Granville

Granville is specifically used in a forcing NoTrump situation over a $1 \vee$ opening. Over partner's $1 \vee$ opening, the meanings of $1 \wedge$ and 1NT are reversed! A 1NT bid promises $4+ \wedge$'s (or 5+ in some versions) and a $1 \wedge$ bid is the Forcing NoTrump (denying $4+ \wedge$'s). This means that after the 'forcing NT bid' of $1 \wedge$, then opener does not have to bid a 3 card minor, but can simply bid 1NT. I cannot see that the 5 card version has any sense, so we shall limit this discussion to 4+ card \wedge suits. Of course, if responder has a 4 card \wedge suit, then the auction cannot go $1 \vee - 1 \wedge - 1$ NT - pass as the initial response would have been 1NT (showing \wedge 's and forcing). And if the responder has a \wedge suit and bids 1NT, then opener is forced to bid without \wedge support and may have to bid the 3 card minor on this occasion.

So, swings and roundabouts really. Works when responder does not have a \blacktriangle suit but is inferior when he does. I guess that the odds are very slightly in favour of not having $4+ \spadesuit$'s, so the convention does perhaps have a slight mathematical advantage; but a similar convention is unavailable with a $1 \spadesuit$ opening. There also appear to be some other disadvantages with the convention. One important one is that $2 \clubsuit$ in the sequence $1 \blacktriangledown - 1 \spadesuit - 1 \text{NT} - 2 \clubsuit$ is frequently used as checkback, looking for 3 card \spadesuit support; this is not possible using the Granville convention.

Thus my advice is to stick with the conventional Forcing No Trump.

Pattaya bridge Club

www.pattayabridge.com