

## Ironworking and Tool making

**Category Rules:** The category is for tools and items constructed out of iron. Tools made of wood and other materials should be judged in their appropriate categories. Documentation should include discussion of the elements of the piece and the rationale for them, as well as the precedents and reasoning behind its design and function.

### Documentation (0 to 4 points):

- 0: No documentation provided with entry.
- 1: Minimal information consisting of time, place and style.
- 2: Information consisting of time, place, and style, plus use of general sources; reliance on tertiary sources with perhaps one secondary source (ex: use of encyclopedia articles with a possible additional use of a book or article that refers to a period source.).
- 3: Information consisting of time, place, and style, plus a developed discussion making use of critical references; sources are largely secondary (ex: sources refer to period references; documentation discusses, compares, and contrasts the source's views).
- 4: Information consisting of time, place, and style, plus explanation of original research/experiment and relation of source material to it. Primary sources along with critical references, if available, are emphasized (ex: sources used are from the appropriate period for the entry, such as period manuscripts, paintings or artifacts, archaeological essays of primary source item, etc.).

### Methods and Materials (0 to 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.
- 2: Use of both modern materials and methods to produce a work that looks or feels authentic to the time period it purports to be.
- 3: Use of either modern materials or methods to produce a work that looks or feels authentic.
- 4: Use of totally authentic materials and methods.

**Scope (0 to 6 points):** Rank the ambition, not the success, of the entry on a scale of 0 to 6 for each of the following elements and average for the total Scope score (Total of element scores divided by 8).

- Joinery.
- Types of tools used and their availability.
- Ornamentation/decoration/sculptural forms.
- Hammering techniques.
- Types of materials used.
- Amount of handwork.
- Extent gone to ensure authenticity of patterns, techniques and materials used.
- Complexity of design and type of artifact, using the following suggested scale:
  - 1: Single dimension bends, simple rustic fire tool.
  - 2: Two dimensional bends, use of standard smithing tools, uneven simple twists.
  - 3: Three dimensional bends, use of complex or specialized tools, chains, even simple twists and splits.

4: Complex decorative twists, bends, fullering (hammered grooves), pots, pans and cauldrons, riveting, chasing, raising and or piercing.

5: Forge weldments, animal heads (mouth, eyes, nostrils, ears, etc.).

6: Decorative chisel work, surface treatment, scrollwork, gilding, iron gate or rood screen.

**Skill (0 to 6 points):** How well is the entry made? When considering Skill, the presence of firescale and/or small areas of rust should not be automatically reason for a lower score. Rank the success of the entry on a scale of 0 to 6 points for each of the following elements and average for the total Skill score (Total of element scores divided by 6).

- Mastery of period style.
- General proportions of piece in relation to period examples.
- Durability of piece.
- Functionality of piece.
- Control of forming and assembly techniques (casting, dishing, raising, twisting, bending, welding, riveting, hinges, etc.).
- Control of finishing techniques (planishing, filing, polishing, etc.).

**Creativity (0 to 4 points):**

- 0: Rote-copied item with mistakes added.
- 1: Rote-copied item with no innovations or documented knowledge of period style.
- 2: Logical combination of period elements with some innovation of embellishment or techniques, all logical to the period context of the persona for whom the costume is constructed.
- 3: As in #2, plus much individual interpretation and interpolation logical to the period context of the persona for whom the costume is constructed; that is, the range of possible styles considered and innovative combinations which appear to fit logically together.
- 4: As in #3 plus each element shows such consideration and choice logically innovative to itself. Elements work together in a cohesive fashion which is specific to the needs of the persona for whom the item is constructed.

**Judge's Observations (0 to 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 judge may allow her/his personality, private opinions and personal preferences to influence scoring.

*Contributors:* Guillaume le Fort & Guillaume Henri de Mathieu (based on the Decorative Metalwork criteria by Malutka sep Srebnitska written in 1982), no date given.

*Editors:* Bronwyn ferch Gwyn ap Rhys, 1987; Thorhalla Carlsdottir af Bröberg, 1997, Gwyneth Banfhidhleir, 2003.