

# Armor: Plate

## Category Rules

This category is for judging armor made primarily from metal plate such as helmets, couters, gauntlets, greaves, and poleyns. Suits composed primarily of metal on a cloth or leather substrate such as Wisby or Roman lorica would also be considered plate for the purpose of this criteria. Entries must be modeled either in person (but not necessarily by the entrant) or via photographs from all angles in order to judge fit under the Skill section.

## Research and Documentation (Score: 0-4 points)

- 0 No documentation provided with entry. Face-to-face judging adds very little information.
- 1 Minimal information is provided for time, place and style. Face-to-face judging adds some background information.
- 2 As in #1, generalized sources are given with no emphasis on primary and/or scholarly resources. In face-to-face judging, no further understanding of the resources is evident. Materials and methods of construction of the entry are described.
- 3 As in #2, there is a good balance of resources: primary and/or scholarly sources well supported by other resources. Documentation and/or face-to-face judging provides well developed discussion of research. Materials and methods of construction are described and the reasons for the choices made are discussed.
- 4 As in #3, in-depth and extensive documentation provides a good balance of resources, emphasizing primary (if available) and/or scholarly resources backed up with a significant selection of other resources. Documentation and/or face-to-face judging provide a good explanation of original research and experimentation related to the research. Face-to-face judging indicates a keen grasp of the research and the entrant can discuss it easily with active engagement. Appendices included in documentation (if any) help provide further pertinent information to subject and time period.

## Materials and Methods (Score: 0-4 points)

- 0 Entry is completely modern with no relationship to period elements or practices.
- 1 Use of modern materials and methods to produce a work that would not be accepted in period but either bears some relationship to an authentic work or which might be useful within SCA culture. Entry is inconsistent to period, location, and persona (ex: some period elements, but doubtful authenticity of materials, colors, technique, design, or planned use).
- 2 Use of **both** modern materials and methods to produce a work that looks or feels authentic to the time period, location, culture, and economic class for which it was constructed.
- 3 Use of **either** modern materials **or** methods to produce a work that looks or feels authentic to the time period, location, culture, and economic class for which it was constructed without explanation of any substituted materials.
- 4 Use of materials and methods entirely documentable to the period for which it was constructed; or modern materials are used in a way that does not detract from the appearance and feels appropriate to the persona for whom the item was constructed. Reasons for the substitution are explained in the documentation. Substitutions of

modern materials for materials which are no longer readily available will not be penalized so long as an effort has been made to substitute materials with a close appearance to the original.

### **Scope** (Score: 0-6 points for each bullet item)

Rank the **ambition**, not the success, of the entry for each of the following elements.

- Scale and complexity: Consider the scale and complexity of the entry including difficulty of achieving proper fit and required flexibility. Brigantine greaves < a simple coat of plates < a fully articulated leg harness < a full panoply of armor.
- Difficulty of techniques being used: Consider the extent and the inherent difficulty of the techniques used in the construction of the entry.
- Basic techniques: cutting, riveting, planishing, simple curves.
- Intermediate techniques: two-dimensional curves, basic articulation.
- Advanced techniques: Deep raising, complex articulation.
- Extent gone to ensure authenticity of techniques used: Consider any custom tooling, experimental archeology, etc.

#### *Optional*

- Decoration and embellishment: Consider the extent of any decorative elements of the piece.

### **Skill** (Score: 0-6 points for each bullet item)

How well is the entry made? Rank the **success** of the entry for each of the following elements.

- Construction: Is the armor well made? Were appropriate materials chosen? Were the construction elements well executed?
- Fit and usability: Does the armor fit its wearer? Does the articulation gap? Does it allow proper movement? Will it survive reasonable use for an item of this type?
- Fit and finish: Does the item present itself well or does it appear crude as if basic functionality was the end goal?

#### *Optional*

- Decoration and embellishment: Were the decorative elements (if any) well executed?

### **Ingenuity** (Score: 0-4 points)

Judge the ingenuity of the entry. Was the entrant resourceful and inventive in the approach to creating their entry? Does the entry reflect the entrant's vision of period context? Is original thought, contemplation, interpretation, and vision evident according to the entrant's period?

### **Judge's Observation** (Score: 0-6 points)

Rank the entry as a whole. How well do all the separately judged parts fit together? The entry's overall effect is judged in this section. This is the only section of the criteria where the judges may allow their personality, private opinions, and personal preferences to influence scoring.