16 TT "PROBLEMIST UKRAJINY"<br>16-й тематичний конкурс мініатюр «Проблеміст України» - 2016<br>Підсумки * Awards * Итоги

Теми 16 TT «Проблеміст України»
Theme of 16 TT "Problemist Ukrajiny"
Темы 16 TT «Проблемист Украины»
Двоходівки. Не менше трьох захистів чорних на одному і тому полі у будьякій фазі (ілюзорна гра, хибний слід, дійсна гра). Якщо захистів два, то обов’язкова переміна гри. Близнюки дозволяються.

Twomovers. Defences (black moves bringing a change in the play) on the same square leading to three or more distinct variations during the whole solution (set, try and actual play). If there are only two defences they must show at least a pair of changed mates. Twins are allowed.

Двухходовки. Не менее трех защит черных на одном и том же поле в любой фазе (иллюзорная игра, ложный след, решение). Если защит две, то обязательна перемена игры. Близнецы разрешаются.

Judge: Charles Ouellet<br>Canada

I received 41 entries composed by 16 authors from 10 countries: Mykola Chernyavskyy (Ukraine - 1, 2, 3*, 10*, 22*, 23*, 24*, 36*), Suleyman Abdullayev (Azerbaijan - 3*, 29, 30), Carlos Grassano (Argentina-4, 5, 6), Eduard Nagovitzyn (Russia - 7, 8, 9, 10*), Ingemar Lind (Sweden - 11, 12), Karol Mlynka (Slovakia - 13), Nikita Kravtsov (Russia - 14, 15, 16), Myron Hnatyna (Ukraine - 17), Myhajlo Halma (Ukraine - 18, 19), Miroslav Svitek (Czech Republic - 20, 21), Petro Novitskyi (Ukraine - 22*, 23*, 24*, 36*), Pietro Pitton (Italy - 25), Robert Lincoln (USA - 26, 27, 28), Dieter Mueller (Germany - 31), Zoltan Labai (Slovakia - 32, 33, 34), Pavel Murashev (Russia - 35, 37, 38, 40, 41).

The participation to this tourney was amazing not only in quantity but also in quality as it is reflected in the large number of awarded entries ( $41 \%$ of the total input). My task as a judge however lead me for many valuable entries having exploited bright but already shown ideas to refine my criteria such as to include these or not in the award according to their ability to bring a novelty or a significant improvement over their predecessors. Therefore at last the rejected entries coupled with their anticipations reproduced in annex can be found in the following list: 4 (A), 11 (B, C), 12 (D), 35 (E), 36 (F, G), 37 (H) and $20(\mathrm{~N})$ which was added after the revision of my preliminary award by the tourney director. Regarding the enough original ones I thought that to be fair for the composers of their forerunners it would be appropriate in each case to add the mention «after... » close to the author's name of the awarded entry. The annex also contains other published compositions I found of interest to share for establishing comparisons with some entries discussed in the following award.

## 21. Miroslav Svitek Czech Republic <br> $1^{\text {st }}$ Prize



The three thematic defences occurring on e6 are provided by a pawn and two figures, here a queen and a knight. In the try play these defences bring a change as they are able to split the double threat. The key also introduces a double threat (sadly only one of the mates can be forced) this time defeated by the thematic defences leading to new mates. The changed mates are a very welcome addition to a task that had been only achieved once in a twomover miniature with a quiet and flawless key (see I) but far less accuracy. Perfect accuracy displaying only thematic moves on a single square is of course easier to get with a checking key (see J). By successfully taking up the high technical challenge related to this particular way of showing three defences on the same square this entry was then a logical choice for the top honour.
2nd Prize
2

A very similar matrix leading to the same post-key play (see H) has already been extracted from an even earlier one (see G) used in a quite exceptional twomover miniature probably achieving for the first time the Schedej theme. In each of these compositions the white unit captured by the three thematic defences could have been a pawn instead of a bishop (in G) or a knight (in H). The merit of the present entry is to have successfully exploited in the try play the white knight further captured after the key. With the keypiece at f 3 in the diagram position the try 1 . Se3? does not introduce a zugzwang but a threat (2.Qg3\#) which is uniquely defeated by $1 \ldots$. Bxf3! and the wRf3 in this case also prevents $1 . . . \mathrm{Be} 4+$ while the wKf5 is defining the try 1.Rf4? The wRf3 also contributes to the checking try $1 . Q e 5+$ ? promoted to a mate in the actual play by allowing the mate $2 . Q g 3 \#$. With $1 . Q g 3+$ ? Kg 1 ! the author was then in position to show the Urania theme in the try play. The try 1.Qe3? also on the same square e3 adds a pleasant echo to the theme and introduces a valuable changed mate after $1 \ldots \mathrm{hxg} 2$. The care given to the details in this fine composition proves that a well known idea can sometimes be refined in a genuine way.

## 7. Эдуард Наговицын (after Miklos S. Locker)


$3+2$
1...c1B 2.Qb3\#
1.Qg2?-2.Qd2\#
1...c1Q, c1B 2.Qe2\#, 1...Kc1!
1.Qa2! (1...c1B 2.Qa4, Qb3, Qe2)
1...c1Q, c1R/c1S/Kc1 2.Qe2/Qd2/Ka1\#

B: $\mathbf{Q g 8} \rightarrow \mathbf{f 8}$
1.Qf4? - 2.Qd2\#
1...c1B 2.Qa4\#, 1...c1Q!
1.Qe7?-2.Qe1\#
1...c1Q, R, B 2.Qe2\#, 1...c1S!
1.Qf2! - 2.Qe1,Qd2\# (1...c1R 2.Qd2, Qe2\#)
1...Kc1/c1S/c1Q, c1B 2.Qe1/Qd2/Qe2\#

Certainly the most deceptively simple twin of the tourney paradoxically revealing a rich and profound content. As the matrix of this composition is very close to the one used in another much earlier tanagra (D) the risk of a total anticipation was high. Furthermore the solution given to it by the author was in my view missing to enhance its originality. Since the actual play of a) is similar to the one shown in (D) emphasis was then needed to be put on both the set and the try play. But I also noticed that b) was undervalued since in the try 1.Qf4? the variation 1...c1B 2.Qa4\# was not mentioned reducing by the same way the interest of its precise refutation. I also found necessary to present some content of a) in b) for greater accuracy. With 1.Qe7? (instead of 1.Qe8?) the dual mate 1...c1B 2.Qa4\# is avoided. With its three phases the solution of b) now presents the Barnes theme. But for me the real novelty introduced by this entry where three of the four thematic defences are each refuting a try is probably that the try of a) combined with both the second try of b) and its actual play shows the Hannelius theme. To fully appreciate this twin composition both parts of it need to be considered from a higher level only able to let see at last their organic interconnection.
$4^{\text {th }}$ Prize

1...Sc5, S - (Sa5) 2.Q(x)a5\#
1.Kb8? - 2.Qb4\#
1...Sd6 (Sa5) 2.Q(x)a5\#, 1...c5!
1.Qg7!
1...Sc5, S-/c5/Kc5 2.Qa7/Qxb7/Qd4\#

B: Sb7 $\rightarrow$ b3
1.Qe5?
1...c5/S- (Sa5) 2.Qd6/Q(x)a5\#, 1...Sc5!
1.Qg7? - 2.Qa7\#
1...c5 2.Qb7\#, 1...Kc5!
1.Kb8!-2.Qb4\#
1...c5/Sd4(Sa5) 2.Qf6/Q(x)a5\#

An ambitious conception underlies the present twomover miniature where the three thematic black moves on the same square appear to be more or less activated according to the line of play considered throughout its whole content. As in the 3 prizewinner this other fine twin highly values the thematic moves for their role as try refutations. All equal in this respect they however greatly differ in the number of mates they allow as defences in each solution as well as in the overall set, try and actual play. There are three (3) mates after $1 \ldots . . c 5(a=1, b=2)$, two (2) after $1 \ldots . . S c 5(a=2, b=0)$ and only one after $1 \ldots$ Kb5 ( $a=1, b=0$ ). These six (6) mates then occur twice as much in the first solution than in the second $(a=4, b=2)$ while at the opposite the three (3) try refutations also displayed by these same thematic moves just occur in the reverse proportion as a) only shows one (1) and b), two (2). A delicate unconventional balance between both solutions is then achieved by contrast in a most baroque style! Hopefully the key in a) introduces a try in b) and reciprocally. The twinning device here used is surely one of the highlights of this composition as both positions occupied by the thematic black knight allow him to still play on the thematic square c5 with however different side effects. The rather unequal quality of play displayed during both solutions is more than compensated by its variety, a feature having greatly contributed for me to praise this entry and award it its high distinction.

## 39. Павел Мурашев

## Россия

$5^{\text {th }}$ Prize


4+3 2\#
1...e5/Ke5, f3 2.Qa8/Qxe6\#
1.Qb3?
1...e5/Ke5, f3 2.Qb7/Qxe6\#, 1...Kf3!
1.Qxe6+? Kf3!
1.Sh2?-2.Qxe6\#
1...Ke3 2.Rxe6\#, 1...e5!
1.Rxe6+?
1...Kf3 2.Qe2\#, 1...Kf5!
1.Qd2!
1...e5/Ke5,f3/Kf3 2.Qd3/Qd4/Rxf4\#

Undoubtedly one of the most original entries of the present tourney and the only one to double the theme with two squares welcoming each a pair of defences. This feat to my knowledge has only been achieved twice (see K and L) with each time half the defences splitting a double threat. Here at the opposite the key introduces no threat at all but a zugzwang. Two defences on different squares then lead to the same mate (hopefully changed from the set play) while the two remaining defences are able not only to introduce changed mates ( $3 \times 1$ for $1 \ldots \mathrm{e} 5$ and 2 x 1 for $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 3$ in the whole solution) but to refute tries in other phases of play. As in the 2 prizewinner the try play of this entry also shows the Urania theme but with only one checking try instead of two. Having been able to show four distinct mates instead of three after the two thematic pairs of defences this fine entry would have reach the top rank. As it is however it fully deserves a prize.

## 34. Zoltan Labai

## Slovakia

Special Prize

1.f3+? Kd3!
1.Qb5?Be2? - 2.f3\#, 1...d3!
1.f4?
1...d3 2.Qe5\#, 1...Kd3!
1.Bd2?
1...Kd3 2.Qe2\#, 1...d3!
1.Qc5!
1...d3/Kd3 2.f3/Qc2\#
1.Bb3!
1...d3/Kd3 2.Qd5/Qf3\#

Since I remained silent in the tourney announcement regarding multiple solutions while I allowed twins I further received some entries like the present one featuring two solutions. In the helpmate field both options are equally valued with even a preference for multiple solutions. In any case and particularly in the direct mate field the match between the solutions must be of such quality as to express the author's intention instead of suggesting the acceptance of an undesirable cook. This being stated when the purpose of the author is to show a theme spread over numerous phases it does not matter if these phases are a set, a try play or the actual one. What is of the primary importance then is the balance between the phases, which is not so easy to achieve. The present entry I decided to acknowledge with a Special Prize has won my approval since its overall achievement is impressive as it shows a blend of Dombrovskis and Urania themes with a split $3 x 2$ Zagoruiko spread over four phases. One can only regret that the wPf2 has no function in the 1.Bb3! phase, a kind of flaw shared by many modern compositions where some units are only involved in a part of the solution. However at the price of one less changed mate it is possible to show the main content of this fine entry with only one solution (see the attached version below) while simply expecting the same original result in twin form just seems out of reach.

Zoltan Labai (version Charles Ouellet)
Special Prize

1.f3+? Kd3!
1.Qb5? Be2? - 2.f3\#, 1...d3!
1.f4? 1...d3 2.Qe5\#, 1...Kd3!
1.Kb2? 1...Kd3 2.Qe2\#, 1...d3!
1.Bb3? 1...d3 2.Qd5\#, 1...Kd3!
1.Qc5!
1...d3/Kd3 2.f3/Qc2\#

## 29. Suleyman Abdullayev

. Azerbaijan
$1^{\text {st }}$ Honorable Mention


4+3
2\#
1.Qd2?-2.Qa2\#
1...b5 2.Qa5\#, 1...Sb5!
1.Qe3?-2.Qa3\#
1...b5 2.Qa7\#, 1...Sb5!
1.Qg7?-2.Qa1\#
1...Sb5 2.Qb7\#, 1...b5!
1.Qc1!-2.Qa1, Qa3\#
1...Sb5/b5 2.Qc8/Qc6\#

This interesting miniature involving over four phases an unusual pair of precise defences on the same square displayed by a knight and a pawn allows altogether a total of five really distinct mates, three after $1 \ldots \mathrm{~b} 5$ and two after $1 \ldots \mathrm{Sb} 5$. All white moves are delivered by the queen for achieving outstanding unity. Both defences also refute at least one try. The only small blemish of this composition appears to be the unnecessary double threat introduced by the keymove in the actual play.

## 15. Никита Кравцов

## Россия

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Honorable Mention

$3+4$
2\#
1...Kb4 2.Qf4\#, 1.Qc8? 1...Kb4 2.Qg4\#, 1...b4!
1.Qxb6? 1...Kb42.Qd4\#, 1...b4! (2.Qc6??)
1.Qe8!-2.Rc4\#, 1...Kb4/b4 2.Qe4/Rxb6\#

## B: - wRc6

1.Qe8? Kb4! 1.Qxb6! 1...Kb4/b4 2.Qd4/Qc6\#

An elegant twinning device introduces a sharp contrast between the two solutions of this simply charming entry. Both keys lead to a try in the other solution while each thematic defence is also involved as a try refutation. Both defences introduce changed mates throughout the whole composition for an overall total of four distinct mates after 1...Kb4 and two after 1...b4.

## 26. Robert Lincoln

## USA <br> 3rd Honorable Mention


1.Rf8? 1...Kg4 2.Qf3\#, 1...g4!
1.Ra1? 1...g4 2.Rh1\#, 1...Kg4!
1.Rh8!
1...Kg4/g4 2.Qg2/Rh4\#

A very elegant rendering in three phases of two defences on the same square each of these introducing a pair of mates after having refuted each in turn one of the tries. Unity is achieved by the wRa8 delivering all keymoves with long sweeping manoeuvers exploiting the full chessboard (from one corner to all the others). The construction is flawless making good use of the wPe3 which not only prevents the cook 1.Ra3+ but plays altogether with the wKe6 an active role in the actual play.

## 28. Robert Lincoln



Another fine example by the author of the 3 Honorable Mention winner showing a pawn and a king meeting on the same square for each in turn displaying a defence twice followed by distinct mates and a try refutation once. The overall result is good but simply does not match in economy of space and material the one achieved by the perfect entry in this regard just ranked above.

## 25. Pietro Pitton

Italy
$5^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention


```
    3+4
    2#
1...a1S/Sb6, Sc5 (Sc3) 2.Qb1/Q(x)c3# (1...a1B 2.Qb1#)
1. Qxe3! (1...a1B 2.Qd2, Qa3#)
1...a1Q, a1R/a 1S/Ka1/Sb6, Sc5(Sc3) 2.Qd2/Qa3/Qc1/Q(x)c3#
```

This original composition features unusual mates after two black promotions and a black king flight occurring on the same square. The capturing key allows the thematic flight and prepares the keypiece to safely deliver the thematic mates. The accuracy in the promotion play is good and matches the one usually achieved in the same type of compositions. The whole solution displays three thematic defences on the same square and one changed mate.

## 2. Микола Чернявський

Україна
$6^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention


Relying upon a double threat this composition is a rather straightforward illustration of the three natural defences occurring on $\mathrm{f8}$ with the two units, king and rook, involved in the short castling. A much more elaborated composition (see L) but not free of major flaws however had already exploited the three units involved in both castlings with the help also of such a double threat just to show the required theme of the present tourney. Only two other sound and valuable examples involving short castling have already been published. The importance of acknowledging the present composition has therefore played a decisive role in my decision to include it or not in the award. Considering the relatively high standard of quality already met by the successful entries quoted until now I felt the need of upgrading this one such as to propose its following version as the definitive one able to really honor the original author's idea.

## Mykola Chernyavskyy (version Charles Ouellet)

$6^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention

1.Sa7?-2.Qc8\#
$1 . . .0-0$ ! and $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 8$ !
1.Se7?-2.Qc8\#, 1...Kf8!
1.Qg6+?
1...Kf8 2.Qf7\#, 1...hxg6!
1.Qf2? Qf5? - 2.Qf7\#, 1...Rf8!
1.Qb2! - 2.Qb8, Qxh8\#
1...Rf8, Rg8/Kf8/0-0 2.Qb8/Qxh8/Se7\#

Three defences occur on the same square f8 with $1 \ldots 0-0$ as total defence leading to a model mate. The accuracy is almost perfect as only one unthematic defence remains in the solution. All thematic defences are also involved either as a unique or optional try refutation and the whole solution shows one changed mate after 1...Kf8. With 1.Se7? (key) and 2.Se7\# (mate) along with Qf7\# (threat/mate) after 1.Qf2? Qf5?/1...Kf8 now appears a mixed combination of all the characteristic elements of the Urania theme. At last the unit required to have played the last black move needed to make $1 \ldots 0-0$ legal is now the bPd6 (coming from c7 or e7) most useful to prevent the cook 1.Qc5. A clearly satisfying version of a pioneer entry in a field hardly able to arise many valuable contributions.

## 38. Павел Мурашев

## - Россия <br> $1^{\text {st }}$ Commendation



4+3 2\#
1...b5/Sb5 2.Qa5/Qc8\#
1.Qd4!
1...b5/Sb5, S-/Kb5 2.Qa7/Qa4/Qc4\#

Two of the three thematic defences are provided with a set mate. The key then meets the thematic unprovided flight and introduces a pair of changed mates following the two other defences. In the set as in the actual play a different selfblock on b5 is exploited due to the knight in the former and to the pawn in the latter.
However the other corresponding defences of these units differ by the damage they introduced. The thematic knight move is also less appealing in the actual play since a random move of this same unit produces the same effect.

## Slovakia

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Commendation


```
3+4
2#
1...c4 2.Qd6#
1.Qa6?-2.Qd6, Qd3, Qe2, Qf1#
1...c4/c1Q, c1B/Sc1 2.Qd6/Qe2/Qf1#,1...c1S!
1.Qb2! (1...c1R 2.Qd2, Qe2#)
1...c4/c1Q, c1B/c1S/Sc1(S- ) 2.Qd4/Qe2/Qd2/Qxc1(Qc1)#
```

The matrix used in this twomover miniature has already been exploited in an earlier one (see M) showing the Hannelius theme. The novelty introduced by the present entry comes from an extra black pawn replacing a white one used as a plug in its forerunner for now allowing an unthematic variation leading to a changed mate. However most of the thematic try play present in the earlier composition has been lost leaving in the present one only a single try (with a quadruple threat not fully justified) still refuted by a thematic defence.

## 8. Эдуард Наговицын

## Россия <br> $3^{\text {rd }}$ Commendation



3+4 2\#
1.Qa8?-2.Qe4\#
1...d5 2.Qb8\#, 1...Bd5!
1.Qe8? 1...d5/Kd5 2.Qb8/Qb5\#, 1...a2!
1.Qb1!-2.Qe4\#
1...d5/Kd5/Bd5 2.Qb8/Qb5/Qf5\#

Three defences on a single square are progressively introduced one by one in the three phases of play. One of the try refutations is a thematic move.
10. Микола Чернявський

Україна
\& Эдуард Наговицын

## - Россия

$4^{\text {th }}$ Commendation


4+3
2\#
1.Qb8?-2.Qe5\#
1...Kd4 2.Qb4\#, 1...Sd6!
1.Qa3!
1...Kd4/d4, Kf4/Sd4, S- 2.Qb4/Qf3/Qe3\#

Three defences on a single square are mixed with some other unthematic ones in an open setting including two flight squares.
A valuable try not refuted by a thematic defence however introduces one of the thematic variations.
41. Павел Мурашев

## Россия

$5^{\text {th }}$ Commendation

1.Qf8!
1...Sh5, S - /Kh5/h5 2.Qf5/Qf7/Qg7\#

The give-and-take key greatly contributes to the interest of this composition by allowing the keypiece to find access again to the f5 square after the first of the three thematic defences.

## ANNEX

A - Valery Resinkin
Chyrvonaja smena (Minsk) 1976
2nd Honorable Mention

1.Qg4? zz
1...Ke1/c1Q/c1S 2.Qe2/Qe2/Qd1\#, 1...Kc1!
1.Qf5! zz
1...Ke1/c1Q/c1S/Kc1 2.Bc3/Qf2/Qa5/Qc2\#

C - Jan Ingvar Hannelius
Satakunnan Kansa 1981-05-01

1... Kf1/f1Q/f1S 2.Qxf2/Bxb4/Bf2\#
1.Ka4? Kb2? zz
1...Kf1/f1Q/f1S 2.Qxf2/Bxb4/Bf2\#, 1...b3!
1.Bxb4+? Kf1!
1.Qd3? - 2.Bxb4\#, 1...f1-!
1.Be3! zz Kf1/f1Q/f1S 2.Qxf2/Qd2/Bf2\#

B - William Anthony Shinkman
St. John Globe 1905

1.Bh4+? Kd1!
1.Qf3? - 2.Bh4\#, 1...d1-!
1.Ka1?Kb1?Kb3?/Kb2? zz, 1...d1Q+!/d1S+!
1.Bf4? zz d1Q/d1S/Kd1 2.Bg3/Bd2/Qxd2\#,
1...g5!
1.Ka3! zz d1Q/d1S/Kd1 2.Bh4/Bd2/Qxd2\#

D - Miklos S. Locker
Zakarpatska Pravda, 1955

1...e1B 2.Qd3\#
1.Qh4? - 2.Qf2\#
1...e1B 2.Qc4\#, 1...e1Q!
1.Qh2?-2.Qf2, Qg1\#
1...e1B/e1Q 2.Qg2/Qg2\#, 1...Ke1!
1.Qc2! zz
1...e1B/e1R/e1Q/e1S/Ke1
2.Qd3,Qc4,Qg2/Qg2/Qg2/Qf2/Qc1\#

E - Vassyl Marcovcij
Chervonyj hirnyk, 1997
Special Prize

1...Sd4/d4 2.Bd6/Qf5\#
1.Bxd5? zz
1...S- /Sd4/d4/Kd4 2.Bc3/Bd6/Qe4\#, 1...Sf4!
1.Be7? - 2.Bf6, Qe3\#
1...d4/Sf4 2.Bf6/Qe3\#, 1...Kd4!
1.Bd2! zz
1...S- /Sf4/Sd4/d4/Kd4
2.Qf4/Qxf4/Qf4/Qf5/Qxd5\#

G - Adam Maniak
Schach-Aktiv, 1987


F - Eric Torngren
6921 Tidskrift for Schack, 1982, 8-04


H - Mahir Mammadov
Olympia dunyasi, 2006-12-05
2nd Honorable Mention

1.Qb4+? Kb6!
1.Bxc6? zz
1...axb5 2.Qxb5\#, 1...Kb6!
1.bxa6? zz
1...c5 2.Qb5\#, 1...Кxa6!
1.b6? - 2.Qb4\#, 1...c5!
1.bxc6?-2.Qb4\#, stalemate!
1.Qd4! zz 1...Kxb5/axb5/cxb5/c5
2.Qb4/Qa7/Qd8/Qd8\#

I - Werner Biedermann
Neue Leipziger Zeitung, 1933


K - Frithiof Lindgren
Svenska Dagbladet, 1928-04-08
1st Prize

1...Qe3! - 2.Qd3, Rc1\#
(1...e1B 2.Qd3, Rc1\#)
1...e1Q, e1R/e1S 2.Qd3/Rc1\#
(1...exd1B 2.Qc3, Sa3\#)
1...exd1Q, exd1R/exd1S 2.Qc3/Sa3\#

J - Luke Neyndorff \& Walter Diaz
StrateGems
Third Miniature Tourney, 2012
3rd Commendation


L - Wiktor M. Pylypenko
2622 Karpati Igaz Szo, 10/1969

1...Rb8/0-0-0 2.Qxb8/Qb7\#
1.Qb7? - 2.Rxa8, Qxa8, Qe7\#
1...0-0 2.Qg7, Qh7\#, 1...Rxa7!
1.Ke6! - 2.Rxa8, Qxh8\#
1...Rf8/Rd8, Kd8/0-0/0-0-0
2.Rxa8/Qxh8/Qg7/Qb7\#

M - Anatolij Skrypnyk
Leninske plemja, 1989-09-24

1...Sc1, Sf4 2.Qg1\#
1.Qe5? Qe7? - 2.Qxe2\#
1...Sc1 2.Qe1\#, 1...c1S!
1.Qg5? - 2.Qd2\#
1...Sf4 2.Qg1\#, 1...c1Q, c1B!
1.Qh6? - 2.Qd2\#
1...Sf4 2.Qh1\#, 1...c1Q, c1B!
1.Qb2! zz
(1...c1R 2.Qd2,Qxe2\#)
1...c1S/c1Q,c1B/Sc1 2.Qd2/Qxe2/Qxc1\#

N - Robert Lincoln
Fun with chess miniatures 1996

1...Sc7 2.Qxc7\#
1.Ke7? - 2.Qd8\#
1...b5,b6/Bb6/Sb6/Sc7
2.Qa6/Qxa8/Qc5/Qxc7\#, 1...Bc5+!
1.Ke8! - 2.Qd8\#
1...b5,b6/Bb6/Sb6/Sc7+
2.Qa6/Qxa8/Qc5/Qxc7\#

I thank all participants to this interesting tourney and offer my congratulations to the awarded authors. Many thanks go to the tourney director, Mykola Chernyavskyy, who largely contributed by his mastery of the topic to the search of anticipations.


Триходівки. Тема Хольста. Вітатиметься точне чорне перетворення, хай навіть і не потрібне для спростування тематичної спроби; натомість воно може бути спростуванням нетематичного хибного сліду.

## Treemovers. Theme Holst. A precise black promotion although not required for refuting the thematic try is welcome and could otherwise refute an unthematic try instead.

Трехходовки. Тема Хольста. Приветствуется точное черное превращение, пусть даже и не нужное для опровержения тематической попытки; зато оно может быть опровержением нетематического ложного следа.

## Judge: Charles Ouellet <br> Canada

I received 20 entries composed by 8 authors from 6 countries: Carlos Grassano (Argentina-1), Dieter Mueller (Germany - 2, 3, 4, 5), Ingemar Lind (Sweden - 6, 7), Karol Mlynka (Slovakia - 8, 9, 10), Nikita Kravtsov (Russia - 11), Myron Hnatyna (Ukraine - 12, 19, 20*), Mykola Chernyavskyy (Ukraine - 13, 14, 15, 17*,18*, 20*), Mikhail Chernushko (Russia-16, 17*,18*).

First of all I wish to thank all competitors who have accepted to join myself in the investigation of the Holst theme for the present \#3 miniature tourney which from a participation point of view is a success. However, for an unknown reason I can hardly explain, most of the submitted entries failed to fulfill the requirements of the chosen theme letting me no other choice than quickly discarding 16 of the 20 entries ( $80 \%$ !). From the remaining 4 entries I also had to eliminate one, anticipated by the example 2 given in the announcement of the tourney (the same result could have been simply produced by moving the wKh2 to e2 for adding the desired unthematic tries 1.Sd6? Se7? Rh8? $\mathrm{a} 1=\mathrm{Q}$ ! refuted by a precise black promotion). My award is therefore the following:

## 7. Ingemar Lind

## Sweden

Prize

$2+2$
3\#
1.Kc3? - 2.Qc2, Qe1, Qf1\#
1...a1B+ 2.Kd3 (Kb3) - (Bc3) 3.Qc2 (Qc2)\#
1...a1Q+!
1.Kb3!-2.Qc2, Qe1\#
1...a1S+ 2.Kc3! - 3.Qe1, Qf1\# (2...a1Q, B+??)
2...5.2/Kb1 3.Qxc2/Qb2\#

This white minimal and new definitive letzform of the Holst theme here features a precise black promotion to refute the thematic try. The new mate 3.Qb2\# introduced by the actual play happens to be the icing on the cake of this well deserved prizewinner, a fine rendering in \#3 of the Holst theme improving with the same material over a famous \#4 composed by another Swedish composer (see Herbert Hultberg's illustration in the annex). It indeed succeeds to force after a better key and with one less move a precise thematic try refutation. It is amusing to notice that each Wenigsteiner discussed here shows a strategy that was first introduced by Victor Holst himself (see his pioneer example in the annex) 130 years ago!
16. Михаил Чернушко

1.Ka6? A - 2.Sb6\#
1...g1B 2.c7 B (3.c8Q,R\#) Bxa7 3.Bf3\# C \& 2.Bf3 C (3.c7\# B)
1...g1Q!
1.Bf3! C - g1B 2.c7+ B Kxa7 3.c8S\# \& 2.Ka6 A (3.c7\# B)
1...g1Q,R 2.c7+ B Kxa7 3.c8S\#
1...g1S 2.Ka6 A (3.Sb6\#) Sxf3 3.Sb6\# (if 2...g1Q,B?? 3.c7\#)

The greatest merit of this composition lies in the quiet and precise refutation of the thematic try, a unique and most remarkable feat. As in the Prizewinner double continuations also occur in both phases but in three moves instead of two, which is better. The actual play involves all four black promotions: the 1...g1=B defence introduces both threatening variations that $1 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 1=\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R}$ on one hand and $1 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 1=\mathrm{S}$ on the other will split, the last one crowned as expected by the try threatening mate instead of the real actual play one 3.c7\#. A very clever use is made of the wPc6 firing a battery on the second move before mating after a precise promotion on the third. All these positive aspects however are sadly darkened by two flaws: a minor and a major one. As both phases involve the same three white moves on $\mathrm{a6}, \mathrm{c} 7$ and f 3 and mainly differ by the order in which they are played therefore this very well crafted composition just lacks a little bit of surprise in the actual play to fully satisfy my taste, which is in my view its minor flaw. But what is more damaging and constitutes its major flaw is linked to the logical character of the Holst theme. As the avoided black promotion on the second move in the actual play is not delivering check and as the chosen promotion on the first move prevents one of the two threatening variations Black would be mated anyway in the case of being allowed to play instead the impossible desired promotion used to refute the thematic try. From my point of view this flaw can be compared in gravity to an illegal diagram position. Hence the Special Honourable Mention.

## 6. Ingemar Lind

## Sweden

Commendation


2+5 3\#
1...d1S 2.Re5-3.Rh5\#, 1...g1S 2.Kg6-3.Re8\#
1.Re4? - 2.Rh4\#, 1...Bd8!
1.Re6? - 2.Rh6\#, 1...Kh7!
1.Re5? - 2.Rh5\#, 1...d1Q,B!
1.Kg6? - 2.Re8\#, 1...g1Q,R+!
1.Re3!-2.Rh3\#
1...g1S 2.Kg6! - 3.Rh8\# (2...g1Q,R??)
1...d1Q, B 2.Rh3+ Qh5,Bh5 3.Rxh5\#

A white minimal this time featuring model mates with additional set and try play involving a second black pawn ready to promote. However neither the thematic or the unthematic try refutation here requires a precise black promotion. The core of this composition, a tanagra, can be seen in the following version.

## 6. Ingemar Lind

(version Charles Ouellet)
Commendation

1...g1S 2.Kg6-3.Rc8\#1...d4 2.Rc5-3.Rh5\#
1.Rc6? - 2.Rh6\#, 1...Kh7!
1.Rc1?
1...g1Q, R, B 2.Rxg1-3.Rh1\#
1...g1S 2.Kg6-3.Rc8\# \& 2.Rxg1-3.Rh1\#
1...d4 2.Rc5-3.Rh5\#, 1...Kh7!
1.Kg6? - 2.Rc8\#, 1...g1Q, R+!
1.Rc3!-2.Rh3\#
1...g1S 2.Kg6! - 3.Rc8\# (2...g1Q, R??)

ANNEX
Herbert Hultberg
Aftonbladet, 24 July 1927

1.Ke3? - 2.Qd4+ (2...Kc1 3.Qa1\#) Ke1
3.Qd2+ Kf1 4.Qf2\# \& 2.Qb3 (2...Kc1
3.Qb4 Kd1 4.Qd2\#) Ke1 3.Qxc2 Kf1
4.Qf2\#
1...c1Q, B+!
1.Kf2!
1...c1Q, R, B 2.Qe2\#
1...Kd2 2.Qd4+ Kc1 3.Qb4 Kd1 4.Qe1\#
1...c1S 2.Ke3! (2...c1Q,B+??)
2...Ke1 3.Qf2+Kd1 4.Qd2\#
2...Sb3 3.Qc3 Sd2 (S -) 4.Qxd2 (Qd2)\#

Victor Holst
Husvennen, 1886

1.Kc3? - 2. Qg4\# \& 2.Sg1\#, 1...a1=Q,B+!
1.Kb3! - 2.Sg1+ Kd2 3.Qf4\#
1....Be4 2.Qxe4+ Kd2 3.Qe3\#
1...a1S+ 2.Kc3!-3.Qg4\# \& 3.Sg1\#
(2...a1Q,B+??)
2...Kf3, Bf5, Sf6, Sh6 (g1=S)
3.Sg1(Sxg1)\#

I wish to thank Mykola Chernyavskky, director of the 16 TT Problemist Ukrajiny, for his support in the production of this award and invite all participants to take advantage of the present experience for further tournaments.


Багатоходівка (4-6 ходів) з принаймні одним близнюком зі зміною гри. Перевага буде віддаватися композиціям з найменшим числом повторюваних ходів сторін.

## A more-mover in 4-6 moves with at least one twin and play change. Entries with lesser repetitions of moves of the sides will have a preference.

Многоходовка (4-6 ходов) с по крайней мере одним близнецом с переменой игры. Предпочтение будет отдаваться композициям с наименьшим числом повторяющихся ходов сторон.

Judge: Rauf Aliovsadsade



USA

36 problems by 14 authors from 8 countries competed: Alexander Fica (Czech Republic) \& Zoltan Labai (Slovakia) - № 1, Zoltan Labai (Slovakia) - 2, Charles Ouellet (Canada) -3-5, Dieter Müller \& Mirko Degenkolbe (Deutschland) - 6, 15, Dieter Müller (Deutschland) - 7, 16, 17, Ingemar Lind \& Rolf Uppström (Sweden) - 8, Ingemar Lind (Sweden) - 9-10, Karol Mlynka (Slovakia) -11-13, Myron Hnatyna (Ukraine) - 14, Pietro Pitton (Italy) - 18, Stefan Felber (Deutschland) - 19-21, Valery Barsukov (Russia) - 22-24, Victor Zheglov (Russia) - 25-30, Mykola Chernyavskyy (Ukraine) - 31-36.
The overall impression from the tourney has proven to be satisfactory.
The organizers sent me anonymously 36 entries.
Some remarks:
a) $N 1(\mathrm{Kg} 6 / \mathrm{Kd} 4)$ would have been awarded-good conception-if not for the flight-taking keys;
b) N6 wasn't thematic, problems in \#4-\#6 moves were required only, as per announcement;
c) the way of cornering of a black King in $N 11$ (Kf2/Kh1) has been shown many times;
d) frequent repetition of mates in $N 13$ (Kf1/Kh1) and $N 17$ (Ke6/Ke4) left these entries without distinction.
In judging this competition, I was not after the quantity of twins, but more after the quality.
By the way, I don't consider virtual threats to be real ones, thus, I disregarded them completely whenever the authors pointed them out.
It goes without saying that, I shouldn't expect every participant to be happy about the award-it is what it is.
I've selected 16 compositions, and it took me a short while to figure out the top four compositions.

## 30. Виктор Жеглов

## Россия

1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Prize

a) 1. Sbc6!
1...Ke6 2.Kf3 Kd6 3.Qe7+ Kd5 4.Qe5\#,
1...Kc5 2.Qd4+ Kb5 3.Qb4+ Ka6 4.Qb7\#.
b) $\mathbf{S b 8} \boldsymbol{\rightarrow} \mathbf{b 6}$
1.Qg5!
1...Ke6 2.Qg6+ Ke7 3.Sc6+ Kf8 4.Sd7\#,
2...Ke5 3.Sc6+ Kf4 4.Sd5\#,
1...Kc7 2.Qf6 Kb8 3.Qc6 Ka7 4.Qb7\#.

## c)+bBc5

1.Sac6!
1...Bd4 2.Qd7+ (threat) Kc5 3.Qd4+ Kb5
4.Qb4\#,
1...Ke6 2.Qg6+ Kd5 3.Qf7+ Kd6 4.Qd7\#, 3...Ke4 4.Qf3\#.

Three parts. Different Knights make key moves, twin creation in c) is very nice.

## 28. Виктор Жеглов

```
        Россия
```

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize

a) 1 . Ke 7 !
1... Rb8 2. Bd5+ (threat) Ka7 3.Bd4+ Ka6 4.Bc4+ Ka5/Rb5 5.Qa3/Qxb5\#, 1... Rxf7+ 2.Kxf7 Ka7 3.Qb5 Ka8 4.Qa6+ Kb8 5.Be5\#
b) Qb2 $\rightarrow$ c7

1. Kf5!
1... Rd8 2.Be5 Rf8 3.Ke4 Rd8 4.Bd5+ Rxd5 5.Qb8\#,
1...Rxf7+ 2.Qxf7 Kb8 3.Qd7 Ka8 4. Qc8+ Ka7 5.Bd4\#.

Nicely done! White King's shielding by Bishop. Two full variations in twins.
24. Валерий Барсуков

Россия
$3^{\text {th }}$ Prize


5+2
4\#
a) 1 . Sc3!

1. ... Kf2 2. Se4+ Kf3 3. Ke5 Ke3 4. Rg3\#,
2. ... Kf4 2. Rg2 Kf3 3. Be4+ Kf4 4. Se2\# .
b) $\mathbf{S b 1} \boldsymbol{\rightarrow} \mathbf{h}$
3. Sf2!
4. ... Kxf2 2. Ke4 Ke1 3. Ke3 Kd1 4. Rg1\#,
5. ... Kf4 2. Sh3+ Kf3 3. Kc3 Ke3 4. Rg3\#.

Good key in part b). Two full variations in either twin.
16. Dieter Mueller
$\square$ Deutschland $4^{\text {th }}$ Prize

$4+1$
4\#
a) 1.Rc1? Kd6 2.Kf6 Kd7 3.Be6+ Kd8/Kd6 4.Rc8/Se4\#,1...Kd4!
1.Se4? Kd4 2.Kf4 Kd3 3.Rc1 Ke2/Kd4 4.Bc4 Rd1\#,1... Ke4!
1.Rc4! Kd6 2.Kf6 Kd7 3.Be6+ Kd8/Kd6 4.Rc8/Se4\# .
b) Bg8 $\rightarrow \mathbf{c 4}$
1.Rc8? Kd6 2.Kf6 Kd7 3.Be6 Kd6 4.Se4\#, 1... Kd4!
1.Sg4+? Ke4 2.Rd6 Kf3 3.Bf1 Kg3/Ke4 4.Rd3/Bg2\# ,1... Kd4!
1.Bb5! K~ 2.Kf4 K~ 3.Se4 K~ 4.Rd6\#.

Nice, two tries in either twin!
27. Виктор Жеглов
$1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{HM}$


## 4+2 <br> 6\#

a) 1.Bd6! (2.Bf3+),1...Qf7 2. Qa5+ Kb7 3. Qb5+ Ka7 4. Bc5 Ka8 5. Qa6+ Kb8/Qa7 6.Qc8/Qxa7\#.
b) $\mathbf{Q g} 5 \rightarrow \mathbf{f 6}$
1.Be5! (2.Qa6+),1...Kb7 2. Bf3+ Kc8 3.

Qc6+ Kd8 4. Bf6 + Qe7 5. Bg4 Qxf6 6. Qd7\#.
c) $\mathbf{Q g} 5 \rightarrow \mathbf{f} \mathbf{1}$
1.Bf4! (2.Qa6+),1...Qg6 2. Qb5 Qb6! 3.

Bf3+ Ka7 4. Bb8+ Kxb8 5. Qxb6+ Kc8 6. Bg4\#.

Again three parts, clever use of a bQ.
31. Микола Чернявський

## Україна

$2^{\text {nd }} \mathbf{H M}$


4+3
5\#
a) 1. Qe1! (2. Qc3+),1... Kd5 2. Qe3 Se4 3. Qxe4+ Kd6 4. Qe6+ Kc7 5. Qb6\#.
b) $\mathrm{Se} 8 \rightarrow \mathrm{f} 8$
1.Qe7! (2.Qc5\#),1...S8d7 2.Kb5 Kd5
3.Sc3+ d4 4.Se2+ Kd5 5.Qe6\#.
c) $\mathbf{S a} 4 \rightarrow \mathrm{~d} 1$

1. Qe3+! Kd5 2. Sc3+ Kd6 3. Qe6 Kc5 4. Qb6 Kc4 5. Qb4\#.

Three nice parts.

## 10. Ingemar Lind

Sweden
$3^{\text {rd }} \mathrm{HM}$

$3+4$
4\#
a) 1.Kc7? It is Black's turn to move: 0...a6 1.Rxb7! h6 2.Kc7 a5 3.Rb5 a4 4.Ra5\#.
b) wPe7
1.e8Q? It is Black's turn to move: $0 . . . a 5$ 1.e8Q! Ka7 2.Qb5 b6 3.h6 Ka8/a4 4.Qa6/Qxa4\#.
c) bBh7
1.Kc7! a5 2.Kb6 Bf5 3.Re8+ Bc8 4.Rxc8\#,2...Bg6 3.hxg6 ~ 4.Re8\#.

Some retro involved.

## 9. Ingemar Lind <br> Sweden

## $4^{\text {th }} \mathbf{H M}$


a) 1. Ke 2 ? Ke 4 2. $\mathrm{Qg} 5 \mathrm{Kd4} \mathrm{3}. \mathrm{Be6}$ Ke4/Kc3 4.Qe3/Qd2\#,1...Kf4!
1.Bh5? Ke6!

1. Qb6! Kd5 2. Ke3 Kc4 3. Be6+ Kc3 4. Qb3\#.
b) $-\operatorname{Bg} 4+\operatorname{Sg} 7$
2. Sf5? Ke6 2. Kg4 Ke5 3. Qd6+ Ke4 4. Qd4\#, 2... Kf7 3. Qe7+ K~ 4.Qg7\#,1...Kxf5!
1.Sh5? Ke6!
3. Kg4! Ke4 2. Sf5 Ke5 3. Qd6+ Ke4 4. Qd4\#.
Two tries in either twin.

## 15. Dieter Müller \&

 Mirko DegenkolbeDeutschland
$5^{\text {th }} \mathrm{HM}$

$4+1$
6\#
a) 1. Se4! Ke 52 . h3 Kd5 3. Rd6+ Ke 54. Ke3 Kf5 5. Kd4 Kf4 6. Rf6\#.
b) Ph2 $\rightarrow \mathrm{c} 2$
1.Sf3! Kc5 2.Sd4 Kd5 3.Rc6 Ke5 4.Ke3 Kd5 5.c4+ Ke5 6.Re6\#. Ideal-mate in part a).

## 14. Мирон Гнатина

Україна
$6^{\text {th }} \mathbf{H M}$

a) 1.Kb4! a3 2.Kxa3 a5 3.Ka4.
b) $\mathbf{P a} 4 \rightarrow \mathbf{d} 4$
1.Kd3! a5 2.Ke2 a4 3.Kf1.
c)=b)Pa6 $\rightarrow$ b3
1.Kxb3! d3 2.Kc3 d2 3.Kxd2.
d)=b)Kc4 $\rightarrow$ d6
1.Ke5! ~ 2.Kf4 ~ 3.Kg3.
wKing and bPawns duel.

## 21. Stefan Felber

Deutschland $3^{\text {rd }}$ Comm.

a) 1.Kh2! Kf3 2.Kg1 Ke4 3.Kf1 Kf3 4.Bd5\#.
b) position one row down
1.Kh2! Kf2 2.Bd2 Kf1 3.Sg3+ Kf2 4.Sd3\#.
22. Валерий Барсуков
$\square$ Россия $4^{\text {th }}$ Comm.

a) 1.Qb7! Kd6 2.Kxe4 Kc5 3.Kd3 Kd6 4.Kd4 Ke6 5.Qd5\#.
b) $\mathbf{S g} 8 \rightarrow \mathbf{g} 7$
1.Sf5! Kd5 2.Qc7 Ke6 3.Kxe4 Kf6 4.Qg7+ Ke6 5.Qe7\#.

## 23. Валерий Барсуков

## Россия

$5^{\text {th }}$ Comm.

a) 1. Kd3! Kd5 2. Sf5 Kc5 3. Ke4 Kb5 4. Sd4+ Ka4 5. Ra6\#, 4. ... Kc5/Kc4 5. Rc6\#, (2... Ke5 3. Se3 Kf4 4. Be1 Ke5/Kf3 5. Bg3/Rf6\#), 3... Kc4 4. Sd4 Kc5 5. Rc6\#.
b) Sd6 $\rightarrow$ c8

1. Kd3! Kf5 2. Se7+ Ke5 3. Bc3+ Kf4 4. Ke2 Ke4 5. Rg4\#
2. Микола Чернявський

Україна
$6^{\text {th }} \mathbf{C o m m}$.

a) 1.Kc2! Kd 4 2.Re2 Kc4 3.Re5 Kb4 4.Sa5 5.Sc6 Ka3 6.Ra5\#.
b) Kd2 $\rightarrow \mathrm{a} 3$
1.Kb4! Kd4 2.Sd6 Ke3 3.Sg4+ Kd3 4.Sc4 Ke4 5.Sf6+ K~ 6.Rd2\#.

Congratulations to the winners and good luck to all in the future!

Rauf Aliovsadzade<br>Lincoln, 30.07.2016
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