

Manuscript Arts—Bookbinding

LEVEL : OPEN

ENTRANT #: _____

ENTRY #: _____

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 18–19 of *Judges’ Certification Handbook*]):

- 1 Falls considerably below Atenveldt Standard.
- 2 – 3 Falls slightly below Atenveldt Standard.
- 4 Meets Atenveldt Standard.
- 5 – 6 Exceeds Atenveldt Standard.
- 7 Far exceeds Atenveldt Standard.

DOCUMENTATION:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Includes complete information relating to the pre-17th century 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); any special purpose(s) &/or use(s) 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/decorative elements, and styles; any illustrations (photos) of work stages now hidden in the completed entry; 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?

COMPLEXITY &/OR DIFFICULTY:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Assessment of the scope, ambition, and difficulty of the entry. What was the variety used and difficulty attempted with respect to media being bound, binding style, materials, techniques, and design elements? How much material was bound? How complex was the scope (i.e., size of work and amount of detail and decoration) of the entry? Did the entrant make any specialty tools required for the project? Did the entrant(s) undertake extended techniques (e.g., mixing dyes &/or glues using pre-17th century recipes/techniques, gilding, leather tooling, metalwork, etc.)? What form(s) of binding decoration were undertaken?

WORKMANSHIP:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The skills used and the resulting quality of work in producing the entry. Was the basic binding itself (by pre-17th century standards) appropriate and consistently well executed? Was the binding sturdy and did it operate well? Were decorative element(s) applied well aligned, consistent, and completed with skill? Overall, do the design elements of the binding and any decoration work appropriately together (by pre-17th century standards)? Overall, how well did the entry achieve the design and purpose(s) proposed by the entrant?

ÆSTHETIC QUALITIES:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The overall æsthetic effect and appeal of the entry, as perceived by the judges. Did the use of binding design and any decorative elements result in a beautiful piece? Does it look, and feel the way it should? Was binding and application of any decorative elements consistent and well proportioned? Were there obvious errors and corrections/repairs?

AUTHENTICITY:

Circle Score Given: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How closely the entrant followed pre-17th century techniques and how nearly the entrant achieved a piece that would not have been out of place in a pre-17th century cultural setting. Were the binding style and associated decorative elements appropriate to the entrant's stated time frame &/or culture for the project? To what degree did the entrant use pre-17th century media, materials, tools, and techniques to produce the finished work? Overall, to what degree could the entry be mistaken for a fine pre-17th century work?

