iii) 11.Qa8? Rg6+ 12.Kh7 Rg5 13.c8Q Rh5+ 14.Kg7 Rg5+ 15.Kh6 Rh5+.

## Selfmates

## 1447. Valery Kopyl

1.Rh5? exf2!, 1.Kh5? e2!; 1.Re5!(~), 1...exf2 2.Kh5 f1=Q 3.Qxf1+ Se2 4.h4 Kd4 5.Qf4+ Sxf4\#, 1...e2 2.Rh5 e1=Q 3.Rxe1 Kd5 4.Sb6+ Kc5 5.Qf5+ Sxf5\#.

Dva pravil'nih eho-mata v stile Havela. Tema Hoffmana s loznimi sledami na pole h5. (Two echo model mates in Havel style. Theme Hoffmann with tries on h5.) (Author) I normally don't like s\# with black pieces that exist to be annihilated, but the pawn figures so much into the play here, in tries and solution, that there is good strategic justification for its use. A good combination of Bohemian models with modern strategic play. (SD)
1448. Leonid Makaronez, Leonid Lyubashevsky 1.Bxc5+? Kxc5 2.Qxe3+ Rxe3!; 1.Qc4+! Ke5 2.g4 hxg3(ep) 3.Qe6+ Kd4 4.Bxc5+ Kxc5 5.Qxe3+ Kb4 6.Qc3+ Bxc3\#.

Very good switchback maneuver to get the queen back to c3 (which was threatened by $2 . g 4$ !) in a roundabout manner.
(SD) - Logical problem in heavy construction with some underused pieces, f.ex. wSh4 is only used to guard f4. (FR)

## 1449. Stephan Dietrich

1.0-0! Kd3 2.Rfd1+ Ke3 3.Kh2! Kf2 4.Rd2+ Ke3 5.Se5 Kxd2 6.Re1! Kxe1 7.Qc1+ Kf2 8.Bh4+ Rxh4\#.

Castling-key; sacrifice of the two rooks after silent moves; no pawns. (Author) - A competent problem. It is obvious that h 2 is the square on which white will be mated, so the castling key is not a surprise, although it is of course attractive. And I always like a two rook sac. (SD)

## 1450. Guy Sobrecases

*1...Sf3\#; 1.Q~? h2 2.Qxh2, but 2...Sh3!; 1.Rc5! Kd4 2.Qe5+ Kd3 3.Qb8!! h2 4.Qb5+ Kd4 5.Qxb4+ Kd3 6.Rh5! h1=~ 7.Rxh1 Sh3 8.Qd2+ exd2\# (3.Qe8? Kd4! 4.Qb5 Sf3+!, 3.Ra5!? h2 4.Qb5+ Kc3!).
( $\mathrm{s} \# 8$ of the solving open of Rio during the WCCC 2009) Congratulations to Tadashi Wakashima and Milan Velimirovic who have been the only ones to solve it! (Author) - The reason for the interrupted queen sweep h2-e5-b8 is one of my favorite parts of this excellent problem.
(SD) - Fata Morgana in unusual construction with some very difficult moves - a fine achievement. (FR)

## 1451. Ivan Bryukhanov

1.Sb3! e3 2.Sc5 e4 3.Kc1 Ka1 4.Qc3+ Ka2 5.Qb3+ Ka1 6.Be1 b4 7.Sd3 exd3 8.Bc3+ bxc3 9.Qb2+ cxb2 \#.

Ideal mate. (Author ) - I see we have "twin sons of different mothers" here with an ideal mate with 4 pawns that to my knowledge, has not been achieved before. This means of course we have the same mate in mine and Harry's problem, s\#13 in this issue. - It would be in poor taste to compare the problems, but I will make some comments here: I like how Ivan, whom I have seen described as "Mr. b2\#" makes use of two important factors in ideal mate pawn mates: temporary blocks (e1 must be blocked) and movement of both kings (the little check the king around so bishop can get to el is a nice touch). The pawns are a bit far advanced, but the strategy used in this problem is nice. (SD)

## 1452. Paul Raican

1.Sb3! (~), 1...b5 2.Kb1 Kxb3 3.Qe6+ Kb4 4.Qg4 Kb3 5.Rc3+ Kb4 6.Rc1 Kb3 7.Bb2 b4 8.Ra3+ bxa3 9.Ba1 a2\#, 1...bxc5 2.Be3 Kb5 3.Qb7+ Kc4 4.Qd7 Kb4 5.Bd2+ Kc4 6.Kb1 Kb3 7.Qg4 c4 8.Ra1 c3 9.Bc1 c2\#.
Mirror mates. (Author) - Those are very pretty mirrors done in an attractive minimal format. The key is not hard to find, probably the only drawback of this very nicely done ornamental problem as the rest of the play is quite deep. (SD) • The dropping pawn is still alive. (FR)

## 1453. Ivan Soroka

1.Qa8! (~2.Bxd3+ Kxd3\#) Rg3 2.Qd8! (~3.Q/Bxd3+ Rxd3 4.B/Qxd3+ Kxd3\#) Rg2 3.Qh8! Rg3 4.Qh7! Rg2 5.Qxh2! Rg3 6.Qh7! Rg2 7.Qh1! Rg3 8.Qe4! Rg2 9.Qxg2 ~ 10.Bxd3+ Kxd3\#. Zigzag der weißen Damen a6-a8-d8-h8-h7-h2-h7-h1-e4-g2! Duell der weißen Damen gegen schwarzen Turm. Die weiße Dame besucht drei Ecken - a8, h8 und h1. 7.Dh1!! ist eine echte Überraschung! (Author) - Echte Uberraschung indeed! I probably could never conceive of something like this, but I can appreciate it. It is a Meisterwerk. (SD)

## 1454. Zoran Sibinović

1.Be1 c4 2.Bf2 c3 3.Bd3 c2 4.Ke1 Kg2 5.Bf1+ Kh1 6.Bg3 Kg1 7.Sf3+ Kh1 8.Sd2 Kg1 9.Qe3+ Kh1 10.Qe4+ Kg1 11.Be1 Bxg3\#.

Nice use of all the black pieces. (SD) - A difficult puzzle, but nothing more. (FR)
1455. Steven Dowd, Henry Tanner
1.g6-g7 Ka2-a1 2.Re3-e2! e4-e3 3.g7-g8Q e5-e4 4.Bb8-g3 e6-e5 5.Qg8-b3 e7-e6 6.Re2-c2 e3-e2 7.Bg3-e1 e4-e3 8.Sg1-f3 e5-e4 9.Sf3-d4 e6-e5 10.Rc2-c3 e5xd4 11.Rc3-d3 e4xd3 12.Be1-c3+ d4xc3 13.Qb3-b2+c3xb2\#.
To our knowledge, the only correct ideal mate selfmate using four black pawns (we checked the PDB and IMR). We also believe this may be the absolute length record. One of each white piece type ( $Q, R, B, S$ ) is sacrificed. (Authors) - And the caravan moves on ... Nice mating position. What about wRe1 and wPg5, then s\#15 (1.Re3 Ka1 2.g6 Ka2 etc.), or wPg4 without flight capture (1.g5 etc.) - are there any cooks? (FR)

## Helpmates

## 1456. Dmitry Zhilko

a) 1.c1=S Rd2 2.Se2 Rd3\#, b) 1.Rg7 Bd6 2.Rg3 Bc5\#, c) 1.Rf7 Be5 2.Rf3 Re2\#, d) 1.Kd4 Rxb2 2.Kc3 Be5\#.
The pinned piece moving on the line, but the task is not pure because in d-form rook is capturing rook as well. Nice idea and well perfomed (KS)
1457. György Bakcsi
a) $1 . \mathrm{Bxh} 6 \mathrm{Sb} 62 . \mathrm{Bf} 8 \mathrm{~d} 7 \#$, b) 1.Bxa4 Sf5 2.Be8 dxe7\#.

Simplicity is sometimes good! (KS)

## 1458. Andrey Dikusarov, Ivan Antipin

1.Sxf4 Sh2+ 2.Ke5 Sg4\#, 1.Sxc5 Sd4+ 2.Kd6 Sb5\#, 1.bxc3 Sd2+ 2.Kd4 Sb3\#.

Elimination of white pawns to grant the bK three different flights with Siers battery play. All mates are models [Authors] WinChloe gives two examples featuring a full bK-cross in 4 solutions form, but with mere square-blocks in the B1 move (HF) - Comparison would also be nice to see. Nice idea, economic. (KS)

## 1459. Živko Janevski

1.Ke4 Rf3 2.Qc4 Bc6\#, 1.Kf4 Bh5 2.Qe4 Rf3\#, 1.Kd6 Rc4 2.Qd5 Rc6\#, 1.Bc7 Ra5+ 2.Kd6 Bb4\#.
A difficult task of fourfold bQ transferred pin with pinmates by four different white pieces in an economical and well constructed position. Probably the first realisation of this task! (Author) • I think the author's comments say it all except that I wish I could compose things this nice! (SD) • To be perfect the fourth solution would lead the bK to d5, but the first task can't never be perfect. What there otherwise would to improve? (KS)

## 1460. Luis Miguel Martín

1.Sed4 Sc5 2.bxc5 e4\#, 1.Se5 Sc4 2.bxc4 Rd6\#.

Anticipatory self-blocks and self-blocks. White sacrifices and square vacation sequences (Author) - Very nice analogy. I don't like WPa6, but all my attempts to remove it failed or looked very ugly. (SD)

## 1461. Menachem Witztum

a) 1.d5 Kxg2 2.Be5 Qh7\#, b) 1.d6 Kxg3 2.Qe4 Qh5\#.

This one took a few minutes to appreciate, especially once you realize the Qa8 can't just be a bishop because of the second solution. (SD)

## 1462. Vladimir Kozhakin

a) 1.Qd4 Rd6 2.e3 Sxf4\#, b) 1.e3 Rd5+ 2.Rd4 Be4\#.

Quite a heavy setting although there is only two solutions. I would expect with this material get four $(2+2)$ or both in the same form. The idea is nice, but perhaps already made before. (KS)

## 1463. Ricardo de Mattos Vieira

a) 1.Sc5 Kxd4 2.Bd6 Qg5\#, b) 1.Bb5 Kxe4 2.Sc6 Qf5\#.

The antithesis idea [the positive effect (unpinning) introduced by B1 is eliminated by W1 (self-pinning)] presented in a h\#2 (Author) - Quite heavy black setting and only because of the wQ. in this case I would rather avoid to compose in two different forms because the change is so small. Also what the solutions includes aren't the same: in a) black both pieces unguard square g 5 and also unpins wQ while in b) there is only unpinning. To the author as a hint: to make two other solutions by starting with $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 5$ and 1.Bc5. One has to have goals ... (KS)
1464. Dmitry Alexandrov
a) 1.d1=B Sxf1 $2 . B x f 3 \mathrm{Sg} 3 \#$, b) $1 . d 1=R \mathrm{Sg} 22 . \mathrm{Rxd} 5 \mathrm{Re} 3 \#$, c) 1.d1=S Rxf2 2.Sxe3 Sf6\#.

Cyclic Zilahi with square blocks following the black promotions. The thematic white pieces stand on bK flights, which seems to be a novel feature. Personally, I consider the "technical" twin rather unpleasant (HF)

## 1465. Misha Shapiro

1.Bxe4 Be3 2.Bc6 Qf4\#, 1.Bxd4 Sc3 2.Be3 Qe4\#.

## 1466. Abdelaziz Onkoud

a) 1.Bd5 Se6 $2 . \mathrm{Be} 4 \mathrm{c} 4 \#$, b) 1.Rbf4 Se4 2.Rf7 Bc4\#.
1467. Viktor Chepizhny
a) 1.Re8 Qc8 2.Be7 Qxd7\#, b) 1.Bc2 Qxc6 2.Rd3 Qe4\#.

Two black half-pins with self-interferences after critical moves. Pity for the rather crude twinning, but the need to guard $\mathrm{f} 4 / \mathrm{g} 5$ only in the first part must have probably been a real headache for the composer (HF)

## 1468. Abdelaziz Onkoud

a) 1...Sxd2 2.Qc7 Bxb7+ 3.Kxd6 Se4\#, b) 1...Sxb7 2.Bf1 Rxd2+ 3.Kxe4 Sd6\#.

Echo diagonal-orthogonal, Zilahi, Switchback, Boros, Mats modèles, Mat par clouage, Auto-clouage indirect, Clouage indirect, Echange de fonctions de pièces blanches, Batteries masquées. (Author) - Why does this has to be in two forms? Otherwise very beautiful and well-done problem, but somehow I don't understand this $\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}$-forms, because 2 solutions should go easily from the diagram. (KS)

## 1469. Christer Jonsson

a) 1.Kd4 Rc4+2.bxc4 Sg3 3.Kc3 Se2\#, b) 1.Rd4 Rc5+ 2.bxc5 Kc2 3.Kc4 Se3\#.
This one is very pretty, and made me laugh. Enough said. :)
(SD) - Nice echo mate, but how about to make it in two straight solutions by adding b6-pawn to the diagram. (KS)

## 1470. Aleksandr Maksimov

1...Sd4 2.Kf4 g3+ 3.Ke3 Sf5\#, 1.Qd6 Sd4 2.Qh2 g3 3.Qd2 Sf5\#.

Black king switchback in the set line, queen Rundlauf in
the solution. Simple, but clever (HF) - I agree, a good combination of switchback and rundlauf. A helpmate you like to show others. (SD)

## 1471. Dmitry Alexandrov

1.cxd5 Sg2 2.d4 Bxc4 3.Qe5 exd3\#, 1.Sd4 Sxd3 2.Qd6 Bf5 3.Kxd5 e4\#, 1.Se3 Bg4 2.cxd5 Se6 3.Qe5 exf3\#, 1.Ke5 e4 2.Qg7 Sg6 3.Kf6 e5\#.
3/4 Albino with an additional pawn mate. Repeat of B2. Not bad. (SD)

## 1472. Christopher J.A. Jones

a) 1.Kd5 (Kxe5?) Rf5 2.Qf7 Kxg4 3.Ke6 Bxf7\#, b) 1.Kxe5 (Kf5?) Bb3 2.Qf7 gxf4+ 3.Kf6 Rxf7\#.
The tries are based on tempi - being in the right place at the right time. (SD) - White rook and bishop are switching roles between the solutions. Nice and enjoyable play! Only minus is how the black rook is blocked in a-file. Excellent problem. (KS)

## 1473. Dmitry Alexandrov

1.Qxc7 Bxe6 2.Qf4 Bxg4+ 3.Ke5 Re6\#, 1.Kf5 Ra4 2.Bf6 Rxg4 3.Se5 Bxe6\#, 1.Ke7 Bd7 2.Kd8 Rd6 3.Se7 Sxe6\#.

4th WCCT strikes back! Hard nut for solvers, partly because of varied bK walks into mating nets. Generally speaking, I find $\mathrm{h} \# 3$ the most demanding in solving competitions. (JL) - Three mates from same square with intresting play. Although I'm can't stop thinking are all black pawns really needed and could bQc1 be a rook. (KS)
1474. Pierre Tritten
1.Se3 Bxg7 2.Be4 Bf8 3.Kd4 Be7 4.Qc4 Bf6\#, 1.Rd6 Sxg2 2.Kd5 Se1 3.Rc4 Sd3 4.Be4 Sf4\#.
Two model mates after white knight and bishop Rundlauf (Author) - Excellent work! Pierre have made really enjoyable problem. (KS)

## 1475. Kenneth Solja

1.Qb8 Bxb8 2.Sc7 Ka3 3.Ke5 Kb4 4.Be6 Kc5 5.Rf5 Bxc7\#.

Opferbahnung and Maslar; the black Bf6 could be a pawn (HF) • I like how the kegel unravels itself at first (of course
you have to give the WB a move!) and then sort of reforms. A worthy dedication. (SD) • Difficult solving. (JL) • The idea of this problem was to make it without pawns, that's why there are no pawns. (KS)

## 1476. Mihail Croitor

1.h6 Kg6 2.Kf1 Kf7 3.Ke2 Kxe7 4.Kxd3 Kf6 5.Ke4 e7 6.d3 e8=B 7.d4 Bc6\#.

Excellent use of the first move (with an h6 pawn that is necessary for an underpromotion). After that, not hard to see solution but ornamentally nice. (SD) • Nice idea! (KS)

## 1477. Luis Miguel Martín

1...e5 2.Bg1 Kxg1 3.b5 Kh1 4.b4 Kg1 5.b3 Kh1 6.b2 Kg1 7.b1=B (b1=Q?) Kh1 8.Bf5 Kg1 9.Bxh3 Kh1 10.Bxg2+ Bxg2 11.Kg4 Bd5 12.Kh3 Bxe6\#.

Ceriani-Frolkin and Phenix with choice of promotion (HF)

- This is a well-known mating maneuver and choice of promotion to avoid check so I would be surprised if it has not been done before. If not, hats off to the author. Where is the switchback? Not in the oscillating white king, I hope? The use of Ceriani-Frolkin sort of boggles me in these problems (and I've done a million of them, ask anyone) as it is so common - it is much more usual to use a promoted piece as a "can-opener" than it is as block (ideally it should do both). Also, a Phenix? I've done several of these "sac a bishop of one color and make one of another" in all areas (directmates, selfmates and of course helpmates) and I always feel uncomfortable calling them "Phenixes" as the bishop on dark squares is stuck there forever and the one newly born is a completely different kind of bishop... Those last three comments were not directed at the problem, but a question on terminology. (SD) - I think the problem would be better as 11 -mover starting with 1. Bg1. (KS)


## Fairies

## 1478. Ján Dučák

Try: 1.d8=R? (~), 1...Sc7, Sxd6, Sxg7, a6 2.Rd7, Rc7, Rxa7, Rd7\#, 1...a5!; 1.Rxa7! 2.dxe8=S\#, 1..Sc7, Sxd6, Sxg7, Bxd6 2.d8=Q, d8=S, d8=R, d8=B\#. (Secondary variation: 1...Bb4/Bac5 2.d8=Q\#).

Three changed mates after the bS moves and AUW in the actual play, based on specific Functionary motives. A neat fairy problem. (EH)

## 1479. Anatoly Styopochkin

1.0-0! g5 2.hxg5 ep Rf7 3.Rb1 Rf1 4.g7 Rf8 5.g8=Q Rf1 6.Qa2+ Kc1 (Ka3) 7.Qd2(Rb4)\#.
Valladao theme (Author) • ... with very few pieces indeed. (EH) - Combination Maximummer + Köko allows surprising effects. To tell the truth, similar renderings of Valladao with opening sequence including castling and en passant capture with no strong underlying strategy do not impress me much. (JL)

## 1480. Aleksandar Popovski

1.Rxd5? Rxc2 2.hxg4 Rc8 3.Kh3 Rc1 4.Rc5 Rh1\#, 1...Rc8!; 1.Sd4 ? Rc1 2.hxg4 Rc8 3.Kh3 Rc1 4.Sc2 Rh1\# but 1...Rh5!; 1.hxg4!(~), 1...Rh5 2.g5 Rxg5 3.Rf8+ Sf5 $4 . g 4$ hxg3 ep.\#, 1...Rd1 2.Sd4 Rh5 3.Rf8+ Sf5 4.Kh3 Rh1\#.

While Rh1\# is found in multiple sequences, star variation 1 ...Rh5 ends in an unexpected battery mate from the other side by en passant capture. Maximummers with variations have still some gems hidden. (JL)
1481. Anatoly Styopochkin
a) 1.Ke6+! Ke7 2.Qh3 Qe5 3.Kf7 Qh2 4.Kf8 Qg3 5.Qh4+ Qg5 6.Qh6 Qg8\#, b) 1.Qd4! Qc3 2.Ke6+ Ke7 3.Qb4+ Qc5 4.Kd7 Kd8 5.Qb6+ Ke7 6.Kd8 Qc8\#, c) 1.Qg3! Qd8 2.Ke6+ Qh4 3.Qg4 Qf6 4.Kf7 Qf3 5.Ke8+ Qf5 6.Qg6 Qf8\#.

Chameleon echo mates (Author) - If only the echo mates were set at least as multiple solutions rather than as twin solutions... and variations would be even better. (JL)

## 1482. Anatoly Styopochkin

a) 1.Bd5! Qa1+ 2.Kb7 Qf6 3.Ba2 Qc3 4.Ka7 Qc8 5.Be6 Qc1 6.Bd7 Qg5 7.Bc8 Qa5\#, b) 1.Ka5! Qa1+ 2.Kb4 Qf6 3.Kb3 Qa1 4.Bb5 Qf6 5.Ka2 Qf1 6.Bc4 Qf6 7.Ka3 Qa1\#.

Echo mates (Author) - Antiköko is largely unexplored fairy condition, it should be tried more. (JL)

## 1483. Peter Harris

1. $n \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{axb} 6[+\mathrm{nPa} 1=\mathrm{nQ}][\mathrm{nPb} 2]+2 . b x a 1=B[+n Q a 2][n B f 8] n R O x f 8$ [ $+\mathrm{nBh} 8][\mathrm{nROf8}] \#$, 1.bxa5[+nPb8=nR][nPa7] nKb1 2.a6 nROxa6 [ $+\mathrm{nPc} 1=\mathrm{nR}][\mathrm{nRO} \mathrm{a} 8]$ \#.
Amazing mates with the neutral King. In each mate, the neutral Rose is reborn on the rebirth square of the neutral checking unit, which explains why Black is in check but White is not! By the way, the problem also realises the Zilahi theme - as a side effect of the captures of the nPs. (EH) - Mates by neutral units are one of my beloved areas. They have to be made in an irreversible way, not difficult in Circe or Anticirce. But here we have added complexity of mating the neutral king, requiring some effect disallowing check by Black. Usually it is done by pawn check (directional effect), but here we see asymmetry of Circe squares. Well done! (JL) • The second solution here ( R promotion) is remarkably well considered, and specific to all fairy elements employed! Unfortunately, without any unifying theme, the alternative solution may read like an interesting cook (any Zilahi claim is purely a secondary -the strong thematic impression here, ultimately, is the finale). With greater unity in the two finales, a better case might be made for asymmetric solutions. (KB)

## 1484. Vlaicu Crisan

1.Kxc2-c8 nRxd4-b3 2.fxe6-c7 Bxe1-e6\#, 1.Kxd2-h6 nBxd4-e2 2.fxe6-g5 Rxa2-e6\#.

Triple exchange of functions between white/black/neutral Rook and Bishop. All moves are Take \& Make specific. (Author) - The artistic impression is strong as usual with Vlaicu's problems. "e6" is the thematic square: it must be evacuated in order to leave the field for the mating white unit. For that purpose, $n B$ and $n R$ exchange their functions and interfere respectively the bRe 1 and bBa 2 , which are alternatively captured. The Zilahi executed by the bK is an excellent addition to these various changes of function. We will certainly see this problem again... (EH) - Impressive analogy, indeed. As there are only three cook-stoppers at the diagram (a1, a5, a8, well, wK is probably one too, but it is conventional to have a king on the board), I wonder how many different versions existed before this polished one. (JL)

## 1485. Vadim Vinokurov

a) 1.Qxd3(=wQ) Qc4! 2.Bxe6(=wB) Qa6\#, b) 1.Bxd3(=wB) Be4! 2.Rxf2(=wR) Bf5\#, c) 1.Rxf2(=wR) Rf3! 2.Qxd3(=wQ) Rf1\#.

Tempo of three different white figures. Cycle of the transformed white figures. (Author) - Tempo moves are worth something, but impression from the cycle is blurred by two facts: 1. different bishop captures (compared to the
identical by queen and rook); 2 . lack of switchback mate by rook (compared to one by queen and bishop. Here are two problems for comparison.


1485a: a) 1.Rxa2=(w) Ra5 2.Bxe6=(w) Bf5\#, b) 1.Bxe6 =(w) Bb3 2.Sxe3=(w) Sc2\#, c) 1.Sxe3=(w) Sd5 2.Rxa2 =(w) Ra8\#. 1485b: 1.Bxh4(w) Bxf6(b) 2.Sfxd6(w) Sf7\#, 1.Sfxd6(w) Sxb5(b) 2.Sxb6(w) Sc4\#, 1.Sxb6(w) Sxd7(b) 2.Rexd6(w) Re6\#, 1.Rexd6(w) Rxc6(b) 2.Rxd2(w) Rd5\#, 1.Rxd2(w) Rxe2(b) 2.Bxh4(w) Bg3\#. (JL)

## 1486. Dmitri Turevski

1.. Sc6 2.Kd5 Ge2 3.Gd6 Sbd4\#, 1.. Sc7+ 2.Kd6 b4 3.Gd7 Sed5\#.
Chameleon echo model mates. (Author) - Shift of mating picture with eight pieces. (JL)

## 1487. Peter Harris

a) $1 . \mathrm{nBd} 5 \mathrm{nQb} 8+2 . \mathrm{nQg} 8 \mathrm{nRa} 1+3 . \mathrm{nBa} 2 \mathrm{nQxa2}[\mathrm{nQ} \rightarrow \mathrm{c} 7] \#$, b) 1.Ka8 nBh7 2.nQc7 nBb1 3.nRh7 nBxh7[nB $\rightarrow$ h1]\#.

The link between solutions is not very strong. (JL)

## 1488. Yoshikazu Ueda

1.TRf3 Kg7 2.d1=nQ f8=nTR 3.nTRf5 nQxf3\#, 1.SIf5 Ke7 2. $\mathrm{d} 1=n \mathrm{SI}$ f8=nR 3.nSIf3 nRxf5\#.

Good analogy. (JL)

## 1489. Vito Rallo

a) $1 . . . \mathrm{Sg} 32 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Sxe} 23 . \mathrm{Kh} 1[+\mathrm{bPf} 1=\mathrm{bS}]+\mathrm{Kf} 2$ 4.Sh2 Sg3\#, b) 1...Sxd2 2.Kh2[+bPd1=bR] Kxe3 3.Rg1[+bPh3] Kf2 4.Rh1 Sf3\#. One little defect: bPd2 used only in one solution (Author) No strong theme. (JL)

## 1490. Vito Rallo

a) $1 . . . \mathrm{Sf3}+2 . \mathrm{Kxe4} 4 \mathrm{Kd7}[+\mathrm{nPd4} 43 . \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Kc6} 4 . \mathrm{Kxe6} \mathrm{Sg} 5[+n P f 8=n Q] \#$,
b) $1 . . . e 52 . \mathrm{Kxe} 5 \mathrm{Kg6}[+\mathrm{nPf4} 4]+3 . \mathrm{Kxe6} \mathrm{Se} 4[+\mathrm{nPf8}=\mathrm{nQ}] 4 . \mathrm{nQd8} \mathrm{Sc} 5 \#$. Echo mirror mates. (Author) - Symmetry of the final positions is adequately spiced by good portion of asymmetry in the play. (JL)

## 1491. Kevin Begley

1.Kf5 e6 2.Kf6 dxe6 3.Kg7(f7) exf7 4.Kh8(g8) Ke7 5.gxf7 Kf6(g6) 6.fxg6 Kf7(g7)\#, 1.Kxd5 Ke7(d4) 2.exd4 Kd8(c5) 3.Kc6 dxc5 4.Kb7(b6) cxb6 5.Ka8(a7) Kc7 6.axb6 Kc8(b7)\#.

Ideal Mates Echoes in 2 corners.(Author) - The mates are not quite in exact echo ( wKc 8 in one position, wKf 7 in the other), but the problem is still lovely. (EH) • Mates in two different corners are often welcomed. Another example of mate by neutral piece, although in this case the mating moves are made by wK and thus it is non-reversible by default. (JL)

## 1492. Frantisek Sabol

1.Bg6 (1.Bh5?) Sf7 2.Ke1[e8]xf7 Bg7 3.Bd2 Ka8[e1]xd2 4.Rh7 Ke3 5.Bh5 Kf4 6.Kg6 Kg5 7.Kh6 Kg6\#.

Not computer tested! 7 moves / 7 stones; ideal mate (Author). - Royal battery mate?! With bK on h6?! And tempo move? While not rich as far as a content is concerned, the solution is surely suprising. (JL)

## 1493. Yoshikazu Ueda

1.nPAh3+ Kb2 2.nPAh2+ Kc1 3.nPAh1+ Kd2 4.nPAh2+ Ke1 5.nPAh1+nPAh3 6.nPAe3+nPAg3 7.nPAg1+ Kd2 8.nPAg2+ Kc1 9.nPAg1+ Kb2 10.nPAg2+ nPAxg6 11.nPAb6+ nPAf6 12.nPAf2+ nPAf4 13.nPAb4+ nPAg4 14.nPAg2+ Kc1 15.nPAg1+ Kd2 16. nPAg2+ Ke1 17.nPAg1+ nPAg3 18.nPAe3+ nPAh3 19.nPAh1+ Kd2 20.nPAh2+ Kc1 21.nPAh1+ Kb2 22.nPAh2+ nPAxh6 23. nPAb6+ nPAf6 24.nPAf2+ nPAf4 25.nPAb4+ nPAg4 26.nPAg2+ Kc1 27.nPAg1+ Kd2 28.nPAg2+ Ke1 29.nPAg1+ nPAg3 30. nPAe3+ nPAh3 31.nPAh1+ Kd2 32.nPAh2+ Kc1 33.nPAh1+ Kb2 34.nPAh2+ nPAxh7 35.nPAb7+ nPAf7 36.nPAf2+ nPAf4 37. nPAb4+ nPAg4 38.nPAg2+ Ka3 39.nPAg3+ Lxg3-h3\#.
Logically grounded clockwork. Ultimate goal of Black is to remove both Ph 6 and Ph 7 . But to avoid loss of consecutive checks possibilities it is necessary to remove Pg6. (JL)

## 1494. Peter Harris

1...Ra1=Q 2.Rf2=Q Qaf6=S 3.Se4=B+ Sxe4=B\#, 1...Qb4=S 2.Rc5=Q Rxg5=Q 3.Ke4+ Kxc5\#.

I particularly wanted a mate in one solution to have no isardam dependence - as a contrast - and to give thinking solvers, who seek and expect to find another isardam pin, a surprise. (Author) - There are surely hidden some gems in the combination Isardam+Chameleon Chess, especially in the effects related to taboo king due to isardam rule and related transformation. (JL)

## 1495. Geoff Foster

1.Kd7 Lxb7-a8[+wPe4] 2.Kd6 Lxe4-f3[+wPa8=wB] 3.Bc6 Lxc6b7[+wBf3] 4.Kc5 Lxf3-g2[+wBb7]5.Kb4 Lxb7-a8[+wBg2] 6.Bb7 Lxb7-c6[+wBa8] 7.Bb7 Lxb7-a8[+wBc6] 8.Be8 Lxe8-f8[+wBa8]+ 9.gxf8=B[+bLg7] Lxg6-g5[+wPg7] 10.Ka4 Kf7 11.g8=B+ Ke8 12.Bb3 Kxf8[+wBe8]13.Bb5 Lxb5-a5[+wBg5]\#.

The following problem was in the latest Fairings: 1495a.
1.Kd1 Lxd2-c1[+bPg5] 2.Ke2 Lxg5-h6[+bPc1=B] 3.Bg5 Lxg5-f4 [+bBh6] 4.Bg5 Lxg5-h6[+bBf4] 5.Kd1 Lxf4-e3[+bBh6] 6.Bxe3 [+wLh6] Lxe3-d2[+bBh6]; 7.Be3 Lxe3-f4[+bBd2] 8.Be3 Lxe3d2[+bBf4] 9.Bd6 Lxd6-d7[+bBd2] 10.Ke1 Lxd2-d1[+bBd7]\#

The composer's comment was: "The b and Q both visit every square on the c1-h6 diagonal. At last, after many

1495a. Chris Feather Fairings 4, 2009
 attempts, I have regretfully abandoned my efforts to show the idea on a long diagonal." I then had a thought. The mating move is White's only move (this must be very rare), so the problem could be set as a helpselfmate. (...) it turned out to be a sound 13 -mover with a completely different solution! Not only are there an additional two bishop promotions, but also the white king undertakes a march, with the route determined by the need to avoid checks from the locust! Also, the thematic bishop conducts an unusual capturing routine with the locust in order to lose a tempo! (Author) - This tweak abandons the soul of Feather's beautiful idea - a long-diagonal rendering in hs\# form would have been extremely impressive! There is no denying that the solution here is astounding, but no
comparison to Feather's purely thematic construction. (KB)

- Does Geoff's comment mean this problem was not composed, but rather found? Well, it happens, finds of this level are however quite rare. (JL)


## 1496. Aleksandar Popovski

1.Rf4=B Kh2 2.Bxg3=R Bxe2=R 3.Rg5=B Kh3 4.Be3=S Rxe3=Q[+bSe4]\# \& 4.Bxh4=R\#, 1.Rxh4=Q Bxe2=R 2.Qxg3 [+wPf2]+ Kf1 3.Qe5=R Ke1 4.Re4=B Rxe4=Q [+bBe6]\# \& 4.Rxe2=Q\#.

## 1497. Chris J. Feather

a) $1 . \mathrm{Kxe} 6[\mathrm{wSe7}] 2 . \mathrm{Kxe5}[\mathrm{wPe6}] 3 . \mathrm{Kd6} 4 . \mathrm{Kxe7}[\mathrm{wSd6}] 5 . \mathrm{Kxe6}$ [wPe7] 6.Kxd6[wSe6] 7.Kd7 8.Ke8 9.Kf7 e8Q\#, b) 1.Kd6 2.Kxe5 [wBPd6] 3.Kxe6[wSe5] 4.Ke7 5.Kd8 6.Kc7 7.Kxd6[wBPc7] 8.Ke7 9.Ke8 BPd8Q\#.

Fun \& economical problem. Pity that c) giraffe e6 (setting up $9 . . . \mathrm{f8Q} \#)$ shares too much in common with a). Of course, this form of twinning is playing with fire -- leaving unused fairy element(s) in portions, and often appearing a mere afterthought. Somehow it works here. (KB)

## 1498. György Bakcsi

a) 1.Ka2 5.Kxe4 7.Kg6 8.Bxg7, b) 1.Kb1 4.Kxe3 7.Kh6 8.g5 Bg7\#. Two royal trips with the same mating move, the suprise elements seem to be absent, however. (JL)

## 1499. Vaclav Kotesovec

1.Gh3 2.Gd3 3.Gb3 4.Gxb7(b3) 5.Gd7 6.Gh7 7.Gh3 8.Gd3 9.Gxb3(d3) 10.Gb7 11.Gd7 12.Gh7 13.Gh3 14.Gxd3(h3) 15.Gd7 16.Gh7 17.Gxh3(h7) 18.Gd3 19.Gd7 20.Gxh7(d7) 21.Gh3\#; 1.Gf7 2.Gxb7(f7) 3.Gd7 4.Gxg7(d7) 5.Gb2 6.Gb7 7.Gxd7(b7) 8.Gg7 9.Gb2 10.Gd4 11.Ga7 12.Gxc7(a7) 13.Gg7 14.Ge7 15.Gxa7(e7) 16.Gc7 17.Gxf7(c7) 18.Gd7 19.Gxb7(d7) 20.Gb5 21.Ge8\#.

C+ (Author) - Amazing pair of solutions, especially the second one with the burial of the bB and the multiple hops of the wG on the 7th rank. (EH) - Twice mate by grasshopper over immobilized piece, in the first solution pawn, in the second bishop. I especially appreciate the fact that motions of white grasshopper are not entirely monotonous, but rather take into account changing configurations on the board. (JL)

## Retro/Math

## 1500. Stanislav Vokál

The last move was Pd2-d4 only. If Pc3xd4 is retracted, there is one capture too much of black pieces. Thus, en passant is possible in the first move:
1.exd3 e.p.+ Bd4 2.Bb4 cxd3\# (model mate).

En passant capture. (Author)

## 1501. Henryk Grudzinski

1.d3 h5 2.Bh6 gxh6-c1=Q 3.Sd2 Qxa1-c1 4.e3 Qxd2-e4 5.Qg4 hxg4-d1=B 6.Se2 Bxe2-c3+ 7.bxc3-g7 f6 8.dxe4-h7.
Two Ceriani-Frolkin promotions after accelerated excelsiors. (Author)

## 1502. Bernd Gräfrath

1.a4 e6 2.a5 Qf6 3.a6 Qxb2 4.axb7 Qxc2 5.bxa8=R Qxb1 6.R8xa7 Qxa1 7.Rxa1 g6 8.h4 Bg7 9.Rh3 Bxa1 10.Ra3 Bd4 11.Ra8.

Pronkin-Ra1 (captured!) and Anti-Pronkin-Ra8. (Author)

## 1503. Guy Sobrecases

1.d4 f6! tempo 2.Qd2 f5 3.Qh6 f4 4.a3 f3 5.Bg5 fxg2 $6 . f 4$ a6 7.Sf3 g1=B! 8.Bh3 Be3 9.Bf5 Bc1 10. 0-0 Be3 11.Kh1 Bg1 12.Rxg1, 7... g1=S? 8.Bh3 Sh3? 9.Bf5 Sf2 10.0-0 Sh3! (10...Sh1? 11.Kxh1 -?- zz 12.Rg1) 11.Kh1 Sg1 12.Rxg1; 1... f5? 2.Qd2 f4 3.a3 f3
4.Qh6 fxg2 5.Bg5 a6 6.f4 -?- zz 7.Sf3 g1=B 8.Bh3 Be3 9.Bf5 Bc1 10.0-0 Be3+ 11.Kh1 Bg1 12.Rxg1.

Donati-50 theme showing a promoted Bishop Rundlauf and sacrifice; Tempo. (Author) - A pity that $4 . \mathrm{a} 3$ and 6 ...a6 were necessary. Apart from this, a very nice SPG! (SH)

## 1504. Kevin Begley, Kostas Prentos

1.h4 f5 2.h5 g5 3.hxg6 e.p. f4 [+bPg4] 4.e4 fxe3 e.p. 5.gxh7 [ $+\mathrm{wPf5}$ ] e5 [+bPh5] 6.fxe6 e.p. h4 [+bPe4] $7 . f 4$ gxf3 e.p. 8.g4 [ $+w P f 6$ ] hxg3 e.p. 9.d4 [+wPg6] exd3 e.p. 10.g7 [ + wPd5] c5 11.dxc6 e.p. dxc2 [+bPb4] 12.a4 [+wPc4] bxa3 e.p. 13.c5 [+wPa5] d5 14.cxd6 e.p. b5 [+bPd3] 15.axb6 e.p. f2 [+bPb4]\#.
10 en passant captures in 30 (exclusively pawn-) halfmoves. Task. (Authors)

## 1505. Kevin Begley, Kostas Prentos

1.b4 Ka3 2.b5 a5 3.bxa6 e.p. Kb2 [+BPb4] 4.a4 bxa3 e.p. 5.a7 [+WPa5] b5 $6 . a x b 6$ e.p. a2 [+BPb4] $7 . c 4$ bxc3 e.p. 8.b7 [+WPc5] d5 9.cxd6 e.p. c2 [+BPd4] 10.e4 dxe3 e.p. 11.d7 [+WPe5] f5 12.exf6 e.p. e2 [+BPf4] $13 . g 4$ fxg3 e.p. $14 . f 7$ [+WPg5] h5 15.gxh6 e.p. Ka1 [+BPg4] 16.h4 gxh3 e.p. 17.h7 [+WPh5] g5 18.hxg6 e.p. h2 [+BPg4] 19.f4 gxf3 e.p. 20.g7 [+WPf5] e5 21.fxe6 e.p. f2 [+BPe4] 22.d4 exd3 e.p. 23.e7 [+WPd5] c5 24.dxc6 e.p. d2 [ $+\mathrm{BPc4}$ ] 25.c7.
15 en passant captures relocate an entire rank of white pawns, which replace a rank of black pawns. (Authors)

## 1506. Dragan Lj. Petrović

0.- Sg1xSh3 [Sb1]+ 1.Ra1-d1 a5xRb4 [Ra1] 2.Sd1-f2 a6-a5 3.Bf2-e1 b7xBa6 4.Qe1-f1 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 5.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ (in the further text this tempo manoeuvre $\mathrm{Sf1xPg} 3$ [Pg2] --- g2-g3 ---Sg3-f1+ will be denoted as "...") 6.Sb2-d1 ...8.Qd1-e1 Sf1xQg3 [Qd1] 9.Qh4-g3 Sg3-f1+ 10.Qh6-h4 (the introduction is over. To release the position the Pc 7 should be transported to g 7 by several uncaptures of the wQ. But to come back to d1 the wQ must pass the south-east canyon via h3-g2-f2-f1. Hence we need the Bishop's help.) ...14.Qa5xPb6 [Pb7] b7-b6 15.Qb6xPa5 [Pa7] ...17.Qc6xPb6 [Pb7] ...19.Qh6xPc6 [Pc7] ...21.Bb7-a6 ...23.Be1$\mathrm{f} 2 . . .25 . \mathrm{Sf} 2-\mathrm{h} 3 \ldots 27 . \mathrm{Qh} 3-\mathrm{h} 6 \mathrm{Sf1} 1 \mathrm{Pg} 3$ [Pg2] (the gate is open. We have 3 tempi for the first stage of the wQ's return.) 28.Qg2-h3 a6a5 29.Sh3-f2 a7-a6 30.Qf2-g2 c7-c6 31.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 32.Ba6-b7 ...34.Bb7xPa6 [Pa7] ...36.Bc6-b7 ...38.Bd5xPc6 [Pc7] (two more tempi are prepared) ...40.Qf1-f2 a7-a6 41.Bf2-e1 b7-b6 42.Qd1-f1 d7xQc6 [Qd1] 43.Qa6 ...45.Qb6xPa6 [Pa7] ...47.Qh6xPb6 [Pb7] ...49.Bc6xPd5 [Pd7] ...51.Be1-f2 ...53.Sf2-h3 ...55.Qh3-h6 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 56.Qg2-h3 a7-a6 57.Sh3-f2 d6-d5 58.Qf2-g2 d7-d6 59.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 60.Bd5-c6 ...62.Bc6xPd5 [Pd7] ...64.Qf1-f2 d6d5 65.Bf2-e1 d7-d6 66.Qd1-f1 c7xQb6 [Qd1] (see the comment after 138.- c7-c6) 67.Bd5xPc6 [Pc7] c7-c6 68.Qa5-b6 ...70.Qb6xPa5 [Pa7] ...72.Qh6-b6 ...74.Bc6xPd5 [Pd7] ...76.Be1f2 ...78.Sf2-h3 ...80.Qh3-h6 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 81.Qg2-h3 a6-a5 82.Sh3-f2 a7-a6 83.Qf2-g2 d6-d5 84.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 85.Bd5xPc6 [Pc7] d7-d6 86.Bf7xd5 [Pd7] ...88.Qf1-f2 c7-c6 89.Bf2-e1 d6-d5 90.Qd1-f1 e7xQd6 [Qd1] 91.Qa6-d6+ ...93.Qa5xPa6 [Pa7] a7-a6 94.Qa6xPa5 [Pa7] ...96.Qc6-a6 ...98.Qe6xPc6 [Pc7] ... 100. Qh6xPe6 [Pe7] ...102.Be1-f2 ...104.Sf2-h3 ...106.Qh3-h6 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 107.Qg2-h3 a6-a5 108.Sh3-f2 a7-a6 109.Qf2-g2 e7-e6 110.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 111.Be6-f7 ...113.Bc8xPe6 [Pe7] ...115.Ba6c8 ...117.Bb7xPa6 [Pa7] ...119.Qf1-f2 a7-a6 120.Bf2-e1 c7-c6 121.Qd1-f1 f7xQe6 [Qd1] (one file more! No!? Due to the check neither the $w Q$ nor the $w B$ is able to uncapture the bP on f6. But we ignore this fact and prepare the next return to d1.) 122.Qa6-e6 ...124.Qa5xPa6 [Pa7] a7-a6 125.Qb6xPa5 [Pa7] ...127.Qc6-b6 ...129.Qh6xPc6 [Pc7] ...131.Be1-f2 ...133.Sf2-h3 ...135.Qh3-h6 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 136.Qg2-h3 a6-a5 137.Sh3-f2 a7-a6 138.Qf2-g2 c7-c6 (at this moment we can see the reason of 66.- c7xQb6
[Qd1]. With the bPP on $a 7$ and $b 7$, the wB is unable to make the last two tempi) 139.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 140.Ba6-b7 ... 142. Bb7xPa6 [Pa7] ... 144.Bc6-b7 ... 146.Bd5xPc6 [Pc7] ... 148. Qf1-f2 a7-a6 149.Bf2-e1 c7-c6 150.Qd1-f1 Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 151.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 152.Be1xPf2 [Pf7]! (the core of the problem. The bP will continue his journey to g7 via f2-g3-h4-h6!) Sf1xPg3 [Pg2] 153.g2-g3 g3xQf2 [Qd1] 154.B- h4xPg3 [Pg2] 155.g2-g3 Sg3-f1+ 156.Qf1-f2 h5-h4 157.Bf2-e1 h6-h5 158.Qd1-f1 g7xQh6 [Qd1] 159.h4xPg5 [Pg7].
The main strategy in this kind of circe retro moremovers is determined. There are places where moves can be interchanged without materially affecting the strategy. (Author)
Commentators (issues 35 and 36): Frank Richter (FR), Geoff Foster (GF), Gilles Regniers (GR), Guy Sobrecases (GS), Hans Gruber (HG), Hauke Reddmann (HR), Joost de Heer (JdeH), Juraj Lörinc (JL), Kenneth Solja (KS), Kevin Begley (KB), Mihai Neghina (MN), Mihail Croitor (MC), Paz Einat (PE), Siegfried Hornecker (SH), Steven Dowd (SD), Vilimantas Satkus (VS).

## Improved Versions

957v.


957v: 1.Se3? ~ 2.Qxc4\#, 1... Sd2 2.Qe5\#, 1... Sxe3 2.Rd2\#, 1... Bxe2 2.Sc2\#, 1... Qxb4/Qc8 2.Sf5\#, 1... Bb3!; 1.Sd2! ~ 2.Qxc4\#, 1... Sxd2 2.Rxd2\#, 1... Se3 2.Qe5\#, 1... Bxe2 2.Sb3\#, 1... Qxb4/Qc8 2.Sf3\#.
1408v: 1.Qe3? ~ 2.S2d3\#, 1... Sd~ 2.exf5\#, 1... Sxe4 2.Qxe4\#, 1... Sc4!; 1.Qb6? ~ 2.Qxd6\#, 1... Sd~ 2.S4d3\#, 1... Sxe4 2.S2d3\#, 1... Bd2!; 1.gxf5! ~ 2.S4d3\#, 1... Sd~ 2.f6\#, 1... Sxe4 2.Sg4\#, 1... Sxf5 2.Qc7\#, 1... Rc5,Rb6/Rd5 2.Qxc5,Rd5\#.
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Milan Velimirović original
b) rotate the final position $90^{\circ} \mathrm{U}$
+c) ditto
$+d)$ dittoooo...
etc.


Live as long and as prosper as it is possible to repeat the stipulated twinning!

