FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (RW 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, we're going to reproduce a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework in a series of articles, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

'Out of touch'

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Q10.

Question

There is an assumption in this that all ringing can be defined in terms of methods and I believe this to be wrong. The term 'method' should have a very specific meaning and what should be described is change ringing which is the general term for what we do. Proposal H did not mention methods. Throughout the framework there is undue mention of methods where it should be change ringing.

The definition of a method seems to be virtually identical to a block.

The definitions used are not ones which would be understandable or recognisable to an ordinary ringer. There seems far too much emphasis on mathematical concepts rather than practical ringing. For instance 'the identity change' is not a change in the terminology of ringing – it is simply a repeated row. I'm afraid this framework does not do what the Council asked for and needs a fundamental reevaluation; the present team and reviewers have too many people from a computing and mathematical background and seem out of touch with practical ringing in the wider world.

Answer

Many ringers would agree with the idea that a method should have a more limited meaning than just any sequence of changes. The problem is that this falls into the category of "sounds good, doesn't work". In over 100 years of trying, the ringing community hasn't found a limited definition of 'method' that is widely agreed upon. Some of the harshest battles in 20th century ringing related to the definition of a method (e.g. see the book *Forbidden Methods* by Karl Grave (2010, published by The Whiting Society of Ringers), which describes how some methods were described as 'illegitimate' or even 'bastards'). A peal of Not a Block Major rung in 2014 is an example of a more recent dispute over the definition of a method.

Progress comes from learning from the past. Since there is no practicable way of limiting the definition of a method without also ruling out sensible cases, the only solution is to enable any sequence of changes to be named as a method. This is what the framework does, and it's also consistent with our permissive/descriptive mandate. We trust that ringers will be sensible in what they choose to name as methods. And if they're not sensible, Section 5.E.3 of the framework contains an anti-abuse provision.

On Method vs Block, we've now added additional explanation to 3.E.1 on the difference between these two terms. The distinction is key – a method is the process (i.e. the changes) and a block is the result of applying the process (i.e. the changes plus the rows produced, given a specified starting row).

We recognise the problem of self-selection in a project like this. The sort of people who are interested in becoming politicians are often the last people you want running a country, and the same may be true of people who volunteer to develop a method ringing framework. The only responses we can give are:

(1) We've been very conscious of the need to keep things as simple as possible. Many solutions that were more elegant or more purist were ruled out of the framework because we decided they were too complex to include.

(2) The framework isn't intended as a primer on method ringing for people new to the Exercise – there are other publications that capably meet that need. The intended audience for the framework starts at the level of ringers who are already familiar with the basics of method ringing.

(3) To be effective, the framework needs to be able to describe all reasonably foreseeable forms of method ringing, not just 'everyday' ringing. Otherwise it's not a framework – it's a limited description of some common forms of method ringing. We don't believe that's what the Central Council intended. We don't dispute that covering all foreseeable forms of method ringing means

there is some complexity to the framework. But we think we've simplified things about as much as is possible, and we deliberately included lots of examples, diagrams and explanations to try and make things as clear as possible.

At the same time, we're open to any suggestions on how the framework could be simplified. There will be subsequent versions of the framework, which will give the opportunity for new ideas to be considered.

The Ringing World and its predecessors

Until the advent of the internet, the chief source of timely news and information about ringing was *The Ringing World* and its predecessors. As such, these journals provide a fascinating historical record of bells and ringing for over 130 years. Until about 10 years ago these were only available to those with access to library copies or who were able to find and afford to buy their own. So in 2007 the Central Council Library issued, on DVD, the complete series of *Bell News*, 27,000 pages running from 1881 to 1915. Then followed *The Ringing World*, from its first edition in 1911 to 2000, in 30-year batches. This was financed by sales of the DVDs and by the Friends of the Library. Production costs for *Bell News* and *The Ringing World* (1911–1970) have now been covered and they are freely available on the CC website (Resources - Library - Online Publications), as are the *Bells and Bell Ringing* columns of *Church Bells* (1870-1906) and the short-lived *Campanology* (1896/7) and *The Bellringer* (1907). All individual issues of *The Ringing World* from 2001 onwards are available, via BellBoard, to subscribers, but the CC Library can provide annual versions of these on DVD, with all proceeds going to *The Ringing World*. As a result of this enterprise the Library has so far raised over £1,800 for *The Ringing World*.

Prior to the publication of specialist journals, accounts of bellringing performances could be found in provincial newspapers. Thanks to the work started by Cyril Wratten and carried on by John Eisel and others, the Library was able to publish, in book form, an enormous amount of information covering the 18th century and the period from 1800 to 1845. The work by John Eisel is ongoing and further publication, in digital format, is planned. Details can again be found on the CC website (Resources - Library - Publications).

These books and DVDs make ideal presents for any ringer interested in either the recent history of ringing or in more distant achievements and controversies. See our advert (p.1244) for details of special offers for Christmas.

PAUL JOHNSON

a footnote stating that it was the 'First peal by a lady in this diocese'.

What has a 1906 peal for the NDA got to do with a peal in Rumbugh, Suffolk? In this day and age it is not abnormal to ring a peal in one county for another Association if sufficient numbers were available from the initial Association.

The diocese of Norwich included the County of Suffolk in the early years of the twentieth century, hence most peals rung in Suffolk at that time were for the NDA.

There must be more to this story but I have yet to reach any definite details of her marriage and death from the available ancestry information.

<div align="right">ALAN F ELLIS</div>

Holy Rosary Cathedral,
Vancouver, B.C., Canada

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

SIR, – In answer to the question posed by Dermot Elworthy in the 7th December issue, the peal in question was probably the one rung at Rumburgh in Suffolk on 16th August 1906 and recorded in *Bell News* of 25th August that year.

The band was Miss Birdie Robinson (treble), Frederick C Lambert (C), T Linton Wilson, Arthur H Took and Edward Chatten. The methods were Plain Bob, Old Doubles, April Day and Grandsire, and the footnote said simply "First peal by a lady in this diocese".

<div align="right">TED STEELE</div>

Hatfield, Doncaster

Senior moment

SIR, – I read with interest the letter of John Harrison (p.1226), who complained about the lack of peals of 5,075 changes. One of my few peals was of 5,075 Double Norwich rung at Allesley on 28th April 2008, as a 75th birthday tribute to Ian Thompson, who rang the sixth. The composition was by John R Fisher, but I cannot remember the details.

<div align="right">GEORGE HARRISON</div>

Harborne, Birmingham

Classic car quarter appeal

SIR, – We live in times of ever-changing certainties!

Two constants I am involved with are Church Bell Ringing and the idiosyncratic Morgan Motor Car.

2019 is the 110th anniversary of the Morgan company's foundation. I may have croaked before a more significant date.

Stoke Lacy in Herefordshire is the Morgan family church, with a ring of six bells. I have the high honour of being granted permission to organise a quarter peal for the day's celebrations on **Saturday, 6th July 2019**.

Are there any other Morgan owners/enthusiasts who would like to join in the ringing?

Please contact me at **brenthouse@icloud.com**. Alternatively, pigeon post is always gratefully received: Brent House, Vicarage Road, Meole Brace, Shrewsbury, Salop SY39EZ.

<div align="right">JOHN D NEAL</div>

Shrewsbury, Shropshire

FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this article series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

2. Terms

FAQ Section B 'Clarity': Question 8.

Question

I'm not sure the layman would understand the difference in the definitions of Block & Method. The further explanation helps but the actual definition is almost identical.

Answer

The are various terms in method ringing that have similar meanings (e.g. touch and composition), as well as terms that have more than one meaning (e.g. lead can refer to ringing in 1st's place or a lead of a method). We've tried to distinguish similar terms as best we can: We view a method as just the sequence of changes, without considering the rows that the method can be used to generate.

A block, on the other hand, results from applying a sequence of changes (i.e. a method or a composition) to a starting row (normally rounds). A block therefore comprises a set of rows and the changes used to generate them.

A method can be viewed as the process, and a block as the result of the process.

Related to these terms, a touch is a block generated by a composition, and a plain lead and a plain course are blocks generated by a single method without any calls.

FAQ Section B 'Clarity': Question 4.

Question

There seems to be a tendency in ringing and in business to introduce a new vocabulary which the older practitioners find difficult to understand, so perhaps a glossary of terms might be given somewhere. Reports of peals in the *RW* now refer to cyclical and particles and it would be helpful to the rank and file ringers if these terms could be explained.

Answer

The framework does define the ringing terms it uses as they are introduced. However, we've only defined the terms that are needed across the framework. We don't view the framework as the right place to house an extensive glossary of ringing terms – this would turn an already-complex document into an even more complex one. However an extensive glossary of ringing terms already exists: John Harrison's Glossary of Ringing Terms, at **http://jaharrison.me.uk/Ringing/Glossary/**.

FAQ Section B 'Clarity': Question 10.

Question

Have a much simpler section which explains standard method ringing so that ordinary ringers can see how to talk and write about what they do. Then put all the strange exotic stuff at the back. This document is too long and complex for any ordinary ringer to read, and not sufficiently precise, nor using the right mathematical terms, to be usefully referenced from a mathematical paper.

Answer

We considered this, but the difficulty is that there will be lots of different views on where to draw the line between vanilla and exotic. This approach could also make it harder for readers to find the information they're looking for.

Also, the framework exists to be able to describe all method ringing and is not intended as an introductory primer to method ringing – there are other publications that provide this.

The framework is also intentionally not a mathematical paper. Although not an introductory primer, it should be accessible to as many ringers as possible. However, we are considering adding a new section to a subsequent version of the framework that describes method ringing in mathematical terms (with development of this led by a ringing mathematician). This could then by used by mathematicians – e.g. to reference in an academic paper.

FAQs from the Framework

*T*he Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

3. Norms

FAQ Section F 'Whole-Pull Ringing': Question 1.

Question

It would be useful to allow whole pull performances (i.e. every row repeated) – but only when half-muffled.

Answer

A very important aspect of the new framework is that we are not seeking to allow or disallow certain types of ringing. Instead we're aiming to provide standard terminology that enables ringers to describe what they rang, so that other ringers can read about ringing performances and be clear on what was rung.

Whole-pull ringing doesn't follow the norms of method ringing. Under Section 6.C n) the report of a whole-pull performance should therefore include a disclosure that the composition was rung in whole pulls. As noted above, whole-pull ringing can work well when the bells are half-muffled.

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 8.

Question

Perhaps the online version of The Ringing World could change reports to match the reader's wishes. E.g. if you don't agree with jump changes, you could filter out any performances that used them.

Answer

The purpose of 6.C (performance norms) is to make ringers aware when performances include features that differ from common practice. It will, of course, be for The Ringing World to decide if and how to make use of this information, but it could indeed potentially be used to let readers filter out certain types of performances that they're not interested in reading about.

FAQ Section J 'Record Lengths': Question 2.

Question

There is some uncertainty in record length ringing as to what the umpires should do. Can the framework clarify this?

Answer

Agreed. We've now expanded 7.B.5 to include, in general terms, the type of checking the umpire(s) should do. Also, 6.C.2.g states the norm that 'No person not ringing provided any assistance in the execution of the ringing during the Performance, e.g. making calls, detecting or correcting errors.' This replaces the 'No assistance of any kind' language of the Decisions. This means that if an umpire (or any other person present), say, picks up a ringer's water bottle that has fallen out of the ringer's reach, this is acceptable as it isn't assistance with the execution of the ringing. The same would apply to turning on a light, turning off a heater, etc.

From the Framework

Framework Section 6: 'Performance Reporting'

C. Performance Norms

1. A Performance Report should state any aspect of the Performance that does not comply with the following norms, which will be assumed unless otherwise stated.

2. The following are considered Norms for all reported Performances:

a) The Performance was a Round Block that started and ended in Rounds;

b) The Performance was a True Touch, or a Touch with Accepted Truth (as defined in Section 3.J);

c) The Performance was rung without interval;

d) On handbells the bells were retained in hand throughout the Performance;

e) The same person or persons rang each bell or bells continuously throughout the Performance;

f) Neither ringers nor conductor(s) used any physical aids to memory during the Performance;

g) No person not ringing provided any assistance in the execution of the ringing during the Performance, e.g. making calls, detecting or correcting errors;

h) Tower bells (or simulations thereof) were rung full-circle-style;

i) Handbells (or simulations thereof) were rung in alternating up-strokes and down-strokes;

j) If Cover Bell(s) were used, these were in the highest Place(s) of the Rows;

k) Jump Changes were not used;

l) Only one Method / Variation was rung in any one Row;

m) A Performance with only one ringer was witnessed by an umpire;

n) The Performance was consistent with the framework.

Framework Section 7: 'Record Lengths'

A. Requirements

1. To be included in the Central Council's register of Record Lengths, the Performance must comply with all of the requirements in Section 7.B and 7.C.

2. The Performance must also comply with norms a) to i) in Section 6.C.

3. For a handbell Record Length, every ringer rings at least two bells.

B. Notification and Verification

1. Notice of the attempt must be provided to *The Ringing World* to enable the notice to be published at least 14 days prior to the attempt.

2. The notice must state the location, date and start time of the attempt, the Length and the Method(s) to be rung.

3. A copy of the notice must also be provided to the Central Council at least 14 days prior to the attempt.

4. Arrangement must be made for interested people to be able to listen to the Performance.

5. The ringing must be heard, and the figures of the Composition checked throughout, by competent umpire(s).

Further explanation: The umpire(s) should do sufficient checking during the Performance to be confident that the composition was correctly called, and that there were no substantive errors or shifts. The umpire(s) should also ensure that, in their opionion, the quality of the ringing remains sufficiently high throughout the Performance for a Record Length. If the umpire(s) believe the quality has dropped below an acceptable level, and the ringing is continuing, they should let the conductor know this so the attempt can be stopped.

C. Reporting

1. A Performance Report must be sent to both *The Ringing World* (preferably via *BellBoard*) for publication, and to the Central Council.

2. The Performance Report must comply with the requirements of Section 6.

3. The Performance Report must include the Composition that was rung.

4. An umpire(s)' report must be sent with the Performance Report to both *The Ringing World* and the Central Council.

FAQs from the Framework

*T*he Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

4. 'Tread carefully'

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 3.

Question

I would urge the proponents of these changes to tread very carefully indeed. History shows that when traditional and ingrained systems are swept away, those who are not prepared to put up with it will break away from the existing structures and form their own traditional groups. Anglicanism is a good example where there are now thousands of traditionalists broken away from Lambeth throughout the world. An alternative Council of Traditional English Change Ringers would be a disaster for the art given the challenges to ringing posed by ongoing collapse of the Church of England.

Answer

The Decisions have been a source of controversy since the formation of the Council, and many believe the Decisions' approach of ruling out ringing that hasn't been done before has harmed the Council's reputation, especially among more advanced ringers. The motion to switch to a descriptive / permissive approach passed with a very clear majority at the Edinburgh CC meeting.

However we recognise that traditionalists won't like all the forms of method ringing that the framework describes. The framework uses a disclosure approach so that performances that differ from method ringing norms can be identified as such.

There is also, deliberately, nothing in the framework that prevents a group of traditionalist ringers from forming a society (which could become affiliated with the Central Council) that implements additional restrictions on what it considers methods or peals. For example, this society might choose only to recognise peals of Triples and below that are rung in whole extents, and only that involve methods that are principles or are hunters with Plain Bob or Grandsire leadheads / leadends.

Ultimately ringers with a wide range of opinions have to find ways to coexist with one another, and we believe that a descriptive / permissive approach, paired with disclosure and the ability of like-minded ringers to group together to focus on the types of ringing they're interested in, is the most likely way to achieve this.

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 4.

Question

I think that what we should strive to avoid is offending against first principles of change ringing that have been established for centuries. Thus I cannot support the introduction of jump changes and multiple covering bells in peals. The peal is a benchmark of achievement and there is no case for allowing people who can barely handle a bell in Rounds to follow another bell for three hours in the pretense that they are now a peal ringer. Extra covering bells have a place in Quarters to give rope-time to learners, but not in peal ringing. If this is permitted we will soon see a peal of Minimus rung on 12 with 8 covering bells which would bring our art into disrepute.

It appears from what has been published that a recordable peal could now be rung on 1 and 2 bells. That is a nonsense. However what I do want to see, and have advocated for many years is the acceptance of Singles. I do not see a case for saying that a band who have worked away at a probably rough 3 for nearly three hours have not rung a Peal. Singles should be the basic minimum stage for change ringing.

I am much concerned that ringing is going to join the Gadarene rush to abolish all standards so as to be 'more inclusive'. The abolition of traditional standards is a disease. Ringing should work towards improving standards, not abolishing them to placate the PC brigade.

Answer

Much Central Council time was taken up debating whether 4-bell peals should be recognised. We could clearly spend more time debating whether 3-bell peals should be recognised, and then 2-bell peals. Similarly, we could spend much time in the future debating whether jump changes and multiple cover bells should be recognised. With the CRAG mandate, the Council has decided this is not a good approach. The mandate was very clear – the aim of the framework is to be permissive and describe what ringers choose to ring, rather than specifying rules over what the Council will and will not recognise. This is a direct response by the Council to the recognition that the previous system hasn't worked well, has caused much controversy, and has harmed the Council's reputation, obscuring much of its other good work. It's now time to try something new – namely to provide standard terminology for ringers to describe what they rang, and leave it to them to decide what they want to ring.

The aim of trying to use the framework to enforce ringing standards (i.e. quality) is also misguided in our view. Standards vary widely by band and location, and a one-size-fits-all central approach will inevitably result in the bar being set too high for some and too low for others. Encouraging improved ringing quality is better addressed at the local level, with the Central Council possibly providing guidance/tips, and/or promoting training events and similar.

St Athan plans

Plans are afoot to renovate the bell installation at the village of St Athan in the Vale of Glamorgan, where the church bells have been unringable and the clock chimes silent for over a year now. The frame holding the ring of six, together with the tower itself are said to need major repair work.

Writing in the *Cowbridge Gem* of 25th November, the Chairman of St Athan Community Council, Brian Acott, relates that the church wardens and restoration committee are working hard to raise funds to support the bid to reach the target of £195,000 required to pay for the works, with the hope also of creating a new ringing training facility.

The last major works to the tower of St Tathan's Church were carried out after Alderman William Roberts, a man brought up in St Athan, became Lord Mayor of Cardiff a century ago. To mark victory in the Great War, Roberts donated two new bells (the tenor and treble) and paid for the existing historic four bells, dated 1635, 1707, 1720 and 1744, to be recast with the facsimiles of their original inscriptions. The new six (tenor c.7cwt in A) were rehung during 1919 in a cast iron frame mortised into the 14th/15th century tower. The frame "has suffered the ravages of time, causing damage to the tower and clock".

(Our thanks to Derek Jones of Llandough for drawing our attention to the article published in the Cowbridge Gem *of 25th November 2018)*

Dickleburgh, Norfolk. 25 Nov, 1260 PB Minor: Angie Jones 1, David Paddison 2, James Catchpole 3, Betty Baines 4, Ian Grandfield 5, Michael Hodgkinson (C) 6. Rung as part of the Tree of Life celebration & as a farewell to Bishop Graham James, who took his last services at Norwich Cathedral today. 150th Q in 2018: 4.   **£3**

Erpingham, Norfolk. 25 Nov, 1320 Single Oxford Bob Minor: Robert Goodliffe 1, Anna Johns 2, Anne Bridge 3, Richard Johns 4, Guy Morton 5, Andrew Lubbock (C) 6. Rung as a retirement compliment to The Rt Revd Graham James, Bishop of Norwich.

Hethersett, Norfolk. 25 Nov, 1260 Doubles (4m): Richard Powell 1, Anne C Larner 2, Chris Denmark 3, Caroline Smith 4, Mark E Larner (C) 5. Rung to mark the final service of the Bishop of Norwich, The Rt Revd Graham James, in the Diocese.   **£2.50**

Norton Subcourse, Norfolk. 22 Nov, 1320 Norwich S Minor: David Webb 1, Ann-M Webb 2, Katie Wright (C) 3, Diana Leach 4, Richard Salisbury 5, Stephen Rabong 6. Rung to mark the retirement of the Rt Revd Graham James as Bishop of Norwich. 150th Q in 2018 - 1. 50th Q in 2018 - 6.

Norwich, Norfolk. (S George, Colegate) 24 Nov, 1320 PB Minor: Maureen Cubitt 1, Catherine Sturgess 2, Barbara Mesney 3, John Mortimer 4, Jon Spreadbury 5, Stephen Day (C) 6. With thanks & best wishes to Bishop Graham on his retirement.   **£3**

Norwich, Norfolk. (S Giles) 24 Nov, 1344 PB Major: Kaeko Tozawa 1, Catherine Sturgess 2, Richard Turk 3, Alan Spreadbury 4, Dawn Pullan 5, Faith Pearce 6, Joseph Dillon 7, Ben Trent (C) 8. With best wishes to the Revd Father Canon Captain Darren Thornton on his 50th Birthday & to the Right Revd Bishop Graham James on his retirement. 1st Major: 1.   **£4**

Norwich, Norfolk. (S Peter Mancroft - The Mancroft Ringing Discovery Centre) 20 Nov, 1260 Grandsire Doubles: Judy Farrimond 1, Nikki Thomas 2, Richard Turk 3, Martin Farrimond 4, Jon Spreadbury (C) 5, Catherine Sturgess 6. Rung as a farewell compliment to Bishop Graham & Julie James.

Norwich, Norfolk. (S Peter Mancroft) 25 Nov, 1311 Stedman Cinques: Thomas Roast 1, Janet House 2, Nikki Thomas 3, James Hughes 4, Faith Pearce 5, Stephen Day 6, Richard Turk 7, Stephen Bounds 8, Richard Carter (C) 9, Michael Clements 10, Neil Thomas 11, Ben Trent 12. Rung as a farewell to the Right Revd Graham James, Lord Bishop of Norwich.   **£6**

Wymondham, Norfolk. 18 Nov, 1264 PB Major: Rosamunde Codling 1, Pauline Clarke 2, Rosemary Charles 3, Teresa Doggett 4, David Ward 5, Robert Gardner 6, Anthony Sargent 7, Hayden Charles (C) 8. Rung to mark the retirement of the Rt Revd Graham James as Bishop of Norwich.   **£4**

Ashill, Norfolk. 25 Nov, Call Changes: Wendy Peckham 1, Judy Howard 2, Lee Fell 3, Diane Baylis 4, Margaret Wright 5, Jaci Capel 6, Ruth Ostler 7. With best wishes from everyone at St Nicholas Ashill to Bishop Graham Bishop of Norwich & his wife Julie on their retirement.

Great Ryburgh, Norfolk. 25 Nov, Call Changes: Sue Massingham 1, Amanda Burr 2, Freya Bowditch 3, Fenella Purdy 4, Rosemary Ditchman 5, Peter Trent (C) 6. Thank you Bishop Graham.

Happisburgh, Norfolk. 21 Nov, Call Changes: Gilbert Larter (C) 1, Janet Cooper 2, Sarah Lloyd 3, Daniel Back 4, Joan Larter 5, George Riseborough 6. Wishing Bishop Graham well in his retirement.

Happisburgh, Norfolk. 21 Nov, Call Changes: Sarah Lloyd 1, Janet Cooper 2, Steve Back 3, Gilbert Larter (C) 4, Joan Larter 5, George Riseborough 6. Wishing Bishop Graham well in his retirement.

Holme Hale, Norfolk. 25 Nov, Call Changes: Alice Simpson 1, Pamela Medlock 2, Linda Ballard 3, Ann Curston 4, Andy Scarlett (C) 5. Rung to mark the retirement of Bishop Graham, wishing him & Julie a long & happy retirement.

Holt, Norfolk. (S Andrew) 25 Nov, 56 Plain Hunt Triples: Theo Crowder 1, John Norman 2, Adelene Clifton 3, Shelagh Rump 4, Sheila Padley 5, Jon Clifton 6, Lorraine Marks 7, Sue Morton (C) 8. As part of Sunday Service Ringing - a retirement compliment to Bishop Graham.   **£2**

Reedham, Norfolk. 19 Nov, 20 Rounds: Judy A Farrimond 1, Mary Jones 2, Diana Gilder (C) 3, Jayne Booth 4, David Breeze 5, Martin D Farrimond 6. Wishing Bishop Graham James well in his retirement.

Swaffham, Norfolk. 25 Nov, Call Changes: Carolyn Watts/Linda Ballard (C) 1, Michael Wingate 2, Pamela Medlock 3, Ann Curston 4, Audrey Bould 5, Sarah Seaman 6, Graham Bould 7, Andy Scarlett 8. Rung to mark the retirement of Bishop Graham, wishing him & Julie a long & happy retirement.

Commemorating the centenary of the Armistice

Finchampstead, Berks. 11 Nov, Call Changes, PB Doubles, PB Minor, Grandsire Doubles: Hugh Dempster 1, Mary Ede 2, Derek Barrett 3, Pearl Larkins 4, Tricia Amos 5, Judith Witting 6, Richard Wheeler 7, Helen Anderson 8, Jo Lewis 9. Ringing half-muffled from 10.20am for the 10.50am service, 11am silence, ringing open from 12.20 – 12.55pm, ringing at 7.05 - 7.20pm after beacon lit on church tower. £4.50
Reprinted after an incomplete report was printed on p.1262.

Quarter peal commemorating the centenary of World War I

Rochester, Kent. (Cathedral) 6 Jan, 1259 Grandsire Caters: Ellen Jones 1, Amy Wallace 2, Darren Elphick 3, Emma Cundiff 4, Rebecca L Winter 5, Stuart Cox 6, Barry Roberts 7, Thomas A Winter 8, Neil Jones (C) 9, Nick Wheeler 10. For Evensong on the Feast of the Epiphany & remembering 2nd Lieutenant Flying Officer George White Willis (RAF), who was killed in France on the 4th January 1919 & is commemorated on the inscriptions of the Treble & 2nd bells at this Cathedral.   **£5**

See also peal reports on p.87

FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

5. Modes

FAQ Section H 'Method Extension': Question 1.

Question

I could follow most of [Section 13 – Method Extension Processes] (the diagrams are helpful), but I didn't understand just what a 'mode' was and what it was supposed to mean. It also wasn't clear that the example was Mode=2 from the supplied diagrams. What is the significance of Mode=2, and how is is different from Mode=1 or Mode=6? I understood that Mode has a number between 1 and the Stage (so 6 in this example), but I don't understand what the significance of the selection is. This seems important for the remainder of the criteria and how each section is defined.

Answer

Thanks – helpful feedback. We've now separately defined Mode in the framework (see Appendix D.A.4), and have shown in the further explanation of this section how different modes affect an example string of place notation.

From the Framework
Appendix D. Method Extension Processes
A. Definitions
4. Mode

The Mode of an Extension Process specifies which Places remain static, and which Places expand.

Further explanation: Mode m means that all Places up to and including Place m remain static, and all Places above Place m expand.

E.g. an Extension Process might operate by copying 4 Changes and inserting them into a Method's sequence of Changes immediately following these copied 4 Changes.

Assume the 4 Changes to be copied are x12x36.

If the Mode used is 1, the resulting sequence is x12x36x14x58. I.e. the 1 in 12 remains static, but all Places higher than 1 expand (i.e. increase) by 2 Places in the inserted section.

If the Mode used is 2, the resulting sequence is x12x36x12x58. I.e. the 12 remains static, but all Places higher than 2 expand by 2 Places in the inserted section.

If the Mode used is 3, the resulting sequence is x12x36x12x38. I.e. the 12 and the 3 in 36 remain static, and all Places higher than 3 expand by 2 Places in the inserted section.

Note that some Extension Processes operate separately on below-the-treble Places and above-the-treble Places. When Mode is used with above-the-treble Places, it may operate with respect to the highest Place (i.e. the Method's Stage) rather than Place 1.

FAQs from the Framework

*T*he Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

6. Peals of Triples

FAQ Section K 'Peals of Triples < 5040 Changes': Question 1.

Question

There is an obvious and elegant reason why a peal of Triples should be 5040 changes. I think it is illogical and unnecessary to change this.

Answer

This may be the single most contentious issue that has emerged during the framework project, so here's a longer answer covering this point.

Clearly there's a strong link between the word 'peal' and the ringing of an extent of Triples, and in fact in the early days of ringing, peal was also used to describe the ringing of an extent of Minor.

It might have been more elegant if peals at all stages had originally been defined as 5040 or more changes. But peals of less than 5040 started to be rung for Major and above as early as 1755, and so the 5000 minimum for higher stages is long established, and dates to well before the Central Council was formed.

While many people would like to see 5040 retained as the minimum length for a peal of Triples, there are many others who support the simpler and more consistent approach of peals having a minimum length of 5000 changes at all stages. The limited data we have suggests a split of around 60/40, with the majority favoring standardisation on 5000 at all stages.

It's important to note that the framework gives ranges for the different performance lengths – e.g. a QP is 1250 – 2499, and a half peal is 2500 – 4999. In this context, a peal having a range of 5000 – 9999 and being part of a bigger sequence of performance lengths supports standardisation on a 5000 minimum.

It's perhaps also worth noting that the length of the extent isn't part of ringing's performance terminology anywhere else. For example, a QP of Minor is reasonably close to two extents, but there wasn't a move to make 1440 the minimum number of changes for a Minor QP. This isn't a directly comparable situation given we recognise that the concept

of a peal originated from the goal of ringing an extent. But it highlights that we can view standard performance ranges (<1250, 1250–2499, 2500–4999, 5000–9999, and >=10000) as distinct from extent lengths (24, 120, 720, 5040) which are single numbers.

Setting the minimum length at 5000 for all stages allows those who want to continue ringing no less than 5040 to do so. But setting the definition at 5040 takes away the option of ringing between 5000 and 5039 from those who want it. Using 5000 is therefore the permissive option. It's clearly also the simpler option, as a peal can have the same definition across all stages.

There could be a separate carve-out for Triples – i.e. for all stages except Triples, a peal requires a minimum of 5000 changes, but for Triples the minimum is 5040. But this then raises several other questions: should a QP of Triples (the length that enables a new method to be named) be 1260 instead of 1250? Is a half peal of Triples 2520 and a long length of Triples 10080?

There could also be valid reasons for wanting to ring 5000–5039 Triples. There might be a wish to ring a peal in this length range for an anniversary of the last two numbers (e.g. a 5026 for a 26th birthday) and only a Triples band is available. There could be an interesting compositional reason for doing so – e.g. there's a true, non-round 5039 of Grandsire Triples that only uses bobs. For over two centuries, composers have been searching for a bobs-only extent of Erin Triples. So far, the longest true bobs-only round block found is 4990 changes. If, say, a 5004 is found (before any longer length), a number of ringers would be interested in ringing it.

Even with a move to a standard minimum peal length of 5000, we can be sure that the vast majority of Triples peals will continue to be 5040 changes in length. There is, of course, something very elegant and appealing about ringing every possible row exactly once.

In 2016, the Decisions were relaxed to allow peals of Triples (and lower stages) to include partial extents. Previously a peal of Triples could only be whole multiples of

extents (5040, 10080, 15120, etc). Under the current Decisions, they can be any length that is 5040 or higher. Since that update, 353 peals of Triples have been posted on BellBoard (at the time of writing). Only one of them took advantage of the Decision change – a 5320 of Grandsire Triples – the rest were all 5040s. The 5320 was an interesting performance because the composition was bobs only – not something that can be done in a 5040 of Grandsire Triples. We have similar expectations that ringers will only choose to ring between 5000 and 5039 of Triples when there is a specific reason for doing so.

We've therefore retained 5000 as the minimum length for peals across all stages. This is the permissive approach, and keeping ringing terminology as simple and consistent as possible makes things easier for new ringers joining the Exercise. No one has to ring a 5000 – 5039 of Triples if they don't want to, but equally we don't think anyone should try to prevent those who do want to ring a 5000 – 5039 of Triples from claiming a peal, given this number meets the requirement for a peal at other stages. In any community such as ours there will be a wide range of opinions, and ultimately it's beneficial if we can find ways to coexist as peacefully as possible. No one thinks a 4999 should be a peal (OK, you could probably find someone who thinks this), but there are many ringers who would like to see 5000 as the minimum peal length across all stages. The 5040 supporters can still choose never to ring peals of Triples that are less than 5040 changes. Live and let live.

Abbey answers

In last week's issue (p.80) we relayed Peter Bill's 'name the ringer' quiz from the Buckfast Abbey Rigners Epiphany Lunch. The answers, and the band for 1260 Plain Bob Royal at Buckfast Abbey on Saturday, 15th October 1983 *(p.80)*, were:

From RW 16/12/83:

Buckfast Abbey, Devon. 15 Oct, 1260 PB Royal: W Simmonds 1, D McColough 2, Rowena Mansley 3, N Glanfield 4, N Birt 5, C Beesley 6, D J Roberts 7, C L Barr 8, P L Bill 9, M G Mansley (C) 10. Specially arranged as an 80th Birthday compliment to Bill Simmonds

Our front cover shows Winchester Cathedral, at 554ft the longest Medieval church in the world, as photographed from Wolvesey Castle by **David Forder.**

Want to enter *The Ringing World*'s **front cover competition**? Submit your photos on *BellBoard* (log in and click 'Add photo') or to **frontpage@ ringingworld.co.uk**. If we use your image we'll award a £25 prize and a free copy of that issue.

FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

7. Blocks, rows and changes

FAQ Section B 'Clarity': Question 33
Question

I have never met any ringer who thought a change was anything other than an order of all the bells being rung. You do not need a name for the transition from one to another.

I have never heard the term stage before, I assume this refers to doubles major etc., why not just write number of changing bells or NCB if that is too long?

You do not define lead especially when it is used in reference to principles. To me principles do not have leads.

Answer

On your first point, 'row' and 'change' have indeed been used interchangeably over the years to refer to what the framework describes as a 'row'. In the earliest ringing publications the term 'change' was used to cover both the process of moving the bells and the resulting sequence. However, by the late 1800s, technical writers needed to split the process from the result, and these terms became 'row' and 'change'. E.g. from 'A Note on Grandsire Triples', W.H. Thompson, Macmillan and Bowes, 1886, page 7: 'Any one permutation of the 7 bells is called a 'row'.' The Decisions have been making the distinction between a row and change since at least 1970.

As with many terms, this distinction has not been made consistently, either in common parlance or ringing literature. To address this, we've added the following to Section 3.B.1:

'Note that what is defined as a Row in this section is sometimes described as a Change in common ringing parlance, and this usage of Change will be found in some method ringing books and articles. The framework separately uses Change as the transition between two Rows (see Section 3.C) and this distinction between Row and Change is important in defining a number of other method ringing terms used in the framework. Row is the preferred term wherever possible.'

We do need a term for the transition between rows because these are the building blocks for methods and compositions. E.g.

Plain Bob Minor comprises the changes x16x16x16x16x16x12 – here it's clear that changes are referring to transitions, and not to an order of bells. In a composition, a bob might replace a 12 change with a 14 change, and so on.

On your second point, stage does refer to Doubles, Major, etc. It's an established term – e.g. used in the Decisions since at least 1970.

Finally, principles do have leads in the same way as any other method. We often don't think of them this way, probably because the most well-known principle (Stedman) lends itself to being thought of in sixes, where we don't even normally start and finish at a six-end. But the same lead structure is there (Stedman has 12 changes in a lead), and if you look at other principles (e.g. Double Éire Minor) the lead structure is more apparent.

Not considering principles to have leads is also partly historic. Principles used not to be considered methods, and were said to be made up of divisions rather than leads. But the Decisions have considered principles to be methods since at least 1970. Between 1970 and 1999 the Decisions referred to principles being made up of divisions or leads. In 1999, division was dropped. Consequently the framework drafting team have seen no reason to retain the term division when lead is sufficient, and using one term for all methods is simpler.

FAQ Section B 'Clarity': Question 23
Question

3.D.1. 'Block: A sequence of Changes, all with the same Stage, and the Rows produced by applying these Changes, starting from an initial Row.' So it is both the changes and the rows?

Answer

Yes, both the changes and the rows. A block results from applying a given sequence of changes to an intial row. While in practice, most ringing uses rounds as the initial row, a different block could be obtained from the same sequence of changes by using a different initial row. The two blocks' changes would be the same, but their rows would be different.

FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

8. Processes and dynamic methods

FAQ Section L 'Technical Comments': Question 2.

Question

3.E.1. 'Method: A sequence of Changes all of the same Stage, or a process to generate such a sequence.'

The 'process' part is a little tricky and leaves scope for well defined, but useless definitions.

E.g. process
Ring [1.3.1.3.1.{7|5}.3.1.3.1.3.{7|5}]^840 where at each choice of 7 or 5, 7 is chosen unless it is impossible to generate a round block of the extent with any choice of following 7 or 5s.

This exists, but we don't know what it is. It is a 'static method'.

[3.1.3.1.3.{7|5}]^840 where at each choice of 7 or 5, 7 is chosen unless it is impossible to generate a round block of the extent with any choice of following 7 or 5s.

This might, or might not exist.

What is this?
[3.1.3.1.3.{7|5}]^840 where at each choice of 7 or 5, 7 is chosen unless it is impossible to generate a longer or same length round block than if 5 is chosen, with any choice of following 7 or 5s.

This exists, but we don't know how long it is, but it is fixed and finite.

It is a static method.

Method PI Royal

Generate the digits of PI with a decimal expansion
1->10
2->12
3->30
4->14
5->50
6->16
7->70
8->18
9->90
0->X
ignore the first z digits until the remaining 3628800 changes generates the extent.

Answer

Agreed that processes for generating sequences of changes could be well-defined but practically useless, as demonstrated by your examples. We've now added a technical comment to 3.E.3 (Dynamic Method) [reprinted below], that uses your bobs-only Erin example.

From the Framework

Section 3: Fundamentals of Method Ringing, E: Methods.

Method: A sequence of Changes all of the same Stage, or a process to generate such a sequence.
_____

Example: The sequence of Changes x16x14x16x12 is the Method that has been given the name Little Bob Minor.
_____

Further explanation: A Method has the Stage of its constituent Changes. See elsewhere for an overview of all aspects of Stage.

Individual Changes and sequences of Changes may be represented using place notation, and place notation is used in the example above as well as elsewhere in the framework. Place notation is described in Appendix A.

A Method is usually referred to by a name it is given. A Method (including its name) may be recorded in the Central Council's Methods Library when certain requirements have been met. These requirements are described in Section 5.

A Method is distinct from a Block in that a Method only defines Changes, not Rows. A Block, on the other hand, defines both Changes and Rows. A single Method can produce many Blocks. For example, if a Method is rung starting from Rounds, this produces a Block. If the same Method is rung starting from a non-Rounds Row (such as 'Queens'), the resulting Block is different from the one produced by starting from Rounds.

Dynamic Method:

A Method whose sequence of Changes is not fixed or is not finite.

Example: Dixon's Bob Minor.

Further explanation: Dixon's Bob Minor specifies that Rows are produced by successively applying the pair of Changes x16 except (a) if the Treble is leading after an x Change, replace the next 16 Change with a 12 Change, and (b) if the 2nd or 4th is leading after an x Change, replace the next 16 Change with a 14 Change.

In this Method, the sequence of Changes varies depending on the Rows produced, so using a different initial Row could produce a different sequence of Changes. This Method's sequence of Changes is therefore not fixed, and so Dixon's Bob Minor is an example of a Dynamic Method.

Technical comment: A Dynamic Method should be capable of producing a readily-determinable sequence of Changes. A process such as 'Ring the Changes [3.1.3.1.3.{7|5}]^840 where at each choice of 7 or 5, 7 is chosen unless it is impossible to generate a Round Block of the Extent with any choice of following 7 or 5s' is not a valid Dynamic Method, even though this is a well-defined process.

Dynamic Methods are in their infancy, and more precise definitions in this area may be developed for future versions of the framework if there is sufficient interest by the ringing community.

Withycombe Raleigh, Devon. (S John Ev) 23 Jan, 1346 Cambridge S Maximus: Donald Carter 1, Sue Sawyer 2, Wendy Campbell 3, Hilary Beresford 4, Lesley Tucker 5, Neil Williams 6, Ian Avery 7, Roger King 8, Nigel Birt 9, Neil Deem 10, Graham Tucker 11, Michael Mears (C) 12. Specially arranged & rung to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Nigel Birt's first Q, Grandsire Doubles at St Michael's, Teignmouth on 23/1/1979. 1st Cambridge S Maximus: 6. 25th in the tower: 1.   **£6**

Woodchurch, Wirral. (Holy Cross) 20 Jan, 1440 PB Minor: Carl McCarthy 1, Peter Exley 2, David J King-Hele 3, Tim Shorman 4, Randle T J Tinkler 5, David C Denson (C) 6, Valerie M Beecroft 7. 1st Minor as C. Rung at the end of the morning service.   **£3.50**

Worle, Som. 20 Jan, 1260 Doubles (4m): Jill Burtenshaw 1, Ray Jones 2, Jim Lambard 3, John Boorman 4, Clifford Nicholls (C) 5, David Butler 6.   **£3**

Yateley, Hants. 24 Jan, 1260 Doubles (3m/2v): Patricia Johnson 1, Debbie McLaren 2, Susan Thomas 3, John McLaren 4, Ellis Thomas (C) 5, Martin Johnson 6. Specially arranged & rung as a 75th Birthday compliment to Bob Oakley on 25 Jan 2019. On the front six.

Quarter peals commemorating the centenary of World War I

Dewsbury, W Yorks. 4 Feb, 1260 Grandsire Triples: Ted Steele 1, Janine H Jones 2, C Barrie Dove (C) 3, Robert Schofield 4, Wynford Carter 5, Derek C Johnstone 6, Derek J Tysoe 7, Stuart Mills 8. Rung to Commemorate the 100 years since Dewsbury ringer Private Lewis Harold Lumb M2/136016. Mechanical Transport, Royal Army Service Corps. 291st Siege Battery, Royal Garrison Artillery, died of pneumonia caused by influenza on this day 1919, age 35 years. Today marks the end of the Yorkshire Association of Change Ringers' "Roll of Honour" commemorations, Private L.H. Lumb being the last YACR ringer to die in The Great War.   **£3**

Grain, Kent. 29 Dec, 1272 Minimus (5m): Pat Phipps 1, Graham Heath 2, Julian Lees (C) 3, Doug Davis 4. Remembering the men of Grain who lost their lives in the 1st World War: H. Trevetic, Kings Royal Rifle Corps on 10th March, 1915; J H Armes, Kings Royal Rifle Corps on 31st January 1916; W G Allen, Royal Field Artillery on 7th August, 1916; Harry Pullen, Suffolk Regiment on 10th July 1918.   **£2**

FAQs from the Framework

The Ringing World has published ongoing updates from the team behind the new 'Framework for Method Ringing', built to replace the Central Council's Decisions as they relate to describing change ringing. But what does it all mean?

In Tim Barnes's last update on the project (*RW* 26th Oct), he noted that the Framework website includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section. With the team's permission, this series reproduces a selection of these FAQs with occasional short excerpts from the Framework, to delve into some of the difficult questions the Framework has to deal with, and the approach the team has taken.

Two periods of consultation on the framework have been completed, and the team is now finalizing version 1 of the framework to be handed over to the Executive by the end of 2018. The team is also setting up a forum for ringers to subscribe to if they would like to be informed of framework developments. Details of this forum will be included in future FAQ articles.

The Framework can be found at **https://framework.cccbr.org.uk**. Excerpts have been lightly edited for typographical errors, context and formatting style.

9. 'Funny numbers'

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 9.

Question

It's also a bit silly to ring partial extents of minor, doubles, etc even if you do want a funny number in the peal report. I wouldn't stop someone from doing it, but I don't want to see it reported as a peal, or on a peal board.

Answer

The change to recognise partial extents was made in 2016, passing with a large Central Council majority, so this isn't something new in the framework. To not recognise partial extents goes against the permissive and descriptive elements of the framework mandate, which was also passed by a large Central Council majority.

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 2.

Question

I think that it is slightly odd that jump changes are added, but are then also added to the list of items to be mentioned in performance reports as not conforming to the norms.

Answer

In line with our descriptive/permissive mandate, we've included jump changes in the framework so that if they're rung, there is terminology to describe them. But since jump changes have not been the norm in method ringing, we want their use to be clear in performance reports. Since methods that include jump changes will have 'Jump' in their method titles, additional disclosure is therefore only needed when (a) jump calls are used with non-jump methods, and (b) variations with jump changes are used (variations don't use class descriptors in their titles). This is outlined in the further explanation of Section 6.C.2.

FAQ Section C 'Permissiveness': Question 12.

Question

On the subject of jump changes: The new framework has done an excellent job of allowing the flexibility for bands and composers to explore a multitude of constructs and so it would seem to me to be inconsistent for jump changes to be excluded simply because they have not been part of the traditional framework. I do agree that unfettered inclusion could lead to some bizarre results and so the challenge is to provide a little bit of structure and then see what happens. My proposal is to follow the principle that the primary objective is to allow people to describe accurately what they ring. To do this we should start by saying that changes are classified as jump-n. Normal methods are jump-1 (i.e. no bell changes more than one place) but obviously by extension we could define a jump-2 method and so on. It would also be helpful to define whether we have a jump method or are using jump calls. A standard method with jump bobs might be an interesting idea, not everyone's cup of tea but if it allowed better compositions in methods with a lot of falseness it might get some traction. I don't think the reservation that bands might claim a performance by claiming 'Go rounds' is of any concern. At the end of the day we rely on the honesty of bands and conductors to report what was done and not everyone has the same standards with the rules we've got so to say we are not allowing something because we can't trust people to use it responsibly is not the way to go!

Answer

We agree with all your points. The purpose of the framework is to provide terminology to describe what ringers choose to ring, not to try and impose limits – that was our permissive / descriptive mandate. Your jump-n notation is a good suggestion – it would be interesting to see in a performance report involving jump changes what the size of the jumps were. We haven't included this notation in the first version of the framework given that jump changes are rarely rung, but we've tabled this for consideration in a future version of the framework.