

Covering an honour with an honour

An old chestnut but one that needs looking at.

For starters the maxim applies to defenders (only) and NEVER the declarer.

So ----- if you are the declarer here in 4Sp and the Q Hrts is led

(declarer)	(dummy)
AK65	J1098
543	K762
AQ6	KJ
K43	Q87

there is no reason in the world why you should play the K on the Q *ie cover an honour with an honour* { and actually it is a bad idea here ! }.

It is as a defender that you should consider applying the rule.

e.g	(dummy)	
	J1098	
	<u>Q</u> 76	(defender)
	AQ3	32
	876	<u>K</u> J3
		K6543
		432

Here the Q Hrts is led; it is very likely that the declarer has the Ace and if you play low the declarer will make both the Q in dummy and later the Ace in hand. Two tricks. Well you can prevent that happening by playing the K on the Q. Yes declarer's Ace will no doubt be played on your K BUT you will have stopped the Q and A making separate tricks.

In our example above we can not only stop declarer making two immediate tricks we can also create a probable trick for ourselves in the J Hrts which has been promoted. *ie* Q led , covered by K and beaten by the Ace , and now our Jack will win a trick the next time the suit is led.

So we seem to have two reasons for covering an Hon with an Hon

- i) we prevent the declarer making two separate tricks
- ii) we may promote a trick for ourselves.

There are going to be times when we *shouldn't* cover an Hon with an Hon but before we get to those let us continue examining the possible benefit of covering Honours as a defender.

(see over page)