

# Siege Engines

## Category Rules

This category includes working **scale models** of siege engines that will throw projectiles via torsion, falling or shifting weight, human muscle powers, or other such power sources. Items related to sieges that do not function as offensive projectile weapons, those involving black powder or other incendiary material, and non-functioning replicas of siege weapons are not eligible for this category.

The scale of the engine and the weight of the object to be thrown must be noted in the documentation. The performance of the entry will be measured by its ability to throw a projectile a reasonable distance with good precision, and then the entrant should be prepared to provide data on the performance of the type of engine they are modeling as well as performance data for their model.

## 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 those 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.

- Complexity of the design: Consider the number and complexity of the pieces, and difficulty of working the materials involved in the project.
- Construction techniques: Consider the faithfulness of the joinery techniques used on a full-scale period example.
- 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 entry well-made and of reasonable durability?
- Overall realization of the design (success of the presentation).
- Range: Can the engine throw an appropriately scaled projectile an appropriate distance based on the performance of real-world engines?
- Precision: Does the engine place the projectile in a reasonably tight pattern, shot after shot, relative to its range?

*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.