

# Decorative Metalwork

## Category Rules

This category includes all objects made of metal which try, as one of their primary objectives, to be beautiful and or pleasing to the eye. Entries should consist of finished items. **Warning:** Mercury gilding as practiced by the ancients is extremely dangerous. Such techniques may **not** be used in the ancient manner. Modern safeguards for mercury-gilding are required and must be mentioned in the documentation. Use of modern safeguards may **not** be a cause for a lower authenticity score. OSHA LEVEL 4 containment hood as a **minimum safety precaution is recommended.**

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

Tools made in the course of construction of an entry should be briefly described in the documentation, but need not be exhibited with the entry. Judges are advised to remember that it was common for older works of metal to be redesigned or modified by later smiths. Entrants who adopt this fashion should mention the rationale for all phases of the work in the documentation. Documentation should discuss the elements of the piece and the rationale for them, as well as the precedents and reasoning behind its design and function. Entrants should also discuss where a medieval metalsmith might have obtained the types of materials used; this is especially important if unusual or exotic materials were used to produce the entry. Plating is a special case. There is substantial scholarly argument as to the possible use of electroplating in the ancient world and, if the entrant shows awareness of the arguments, such use should be counted as authentic. Incidental material need not be prepared by the entrant and their use should not be penalized if documentable.

- 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.
- 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.
- 3 Use of **either** period material **or** methods to produce a work that looks or feels authentic to the relevant time period, location, culture, and economic class.
- 4 Use of materials and methods entirely documentable to the period for which it was constructed.

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 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 the following elements.

- Direct manipulation: basic skills of sawing, filing, piercing, twisting, bending, etc.; advanced skills of cold and hot forming, planishing, soldering, forge-welding, riveting, hinges and catches, etc.
- Surface decoration: basic skills of stamping, etching, chasing, polishing, etc.; advanced skills of granulation, filigree, repoussé, niello, etc.
- Incidental materials: formulating solder alloys, fluxes, cleaning compounds, etching compounds, polishing compounds, liver of sulfur, glass mixtures for enameling, grinding enamels from lump, etc.
- Scale and scope of design: size (larger is not necessarily better), difficulty of techniques used, variety of elements, general proportion, period style, etc.
- Preparation of materials: rolling, hammering into sheets, making shot, tempering, hardening, annealing, normalizing, etc.

*Optional*

- Use of multi-metal techniques: lamination, layering, pattern-welding, metal inlay, fitting or formed or cast pieces, etc.
- Incorporation of non-metallic elements: stone, wood, bone, shell, leather, glass, enamel, etc.

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

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

- Success of obtaining period style(s).
- Control of direct manipulation techniques: basic skills of sawing, filing, piercing, twisting, bending, etc.; advanced Skills of cold & hot forming, planishing, soldering, forge-welding, riveting, hinges & catches, etc.
- Control of surface decoration techniques: basic skills of stamping, etching, chasing, polishing, etc.; advanced skills of granulation, filigree, repoussé, niello, etc.
- Application of incidental materials: formulating solder alloys, fluxes, cleaning compounds, etching compounds, polishing compounds, liver of sulfur, glass mixtures for enameling, grinding enamels from lump form, etc.
- Success of the scale and design of the piece: size (larger is not necessarily better), difficulty of techniques used, variety of elements, general proportion, etc.
- Success in the preparation of materials: rolling, hammering into sheets, making shot, tempering, hardening, annealing, normalizing, etc.

*Optional*

- Control of multi-metal techniques: lamination, layering, pattern-welding, metal inlay, fitting or formed or cast pieces, etc.
- Control of non-metallic media: stone, wood, bone, shell, leather, glass, enamel, etc.

**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.