ir Call

4NT showed zero or three.

Alan knew something was wrong at this point, so he passed, hoping to limit the damage.

ber of key cards she held for spades:

Vernay	Schaffer
	1 💗
1 🛦	3 🖍
4	Pass

A good Precision sequence: Schaffer was able to jump to 3 \( \text{h} \) because his opening bid limited him to 15 HCP (otherwise, 1 \( \text{h} \)). The jump in Precision shows a maximum opener and four-card support.

Bridge Bulletin auction: 
$$1 \lor -1 \spadesuit$$
;  $2 \spadesuit -4 \spadesuit$ ; Pass

Scores: 4♠ 11; 4♥ 10; 3♥, 3♠ 6; 1NT 1

Popkins 49, Vernay-Schaffer 43

## Problem 7 South deals. Both vulnerable.

West	East
AAKJ9	<b>↑</b> 73
♥ A K Q J	<b>V</b> 10 8 3 2
♦ K 5	♦ A Q 2
♣ A K 6	♣ J873
Alan	Nancy
7,000	and the second s
2♣	2 or sense tolan
2 💜	2
2NT	3.
3 🍑	13 A Comes div
4 💚	4NT
5.	5 •
6.	6NT
7 💗	Pass

The Popkins play a popular expert treatment commonly known as "Kokish."

The idea is for the 2 opener to

show super-strong balanced hands (25-plus HCP) without jumping to 3NT or higher.

After the 2 ♦ (waiting) response, 2 ♥ shows either a strong hand with hearts or a balanced hand in the 25plus range. Responder continues with 2 ♠ as a conventional relay to find out which type of hand opener has. 2NT shows the balanced battleship.

The next part of the dance is exploration of a possible major-suit fit. Using a modified version of puppet Stayman, Nancy's 3♣ asked if Alan held a five-card major. 3♠ said no. 3♠ showed four hearts (and denied four spades), and Alan confirmed a 4–4 fit by bidding 4♥.

Nancy knew the combined values of the partnership were at or near the slam zone, so she continued with 4NT, RKCB for hearts. 5♣ showed one or four (four, obviously, in this case) and 5♠ asked about the ♥Q.

Typically, the player responding to this inquiry also shows any side-suit kings by bidding the suit with the king. For economy, the cheapest king is shown first. Popkin's response, it seems, should be  $5 \spadesuit$  (showing the  $\heartsuit Q$  and the  $\spadesuit K$ ), but he bypassed spades and chose  $6 \clubsuit$ . In theory, this should deny the  $\spadesuit K$ .

Despite the 4–4 heart fit, Nancy went for the matchpoints (6NT). Alan, with significant extras and a partner clearly interested in finding out more about his hand, took a chance on 7 .

Vernay	Schaffer
1.	1 🄷
2 💜	24
2NT	3♣
3 🌢	3 🏚
4.	4 🌢
6 💚	Pass

1♣ was strong and artificial, showing 16-plus HCP, and 1 ♠ was a negative response, showing 0–7. 2 ♥ promised either a balanced hand in the 24–26 HCP range or a very strong hand with four hearts and a six-card minor. 2♠ was forced, and 2NT showed the big, balanced hand.

3♣ was puppet Stayman, 3♠ revealed at least one four-card major, and 3♠ showed four hearts. 4♣ and

4 ♦ were control-showing bid Vernay, knowing that his pai held the ♦ A and not much els (Schaffer was limited by the 1 response), settled for the small slam in hearts.

Bridge Bulletin auction: 2♣–2 ♦ (waiting); 4NT (27–28 HCP)–6NT; Pass

Scores: 7 ♥ 12; 6 ♥ 10, 6NT 8; 6♣ 5; 5 ♥ 2; 3NT, 7NT 1 Popkins 61, Vernay–Schaffer 53

## Problem 8

West deals. E-W vulnerable.

West	East
<b>A</b> 4	<b>♠</b> A J 7 3
♥ K Q J 10 8	36 \$72
<b>♦</b> 83	♦ A K 10 5
♣ K 9 6 2	♣ Q 10 4
Alan	Nancy
2 💜	2NT
3♠	4 💜
Pass	

Alan began with weak 2 ♥ (a near-maximum). Nancy's 2NT was Ogust, asking opener to further describe his hand. 3 ♠ showed a good suit and a good hand, so Nancy bid the game.

Vernay Schaffer 2 ♦ 2 ♥ Pass

Vernay and Schaffer use the "multi" 2 ♦ bid for any hand that contains a weak two-bid in a major. Their style, according to Vernay, is fairly random with regard to the quality (and length) of the suit and strength of the hand. This explains Schaffer's tepid approach: 2 ♥ was "pass or correct," asking opener to pass if hearts was his suit, or bid 2 ♠ (which Schaffer would have raised to game) if that was his suit.

Vernay, not knowing anything about his partner's hand, obeyed and passed.

Bridge Bulletin auction: 2 ♥-2NT (feature); 3♣-4 ♥; Pass

Scores: 4 ♥ 10; 3NT 5; 3 ♥ 4
Final score: Popkins 71, Vernay—
Schaffer 57