

Miscellaneous Literary Arts

Category Rules

This category is for all literary compositions that do not fit into other Division I categories, such as comics and sequential art. The literary genre of the entry must be documentable to before 1600 C.E. in Europe or any culture having contact with Europe before 1600 C.E. This category is **not** for transcriptions, translations, etc. While a limited amount of material written by others is allowable (i.e., quotes from other sources or significant reworking of an existing story into a new piece), the newly composed material must be of sufficient quantity and nature to justify its classification as a new work. Furthermore, all material not composed by the entrant must be out of copyright (or accompanied by written permission from the copyright owner) and clearly attributed to the original source in the entry's documentation and bibliography.

This is a mail-in category. All mail-in entries must be sent (postmarked) to the KMOAS **by January 15**. No late entries will be accepted. **THE KMOAS RECOMMENDS THAT YOU EMAIL YOUR ENTRY**. Any updates or changes to this deadline will be published in the Middle Kingdom newsletter, *The Pale*. Post-mail entries are accepted, but will be scanned in and delivered via email to judges. This category is eligible for Regional Faires.

Judges may choose not to evaluate more than 15 pages of text (or 30 pages of less dense text, such as in sequential art). If the entry is longer, the entrant must clearly indicate in the documentation which 15 (30) pages the judges should examine. Judged material need not be contiguous and may include up to five segments, as needed. For face-to-face judging, each entry must include four printed copies of the composition and four printed copies of the documentation, typed or written in a neat, legible hand. See Research and Documentation for desired content of the composition and documentation.

Research and Documentation (Score: 0-4 points)

Documentation should include historical information and discussion of all elements relevant to the entry. Recognizing that some kinds of literary art have limited amounts of source material, judges should allow for a greater amount of intelligent guesswork on the part of the entrant while still expecting a sincere attempt to document the entry. If relevant, documentation should include a brief summary of information searches that failed to yield useful information. For full points, the documentation should include:

- The style/genre of literary art to which the entry belongs, as well as the time(s) and place(s) that style was used, and its societal context (i.e., where it would have been written, by whom, under what circumstances, for what purpose, etc.).
 - A detailed discussion of the relevant style, as well as a discussion of all elements of the entry, explaining how each aspect of the entry conforms to stylistic expectations and giving reasons for any departures from standard stylistic practice.
 - If the entry is in a language other than modern English, a translation (translator listed).
 - If the entry is written in a language that does not normally use the Latin alphabet, such as Japanese, Arabic, or Greek, a transliteration of the entry into Roman letters, accompanied by a pronunciation guide.
 - Any transcriptions, redactions, or translations of historical works in whole or in part should include references and thorough documentation of the source material including publication data.
- 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 composition 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 composition are described and reasons for choices 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)

Rank the historical accuracy of materials and methods. Where historic practice is unknown, rank the reasonableness of conjectures. Do not rank the difficulty of the materials and methods. Materials may include topics, source documents, real people/places/events, etc. mentioned in the entry. For compositions intended to be performable, materials also include any equipment and performers called for. Methods are the composer's ways of combining and using material, including the type or style of composition; use of language, literary devices, and/or narrative conventions; elements of duration, structure, sound, etc.; and expectations for the relationships between different parts of the composition.

Regardless of the time/place origin of the piece's style, entries will not be penalized for being written in modern English, provided that the text avoids mention of post-16th-century objects, persons, and places, and the vocabulary and syntax are free of obvious "modernisms." Literary or linguistic devices that do not work in modern English or are offensive/incomprehensible to modern audiences may be replaced with equivalent devices that work well in modern English for modern audiences, provided the substitutions are logical and the differences between the substitute and the original technique are adequately explained in the documentation.

- 0 Entry is completely modern with no relationship to period elements or practices.
- 1 Use of modern materials **and** methods to produce a composition that does not conform to period practice, but which has some relationship to the medieval or Renaissance period.
- 2 Use of **both** modern and period materials and methods to produce a composition that is evocative of the intended style.
- 3 Use of primarily period materials and methods to produce a composition that feels authentic.
- 4 Use of totally authentic materials and methods.

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

Rank the **ambition**, not the success, of the entry for all **applicable** elements.

- Audience Understanding: understanding of intended audience, elements chosen to communicate effectively with intended audience, etc.
- Characters: depth, interpretation, complexity, relevance to plot/subject matter, etc.
- Construction: construction methods and techniques, materials used, etc. (if piece uses visual elements, such as illustrations, to communicate meaning).
- Content: intricacy of plot/subject matter, handling of theme, extent of supporting detail/background, etc.
- Dramatic Devices: asides, choruses, soliloquies, etc. (if piece is intended to be performable).
- Form: structure, relationship of segments to one another, etc.
- Language: grammar, spelling, vocabulary, etc.
- Literary Devices: foreshadowing, irony, hyperbole, metaphor, etc.
- Notation: clarity, legibility, ease of interpretation, appropriateness of extended forms of notation, etc.
- Performability: flow, naturalness, familiarity with performance medium (if piece is intended to be performable).
- Physical Elements: consideration of physical space (floor patterns, blocking, etc.) and objects (props, set pieces, incidental music, blocking, costuming, etc.) (if piece is intended to be performable).
- Poetic Language: linguistic devices (diction, register, rhyme, alliteration, assonance, etc.) and prosody (meter, rhythm, syllable count, scansion, etc.).
- Relationship of Elements: combination, integrating, and synthesis of simultaneous components (text underlay, synchronization of physical movements to spoken text, etc.).

- Technical Communication: effectiveness of instructions for physical techniques (steps, gestures, facial expressions, etc.) and vocal techniques (tone, volume, dialect, pitch, speed of delivery, etc.) (if piece is intended to be performable).
- Visual Artistry: detail, design, pattern, accuracy of representation, control of medium, etc. (if piece uses visual elements, such as illustrations, to communicate meaning).

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

How well are the technical aspects of the performance executed? Rank the **success** of the entry for all **applicable** elements (see Scope for descriptions of elements).

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| ● Audience Understanding | ● Notation |
| ● Characters | ● Performability |
| ● Construction | ● Physical Elements |
| ● Content | ● Poetic Language |
| ● Dramatic Devices | ● Relationship of Elements |
| ● Form | ● Technical Communication |
| ● Language | ● Visual Artistry |
| ● Literary Devices | |

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.