

Ironworking

Category Rules

This category is for functional metalwork. Owing to the extreme difficulty in preparing iron and high-carbon steel from raw materials, judges should consider modern alloys as a conservative substitution for those available to our honorable ancestors in most cases.

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 an item that would not be accepted in period but 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 intended time period, location, culture, and economic class for which it was constructed.
- 3 Use of **either** period material **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 totally authentic materials and methods. 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 look & feel to the original. Please explain the substitution in your documentation, and, if possible, explain how your substitution either resembles a period material, or how the handle of a period material would differ from the replacement.

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

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

- Difficulty of the techniques used: Consider the techniques and the extent to which they were applied. Simple bends and twists < complex bends and twists, drawing < upsetting, punching, swaging < simple scroll work, chasing, raising, joining with rivets and collars < complex scroll work, forge welding.
- Scale and complexity of the entry: Consider the labor that went into the item and the number of pieces and the precision they needed to achieve for the entry to be functional. An arrowhead with a drawn point < tongs with drawn reins. Gimel hinges < small pinned hinges < large pinned hinges.
- 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.

- Realization of design: How well does the result match what was being attempted?
- Control of forming: How well executed were the construction techniques in the piece (e.g. casting, dishing, raising, twisting, bending, welding, riveting, hinges, etc.)?
- Finishing and cleanup: Does the item present itself well or does it appear crude as if minimum functionality was the end goal? (e.g. planishing, filing, polishing, etc.)
- Functionality and durability: Will the item perform its intended function? Will it survive reasonable use for an item of this type?

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.