

# Manuscript Arts—Cartography

LEVEL (check one):  NOVICE  OPEN | ENTRANT #: \_\_\_\_\_ ENTRY #: \_\_\_\_\_ | JUDGE: 1..2..3

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ENTRY: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please use the following numeric judging scale (choice of higher or lower number within each of the five “levels” is dependent upon judge’s evaluation of entry for each of the criteria [see pp 17–18 of *Judges’ Certification Handbook*]):**

- 1–2 Falls well (or considerably) below judge’s concept of “average for Atenveldt” for criterion evaluated.
- 3–4 Falls slightly below judge’s concept of “average for Atenveldt” for criterion evaluated.
- 5–6 Meets judge’s concept of “average for Atenveldt” for the criterion evaluated.
- 7–8 Exceeds judge’s concept of “average for Atenveldt” for criterion evaluated.
- 9–10 Greatly exceeds judge’s concept of “average for Atenveldt” (i.e., ranks “very high”) for criterion evaluated.

## DOCUMENTATION:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Includes complete information relating to the pre-17<sup>th</sup> example(s) used for the entry as well as other information pertinent to the entry for use by judges.* Does the documentation include: Time frame and provenance of model(s); purpose and/or use of model(s); original materials, tools, techniques, styles, and design elements of model(s); a discussion of the materials, techniques, tools, and design elements used to create the entry; appropriate examples of recipes, design elements and styles, symbolism, etc.; and, citations/references? To what degree did the entrant explain the selection of design elements, materials, and styles appropriate to the project? Was the documentation organized and legible?

**Judge’s comments:**

## COMPLEXITY &/OR DIFFICULTY:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Assessment of the scope, ambition, and difficulty of the entry.* What was the variety used and difficulty attempted with respect to media, materials, techniques, design elements, and detail? How complex was the scope (i.e., size of work with respect to amount of detail) of the entry? Did the entrant(s) undertake extended techniques (e.g., mixing paints &/or inks using pre-17<sup>th</sup> century pigments/techniques, use of mapmakers’ tools, use of quills for calligraphy, etc.)? What form(s) of lettering and decoration were undertaken? What was the difficulty/complexity of the projection used and added elements (e.g., compass, rhumb lines, scale, legend, etc.).

**Judge’s comments:**

## WORKMANSHIP:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*The skills used and the resulting quality of work in producing the entry.* How well did the entrant manage to control the media? Was any use of colour and shading, symbolism, and design elements (by pre-17<sup>th</sup> century standards) appropriate and well executed? Was use of calligraphy, design motifs, and projection &/or added elements consistent throughout? Was the execution of perspective and proportion with respect to the selected style well done (by pre-17<sup>th</sup> century standards)?

**Judge’s comments:**

**ÆSTHETIC QUALITIES:**

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*The overall æsthetic effect and appeal of the entry, as perceived by the judges.* Did the use of perspective (if any), cartographic design elements, calligraphy &/or illumination, and stylistic elements result in a beautiful piece? Was the layout and design consistent and even throughout? Were there obvious errors/corrections?

**Judge’s comments:**

**AUTHENTICITY:**

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*How closely the entrant followed pre-17<sup>th</sup> century techniques and how nearly the entrant achieved a piece that would not have been out of place in a pre-17<sup>th</sup> century cultural setting.* Did the entrant use cartographic design elements, alphabet(s), illumination styles, and layout appropriate to the entrant's stated time frame &/or culture for the project? Are the layout, design elements, illumination styles, and calligraphy appropriate with respect to each other (within a pre-17<sup>th</sup> century context)? To what degree did the entrant use pre-17<sup>th</sup> century materials, tools, and techniques to produce the finished work? Overall, to what degree could the entry be mistaken for a pre-17<sup>th</sup> century map or chart?

**Judge’s comments:**

**CREATIVITY:**

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*The extent of the entrant's adaptation of materials, tools, methods, processes, etc., in production of the entry, and the entrant's effort to produce a unique entry.* To what degree has the entrant “personalized” the use of cartographic design elements, calligraphy, and illumination within a consistent pre-17<sup>th</sup> century cartographic style? Has the entrant copied an original map or chart, or has the entrant mad a map or chart of a region or area not previously seen (perhaps of use within the “Current Middle Ages”)? How well has the entrant adapted use of modern materials, tools, and techniques towards the production of a pre-17<sup>th</sup> century effect? Overall, is this an "original" work that would have been acceptable within a pre-17<sup>th</sup> century context?

**Judge’s comments:**

**TOTAL SCORE** (maximum possible = 60):

Judge’s SCA Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge’s SCA Name (please print): \_\_\_\_\_