



Haggis & Neeps

A fixed-partnership version of Haggis.
(The 4 player rules are described first.)

A **neep** is a root vegetable that originated as a cross between the cabbage and the turnip. It is commonly known as a rutabaga, or a swede (Swedish turnip). In Scotland, it is known as turnip, and in Scots as tumshie or neep (from Old English *næp*, Latin *napus*). It is traditionally served with **haggis** where it is often accompanied by **tatties** (potatoes).

Object

Play cards out of your hand quickly. Perhaps bet that you will be the first to play them all. Meanwhile, don't get caught holding a lot of cards if someone else goes out ahead of you, but keep in mind you also want to capture as many cards as you can along the way...

Components

Requires 2 copies of each rank, 2 through 10, in four suits (72 pip cards), plus four Jacks, four Queens, and four Kings (12 court cards) for a total of 84 cards. The playing cards rank from low to high: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, J, Q, K.

Seating & Partners

Players chose partners. These partnerships remained fixed for the entire game. Partners should sit across the table from one another, with one opponent on their left and the other opponent on their right.

Beginning the Round

Place one row of court cards--Jack, Queen, and King--face-up in front of each player.

Shuffle the pip cards then deal 18 cards face-down to each player. A player's hand consists of these 18 dealt cards which are picked up and held plus the 3 court cards, which remain face-up on the table until played. Total hand size is 21.

Card Passing

Organize and assess your hand, then *send* a **Message** to your partner by passing one card, face down. Your partner must select and pass their own Message before receiving yours. After sending their message, they *receive* your Message by picking up your passed card and adding it to their hand. You may now receive your partner's Message in the same manner.

After exchanging Messages, each partner sends a **Response** by passing one additional card to their partner, face down. You must send a Response before receiving the Response from your partner.

You may not pass Court Cards (J, Q, K).

Passing Convention

To ascribe meaning to their Messages and Responses, a partnership can devise whatever passing convention they wish, and they do not need to disclose their convention to their opponents. The convention must be limited to what can be communicated with the passed card. Card must be passed face down. It's best if everyone chooses their Message card and places it on the table in front of themselves, with zero rotation (i.e., perpendicular to themselves), and then have everyone pass their Message at the same time. You can rotate the card while it is being passed, not before. You do not have to wait to send Responses.

Betting

One player from each team may bet to be the first to “go out” (*play all cards from hand*). A player may declare a bet at any time before they play any cards (*this timing also includes **before they pass any cards** and before or after their turn*).

A bet may be for **5 points (Baby Bet)**, **15 points (Little Bet)**, or **30 points (Big Bet)**.

The bets between teams do not have to be equal (*i.e., one team can make a Little Bet while the other makes a Big Bet*). Teams are not required to place a bet. Once declared, a bet may not be retracted or altered by the betting player. A player who has not bet may not do so after playing a card.

If your partner has made a Baby or Little Bet, and you have not played any cards, you may cancel your partner's bet by placing a larger bet of your own (a Little Bet or a Big Bet, respectively). You will now need to go out first for your team's bet to succeed.

Play

Each deal is played over a number of rounds. For the first deal, the player to the dealer's left leads to the first round by playing an opening card combination. This opening combination begins the card pile for the round; all subsequent combinations are played on top of this pile.

Singles

A Single is one card played by itself. When you play a J, Q, or K as a Single, it is played at its printed rank.

Sets

A Set is a group of two or more cards of the same rank (i.e., two or more “of a Kind”). The possible types of Set include:

- ❖ 2 of a Kinds (*pairs*),
- ❖ 3 of a Kinds (*triplets*),
- ❖ 4 of a Kinds,
- ❖ 5 of a Kinds,
- ❖ 6 of a Kinds,
- ❖ 7 of a Kinds,
- ❖ 8 of a Kinds,
- ❖ 9 of a Kinds*,
- ❖ 10 of a Kinds*,
- ❖ 11 of a Kinds*.

Note: The combinations, above, that are denoted with an asterisk () can only be constructed if wildcards are used.*

Sequences

A sequence is a group of three or more Singles, of consecutive rank, sharing the same suit. Examples, would include:

- ❖ 2-3-4,
- ❖ 2-3-4-5,
- ❖ 2-3-4-K-6,
- ❖ 4-J-6-7-Q-9,
- ❖ 10-J-Q,
- ❖ 2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-J-Q-K.

These are just examples; there are many possible Sequences, too many to list them all.

Stairs

A Stair is a group of two or more consecutively ranked Sets. **Each Set in a Stair must share matching suits.** For example, a Pair of 6's and a Pair of 7's would have matching suits if both Sets had Red and Orange as their suits. **The matching suits can include identical suits;** so, Red, Red, Orange can work as matching suits for a Stair of Triplets.

The possible types of Stair are:

- ❖ a Stair of 2 of a Kinds (*Stair*),
- ❖ a Stair of 3 of a Kinds (*Stair of Triplets*),
- ❖ a Stair of 4 of a Kinds,
- ❖ a Stair of 5 of a Kinds,
- ❖ a Stair of 6 of a Kinds,
- ❖ a Stair of 7 of a Kinds,
- ❖ a Stair of 8 of a Kinds.

Court Cards

Each court card (J, Q, or K) can be played as a Single at its printed rank.

One or more court cards may be combined with one or more pip cards to form a Set, Sequence, or Stair. When used to form a combination as a wildcard, a court card may have whichever suit is required and it may stand for any card of **lower or equal rank to itself** (e.g., a J may stand for any rank from 1 to 7 or J but it cannot stand for a Q or K).

When played without pip cards, two or more court cards may ONLY be used to form a Bomb (see below). Otherwise they must be played as Singles.

When the type of a combination played with wildcards is non-obvious, the person playing must declare which type of combination they are playing.

Bombs

There are two families of Bomb: *Pip Bombs* and *Court Bombs*.

Pip Bombs are similar to Sequences, however they may only be formed using 3's, 5's, 7's, and 9's; they must contain all 4 of those ranks and no wildcards. There are two types: a **Rainbow** which must contain **4 different suits** and a **Sequence** which must contain only **one suit**.

Court Bombs are combinations of two or three court cards.

In total, there are 6 bombs. In order, from lowest to highest they are:

- **Rainbow of 3-5-7-9** (*no wild cards*)
- **J-Q**
- **J-K**
- **Q-K**
- **J-Q-K**
- **Sequence of 3-5-7-9** (*no wild cards*)

Playing the Rounds

After leading a combination, play proceeds clockwise with each player having the option to play a higher-ranking combination or pass. Note that a player with a higher combination can choose to pass instead of playing it. A player without a higher combination must pass.

To be higher-ranking, the new combination must be of the exact same type, have the exact same number of cards, and have higher ranking cards. So if a Single is led, only a higher Single can be played; if a Pair is led only a higher Pair can be played; a three-card Sequence can only be beaten by a higher three-card Sequence; and so on.

Bombs are the only exception to this rule. A bomb can be played, in turn-order, to beat any combination except a bomb of the same or higher rank. After a bomb has been played only a higher-ranked bomb may beat it.

Players continue in this manner, playing successively higher combinations of the same size and type, or passing, until a combination is played and all of the other players pass in succession--this ends the round.

A player *goes out* when they have played their last card (*including court cards*). The first player out is called the First Player.

As soon as a player goes out, the round is paused and that player scores 5 times the number of cards in the hand of the opponent who holds the most cards at that time (*including unplayed court cards*).

After the points have been recorded, the round resumes.

A round ends as soon as all players but one have passed in succession or all players on one team have gone out. A player that passes may still play a combination later in that same round.

When the round ends, whoever played the highest combination is the round winner. If the highest combination played was not a bomb, the cards played to the pile are captured by the winner. If the round was won by a bomb, the opponents capture the pile.

The winner leads to start the next round OR, if the round was won with a Bomb, **they may give the lead to their partner**. If the round was not won with a Bomb and the winner has gone out, the player to their left leads.

Ending the Hand

When all players on one team have gone out, both the round and the hand are over. The round ends as soon as the final partner plays their last card. No more cards may be played by the remaining players.

Count the number of cards in the remaining players' hands then put those cards with the First Player's captured cards. If the case of a Slam (see below), you do not need to count the cards.

Scoring

Points are always scored for the following three categories: 1) Cards left in your opponents' hand, 2) Point cards captured during trick play and, at the end of the round, 3) Bets.

1) Cards in Hand

Immediately after a player goes out, and before play resumes, that player's team scores **5 times** the number of cards in the hand of the opponent who holds the most cards at that time (*including unplayed court cards*).

BEWARE: *It is possible for the opposing team's score for cards in hand to be greater than the First Player's, if the First Player's partner is caught holding a lot of cards. Going out first (offensive play) is not the only focus of this game, you need to also focus on shedding cards quickly (defensive play). Relatedly, keep in mind that smart defensive play can significantly reduce the amount that your opponents will score against you even though they've managed to go out before you. You have some control over how badly you might get beaten on any given hand...*

Slam

If the First Player and the second player out are on the same team, the round ends immediately and that team scores a **Slam**: The second player out scores the same amount as the First Player for cards in hand. (*The third and fourth player score nothing for cards in hand*)

2) Captured Cards

Count the number of captured cards. Each team scores one point for each card that they captured.

3) Bets

If a bet was made and the person who placed the bet went out first, that player's team scores **two(2) times the amount bet**. Otherwise the opposing team scores the amount bet. For example: If you made a *Big Bet* and went out first your team would score 60 points; were any other player to go out first your opponents would score 30 points.

Continuing Play

After all the scoring has been recorded, another round begins and new hands are dealt.

The new dealer is the next player (*on the team with the most points*) in turn order from the previous dealer; if there is a tie, the new dealer is the next player in turn order from the previous dealer on the First Player's team.

The player to the left of the dealer leads.

Winning the Game

Play to an agreed-upon number of hands or to an agreed-upon game ending score. A minimum of 4 hands or 350 points is recommended, but shorter or longer games can be played. A full game should be played to 6 hands or 550 points.

Once the agreed-upon number of hands have been played, or one or more players reach or exceed the game-ending score, the player with the most points wins. If the scores are tied, continue playing hands until there is a winner.

Rules Changes For 6 Players

Haggis & Neeps can be played with 6 players. Rules are the same as for 4 players but with the following changes.

Components

Requires 3 copies of each rank, 2 through 10, in four suits (108 pip cards), plus six Jacks, six Queens, and six Kings (18 court cards) for a total of 126 cards.

Seating & Partners

The game is played in fixed partnerships, 3 vs 3. Partners should sit with one opponent on their left and another opponent on their right. From the points of a compass, South will be partnered with the players at NW and NE; North will be partnered with the players at SW and SE.

Card Passing

Each player sends a Message to their left-hand partner by passing one card (face down or face up). After receiving a Message, each player sends a Response to their right-hand partner by passing one card (face down or face up).

Play

With the 12 copies of each rank in the deck, Sets will also include **12 of a Kinds**, **13 of a Kinds**, and **14 of a Kinds**. And Stairs will include a **Stair of 9 of a Kinds**.

Playing the Rounds

If a round is won with a bomb, the winner may lead to start the next round OR they may pass the lead to one of their partners by indicating the chosen partner and saying “You lead”.

Scoring

Slam & Grand Slam

If the First Player and the second player out are on the same team, that team scores a *Slam*: The second player out scores the same amount as the First Player for cards in hand. If the third player out is also on the First Player's team, the team scores a *Grand Slam*: The third player out also scores the same amount as the First Player for cards in hand.

3) Bets

If a bet was made and the person who placed the bet went out first, that player's team scores **three(3) times the amount bet**. Otherwise the opposing team scores the amount bet. For example: If you made a *Big Bet* and went out first your team would score 90 points; were any other player to go out first your opponents would score 30 points.

Winning the Game

A minimum of 3 hands should be played. A full game would be 6 hands. If you prefer to play to a game ending score, try 550 or 650 points.

Haggis & Tatties

A variable-partnership version of Haggis.

(The 3 player rules, Haggis & Tatties, are described first. Rules changes for 5 players will follow.)

A *tattie* is Scots for potato, which is traditionally served with Haggis where it is often accompanied by *neeps* (rutabaga or turnips).

Haggis & Tatties can be played with 3 (or 5) players. Rules are the same as for 4 (or 6) players but with the following changes.

Components

Requires 1 copy of each rank, 2 through 10, in five suits (45 pip cards), plus three Jacks, three Queens, and three Kings (9 court cards) for a total of 54 cards.

Beginning the Round

Deal 3 cards to a kitty (*the Haggis*) and 14 cards face-down to each player.

Declarer Auction

After organizing and assessing their hand, players may bid to become the **Declarer** (*to be the first person to shed all of their cards*). Bidding begins with the **dealer** and continues clockwise. The Declarer will be opposed by the other two players, the **Defenders**.

A bid may be for **15 points**, **30 points**, or **45 points**. A player may bid whichever of these amounts they wish (*E.g., you do not have to bid in order from lowest to highest*), they may potentially match a previous bid, or they may pass. **A player with a lower score may match a bid made by a player with a higher score (say "Match" or "I'll match that"); player's with equal scores need to bid higher or pass.** Once declared, a bid may not be retracted. A player that passes may no longer participate in the bidding process. Bidding proceeds in turn order (clockwise) with players making successively higher bids, matching, or passing until one player has bid and all other players have passed. This ends the bidding. The last player to bid becomes the Declarer. **The Declarer will play first to start the round.**

The Declarer must go out first to win their bid, otherwise the Defenders will split it.

If no players bid, there is no Declarer and the player with the fewest points will play first to start the round; if there is a tie, the first tied-player clockwise from the dealer leads. There will also be no scoring for bids.

Card Exchange

If there is no Declarer, no cards are exchanged.

If the Declarer bid 15, they draw all three (3) cards from the kitty.

If the Declarer bid 30, they draw the top two (2) cards.

If the Declarer bid 45, they draw only the top card.

The Declarer adds the drawn cards to their hand and then discards the same number of cards to the kitty.

The Defenders never exchange any cards.

Playing the Rounds

When the round ends, whoever has played the highest combination becomes the round winner. The round winner captures all cards in the pile **(even if the round was won with a bomb--they do not give the cards to an opponent, they keep the cards for themselves)**.

Winning a round with a bomb does NOT allow you to transfer the lead to another player.

Ending the Hand

Note that, if there is a Declarer, and the Declarer goes out first, the Defenders **DO** continue to play the hand.

When all players but one have gone out, both the round and the hand are over. No more cards may be played by the remaining player.

Scoring

1) Cards in Hand

When any player goes out they score based on the number of cards in the hand of the player (*no matter if they are Defender or Declarer*) who holds the most cards at that time (*including unplayed court cards*).

2) Bids

If there is no Declarer, there is no scoring for Bids.

If the Declarer goes out first, they win **the amount bid (15, 30, or 45)**.

If a Defender goes out first, **that player** scores **two-thirds of the amount bid (10, 20, 30)**; the other Defender scores **one-third of the amount bid (5, 10, 15)**.

3) Captured Cards

The first player out captures the cards in the kitty and the cards remaining in the last player's hand. Count the number of captured cards. Each player scores one point for each card that they captured.

Continuing Play

The new dealer is the player with the most points; if there is a tie, the new dealer is the next player in turn order from the previous dealer.

Winning the Game

A minimum of 6 hands or 250 points is recommended, but shorter or longer games can be played. A full game should be played to 9 hands or 350 points.

Rules Changes For 5 Players

THESE RULES ARE ALPHA. THEY ARE LIKELY TO CHANGE.

Haggis & Tatties can be played with 5 players. Rules are the same as for 3 players but with the following changes.

Components

Requires 2 copies of each rank, 2 through 10, in five suits (90 pip cards), plus five Jacks, five Queens, and five Kings (15 court cards) for a total of 105 cards.

Beginning the Game

Deal 18 cards face-down to each player.

Card Exchange

If there is no Declarer, no cards are exchanged.

Otherwise, the Declarer takes a number of cards from their hand and places those cards face up on the table. Then all of the other players do the same. The Declarer will exchange cards with one of the players and that player will become the Partner. The other players return their cards to their hands. **The Defenders never exchange any cards.**

If the Declarer **bid 15**, they put **three (3) cards** on the table.

If the Declarer **bid 30**, they put **two (2) cards** on the table

If the Declarer **bid 45**, they put **one (1) card** on the table.

Playing the Rounds

Tricks won with a bomb are captured by the bombing player.

If there is a Declarer, any player on the Declarer team that wins a trick with a bomb may either lead to the next trick OR they may pass the lead to their partner. The trick winner still captures all of the cards in the trick.

The Defenders may NOT pass the lead.

Scoring

1) Cards in Hand

If there is no Declarer, there is no scoring for Slams.

Slam

If the Declarer goes out first and their partner goes out second, the partner scores the same amount for cards in hand as the Declarer.

Only the Declarer's Partner can score a Slam and only if the Declarer goes out first.

2) Bids

If there is no Declarer, there is no scoring for Bids.

If the Declarer goes out first, they win **two (2) times the amount bid** while their partner scores **the amount bid**.

If a Defender goes out first, **that player** scores **two-thirds of the amount bid (10, 20, 30)**; the other Defenders each score **one-third of the amount bid (5, 10, 15)**.

If the Partner goes out first, all of the Defenders score **one-third of the amount bid (5, 10, 15)**.

For example, if you were the Declarer and you placed a **bid of 30 points**, and you went out first, you would score **60 points** and your partner would score **30 points**. If you failed to go out first, the Defender that went out first would score **20 points** and each of the other Defenders would score **10 points**.

Winning the Game

Play a minimum of 5 hands. If you prefer to play to a game ending score, try 450 or 550 points.

Credits

Playtesters: Zach Bearinger, Craig Bednar, Sai Beppu, Robert B., Benjamin Chhoa, Emil Conde, Brandon Coonrod, Jay Cormier, Evan Duxbury, Martin Griffiths, Sharon Haimowitz, Craig Hallex, Wendy Hallex, Graeme Jahns, Daniel Kenel, Tori Kenel, Don Kirkby, Al Leduc, Jinpil Lee, Jeremy Lord, Joaquin Lowe, Stephen Mills, Marcel Perro, Dave Peters, Garrett Peterson, Eric Raue, Jeremy Rozenhart, Grayson Scantlebury, Greg Stoddard, Roberta Taylor, Yves Tourigny, Bert Trobaugh, Daniel G. Vieu, Peter Winckles. *<need to add original Haggis playtesters, from end of IBC&C rules>*

Proofreading: Benjamin Chhoa

Development: Graeme Jahns, Mark Klassen, Yves Tourigny (*prototype design and illustration*)



Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike (CC BY-NC-SA)

Designer Notes / Ruminations (Not for publication)

This stuff is mostly for me: to remind myself of why I made a decision, or to remind myself to consider an option...

1. For simplicity's sake, I'm only describing the 4P game in this rules document. I'm intending to have people blind play-test this and I want the rules for the version they will be testing to be as straightforward as possible.
2. Unlike in Tichu, the reward for going out 1-2 is not a fixed amount in Haggis & Neeps: the reward will vary depending upon how well your opponents defend themselves--if they are able to shed many cards, your reward will be less; if you can catch them with many cards still in hand, your reward will be greater. This way, there is opportunity to reward skilful play on the part of the team that does **not** go out first, while still rewarding the team that does go out first.
3. Going out first as a team is rewarded not just in the case where your team goes out 1-2 but also when you go out 1-3 or 2-3 (though, typically, the reward will be greater for going out 1-2). It's not enough for one member of the team to go out first, to maximize your scoring, your partner needs to go out second or third; if they go out fourth, the opponents may end up scoring more for going out as a team than you will for going out first. **I can see people either loving or hating this design decision...**
4. Bombs may be more expensive than you realize. While there are potentially more points to be had by focusing on going out first, more often than not--unless you are betting--the scoring for point cards will be the same or greater than the points scored for cards in hand. I think there will be a lot of bombing in the game, regardless: mostly due to fear. I think the players that can restrain their use of bombs may end up doing better than those who use them more frequently -- but only play-testing will show if this is true...
5. The Stag can be used to pry bombs out of the opponent's hands and deliver a reasonably large number of points to the person who plays it; moreover, if it doesn't get bombed, you still get a fair amount of points and you get the lead! Getting the Stag is fun and yet not overpowering.
6. I like how the Fox is defined as a bomb that cannot be beaten by any other bomb. In theory, this definition ought to eliminate the FAQ in Tichu about whether you can bomb the Dog--here, you can't bomb the Fox because it is a bomb, there is no higher bomb, therefore nothing can be played on top of it. The way passing the lead works for the dog if your partner is already out fits with this idea of Fox as bomb right out of the box (strictly speaking, you wouldn't have to describe the how to handle the situation, the rules already tell you how. It's elegant. Of course, despite this, in practice people *will* still ask if they can bomb the Fox, and who leads if your partner has gone out, it's just the way people are... :/ [EDIT] **Yep :/ Easier to say you pass the card to another player, giving them the lead; they give the card to the opponents so that they capture its points.**
7. At first I added the Stag and Fox to this game so that I could deal out an even number of cards between the players, with none leftover. Now, they are cards I can see adding to the three player game and I can see them making that game better, more interesting (potentially easier to bet in). The Stag could be added to two player, but I don't know how that will change the feel of the game: better or worse? It might unbalance the hands in a way I don't like... The Fox doesn't make sense in two player.
8. I think allowing your partner to raise the bet will reward skilful play. Beyond letting the player with the potentially stronger hand take over the goal of the hand (get me out first instead of you), the Little Bet becomes not just a way for less aggressive players to make less scary bets, it can also be used to convey information to your partner. In particular, I want people to be able to bet before they pass cards, and so send information to their partner about what kind of cards they want passed to them. If my partner makes a Little Bet and I think I can go out first, I can make the Big Bet and take control of the hand: I can signal my intention to raise their bet by passing say a 5 and a 7 or a 3 and a 5 (you want to try to fill their potential rainbow or flush bombs). I'm telling them, I want to go out first and I want you to stay strong enough to go out second. I think the potential for signalling between partners will be greater in this game than in Tichu (not least of which, because you are passing two cards instead of one).
9. People who play Tichu may complain that the card passing is not done between opponents. I don't see any point in doing it here. In Tichu, passing cards to opponents is tension-filled (and, as such, interesting) because there is a chance that your card could be the one that fills a bomb for them. In Haggis & Neeps, the only cards that might fill a bomb are odd number cards so, to avoid filling a bomb in your opponent's hand, you just never pass an odd card to the opponents--not ever. It's just that simple. And because of this, there is almost no tension in the decision (you might fill some other combo but, compared to a bomb, you almost always will not care). It barely matters at all, so why even bother. The more important passing is between partners, where you tell them a bit about the strength of your hand while also trying to fill a bomb in theirs. So, passing two cards to your partner is twice as interesting! Why not three cards? I think it changes the hands too much, in particular it really can put a lot of power into one hand--over-tipping the balance more than I'd like. So, I'm going with passing two at this point.
10. I like the deck configuration. It keeps the range in the ranks restricted so that the chances for being dealt cards that will string together to make larger Sequences or Stairs (with or without wildcards) is more likely. I really enjoy seeing larger Stairs getting played (he played a Stair of 7 of a Kinds!!! BAM!)--just as long as they aren't played against me ... ;)

11. The game ending score is higher because there are more points available in the game, per hand. A typical game should last between 4 to 8 hands. The worst case longest game is 13 hands (Tichu is 20, well, technically its Infinite, but 20 works if you don't allow negative scoring, so 13 is pretty darn acceptable...).
12. It's easier to see when you can bet in this game than it is in 3 player. Despite there being even more bombs. I plan with the expectation that my partner will get the lead back to me at least once--if not, what kind of partner are they?!? :P
13. For version 0.4, removed description of Fox as being Bomb-like -- as expected, it just confused people. Simplified scoring for cards in hand by eliminating the case that had a team going out 2-4 scoring zero points--they now score card in hand points for the second player out. Everybody that goes out scores for cards in hand and, unless it is a Slam, they all score using the same formula. I also reworded the Slam: rather than scoring $10 \times \# \text{cards in hand for shepherd}$, i just say the shepherd's partner scores the same amount as the shepherd did for cards in hand, which amounts to the same thing but doesn't introduce a special case formula for scoring calculation.
14. For version 0.4, I also split the combinations from being just sets, sequences, and bombs, to being Singles, Sets, Sequences, Stairs, and Bombs because there are a surprising number of people who apply generalized rules that, when applied, describe the specific rule in a given case: people need the specific rules for specific cases... Anyway, I also spelled out explicitly what all of the possible types are (3 of a Kind, Stair of 6 of Kind, etc), so that there's no confusion (the player aid really needs to be updated to be this explicit).
15. Version 0.2 had 5 suits, one Stag and **3 Foxes**--I was trying to have an even distribution of cards between the players (no leftovers) while also trying to keep the Pip Cards closely clustered (so that larger combinations occur naturally with greater frequency). I also thought it would let people help their partner more often. It wasn't too bad if you got dealt two foxes, it meant you could help get the lead to your partner twice. But getting 3 Foxes was very frustrating. Also, if you still had more than one Fox, after helping your partner get out, that was frustrating as well.
16. **Why does this game not have Full Houses?** Essentially, they are too easy to make (occurring naturally too frequently, not requiring wildcards to make them), they get rid of a lot of cards and they don't put much pressure on the players to spend wild cards in trying to form them--whereas forming a Stair of 3 of Kinds is more likely to require a wild card (particularly due to the suit restrictions) and so delivers more tension in the game. I think of Full Houses in climbing games as escape valves, they release the pressure (the tension) out of the game. I want the game to be tense. With regard to tension, Haggis is almost like playing a Tichu, every hand (and most of the time that is true even when you are not betting--when you bet the tension is even more, especially in 3P).
17. One thing that came out of the playtest on May 1st, 2018: **This game really needs a specialized scoring pad**--there's so many numbers, so much going on. A well-designed scoring pad would make things easier.
18. Jay recommended I get the point card total to be 75, rather than 74 (as it is in v 0.3). If I make the Fox worth 4 points and the Stag 7; or make the Fox 3 and the Stag 8, this can be done. Trouble is, it makes the game ending score in 3 player, once I've added the Stag and Fox to that game, 61. Can't vary the value of a card based on number of players, as the point values are printed on the cards....You push in one place, and it goes up in another--whack-a-mole on a waterbed... In any case, I'm making that change: it makes it easier to have one team total up their point cards and then find out the other teams point card total by just using subtraction.
19. I'm seriously considering moving to poker chips for scoring. In which case, I will eliminate the point cards. Instead there will be a pot for each round that gets antes and you add chips to the pot whenever you play a face card or a special card (not just when you play a bomb). Essentially, I'd look to take out the points on the odd numbered cards, replacing those amounts with the ante, and potentially charging players to play the Rainbow or Flush bomb... At this point, the game will be not quite Haggis anymore, and I'd likely look to publish it under a different title (possibly linked as a reimplementations in the BGG index). Of course, I would provide 2 and 3 player rules for playing with poker chips as well...
20. It would be good to split the antes into three successively smaller piles: the first player out would take the largest pile, the second out gets the next size pile, and the third player out gets the smallest. This would be similar to the common point card distribution captured by these players (using the point cards as they are now). The antes would only cover the points on the odd number cards, not the face or special cards. I'd probably scale the scoring down by a multiple of 5, so the 24, let's say 25, total points for odd rank point cards would boil down to 5 points. I'd want to make it an even number, so that each team contributed the same amount. Perhaps I can move it up to 6 points, each team puts in 3 chips, which get split into piles of 3, 2, and 1 chip. First player out gets 3, and so on.
21. I'd want to keep the amount of chip-cashing (exchanging larger value chips for the equivalent amount in smaller value chips, and vice-versa) to a minimum...
22. Playing a bomb costs what? Probably simplest to just make them all cost the same. Face cards are worth 40 points total in 4P. scale it down by 5, we get 8. Divide that by 4 and you get the relative value of a J-Q-K bomb, which is 2 chips. Perhaps make the face card bombs all cost 2 chips and the odd card bombs cost 1. The Stag is worth 2 chips (person who wins a trick with the stag gets 2 chips from opponents) and the Dog costs one chip to play... Something along these lines may work better than pen and paper scoring...
23. Jay suggested having increasing blinds to force the game to come to end. I'm not sure that's necessary... A fixed number of hands (say, 6) or one team wins all of the chips will get you to a game end just as surely.

24. The Fox and the Stag were chosen to represent, essentially, Tichu's Dog and Dragon, because these are animals from Scotland. The fox is crafty and so is passing the lead to your partner (plus its doggish...), the Stag is/was the ultimate animal to hunt (in particular 5+ year olds with 10+ point antlers). These older, larger Stags are called Harts. So, I'm also considering calling the cards the Hart and the Hound, and just straight up using a Dog for Haggis & Neeps version of Tichu's Dog... At first I was going to use a Pope and a Page, because what outranks a King? a Pope. And who passes things around in a castle? a Page. And they both start with the letter P, so it sounds cool. Unfortunately(?), Scotland is mostly Protestant/Presbyterian so they don't have the Pope. They have Deacons. Ugh. "And then he played the Deacon...". Meh. So, Animals.
25. Jay recommended adding a warning to players to be mindful of the card in hand points so that they aren't only focused on going out first. Since a lot of the audience of this game will be people familiar with Tichu, they will frequently just play on Tichu-auto-pilot and learn the hard way that you can't play Haggis in exactly the same way, or you'll get crushed...
26. This game is thinky-er than Tichu. It's more tense. It has more opportunities to reward skilful play and punish poor play. It has a larger decision space, so just mathematically it's heavier and deeper. But then so is Haggis for 2 or 3 and it gets lighter weight ratings than Tichu. It's silly. Anyway, the question is, do people want a heavier climbing game than Tichu...? I really think they might not... there is a lot of bombin' goin' on...
27. With the extra set of face cards provided by the 4 player game, I wonder what 3 player would be like if you replace betting with bidding (15/30/50) to be the soloist (ala Dou Di Zhu/Chimera) but also supplied the soloist with those 3 extra face cards as a dummy partner: you could not combine the dummy cards with your hand (you'd set them up across the table where a partner would have been sitting), but you could only use it to play singletons or a bomb, perhaps getting you one or two extra leads; if the dummy gets you the lead, you lead from your own hand, not from the dummy (*that would be dumb<insert groan here>*)...
28. Related to 3 player, regardless of anything else and just as a reminder to myself, based on my trying to model the games scoring with poker chips, I've discovered and decided that the score for succeeding at a bet needs to be doubled: Little Bet pays 30, Big Bet pays 60. Potentially Mega Bet pays 100... Failed bets still only award the amount bet to the opponents... I got that design decision wrong. Needs to be fixed. This is a breaking (*backwards incompatible*) change for the app (*at least, not by the original developer*), which is unlikely to be updated, so that's a concern...
29. If I really wanted to do the 3 player auction fairly, the trailing player should be able to just match a player with a higher scores' bid, the leading player would have to up their bid to take the auction...
30. Oh, and winning the auction wins you the first lead...
31. It seems fair to give the soloist a boost with the dummy face cards: they *are* competing against two sets of face cards after all...
32. Could I let the opposing team in 3-player score a Slam.? No. Partnerships are temporary. If I go out first a Slam does not benefit me, it only benefits my partner who, ultimately, is my adversary...
33. **Playtest 08 May 2018 (4P Haggis & Neeps w/ Chips):** Poker chip scoring did not go well. It's too fiddly, it's too easy to forget to make the payments, it introduces complications that don't exist with pen & paper scoring (low chip count not allowing you to pay for bet or points in tricks, yet you are technically not beaten yet so the hand should be carried out). I think it's better to just make as good of a scoring pad as I can and move forward with that...
34. One thing we didn't try was to just make the pot for a trick a fixed amount, say 5, and don't worry about which cards are used to make the trick. It takes away some of the experience from Haggis where you try to judge whether playing a bomb is worth the points you're giving away. In this case, the points you're giving away would be fixed. The amount to which it would need to be fixed in order to make players hesitate to play a bomb would need to be determined... This doesn't solve the end game issues of running of chips but it would simplify things.
35. In 2P or 3P, everyone would have their own set of chips, but in 4P, it doesn't make sense for everyone to have them, you need a Banker on each team. But, then you miss out on the natural move of the person who is betting slides out their chips to show their betting; here your partner says they bet and then you slide the chips over to them. It's more awkward this way... I'm not liking poker chips for scoring at this point...
36. **October 2018, Version 0.5.0:** I've gone and started to make changes to these rules based on the development of Rooster. In particular, the card passing has changed to be like Rooster's. Additionally, the Fox's power has been changed from Tichu's Dog to Tichu's Sparrow. The Fox now calls for a rank between 2 and 10 and the next player who can answer the call must, either with a single or with a bomb. The game essentially functions like Rooster, now, but it has a different card distribution, fewer bombs, and fewer Court Cards.
37. Note to self: For 6 players, with hand size of 14, I'll need a deck with **9 suits** (9 ranks * 9 suits = 81) + 3 special cards (81+3=84). I've got the Fox and Stag. I can't add a second Fox, it doesn't make sense. I could add a second Stag, but that will mean you'll be able to play a pair of Stags, which is an exceptional case from 3 and 4 player. Or, I could come up with another special powered card (but what?). The point total for the deck, without specials, will be $9*4$ (pips) = 36 + $10*6$ (courts) = 60 => 96. If the Fox is worth 6 (as it would be in 4 player), you have 102 points instead of a nice 100 or 110 points. So, either we have an ugly point total (I don't want that), or we have a card that has different value at different player count (not exactly happy with that), or we add a card that is worth 8 points (-2 points would also work, but I will not have negative points in the game). **The cleanest thing seems to be to add a 3rd special that is worth 8 points....**
38. **27 October 2018, Version 1.0.0. Added 3P Rules. Rules for 5 and 6 player will follow shortly. The game for 4P and 6P is Haggis & Neeps (betting, no auction). The game for 3P and 5P is Haggis & Tatties (auction for first lead and**

Dummy). The game for 2P and 3P (5 suits, no dummy) without partners is your classic Haggis. I may make 4P and 6P variants of that game as well (5P, I don't know). Finally, I can make Haggis, Neeps & Tatties (Burns' Supper?) which would be fixed partnerships, fixed dummy, for 3P and 5P (one person/team plays the entire game with the Dummy as a partner; preferably a strong player--with a weaker partner in 5P). I think Haggis, Neeps & Tatties would also be a version where you auction for lead in 4P/6P as well, and the Declarer's partner plays as Dummy, same as in Bridge. I'm not sure about whether 6P should have 1 or 2 Dummy hands.... Probably 2, as the goal is to have people aware of half the deck during play....

39. For 5P Haggis & Tatties, I'm envisioning all players choosing two cards to pass. putting them face down on the table, then Declarer is passed 4 face-up cards (passed in a way that makes it clear where the card came from), one card from each of the other players, selected from the cards they placed on the table earlier. The Declarer looks at each card and then chooses one to add to their hand and then they pass, face-down, one of the cards they placed on the table over to the player who supplied the card the Declarer chose to keep. This player is Declarer's partner, along with the Dummy. The other players, take back the card they passed and then they pass both of the cards they placed on the table earlier, one card to each of their new partners. They then select two more cards to pass, one to each partner. Meanwhile, the Declarer and their partner can exchange one further card, from their hand--not their cards that are still on the table. The Declarer picks up the Dummy, organizes the hand, then selects one card from it, replacing the chosen card with their card from the table. They then pass the Dummy to their partner, who exchanges their card from the table with one card from the Dummy. Finally, the Declarer's partner arranges the dummy, face up, in columns, organized by rank then by suit. It's a bit involved to describe, but in practice it should be easy enough to perform. For six player it is much simpler: each player passes one card to each of their partners; they then pass another card to each of their partners. Done. You are sending signal cards to both partners and then sending response cards to both partners. The tricky thing, for me, at this point is--how do the Declarer and their partner interact with the Dummy? Does only the Declarer play cards from the Dummy? That would be simplest. In which case, the Dummy should be positioned to the Declarer's left, after their left Defender, and the Declarer's partner should be seated to the Declarer's right, after the Declarer's right Defender. If you imagine a compass: Declarer is at S, Dummy at NW, Partner at NE; Defenders are at SW, N, and SE.
40. Next issue, can the Declarer and their partner discuss what to play from the Dummy? No? I'm not sure. If they don't discuss their own hands but only the cards in the Dummy, is that giving an unfair advantage? It may be--if you advise the Declarer to play a Bomb from Dummy you are telling them something about your hand (depending on the context). Now, the exchange of information is open, so everyone can hear it, which means they too can interpret the meaning of the exchange. I don't know. Usually table talk is discouraged in serious card games, so I'm leaning towards not letting there be a discussion...
41. In 5P Haggis, Neeps & Tatties, I'm envisioning fixed partnerships (2 + Dummy) vs 3. In that version of the game, who controls the Dummy? There's no Declarer in this version, so it can't be that. If a player bets, it seems to make sense that they control the Dummy. That's fine. If neither bets, what then? If this team has the initial lead for the deal, then perhaps the player who makes this lead controls the Dummy. Otherwise, the first partner, in turn order, from whomever leads first controls the Dummy for that deal. This is the ugliest version of the game, for sheer number of exceptional cases....
42. **It might be worthwhile to include a Dealer marker of some kind, to keep track of who dealt (and, by this, who deals next).**
43. 5P Haggis, no Dummy, would need $8 \text{ suits} * 9 \text{ ranks} = 72 \text{ card} + 3 \text{ specials} = 75 \text{ cards} / 5 \text{ players} = 15 \text{ cards/hand}$. With 3 Court Cards per player, you have 15 more cards for a total deck size of 90. Points in the deck would be $8*4 + 10*5 + 6 + ? = 88 + ?$. To have 90 points, we need a special card worth 2 points. But, in 6 player, we need a Special card worth 8 points to have an even 110 points.... Rooster's point system and deck configuration (7 ranks essentially doubled per player + 6 courts = 20 cards per player) make getting points for captured cards be a number divisible by 10 so much easier than Haggis with it's point cards and 9 ranks... It is **not** elegant... Hm. 9 ranks doubled per player would require hand size of 18(!). That's pretty big. Tarot cards would help, but still.... In any case, there would then be 8 pip card points per player. The face cards are currently worth 10 per player, so that would be 18 points per player total. If I want 20 per player, I'd need to add 2 points into the Court Cards: J(2), Q(4), K(6), for 12 points per court card set. So, we would for 2P, 4 suits; 3P, 6 suits; 4P, 8 suits; 5P, 10 suits; 6P, 12 suits. 2P, 40 points; 3P, 60 points; 4P, 80 points; etc... Given a do-over, I would probably be strongly tempted to go this way. The bigger hand size would skew the game balance even more significantly towards leaving people holding lots of cards ($21*5=105$ points; now its $17*5=85$); with slams in the higher player counts, you're looking at 210 (3P/4P) and 315 (5P/6P); right now its (170 and 255, which is still HUGE!).
44. Need to reconsider the game ending score for Neeps, Tatties, and N&T, given the scoring for Slams... I want card points, betting, and points per card in hand to be roughly equivalently, on average. In 2P Haggis, you have 36 card points, bet of 30, typically 20 to 40 points for cards in hand. On average you would get half of each of those amounts per hand ($17+15+15=47$ points per hand, so about 7 to 8 hands to get to 350 for the win). In Neeps, we have 70 points for point cards ($6*4 + 4*10 + 6$); we have bet 30, and probably 40 to 90 points for cards in hand, on average, call it 60. This would have us at roughly 35, 15, 35. **It's clear that we need a 3rd betting amount for 3P and 4P, looks like 60 points.** Alternatively, we pay double for made bets and only penalize the amount bet if you fail.... In any case, we probably need a 4th amount for 5P/6P... $9*4 + 6*10 = 96$, I'd say 60 to 120 points for cards in hand, or about 90 on average, so the 4th bet should probably be 100. The game ending scores will need to be calculated as well. Let's see, for 3/4P we're think about 90 points per hand on average * say 6, would be 540, so I'd say either 500

or 600 would be a long game score. With 5P/6P, your looking at about 150×6 or 900 points, so somewhere in 800, 900, or 1000 points. BUT. Worst case longest game for these higher player counts would be.... I need to calculate these....Time to break out the spreadsheet...

45. A different way to consider game ending score is to say the most you can score in one hand should not be greater than 60% of the game ending score. In 2P Haggis, that's $36+30+85=151$; divide by 0.6 to get around 250 points. For Haggis' long game you're at about 43% of game ending score, if you get the most points possible. So, then, let's just say whatever the biggest score is for 4P and 6P, we double it to get out game ending score, then we need to see what the worst case longest games are to those amounts.
46. For 4P, most can score is $70 + (85 + 85) + 60 = 300$. For 6P, it's $96 + (85+85+85)+100=451$. By Haggis scoring, we could say that 500 and 750 would be good game ending scores for 4P and 6P.
47. Worst case longest game happens when players evenly split point cards (or, take all point cards every N hands, where N is number of players); nobody ever bets; you only ever leave players holding one card, and you alternate who scores this amount (so, again, divided by N). In 2P, that's $17 + (5/2) = 19.5$ points. Worst case longest game is 12 to 18 hands. Tichu is around 20 (or infinity, if you consider the negative point values). Let's see: with 4P we're looking at points split between teams ($70/2=35$) and alternating going out 1-3 (10 points) and 2-4 (5 points). So, $35+(15/2) = 42.5$. If we set the game ending score at 500, worst case it will take about 11 hands to finish. This is inline with our scoring for worst case shortest game. So that's great.
48. It's good to keep in mind that with more players, each deal is going to take longer, so it's better if the worst case longest games are shorter with higher player counts. In 6P, we have $(96/2=48) + (15+10=25/2=12.5) = 60.5$. So, 500 or 600 works fine here. But that makes the max score (451) be 75% of game end, which is high. 750 would be better, but we're pushing longest game in 12 to 13 hand territory. So, maybe 700? If we go with existing Haggis scoring, were looking at 250/350 for 2P/3P; 350/550 for 4P; 550 to 750 for 6P. Or we simplify and say 300, 500, 700. (I think you really need to explicitly tell people it's okay to play to a shorter game ending score and give them a number--otherwise they tend to play the long game and that does not suit them so they think the game is too long and complain.
49. People are used to Haggis' 250/350 end game score by now (it's been nearly 9 years). So, 350/550 and 550/750 seem natural.
50. 28 Oct 2018, Version 1.1.0: Game end scores will be 350/550 and 550/750. These will usually be about 3-5 hands or 6-8 hands.
51. **28 Oct 2018: Update**--I think what I imagine as working, theoretically, for 3P/5P may not work out in practice due sheerly to usability--you just cannot effectively manage a Dummy that is across the table from you; if it is near you, it will not be in turn order, so it will be easy to forget to play it that way... I may need to consider having a variant of Neeps, 4 and 6 players, that exposes a Dummy and has the player seated at Dummy make Declarer's plays for them. So, Bridge... I'm okay with having that 4P variant, but I really wish I could make this physically work for 3P...
52. Actually, it's not that bad... The image to the right is me playing French Rooster (double deck, French suited cards). As Declarer, I'm South, Dummy is North, and the Defenders are West and East, in turn order. My cards are bottom right, with my court set up on my right hand instead of directly in front of me. Everyone else does the same thing, so West's Court Cards are bottom left, Dummy's are top Left and East's are to Right. They are oriented differently, and they are always on your right, so you can't really mix them up with the other player's Court Cards. The Dummy display doesn't take that much room and I can reach the cards easily... So, it looks like this can work!
53. After thinking about it, I believe it would make more sense for everyone to **keep their Court Cards on their left**: this way, the Court Cards for the Dummy are placed to the right of the 7's in the display, where they belong (according to their ranks). See [example on Twitter](#).
54. Serious card players eschew table talk. But I don't know. I kind of like having some kind of table talk that let's the partnership aspect of the game grow. Something like "Bomb it!", "Don't Bomb it." seems harmless enough. If I get to H: N & T for 4P, where the partner is sitting out just playing as directed, personally I'd like that player to be able to discuss with Declarer (maybe only if asked?) what the best play might be--they are partners after all, they should work together. I'm going back and forth on this table talk issue...
55. I'm thinking the 3rd special, for 5-6P, could be a Chevalier (or Cavalier). This card would be worth 4 points (J=2, Q=3, C=4, K=5), it would rank ..., J, Q, C, K, A. The Chevalier (C), aka a Knight, is not in its traditional position (J, C, Q, K), but that's okay--the idea that the Knight has come between the King and the Queen makes me think of Queen Guinevere, Sir Lancelot, and King Arthur (the Jack might be Gawain?). The purpose of the C card is to allow a new way to pressure players to play a wild card, in this case the K. **The C is not part of any bomb, it has a wild suit but not a wild rank**, same as the Stag and Fox, so it can



be part of a Sequence (10-J-Q-C, C-K-A). But I would like this to still be okay: 10-J-Q-K and Q-K-A. There's no issue with the first one, technically that would be 10-J-Q-C, where K acts as C. It's the Q-K-A that doesn't fit the existing rules and would require an exception to include it. That is a bit ugly. Maybe I need to find some other purpose for the Stag, rather than ranking as an animal?

56. If the Fox did not have a point card value, adding the C at 4 points, brings the point card total for the 5P and 6P deck to an even 100 points. Which is great. But I wanted the Fox to round out the value of the 3P and 4P deck; if it has a value there, it should have the same value in 5P/6P, but that would make the total 106, which sucks. Argh... Maybe we have 2 Fox cards, one to use in 3P/4P and a different one to use in 5P/6P? I think I'd make the Fox worth 10 in 5P/6P.
57. An alternative would be to make the Stag worth 2, the C worth 4 and use those two cards in 3P/4P then add the Fox in for 5P/6P with a value of 8. I don't know. I don't much like that. The Stag just naturally seems like it should be the most valuable card. I'm reluctant to make it the highest value card because the only person that can score its points is the person to whom it is dealt (it would have to be bombed, and bombs go to the opponents). **I could make the Stag an exception: If a bombed trick contains the Stag, the trick winner captures the trick. Or, I could make it that you can keep a bombed trick if it has any of the Special cards in it...** This would essentially be the reverse of how the Dragon works in Tichu.... If I did this, I would want the Stag to be worth 6, 8 or 10 points. Probably 8. If the Stag is 6, the C cannot be used with it in 3P/4P and the Fox would need to be worth Zero, otherwise the card point total would be 74 (with Stag and C). If the Stag is worth 8, the card total is at 72 (6+8) before the other specials come in. For symmetry, top rank and bottom rank worth same amount, we could have the Fox be worth 8, which brings the total to 80. For 5P/6P, these two cards brings the point total to 112. If I go with what seems natural, the C worth 4, the total is 116, which sucks. **Or, I make all 3 specials worth 8 points, in which case, the total is 120, which is better.**
58. I think that's it: All 3 specials are worth 8 points, and if you bomb a trick with an animal, you can keep the trick.
59. If you included all 3 of these cards in 2P Haggis, the point card total would be 36+24 = 60 points (which is actually really good...). I think you'd want to increase the hand size, so that the Haggis isn't 11 cards. It would be 15 or 16. 3P Haggis, not Tatties, would have the same hand size. Unfortunately, adding these 3 specials to standard 3P makes the point card total 74 (when it had been a nice even 50 before)... While I think adding the 3 specials to standard Haggis would be an interesting variant, it would make for a very different feel to the game and I don't know (until I try, whether that feel is better than the original).
60. One change that might be made to standard 3P Haggis would be to have the auction for lead, then let the Defenders pass cards as we have in N&T. The Declarer would pick up the Haggis and exchange one card (when you can pick the card you want, you don't need to signal for it, you get just what you want, so I think it's fair that the Declarer exchanges one card while the Defenders exchange two). Still, I'm not sure having this additional variant is worth the additional rules complexity it would bring...
61. **30 Oct 2018: Version 1.2.0.** The Stag and Fox are worth 8 points. A bombed trick that contain the Stag or Fox is kept by the trick winner, they **do not** give the cards to their opponents. This may tempt players to bomb earlier, or hold off bombing until these cards arrive in play...
62. Is it worth considering letting the Stag and Fox be a bomb? All other point cards are used to make bombs... What about the Chevalier? Would I really want to add four more bombs? XC, XA, CA, XCA. That last one is worth 24 points! Where would the bombs rank in this new 10-bomb hierarchy? I don't think it's worthwhile doing this. I like the idea of letting these cards make bombs something that scores for the bomb player more than I like the idea of keeping symmetry with the other point cards...
63. If I'm making all of the Special Cards worth 8 points, and I think I am, then I don't think the 3rd card should be a Chevalier, I think it should be another animal, native to Scotland. This makes the Special Cards consistent and it also eliminates the confusion of having a Court Card that is actually not a Court Card. I still think it should rank between the Queen and the King--I want to tempt people to play their King as a Single, or encourage them to play a bomb, to get the 8 points (maybe 16, if the Fox is in the trick). Candidates for third animal are Pine Marten (a kind of Badger/Otter), or Red Squirrel. The Pine Marten (or Marten) is pretty distinctly Scottish, as is the Red Squirrel. I think more people would know what a Squirrel is... Both of these animals are prey for Foxes, so it doesn't make sense for the Fox to be the lowest ranked Special Card, this new animal would belong in that position.
64. Maybe it's not worth having the wishing abilities for the Fox (or whatever). Maybe it makes more sense to let the Marten/Squirrel rank above the Jack, the Fox above the Queen, the Stag above the King. That would be simple AND it would give you three levers against player's Court Cards... (two levers in 3P/4P).
65. **30 Oct 2018. Version 1.3.0.** The Fox and Stag can only be played as Singles. They rank ...J < Q < X < K < A. This simplifies the rules quite a bit and ranking these cards in this way gives us a good way to try to pry wild cards away from opponents. With Marten (or whatever), the ranking becomes: --- J < M < Q < F < K < A
66. What I know for certain about the Special Cards is this: I need two for 3P/4P and their point total needs to be either 6 or 16; I need three for 5P/6P and their point total needs to be either 14 or 24. I think I want to use them as outlined in Note 65 above, but I'm open to ideas for other uses, powers...
67. 30 Oct 2018. **Playtest.** 4P. Using two specials as outlined in note 65. The A was okay. The F, not so much. It may have been the combination of the two working to do the same thing. Playing the Fox was not interesting and the Stag wasn't that exciting. 8 points is too high, it changes play behaviour too much. Having an exceptional case for a bomb where the winner keeps the trick isn't worth the extra rule. I would say neither card really improved the experience. I still need two cards that make the game

interesting. The point values for the cards should sum to 6 (2+4, 3+3). The thing that's troubling me is the game is struggling to fit together whereas Rooster just works. Beyond that, I have concerns about play length—today's test took 40 minutes to play 3 hands—which is way too long. Also, really, Rooster is more interesting with its 6 court cards. Plus, counting cards is so much simpler, smoother, and quicker than pulling out point cards then adding them up. This game could be good but I think Rooster is great. I'm not sure if Haggis for more than 3P is worth it... I'm mostly trying to do it because I think I can, not because I think it will be better than Rooster. The thing Haggis has is that it is better than Rooster at 2P and it offers a different experience at 3P that is also good.

68. If we just reimplement Haggis as Rooster, I think that would be better than trying to fit Rooster into Haggis. What I mean is it would be okay to include four 8s, 9s, and 10s, so you could play a form of Haggis in Rooster at 2P. You really need the 9 ranks, I feel, at 2P.
69. I think Haggis should maybe remain as it is, just 2&3P. Rooster can be 3-6. But I really need to limit the number of hands to 4-6 at most, otherwise it's just too long.
70. Players were left holding 4,4(Slam); 8, 1, 1; 7, 11, 7. A little over 5 cards on average. $40+50+125=215/3 \approx 70$ points per hand. 3 scores per hand, so about 23 points per score or 4-5 cards on average, as said before. This is inline with Haggis 2P. Rooster is getting similar numbers, for me.
71. 31 Oct 2018. Next test, I will use identical Special Cards, **the Fool**. Each Fool is worth 8 points. They are wild. They can have any rank from 2 to K. **They can be used as wild cards to form bombs, including Court Bombs**. So, you can play 3-X-7-9, or J-X, or Q-X, X-K, J-Q-X, etc... Huge power, but they make bombs even more expensive. If you play two together, need to decide: does this mean you've played a Q-K or should this be its own bomb? If it's its own bomb, where should it rank? It's worth 16 points, so it seems like it should out rank J-Q-K. Not sure if I want it to beat a flush bomb... but it kind of seems like it should... In 6P, you have 3 of these. If X-X is a bomb, X-X-X (24 points!) is a higher bomb. I'm thinking, these two should be the highest bombs.
72. **31 Oct 2018. Version 1.4.0.** The special cards are Fools, ranked below 2 (as natural Singles or Pairs), but they are wild and can be substituted for any rank from 2 to 10. **This includes being substituted to form Rainbow and Flush Bombs**. They cannot be used to form any of the Court Bombs. Seems promising, on paper...
73. 8 November 2018. Version 1.4.1. Removed example of passing convention. Tichu doesn't recommend one, so maybe I should let people come up with their own. Also, I've had play-testers say they found it confusing.... In practice, it has worked quite well for asking for and receiving cards that fill bombs, but I'm not sure I should try to steer people into one system... The alternative though, is first time players will be completely at sea with their first messages.... Maybe a rules appendix with one possible convention for people starting out?
74. 25 January 2019. Version 1.5.0. Robbie Burns Day. Have one Fool per suit. So, 6 Fools. Each Fool has its suit, but its rank is 3/5/7/9. It can be played as any of those ranks, but its suit is fixed. It can be used to form bombs. It **MUST** be played with at least one Pip Card. It is worth 1 point.
75. 31 January 2019. Version 1.6.0. Have only 2 Fools, Fools have wild suits but can only have rank 3, 5, 7, or 9.
76. Note to self: Based on weight tossing events in Highland Games, the Court Card bombs could be named the Sheaf/Bale (J-Q), the Stone (J-K), the Hammer (Q-K), and the Caber (J-Q-K). Rainbow, Sheaf, Stone, Hammer, Caber, Flush.
77. Been playing Guan Dan, Throwing Eggs. Feel like I could make Haggis-ish version where you don't have to hold quite so many cards in your hand--some would be on the table...
78. 25 January 2020. Version 1.7.1. When a Defender goes out, BOTH Defenders score for Card in Hand. The only differentiator would be for Captured Card points.
79. 24 May 2020. I'm not sure it's worthwhile bringing Haggis up to these player counts, mostly because counting up all of these point cards gets tedious but also because adding special cards in just so that the hands deal out evenly at different player counts feels like such a hack. I think I'd be better off making a nearly identical game but one that does not use point cards; instead it works like Rooster with one point per card captured. Also, like Rooster, it scales to the player count by adding and removing whole suits. To do this for a double-deck Haggis (or an 8 suit Haggis?), you would have a hand of 18 cards--which is a lot for almost anyone who did not grow up playing Guan Dan. [Custom Domino Playing Cards](#) maybe a solution.
80. 29 May 2020. Version 2.0.0. Adopting 4 suits doubled for 4P and 4 suits tripled for 6P, though I still need to try 6 suits doubled. Dropped the Fool card and moved to Rooster-style bombs. Dropped card points for higher player count and just count 1 point per captured card (all of the arithmetic was tedious). Adopting [Tripe rules](#) for Haggis & Tatties (3P Auction). Essentially, we're moving to a Rooster and Haggis hybrid.
81. 04 June 2020. I think I could get away with dropping point cards from 2P as well. Right now, I don't need them for any player count above 2. It makes for a slightly different feel but the results are pretty much the same with or without point cards. I feel like I'd maybe I should just stop Haggis and rebrand as Rooster with this game system.
82. 09 June 2020, Version 2.1.0: Added a rule that allows a partner who has not played cards to overcall a partner who has made a smaller bet.
83. 09 June 2020. Version 2.2.0: Removed "The Haggis". Hand size is 18 (+3 wilds) at all player counts other than 2. If I want 18 cards in hand for all player counts, I'd need a 5th suit for 2P and the Haggis would have 9 cards.

84. I'm a little torn on removing the Haggis. I do think it's better to not have few or zero "unknown" cards in a serious card but I did like that every player count would be consistent in having a Haggis (if not consistent in its size). I am also still concerned about a hand size of 18 cards.
85. For the 5P game, I think I need 5 bids, but I'm not sure how I want to get there: 1) I could do 15/30/50/75/100, but the amount of points the declarer would score will get quite high (for a 100 bid played with a partner, they would get 200 and the partner would get 100; if they play alone, the declarer could score 400); if I want to keep scoring reigned-in, I can do 10/20/30/40/50, but then I should do this for all player counts, so as to have a consistent system. Actually, the easiest is to use the first model and require the declarer to choose a partner (simply to keep the scoring somewhat reigned-in). It's a little unfortunate that I named these lower bets; adding new bets without names feels wrong, but giving the higher bets names is awkward... I could remove the names for the bets from all player counts...
86. For 5P: You have an auction, if there is a declarer, the exchange is used to select a partner. The declarer puts a card face up on the table--this is their Message asking for a specific rank. The other 4 players put cards on the table, one card face up the other face down--the face up card is their Response to the Declarer; the face down card is a Message. The Declarer chooses to exchange face up cards with another player; this player is now the Declarer's partner. The Declarer then takes their partner's face down card, adds it to their hand and sends a face down response. The remaining 3 players are the Defenders. They may retrieve the face up card, if they wish, and then they pass cards as in the 6P game.
87. I've restored the game to Version 2.1.0, where there is a Haggis at each player count and the hand size is 16 cards.
88. 09 June 2020. Version 2.3.0. Added first draft of 5P rules. Needs testing. Some of the scoring situations may be awkward.
89. 09 June 2020. Just added the tiny amount of rules needed to play Haggis, Neeps & Tatties (Fixed partnerships with Declarer auction).
90. 11 June 2020. Version 2.4.0. Removed the Haggis from all player counts (other than 2P). Made cards in hand 18 cards at all player counts. Removed any bids or bets above 50. Added a Solo bid options to 5P. Moved the flush bomb back to where it belongs above the JQK and removed the Stair bombs. Currently considering the reintroduction of the Rainbow bomb. This will require 6 suits in the 3 and 6 player game.
91. 5 July 2020, Version 2.5.0. Added 4P Haggis & Tatties. Variable partnerships. It can be done... Should it be?
92. 22 July 2020, Version 2.5.1. Made message passing in 6P face UP. Considering doing this for all player counts...
93. 24 July 2020, Version 2.6.0. A bombed trick is split between opponents in Tatties. There are no slams in 3 player, and only slams for the declarer's side in 5P--and maybe not even there. The thing with Tatties is the alliances are temporary, its every player for themselves. Also: card passing is back to face DOWN in 6P. Nobody was really paying attention to the face up passing, so it didn't matter.
94. 14 December 2020, Version 2.7.0. For practical reasons, I'm moving 3P back to a 5 suit deck: 5P can be played with two 5 suit decks and no player count (currently) needs 6 suits.
95. 15 December 2020, Version 2.8.0: You can pass Message/Response cards face-up or face down. You can assign meaning to the orientation of the card and the manner in which it is passed.
96. 21 December 2020, Version 2.9.0: After a bombed trick's cards are split between the opponents, a leftover card is placed in the Haggis to be won by the player that goes out first.
97. 16 February 2021. Seriously considering just dropping card passing. I don't think it's necessary (other than to appease some people who think it is). It's kind of needed for the 5 player games, as currently defined, but maybe I can define a different way...
98. 23 September 2021. Version 2.12.0: Went back to test 3P and found I didn't care for it in its current state. Played several iterations with various changes and settled on a version where there is an auction and an exchange for the declarer, but not for the defenders (because that exchange just felt really forced and artificial). If there's no bidding, the player with the fewest points leads. Declarer or not, when a player goes out, they always score points for cards in hand from the player with the most cards--**there are no teams**. Last change is significant: If you win a trick with a bomb, **you get to capture the cards**, you don't have to give them away--and you still get to lead the next trick. Giving cards away in 3P was always problematic; it was either king-makery or it involved awkwardness on how to distribute the cards. This way just admits that 3P doesn't have to be exactly like 2P and it feels like it shouldn't. This was definitely the best version of 3P Haggis that I've played--which also makes it the best 3P climbing game I've ever played.
99. 14 October 2021. Version 2.13.0. The exchange of three cards, and the initial lead, was already enough incentive to get players to bid in the 3P game. There was no need to also give players double the amount bid. So, I've gone back to an older variant that awards the amount bid to the Declarer if they go out first, but two-thirds of the amount bid to a Defender that goes out first (the other third goes to their "partner"). Also, the higher the amount you bid the fewer cards you get in the exchange. Without this restriction, there was little holding people back from always making the highest bid (they got to exchange 3 cards, had the lead, and could make maximum profit). Tying the exchange to the bid makes people consider making the lower bids and makes the highest bid riskier. To incentivize the bidding, I've dropped the Baby Bid from 3 player and shifted the bids up to 15, 30, 45. I wanted the top bid to be 50 but that does not split evenly into thirds, so 45 should work.
100. I do NOT want to add the 45 bet to the 2 player game. I think adding the Baby Bet (5 points) is a good idea (to get risk-averse players to poke their toes in the water of betting). The 45 bet (Max Bet? Top Bet?) would further tip the game in favour of stronger players and lead to more lop-sided scoring. I don't want that. The Baby Bet is a sweet nothing, won't hurt to have it.

101. 22 January 2022. The 4P game is still being well received but I do still have some reservations that I think will be cleared up once I can get the game to a physical card table (instead of on playingcards.io): **(1)** I want to make sure that the card passing works smoothly and I want to know if the pass needs to be done in turn-order, simultaneously, or if it can be asynchronous; **(2)** I need to know what size of cards I need to have to make a hand of 18 cards functional for players (I suspect I need Tarot-size); **(3)** I need to settle on a game-ending score (450 seems right but I want more evidence).