

Music Instrument Making

Category Rules

This category is for the judging of musical instruments, be they brass, woodwinds, fabricated- or solid-body stringed, or percussion instruments. Judges are encouraged to assess the scope of the entry by comparing it to other instruments within its class (i.e., compare reeds with reeds) rather than make apples-to-oranges comparisons. During the judging, the instrument should be played (but not necessarily by the entrant) for purposes of addressing quality.

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.

- Scale: consider the size of the instrument and the number of pieces involved in its construction.
- Complexity: consider the difficulty of making an instrument of this type. Give one Complexity score using the class-specific options below:
 - Brass: number of solder joints, angle and number of bends in the tube, fingering pattern.
 - Woodwinds: technique used for creating the tube, geometry of the windway, fingering pattern.
 - Fabricated string: number of pieces, complexity of the curves and assembly, neck attachment, stress the instrument has to bear, pegbox design.
 - Solid-body string: nature and degree of the carving, shell size and thickness, neck attachment or self-neck, pegbox design.
 - Percussion: material and technique used to fabricate the shell, head style and attachment.
- Materials: consider the inherent difficulty in working the chosen materials for this design. A bamboo flute < a bored recorder, normal wood stock < highly figured stock, straight tubed < curved metal elements.
- Extent gone to ensure authenticity of techniques used: 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 techniques: Is the instrument well made? Are critical elements precise? Are joints and seams tight? Finger holes smooth? Frets well made?
- Playability: Can the instrument be tuned and played?
- Fit and finish: Does the item present itself well or does it appear crude as if minimum functionality was the end goal?
- Overall realization of the design (success of the presentation).
- Finishing and cleanup.

Optional

- Decoration and embellishment: Use and appropriateness of decorative techniques.

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.