

REALMS OF AVALON ARTS AND SCIENCES MANUAL

May 2005

*Welcome to the Realms of Avalon Arts and Sciences Manual.
It is our hope that you will find this manual easy to use and practical for your reenactment purposes.*

Goal:

The goal of the Arts & Sciences in Realms of Avalon is to increase the understanding of how arts, crafts, and sciences permeated the entire society of the middle ages and the Renaissance - mostly in Western Europe, but since no place is altogether isolated, also in the rest of the areas in contact with Europe at that time (i.e. most of the world by the end of the Renaissance). We seek to research, and, to the best of our abilities, reproduce the material culture of our Period.

Our first goal is to educate ourselves as we through active participation in tourneys, workshops and demonstrations; and then to spread that knowledge as Knights by taking on squires, as Guildmasters or -mistresses by organizing the study of particular subjects, and as members by exposing the general public to this vast, and vastly entertaining, area of history and of life.

Dame Maria of Hillsbend (Pia hooks), 2001

Revised 2004-2005 by Dame Ruth Freebourne (Ruth Frey)

PART 1 - KNIGHTHOODS, TOURNAMENTS AND MINISTRY ORGANIZATION

I. Requirements for Knighthood 4
II. Tournaments and Wars 5
 A. Tournament Procedures 6
 B. Judging a Tournament 7
 1. Judges and Judges’ Responsibilities 7
 2. How to Judge an Entry 7
 Percentile score requirements by level 9
 Authenticity 10
 Documentation
10
 Documentation Source Requirements 11
 Complexity / Difficulty 13
 Execution 14
 Interpretation 15
 Extra Points 15
 C. Percentile Scores 15
 D. Masterwork Recommendation / Judging 16
 E. Appealing a Judgment 16
 F. Wars and the Distribution of War Points 17
 G. Group Entries 18
 H. Children’s Tournaments 18
 I. Prize Tournaments 18
III. Ministers, Requirements, and Responsibilities 19

PART 2 - WRITING DOCUMENTATION 21

I. What Should be in Documentation? 21
II. Sources 22
 A. Types of Sources 22
 B. Primary Sources as Defined in Avalon 22
 C. Evaluating Sources 24
 1. Primary Sources 24
 2. Secondary Sources 25
III. Citing Sources 26
IV. Writing Bibliography Entries 29

I. REQUIREMENTS FOR KNIGHTHOOD:

The following requirements have to be met for each level before the member is awarded the rank of that level.

Everyone starts at the level of **APPRENTICE** (unless they are transferring experience as per the Rolls manual)

APPRENTICE + 3 tournament entries (TE) = **JOURNEYMAN**

JOURNEYMAN + 5 TE's - one of which earns the minimum percentile (%) score for advancement from the Journeyman level.

+ 2 Demonstration Participation's (DP)

= **MASTER/MISTRESS**

MASTER + 10 TE - 2 of which have to earn the minimum % score for advancement from the Master's level.

+ 3 DP's

+ 1 War Participation (WP)

+ 1 Masterwork award (MW)

= **KNIGHT BACHELOR**

KNIGHT BACHELOR + 18 TE - 4 of which have to earn the minimum % score for advancement at the Knight's level.

+ 6 DP's

+ 3 WP's

+ 2 MW Awards

+ 2 Demonstration Initiations (DI)

= **KNIGHT BANNERET**

KNIGHT BANNERET + 36 TE - of which 8 have to earn the minimum % score for advancement at the Knight's level.

+ 12 DP's

+5 WP's

+ 2 MW Awards

+ 4 DI's

= **KNIGHT COMMANDER**

Please note that to get to Knight Bachelor, you have to have a Masterwork awarded you. To get to Knight Banneret you must teach, in the form of demonstrations and workshops in your field for members and the the public. The same goes for Knight Commander, only more so.

II. TOURNAMENTS

A. TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

* **Who can participate in a tournament as an Artisan (i.e. member involved in A&S)?**

Anyone who has something historically accurate that they have made themselves, along with at least the minimum documentation. (See section on Documentation). There are no age restrictions on Arts tournaments entries, so minors are free to enter, but their work and documentation will be judged by the same criteria as adult entries. There can be no relaxation of requirements for youth entries. For youngsters who are interested in the Arts, but are not yet ready to enter adult-level tournaments, it is possible to hold non-point-bearing children's tournaments (see "**Children's Tournaments**" below) to encourage participation and learning.

* **What is an ENTRY? What are the categories of Entry?**

There are three main types of entries: *projects*, *research papers*, and *educational displays*.

A **project** is anything that can be reasonably supposed to have been made and/or used in Europe, or regions known to Europe, during our time Period (500 AD - 1603 AD): a piece of clothing, metalwork, or leather work; foods or beverages prepared from historical recipes; artwork, poetry, calligraphy and illumination in Period style and subject matter; a performance of Period song or dance, etc.

A **research paper** is a written work which explores some aspect of Period life, arts, or technology. Research papers are especially useful when dealing with things that may not be practical to produce as a project (poisons, firearms, or cathedrals, for example), when dealing with social issues of the time that do not necessarily involve a physical component (e.g. the effect of the Black Death on the economy of a region), or when discussing a particular subject matter across a wide range of time or location (e.g. the history of dance in Europe from the Dark Ages to the Renaissance).

An **educational display** is a display of some sort intended to educate the public and/or our members about some aspect of Period life. Displays may be two-dimensional (e.g. an educational website, poster or flip book) or three-dimensional (e.g. a scale model trebuchet with an accompanying info card), and may be static (the public simply views or reads the display) or interactive (the public somehow handles or works with the display -- e.g. answering questions on an interactive website, using a model trebuchet to fire foam blocks at a target, etc.).

*** What will I, as an Artisan, need to do to enter into a Tourney?**

You will, of course, need your entry ...

Your research that you used in making your entry needs to be compiled into a presentable form, your documentation (see below for more info about documentation).

Your documentation needs to be handed in to your local Arts & Sciences Minister (ASM) at the same time as you sign up for that month's tourney. The ASM may request that Artisans in sign up and turn in their documentation up to 10 days before the tournament, rather than at the event itself, so the ASM has time to arrange for judges. This timing is left to the discretion of the ASM; it is the ASM's duty to inform Artisans within a reasonable time frame what the policy for a tournament will be.

Make sure the ASM knows what your rank/experience is so that the documentation can be evaluated properly.

Prepare an oral presentation for the Judges, to be given at the Tourney. You need not repeat all the information in your written documentation, which the judges will have read, but be ready to present your entry with any necessary comments and explanations, and be prepared to answer questions from the Judges.

No entry can be submitted for evaluation in a tourney more than once without at least 2 significant changes, unless there is a successful appeal of judgment (see below), or unless it is recommended by the ASM (for example, the ASM may allow an Artisan to reenter an item with improved documentation for a better score, etc.).

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE Artisan TO RETRIEVE ENTRIES AND DOCUMENTATION AT THE END OF THE TOURNEY.

*** What will I, as an Arts & Sciences Minister, need to do to put on a Tourney?**

It is the responsibility of the ASM (or Deputy, or Crown, in the absence of either) to:

Provide a sign-up sheet for the Artisans at the determined time.

Inform Artisans within a reasonable time frame if sign-in and submission of documentation will be taking place at a time other than at the event itself. Timing of sign-in is at the discretion of the ASM; the ASM may also require different sign-in times for different sorts of entries (e.g. require research papers to be turned in before an event, to allow judges time to read it, but allow other entries to be made onsite). On-line registration should be considered as an option when sign in takes place in advance of an event.

Evaluate the documentation before the Tourney for technical problems and for completeness of requirements in regards to documentation

Organize appropriate Judges for the Tourney (panel of 3 is min.) for each item Note: at least one Judge per Entry should be considered by an Expert in that field.

Make sure that a suitable area is available for the display of the entries and for Judging the same.

Either supervise the tourney or appoint someone to do it (Deputy, Crown, or Subdivision Head, usually). **Note:** supervising the tourney usually means being the one who knows the rules, the documentation requirements, and also serve as the scribe if a scribe is unavailable.

Make Comment Cards available to the Artisan after the Tournament - please note that it is the Artisan who is responsible for keeping track of Comment Cards and any other records of previous entries.

Prepare and present a listing of any awards achieved by the Artisans to the Crown or Subdivision Head at the event.

Prepare a Rolls report for your Ministry to the Rolls Minister each month

Prepare an Activity Report to the next level up ASM.

It is also the ASM's responsibility to encourage workshops, the formation of guilds, and to assist in directing people to members with like interests.

It is the ASM's responsibility to keep a listing of experts willing to serve as Judges. (I suggest a questionnaire for new members - please note that anyone receiving an Masterwork is also considered an expert and therefor all the Arts Knights should be an expert in something).

B. JUDGING A TOURNAMENT

1. JUDGES AND JUDGES' RESPONSIBILITIES:

An Entry cannot be judged by less than 3 people, at least one of whom must be an Expert in the field. The ASM will evaluate who is an Expert, but the individual will usually a) have a Masterwork award for work in that subject, b) make a Mundane living in the field and/or c) have considerable experience in the field due to other reasons.

In the case that there is no member present at the tournament who qualifies as an Expert in a particular area of study, the ASM must ask the Artisan if they are willing to have their project

judged by non-experts. If the Artisan says no, then judging of their entry will be postponed until an expert is available. If no expert will be available for judging at a local event within a reasonable span of time, by an Artisan's request the local ASM may contact the Crown ASM to arrange for long-distance judging by an expert, with details to be arranged according to the particular project and circumstance.

One of the judges must also be proficient in evaluating documentation; which will usually be the ASM, though any of the judges can serve in this capacity provided they have the requisite knowledge of the rules. The ASM is responsible for training and certifying those who are interested in the art of being an "Administrative" judge (i.e. the judge who knows the rules and who takes responsibility for the paperwork).

Judges are to make an especial effort to judge entries fairly and dispassionately. Extremes of judging should be avoided -- for example, judges should not seek to concentrate exclusively on faults in an entry, resulting in an unfairly harsh score, nor should judges overlook faults and award undeservedly high scores in an effort to spare an Artisan's feelings.

Judges should be clear and direct on Comment Cards given to Artisans, about both the good and the bad points of their projects. The goal is to tell Artisan what they have done well and should continue doing, and to inform Artisans of flaws they need to correct in future entries. This feedback is important for an Artisan's development, and should be treated thoughtfully and respectfully by the judges.

A judge may NOT evaluate their own entry, the entry of a family member, or the entry of a member to which they are bound by a knight-squire relationship.

All entries are to be judged on the merit of the entry itself and on the merits of the documentation provided. Let me be perfectly clear on this - the Artisan is not the one being judged, the entry is. A member who feels incapable of making this distinction on an individual or a general basis should remove themselves from the judging process.

All entries are also to be judged on their success as a re-creation of a historical item (in the case of projects), and as educational/research works in the case of papers and displays. Projects are not to be judged by modern esthetics (e.g. a wine with historically accurate sediment in it should not be marked down because it does not have the clarity we are accustomed to in modern wines) or personal esthetics (e.g. just because a judge does not like chicken does not mean that they should mark down an entry of a chicken recipe). Similarly, research papers and educational displays should not be marked down if they deal with a subject matter the judge does not like, etc.

Note: It is assumed that a judge who feels incapable of judging an entry impartially or accurately for any reason will remove themselves from the process.

Note also that an Artisan may refuse to have any particular judge or panel of judges evaluate their work, however the Artisan may risk a delay in the judging of their entry if no replacement judge or judges are available onsite.

Stringency of judging will increase with the rank of the Artisan, to take into account the accumulation of knowledge in an area; for example, a project which might be complex for a beginner may be considered less complex for a Knight, who has entered several projects of a similar nature.

It is perfectly permissible for the 3 judges to assign different values in the various categories, though discussion among the judges is encouraged and will often result in unanimity in the scoring. **Please note** that in regards to % scores and Masterwork awards (MW's), in addition to a certain score value the unanimous opinion of the Judges is needed to achieve the % or MW.

2. HOW TO JUDGE AN ENTRY.

1. Determine the Authenticity - Yes or No
2. Evaluate the Documentation 15 pts + 2 extra points available
3. Evaluate the Complexity & Difficulty 15 pts + 2 extra points available
4. Evaluate the Execution and Presentation 15 pts + 2 extra points available
5. Evaluate Originality/Interpretation 5 pts available
6. Determine extra points
7. Decide on Advanced Entry/Master Work Recommendation

Percentile score requirements for advancement at:

Apprentice level - 60% (30 pts)
Journeyman level - 75 % (37.5 pts)
Master level - 80 % (40 pts)
Knight level - 90 % (45 pts)

Please note that there are no “wins” awarded for point-bearing A&S tournaments -- all entries are judged individually, and all entries receiving a high enough point score will be awarded credit for reaching their % score level.

An entry earning a **Masterwork** award needs a minimum score of 100 % or 50 points + unanimous consent of the Judges.

Please note also that a Knight attempting a completely new field will have the documentation requirements of Knight level, but everything else should be evaluated at the Novice level, with later entries in the same field being judged to increasingly higher standards as the individual gains experience in the new field.

1. AUTHENTICITY (YES/NO)

The authenticity of an entry is determined by the documentation and the presentation. A project must be shown to be an acceptable reproduction of a Period product. A research paper must prove that it is based on accurate material. An educational project must prove that the information given to the public is accurate.

If, based on presented documentation, an Entry is deemed invalid (bearing in mind that reasonable variations are perfectly admissible in authentic pieces) then the Entry will not be evaluated any further and the reason for this will be noted on the Comment Card along with recommendations for improvement.

A voided entry may be reentered at a later date for evaluation if the void was due to insufficient documentation. An Entry that was deemed void due to other considerations (mostly that they simply would not have done, or had the capability, to do that) will not be reevaluated. Chocolate covered brownies with heraldic icing designs, for instance, will never be a qualified entry, since the item itself is entirely non-Period.

2. DOCUMENTATION (15pts + 2)

TEXT DOCUMENTATION

The text documentation for a **project** must cover the “who, what, when, how, where, and why” of Period production for the type of item represented by the entry. The documentation should provide historical support for the materials, processes, content, etc. used in creating the project.

Note that documentation exists to present the historical background material for an entry, not to be an “English paper” type of exercise. Judges should not mark down project documentation for typographical, mechanical, grammatical, or spelling errors -- unless such errors are so large as to make the documentation genuinely difficult to understand and evaluate. Note that if the project itself is in some written format (such as a poem or story), presented in modern English (as opposed to Period English), the presence of such errors may count against the Execution score of the entry. While niceties like title pages, document covers, and the like may enhance the documentation’s appearance and ease of handling, documentation lacking such additions will not be penalized by removal of points, nor should their presence increase the point score of the documentation.

The text documentation for a **research paper** is the paper itself, and the references cited in the text and given in the bibliography. Since a research paper is the whole of an entry, it is expected to cover the material in greater depth than the standard documentation for a project or educational display. Therefore, research papers have different source requirements (see below for details). In the case of a research paper, the presence of typographical, mechanical, grammatical, or spelling errors are considered under the category of Execution (see below).

The text documentation for an **educational display** must cover the references used in creating the display, and must show that the references support the information given to the public in the display. The documentation need not be a part of the display itself, but may be presented as a separate paper. As with projects, typographical, mechanical, grammatical, or spelling errors in educational display documentation should not be penalized unless they render the documentation impossible to understand. However, such errors in the educational display itself may count against the Execution score of the entry.

ORAL DOCUMENTATION

The oral presentation part of the program exists to allow the Artisan to present the material in the documentation in a slightly more accessible format. It need not completely repeat the material in the text documentation, but it should provide a reasonable introduction to the entry. The oral presentation is a good opportunity for the judges to ask questions and, if the judges so allow, for the audience to do the same. Please note that this is the only time the audience is allowed to speak up during the judging process and those who abuse the privilege, after receiving one warning, can, and will, be escorted off the premises.

Note that in the case of extremely large Wars or Tournaments, the ASM in charge may waive the oral presentation section of documentation (except in the case of Novice entries which have primarily oral documentation), in the interests of time. In these situations, entries will be supported entirely by their text documentation, unless the judges specifically request the chance to question an Artisan about their entry.

There are different documentation requirements for each level of rank based on the assumption that increased experience allows for increased levels of documentation research and difficulty.

DOCUMENTATION SOURCE REQUIREMENTS, BY LEVEL -- PROJECTS AND EDUCATIONAL DISPLAYS

a. **NOVICE** (i.e. 1st time entrant) need only have:

- an oral presentation
- a written bibliography of sources

b. **APPRENTICE** (2 entries)

- oral presentation
- bibliography of sources
- written documentation quoting from at least one secondary source (two is better)

c. **JOURNEYMAN** (5 entries)

- oral presentation
- bibliography of sources
- written documentation quoting/depicting at least 2 secondary sources (3 is better, one primary source preferred)

d. **MASTER** (10 entries)

- oral presentation
- bibliography of sources
- written documentation including:
 - 1 primary source
 - 2-3 secondary sources (3 preferred)

e. **KNIGHTS**

- oral presentation
- list of references
- written documentation including:
 - 2 primary sources (if at all possible)
 - 3-4 secondary sources (4 preferred)

DOCUMENTATION SOURCE REQUIREMENTS -- RESEARCH PAPERS

Because research papers consist entirely of written material, the documentation requirements are increased above those of other entry types. The minimum documentation requirement for any research paper entered at any level equals Knight's level documentation in the other categories. Authors of papers are encouraged to exceed these requirements, especially at higher levels of competition, in order to receive a score above the minimum. Judges will especially consider the number and quality of references in this project category.

Note: The documentation requirements mentioned above are the **minimum** recommended standards for documentation for each level of research experience. The goal is to teach the Artisan the "how to" of research. If the minimum standards are met for each level **no less than 10 pts** shall be given. More work will garner a higher score, and less will get a lower score. For exceptional research and/or presentation of information, up to 2 extra points can be awarded in this category, but each point has to be given by unanimous consent of the judges and justified on the Comment Card.

Note also that primary sources can always be substituted for secondary sources in the above minimums, since primary sources are considered superior in content.

- Further information on documentation and its contents, sources, and construction is given in the **Part 2 - Writing Documentation** section below.

3. COMPLEXITY/DIFFICULTY 15 pts + 2

This category is the main reason for having a judge who is an Expert in the field as it is very difficult for a non-expert to evaluate an item outside their own area of expertise, no matter how extensive an evaluation matrix is available. Avalon has therefore chosen to go with the “Expert” judge as being preferable to the “matrix” idea, though if local regions prefer to use a matrix for a given subject matter they are certainly free to create one. A matrix is a table indicating the number of complexity points earned by a given type of project (e.g., a simple T-tunic would earn 10 points, a T-tunic with trim added would earn 11 points, and so on). Given the difficulty of constructing matrices to fairly and accurately evaluate every possible entry the judges might encounter, and in indicating the relative difficulty of an entry when considering the experience level of the entrant (what is complex for a beginner might be routine for an experienced Artisan), it is preferable to rely on the informed opinion of Expert(s) in judging individual cases. If matrices are desired, the local Guilds can assist with them. The presence of the Expert judge should not discourage the other judges from asking questions and expressing an opinion.

There are two aspects to this category, *complexity* and *difficulty*.

When judging complexity of a **project**, consider the following sorts of questions: Is the item made up of several different pieces? Are the pieces made of different materials? Are the materials compatible, or have extensive modifications been made to make them compatible? Do the processes used to make the item include several different steps? Once you know these answers you will have an idea of how complex the piece is.

When judging complexity of a **research paper**, consider the depth and breadth of material covered in the paper, and the number and types of sources and research involved in compiling the paper. How much personal thought and collation/organization of material was required? How complex, detailed, or wide-ranging is the topic of the paper?

When judging the complexity of an **educational display**, consider the complexity of layout and/or construction of the display. How much work, thought, and organization of material was needed to present the information in the display in the given format? Consider the age group/educational level for which the material is intended. A display to be used at a grade school Medieval Fair is naturally going to present simpler information than one intended for a college library; however, it can be just as difficult to present simple information clearly as it is to present detailed information, and this should be taken into consideration in this category.

Next, it is time to consider how difficult the entry, of whatever type, was to produce. The judges need to consider the level of skill needed to produce the entry (beginner, intermediate, advanced). Only when all these factors have been explored should a point value be assigned.

15 points are available in this category, with 2 possible extra points for very complex and/or highly skilled entries.

Substitutions in projects:

This is a potentially thorny and contentious issue, which I thought best to deal with here. Substitutions of materials and technique are allowed under certain conditions. If the substitution functions as if it was the original material/technique, and if the Artisan can adequately explain the original material/technique, then no points will be subtracted for using a substitute. This allows for machine stitched garb, and bread baked in electric ovens etc.

If the Artisan goes to the time, trouble and expense of using period materials and techniques then the extra effort should be rewarded with a higher score in the difficulty/complexity category, as use of these materials/techniques usually increases both the difficulty and the complexity of the entry.

There is one situation where using a substitute could garner a higher score than using the original, and that is when the Artisan has successfully invented a new technique that removes harmful ingredients/processes (such as use of lead in pottery glazes, and uranium in glass) which still retains the highest possible similarity to the Period item in the end product. A substitution of this sort is often very difficult, and may require much thought, and so should be considered to represent an added level of complexity.

4. EXECUTION 15 pts + 2

In this area the opinion of the expert is also invaluable although execution is perhaps a little easier for non-experts to have an opinion on. It is also the most subjective of the categories as it basically boils down to the question “How well was this done?” and “Did the Artisan achieve what s/he aimed for?” The Expert will know better than a non-expert what to look for, but the Expert may also fall into the trap of seeing only the flaws. Discussion among the judges is vital.

For **projects**, the question boils down to how well the Artisan has managed to reproduce a Period item, and the degree of craftsmanship on display.

For **research projects**, it is how well the paper covers and examines its chosen topic. Note that, since this is primarily a written form of entry, the presence of typographical, mechanical, grammatical, or spelling errors may reduce the Execution score of this type of entry, depending on their frequency and severity.

For **educational displays**, its how well the display imparts its information to the audience for which it was intended.

15 points are available for this category + 2 extra points for extremely well executed projects. Please note that Execution should only be considered after the Complexity as the level of difficulty may moderate the Execution score. An easy piece done well should score lower than a more difficult piece done well.

5. INTERPRETATION 5 pts

In the case of **projects**, interpretation points can be earned for exceptionally good aesthetic/materials/process choices related to the execution of the process. Examples would be fabrics chosen with especially Period-appropriate colors/patterns for a piece of garb; a harmonious and Period-appropriate choice of thread colors for a piece of embroidery; a well-chosen blend of spices for a recipe which only gives vague seasoning instructions in the original; a clever and workable solution to the problem of a process not clearly described in historical literature, but which is necessary to produce an item; use of a Period musical instrument especially well-suited to a piece of music in a performance entry, etc., etc. The Artisan should show that the choices/variations particular to their project follow an established aesthetic, that the Artisan understands that aesthetic, that the variations were possible with the methods and materials available at the time, and further that the variation was likely.

In the case of **research papers**, interpretation points can be earned by a good, coherent, and well-reasoned analysis or discussion of the historical material by the author/Artisan. All discussions have to be thoroughly supported by the historical evidence provided, and show a detailed knowledge of the topic.

In the case of **educational displays**, interpretation points can be earned for choices in materials (physical or informational), layout, and setup which especially facilitate the educational purpose of the display, or which especially affect its aesthetic appeal or attractiveness.

This is not an easy category to judge, but it can be very rewarding for both the judges and the Artisans. It encourages deeper understanding of the less-tangible side of the Period Arts and Sciences, and it will give those who feel stifled by the authenticity/documentation requirement a challenge, since it especially rewards personal artistry within the historical framework.

6. EXTRA POINTS

Extra points can and should be awarded the Artisan who puts in extra effort in one or more of the fields of evaluation. Often it is in the area of documentation that the opportunity for extra points is taken, but it also shows up in the other fields. Please note that the judges have to be unanimous in assigning extra points. Please also note that there are no extra points to be had in Interpretation. That whole field is basically an extra chance at points.

C. PERCENTILE SCORES

Artisans should be aware that not every entry can get a minimum % score for advancement to the next level. As a matter of fact the majority of entries (unless the quality overall is consistently high) will not be awarded a minimum % score. Nor do they need to be. Very few % scores are needed to advance in rank and only the truly good entries should merit this award.

D. MASTERWORK RECOMMENDATIONS AND JUDGING

A Masterwork recommendation needs to be unanimous. The Masterwork award will not be given out at a regular tourney. Based on the Tourney Judges recommendation, and with the consent of the Artisan and the ASM, a Masterwork panel of judges will be assembled (different people from the original panel is preferred). Judging will proceed as with a tourney, but with the added feature of evaluating several related pieces, in the case of projects and educational displays. Several pieces are necessary to demonstrate the Artisan's Mastery of the chosen field, along with appropriate documentation (at the Knight's level) for each piece and with additional explanation for how it all fits together. If the judges deem that the Artisan has Mastered this particular field, the Masterwork award recommendation will be upheld and that recommendation will be communicated to the ASM.

In the case of research papers, multiple papers on related subjects may be presented individually, or may be edited together into one long work. Alternatively, a research paper of exceptional depth, displaying a thorough knowledge of a particular field, may be considered for Masterwork status.

The Crown or Subdivision Head (depending on whether the award is given at a Realm or a Subdivision event) should present the actual award. Please note that an Artisan cannot receive a second Masterwork Award in exactly the same field as the first, but an award in a related field is permissible. For instance, it would be extremely difficult to get a Masterwork in cooking, but quite a bit easier to get in bread baking in the south of France, followed by another one in German pastries. It pays to be specific when choosing a field for the Masterwork. It is the ASM's responsibility to work with the Artisan in selecting a field for a Masterwork presentation.

E. APPEALING A JUDGMENT

It is the Artisan's right to appeal an evaluation that the Artisan feels is unjust. The ASM is responsible for assembling a new panel of judges within 30 days of the appeal for a reevaluation of the Entry. The panel is to consist of different judges from the original one.

The ASM can also call for a reevaluation even if the Artisan has not if the ASM thinks it is called for. An Entry can only be reevaluated once in this way. An Artisan may not use this process to routinely raise their score, and if there is a reasonable assumption by the ASM that this is the case, the Artisan may be barred from entering Tourneys for up to 3 months.

F. WARS AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF WAR POINTS

Entries into a War Tourney are to be evaluated in the same manner and by the same criteria as in a regular Tourney. Each Artisan's points scored will be given to their declared side in the War; the side with the highest total of points in an Arts List will win the War point for that List.

For the purposes of the War Lists in contested Wars, run according to the rules outlined in the Codicils, the entries will be divided into Non-Knights (all Artisans up to and including the rank of Master) and Knights levels. The entries will also be divided by type: Culinary/Alchemy (cooking, brewing, soap making, herbs, medicines etc.), Crafted (anything of practical use, such as clothing, armor, utensils), Fine Arts (any and all decorative arts, such as painting, illumination, embroidery), and Bardic Arts (theater, poetry, music, dance, religious services etc.).

There will be one (1) War point available to the highest scoring side in the following Lists:

- Non-Knights Culinary/Alchemy and Crafted
- Non-Knights Fine Arts and Bardic Arts
- Knights Culinary/Alchemy
- Knights Crafted
- Knights Fine Arts
- Knights Bardic

A total of six (6) points are available for distribution provided that all Lists are active. The point for any inactive list (List with no participants) will not be awarded. Please note that there are no limits on how many entries an Artisan may have, but only one War Entry will be awarded per War, and an Entry at a War Tourney is excluded from being entered again into a regular Tourney. Non-Knightly Artisans may, if they wish, "move up" a level and compete in the Knights level lists as well, but all Knights level entries will be judged at a Knightly level, regardless of the actual rank of the entrant. Note that Knights may *not* "move down" and compete in the Non-Knights lists -- Knights compete at Knights level only.

For the purposes of Fun Wars, the War Arts lists and War Arts point distributions are to be arranged between the hosting ASM and hosting Autocrat/Subdivision Head/Crown, as it is felt will distribute the points most fairly among the field of entrants, and as best fits the nature and tone of the Fun War.

As noted previously, in the case of extremely large Wars (contested or Fun), the ASM in charge may waive the oral presentation of documentation (except in the case of Novice entries which have primarily oral documentation), in the interests of time. In these situations, entries will be supported entirely by their text documentation, unless the judges specifically request the chance to question an Artisan about their entry.

Also at the ASM's discretion, research papers and/or educational displays may be barred from War tournaments because of the time needed for the judges to properly evaluate these types of entries; at a very large event, time may well be at a premium, and judging may need to be streamlined as much as possible. If any categories of entry are to be barred from a given War tournament, the ASM in charge of the tournament must make this publicly known at least thirty (30) days before the War itself.

G. GROUP ENTRIES

Group entries are to be considered in a slightly different manner than individual entries. It is the effort of the group, as a whole, that is to be judged. In a musical group, for instance, it is the evaluation of how well the individuals cooperated in generating the piece of music that matters - not how brilliant an individual performer, a soloist, is. The place for individual evaluation is in solo entries. The standard for evaluation of the documentation for the group is that of the highest ranking member of the group. For example, if the highest ranking member is a Master, then the documentation requirements for the group will be that on the Master level. In a War Tourney the group would enter the List that corresponds to the highest ranking member of the group.

H. CHILDREN'S TOURNAMENTS

While there are no age limits on entry in point-bearing Arts tournaments, younger children may not have the skills needed to compete in a regular tourney. To encourage children to participate in the Arts in a more low-key environment, a group may hold a children's "fun" or "prize" tourney, with judges drawn from among the parents and/or volunteers from the general populace. Parents or guardians should not judge the work of their own child. Such tourneys are not a point bearing activity, but rather undertaken for the fun of it. While the local ASM may certainly participate in organizing and running such a tournament, and it would be within the Ministry's scope, it is not a required duty of the office. Nor is it an exclusive duty of the office -- other individuals besides the ASM may organize such an activity.

I. PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

As with Combat and Archery, any person, House, Subdivision, Guild, or other party may hold a non-point-bearing Arts tournament. While the local ASM is under no obligation to organize or run such tournaments, they should be told of the event and given a chance to approve judges.

III. MINISTERS, REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Given below are the experience requirements and duties of the various types of ASM.

If there is no individual available for a given position with the recommended level of experience, that requirement may be waived as necessary.

*** IMPERIAL ARTS AND SCIENCES MINISTER (IASM)**

- Knight Bachelor in or higher in A&S
- *Coordinate and promote the Arts and Sciences on an overall basis
- *Update the Imperial Arts, Crafts & Sciences Manual as needed
- * Arrange and oversee such Imperial and Imperial War Tourneys as are desired

*** DEPUTY IMPERIAL ASM**

- Knight Bachelor in or higher in A&S
- *Assist the IASM in whatever is needed
- * Stand in for the IASM when needed

*** REALM ASM (RASM)**

- Knight Bachelor or above in A&S
- * Coordinate and promote Arts & Sciences on a Realm basis
- * Arrange and oversee Realm level Tourneys
- * Arrange and oversee Regional War Tourneys
- * Promote Workshops and Demonstrations to the public
- * Encourage the formation of local Guild chapters
- * Present Master Work Awards to the Crown
- * Keep a list of Experts for judging purposes
- * Report to the Realm Rolls Minister on a monthly basis
- *Report to the IASM on a monthly basis

***SUBDIVISION ASM (SASM)**

- Master or higher in A&S
- * Coordinate and promote Arts & Sciences on a Subdivision basis
- * Arrange and oversee the Subdivision's Monthly Tourney (more often if desired)
- * Assist the RASM at Regional War Tourneys
- * Promote Workshops and Demonstrations to the public
- * Encourage the formation of local Guild chapters
- * Present Master Work Awards to the Subdivision Head
- * Keep a list of Experts for judging purposes
- * Report to the Subdivision Rolls Minister on a monthly basis
- *Report to the RASM on a monthly basis

* **DEPUTY REALM ASM AND DEPUTY SUBDIVISION ASM (SASM)**

- Master or higher in A&S

* Assist the RASM or SASM with whatever is needed

* Stand in for the RASM or SASM when needed

* **SCRIBE**

- Willingness to serve and legible hand writing

* Take notes for the Judges during Tourneys by recording comments on the Comment Card. Note: This is a per event position.

* **JUDGES**

- Special qualifications apply; see section on **Judges** (II. B. 1., above)

* Judge impartially and fairly all entries for which they are qualified to pose an opinion during a Tourney Note: This is a per event position

PART 2: WRITING DOCUMENTATION

I. WHAT SHOULD BE IN DOCUMENTATION?

Your A&S documentation is the proof that your entry is based on historical evidence, and that you have worked to make your project as accurate as you can.

Your documentation should include the “who, what, how, where, when, and why” of your project:

- * Who would have made this item, and who would have used it?
- * What would it have been made out of in Period?
- * How would it have been made in Period?
- * Where would this have been made, geographically?
- * When (what century/date) would this have been made?
- * Why would this have been made, or for what purpose would it have been used?

Your documentation here should be supported by your sources, usually included in a bibliography at the end of the documentation, and cited to show what information came from each source (see “**II. Sources**” below).

It’s also good to include a section in your documentation about what you specifically did with your project -- what materials did you use, what tools, what techniques? How did you choose them, based on your research into the Period information you gave earlier? If you constructed a recipe from Period sources, include your version. If you made any changes or substitutions in your materials and methods, explain what they were, and why you made them. This is where you get to showcase your working process, and explain your thoughts and methods.

When you are referring to images for part or all of your documentation, you should have copies or printouts of the images attached to your documentation; that will let the judges see for themselves what you’re talking about, and will make it easier for them to judge your work. Sometimes, people will also include copies or printouts of important pieces of text in their documentation, especially in the case of recipes or other long pieces of writing that are important in documenting the project, but which might be too long or difficult to retype in the documentation itself. If you include copies of images or text, be sure to put the source information on each page, so the judges will know where the copies came from. Or, if you wish,

you can bring the books or journals/magazines you are using for sources, and bookmark important pages for the judges to look at.

The final part of your documentation is your bibliography (written list) of sources, usually given at the end of your written material; the basic requirements for the number and types of sources you use will depend on your level of competition (see “Documentation/Source Requirements by Level” above).

II. SOURCES

Your documentation is only as useful and convincing as your sources, and your clear indication of how you have used them in designing your project.

A. TYPES OF SOURCES

There are two basic types of sources for documentation: *primary sources* and *secondary sources*.

Primary sources represent “firsthand” material. Examples include a photograph or scientific/archaeological illustration of a Period object, a quotation from a Period manuscript, etc. The best primary source would obviously be an actual Period object, or an actual Period manuscript (not a transcription of one), but very few people have access to such sources!

Secondary sources represent “secondhand” material. Examples include texts written based on primary sources but paraphrased by the secondary author, illustrations of Period objects by individuals who are not trained scientific/archaeological illustrators, written descriptions of Period objects without accompanying illustrations, etc.

One way the two sources have been described is that a primary source reads, “I said,” while a secondary source reads, “He said.” One is the original, the other is a restatement of the original.

More rarely, one may encounter a *tertiary source*, in which primary material as described by a secondary author is described again by a new author (“He said he said ...”), an illustration based on a Period object is redrawn by a second artist, etc. Tertiary sources are usually unreliable, and are not considered good enough for documentation on their own, though they may be useful as supporting sources accompanying primary and secondary sources.

B. PRIMARY SOURCES AS DEFINED IN AVALON

For Avalon purposes examples of materials considered primary sources for documentation include: photographs of existing Period items (museum pieces and such); modern

illustrations or diagrams of Period items by qualified scientific/archaeological illustrators; Period illustrations (as from illuminated manuscripts); transcriptions of Period manuscripts and texts, translated if necessary; actual Period objects or manuscripts themselves (if anyone is lucky enough to have them on hand!); and descriptions/illustrations/transcriptions of genuine Period materials made by the Artisan him/herself (for example, notes taken on an object during a visit to a museum).

In the strictest sense, not all of the above sources are truly “primary” sources, and many would not be considered such by professional researchers, or those going by the tightest definitions of source types, but they are considered to be “close enough” for an educational organization such as ours.

Scientific or archaeological illustrations or diagrams of Period items are, technically, secondary sources. However, within the professional research community, accurate illustrations made by trained individuals are considered better than even photographs of actual objects. This is because illustrations can show angles or features that might not be possible to reproduce in a photograph. Because of this, such illustrations can be counted as accurate, primary representations of the items, and are considered to be such by most scholars. However, **only** illustrations made by a trained artist and published in a scholarly or technical context are considered to fall in the category of primary sources.

Period illustrations of objects or activities are technically secondary sources. However, they are secondary sources from within Period, presumably drawn by individuals who were familiar with the subject matter -- representing an “on the spot” report of sorts. Period illustrations are also sometimes our only surviving representations of the use or construction of some items, and are too valuable to discount.

Translations (and even transcriptions) of original texts are also not purely primary sources, but it would be unreasonable for us to expect everyone to be an expert in Period languages, or to have access to a library of original manuscripts.

Observations and notes/sketches/etc. of Period objects and manuscripts made by Artisans themselves are also technically not primary resources, but since they represent original research done by the individual, and direct contact with actual Period material, we are considering such information to be essentially a primary source (it was, at least, primary material when the individual in question saw it!). Note, however, that observations made by anyone *other* than the presenting Artisan are considered to be secondary sources.

If a primary source is presented as part of a larger publication (such as a text excerpt in an otherwise secondary source, or a painting reproduced in an art book), be sure to indicate clearly in your documentation the original nature of the primary material itself, in the form of the name of the author or artist, the date (or approximate date) of the primary material, and the location

from which it came (country name or general region is acceptable), as well as giving bibliography information on the larger source. More information would be useful, of course, but is not required.

C. EVALUATING SOURCES

Not all sources are good sources. When writing documentation, it is important to consider how good and accurate a source is.

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

Even primary sources may not be good sources. An object may be so timeworn that even a photograph or accurate illustration may not be able to give much information about it. A Period illustration might be so crude it does not show anything useful -- and Period illustrations (and descriptions) are not always accurate.

When evaluating primary sources, be sure to consider if they actually represent what you need in your documentation. Do they show or describe the sorts of things or processes used in your project? If they do not, they will not be very useful in documenting your project, even if they are primary sources, and will not be scored well by the judges. Your sources need to support the things that *you* are doing to really count.

Also, when using Period illustrations and descriptions as sources, consider how likely they are to be accurate. A Period illustrator or writer depicting something familiar is probably going to be reasonably accurate. However, an illustrator or writer depicting unfamiliar scenes or objects is likely to be working from other people's descriptions or illustrations, and will probably not be accurate -- and may even be wildly wrong! Be particularly careful about illustrations and descriptions of things from distant lands (where the artist or author has probably never been), or based on legends and hearsay, since they may simply repeat inaccurate things "supposed" to be true. Also be careful of illustrations or accounts of things from earlier times. Period authors and artists often "updated" historical subjects to make them closer to their own times (for example, historical figures are often shown wearing the garb of an artist's own time, rather than the historical clothing that would actually be correct). People generally give accurate accounts of things they see everyday, or have experienced in their own life, but they become less accurate the farther away (in time or location) their subjects get.

When working with translations of original texts, not all translations are equally good. Some translators may be better than others at reading and understanding the material, some may be better than others at giving the true sense of the original work in their translation, and some may even read their own beliefs or attitudes into a text, and thus translate it inaccurately. The best translations are likely to come from scholars, linguists, and others who work with languages professionally. Translations published by museums, universities, and other such sources are

likely to be the most accurate. A good thing to look for is whether or not a translation also includes a transcription of the original text. Having the original text as well as the translation available to the reader means that translators are confident their work is good, and they are expecting people to compare their translation to the original.

2. SECONDARY SOURCES

Secondary sources open up a whole range of potential problems. Because you are reading what someone else has written, or looking at a picture they have drawn, you cannot always be sure they have been accurate in their depictions. An author might leave out an important point when paraphrasing Period writings, or an artist illustrating Period subjects might not copy the image correctly (for example, an artist copying a picture of Period clothing might draw folds or seams inaccurately, giving the wrong impression of how a garment was constructed or worn). Also, secondary sources may be biased towards an author's or artist's speculations, opinions or guesses -- which may have no actual historical basis of support, but may be presented as if they were facts.

One way to evaluate secondary sources is to look at their publisher -- as noted above, materials published by museums, universities, archaeological societies, and other scholarly institutions have the best chance of being accurate. Material published by someone working in their professional field is probably more accurate than material published by someone working outside their area of training, or an amateur writing on the subject. For example, a professor of military history writing about Period weapons is probably more accurate than a professor of economic theory -- or a member of a historical re-creation or re-enactment society with a degree in biology (such as myself) -- writing about the same thing. This is not **always** true; some amateurs or scholars writing outside their usual fields have produced excellent work, and some professional "experts" have published really terrible work, but it's not common.

Another way to evaluate a secondary source is to compare it to other sources in the same field. Generally speaking, most sources on a given subject will agree with each other about major points. If a source completely disagrees with everything else written on the same subject, especially without giving a good reason for disagreeing with everyone else (such as a major new archaeological finding), it should be considered suspicious, and probably inaccurate.

If possible, it can help to compare a secondary source with one or more of the primary sources it uses for its information. For example, compare a drawing of an object to a photograph of the same object, or see if the content of a primary text matches what the secondary source reports. If a secondary source accurately reproduces material from one or more primary sources, that's a good sign.

Something to watch for is whether or not a secondary source cites its primary sources, or otherwise says where it got its information. Interpretations, guesses, and opinions are common

in secondary sources, and there's nothing wrong with that, but it should be made very clear what is historical fact, and what is speculation on the part of the modern author or artist. In any situation where it's hard to tell what's historically supported fact and what isn't, the source should be considered unreliable.

Another rule of thumb is that more recent materials are often the best -- partly because they can use information from the most recent archaeological findings, but also because standards of scholarship have tended to improve over time. Secondary sources from the Victorian era and the early 20th century are notoriously unreliable in general, and are often poor about separating historical facts from the opinions of the secondary source's author or artist. Secondary sources dating from the mid-20th century onwards have tended to be more clearly and objectively handled -- but not always. As with the professional/amateur comparison above, there are exceptions; some older sources are excellent, and some modern sources are not. But it's another case where an overall trend is clear.

Also, one can look at reviews of material by other people working in the field, whether in magazines, internet forums, or other books on the subject. All this can give you is other people's responses to a source, but if everyone unanimously says a source is wonderful or terrible, it's a pretty good indicator of the overall quality of that source.

As a final word, the best thing anyone can do to become good at evaluating sources is to read and do research -- experience and knowledge about a given subject help a lot in learning to evaluate sources, and in deciding whether or not they're good sources for documentation. Always remember that just because something is in print doesn't mean it's true, and all sources are not equal!

III. CITING SOURCES

When writing documentation it is important to support your statements by citing (referring to) your sources, so people can know where you got your information. Basically, whenever you give information from one of your sources, you should let the readers know which bibliography entry it comes from. Citing sources strengthens your "case" for the historical background of your entry. There are many ways to cite sources.

If desired, you can give a full citation (all the reference's information, in the same format as your bibliography entry) along with a quote or paraphrased information, in the text of your documentation. For example:

“In Medieval France, widgets were the main source of income for skilled Artisans working in the cities.” (Davis, Ted. 1987. *Widgets in the Medieval World*. Nowhere University Press: Nowhere, RI)

Another example, paraphrased instead of quoted directly:

Ted Davis says, in his book on widgets (1987. *Widgets in the Medieval World*. Nowhere University Press: Nowhere, RI) that in late Medieval France, skilled Artisans made most of their income from widgets.

A more compact way to cite sources involves referring to your bibliography. In this way, you only have to write out all of a source's information once. If your bibliography is arranged in alphabetical order by authors' last names, you can simply refer to the author by last name, and the date of the publication, in either a direct quote or a paraphrased piece of information:

In late Medieval France, widgets were the main source of income for skilled Artisans working in the cities. (Davis, 1987).

A really extensive direct quotation is usually indented from the rest of the text, and presented without quotation marks, and with the citation (here given as the author's last name and date of publication) following it:

In late Medieval France, widgets were the main source of income for skilled Artisans working in the cities. In the south of France, widget design shows clear indications of Islamic influence, probably based on widgets imported from Spain. Parts for widgets largely came from local materials, though examples have been found using parts imported from China and the Far East. (Davis, 1987)

If you have numbered references in your bibliography, you can cite them simply by their number, either in superscript, or in parentheses:

Widgets were very important to the economy of late Medieval France. They were the main source of income for skilled Artisans (1), and were a major export item in trade with England and Germany (2).

- 1. Davis, Ted. 1987. *Widgets in the Medieval World*. Nowhere University Press: Nowhere, RI.**
- 2. Lewis, Pauline. 2001. *French Widgets: A History*. Academic Press: Academia City, NY.**

A less-popular and more complex method of citation is to use footnotes. The material related to a reference is followed by a superscript number, which refers to a numbered reference given at the bottom of the page where the reference is cited, below the main text. References

cited by footnote are usually given in the same format as a bibliography entry, and represent a lot of duplication of effort, since a bibliography is already required

IV. WRITING BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES

A bibliography is required with all documentation; it has the advantage of putting all your sources in a single list and a single place, so they can be easily evaluated by the judges (to see if you meet the minimum requirements for your competition level), and they allow for easy citation of sources in your text. Bibliographies are usually listed alphabetically by author's last name, and may be broken into sections based on the type of source (books, articles, etc.), though this is not required. Sometimes, if using numbered sources for citation in the text, sources are arranged by the order to which they are cited in the text (e.g. the first source cited will be source 1, the next source will be source 2, etc., regardless of authors' last names).

There are several formats for describing sources in bibliographies. The ones given below are based on a standard scientific format; there are other formats which would be equally acceptable.

BOOKS

Author or authors. Date. *Title*. Publisher: City. Page #s referenced

Davis, Ted. 1987. *Widgets in the Medieval World*. Nowhere University Press: Nowhere, RI. Pg. 124-132.

Referencing page numbers is optional, especially if you cite information from several portions of the text, but it's a nice thing to include if it's practical.

MAGAZINE OR JOURNAL ARTICLES

Author or authors. Date "Article Title." *Journal/Magazine Title*. Volume (number): Page #s of article.

Woodson, Kate. 1991. "Widget Finishing Techniques in a Medieval French Village." *Journal of Widget Studies*. 16(3): 38-55.

ARTICLE OR CHAPTER IN A BOOK OF COLLECTED MATERIAL OR A BOOK FORMAT JOURNAL

Author or authors. Date. "Article/Chapter Title." in: *Book Title*, ed. by Editor's Name. Publisher: city. Page #s referenced.

Avalon A&S Revised Draft Manual (5/05) -- 28

Popadopalous, Larry. 2003. "Widget Display as an Expression of Personal Faith." in: *Religious Issues in Medieval France*. Thomas House Publishing: Pointy Peak, CO. Pgs. 20 - 45.

WEBSITE

Author or authors, if known. Date, if known. "Website or Article Title." URL Date of download/access.

Hobson, Fred. 1998. "Fred's Widget Page." <http://www.geocities.com/hobsonwidget.html>
Accessed 6/10/2002.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

In some cases, information received in a letter, email, or discussion with a noted authority in a given subject area can be used as a secondary source in and of itself, even if the material is not in a published format. If at all possible, a photocopy or printout of a letter or email should be included with your documentation; for bibliography purposes, the information can be listed in the following format:

Person's name, and title, organization, institution, etc. (Personal Communication)

Davis, Ted. Professor of Widgetology, University of Nowhere (Personal Communication)

ARCHEOLOGICAL CITATION

This is a standard format reserved for archaeological reports, based on the way in which archaeological papers are published. Individuals may publish many, many papers in a year, and so their papers are "tracked" more by their number in the sequence of the author's publications for the year (paper #1, paper #2, etc.) rather than by their title, which isn't always included in the reference:

Author's name, date of publication. *Title* [optional]. Number of paper in sequence of all papers published that year, number of paper in sequence of papers published by author's institution for that year, page numbers referenced. City of publication.

Landau, Harry. 1977. *Widget findings in Northumbria*, Miscellaneous paper #15, University of Whatsit Archaeological paper #42, pp. 18 - 29. Denver.