SEQUÊNCIAS

Intenção do designer:

Both Dramatic Sequences and Action Sequences are "my babies" in terms of design. More than any other part of the core game system, those have my fingerprints all over them. Dramatic Sequences work the way they do because I wanted to avoid halting a roleplay moment in order to stop, announce an Approach, roll dice, and compare Raises to see what happens. I wanted the mechanics to inform the roleplaying without getting in the way. So rather than stopping everytime something may or may not happen, you roll at the beginning of the encounter and now you have a pool of currency. If something may or may not happen, you as the player can choose to spend a piece of your currency to make it happen... or not spend a piece of your currency, and the GM gets to DECIDE what happens. This also lets the players have a sense of how they're doing and whether or not they've overplayed their hand or overstayed their welcome. My big inspiration for this was the idea of an interrogation scene. If the Heroes are getting questioned, they need to spend a Raise everytime they want to tell a lie or mislead the guard to make sure they aren't found out. But there's a reason why, in real life and in fiction, these interrogations tend to go on for a really long time. You get tired, your story slips up a little and doesn't make sense, you contradict yourself. This adds a note of tension to the scene that otherwise would have needed to be artifically added (something like "every time you try to lie to the same character again in a scene, you roll 1 fewer dice"). Instead I opted for a system where you have a certain amount of ammunition, and you as the player know it going in. So when the guard asks you who you showed up with, you know you can only convincingly lie to him 4 times. Do you want to tell him who you really came with? Is THAT the most important use of this currency? Relegating each of these to separate rolls, in my opinion, actually reduces the dramatic tension. I'm not making a decision, I'm just hoping the dice come up in my favor. Which, while that can be exciting, is less interesting to me personally.

Sobre escolhas e não sobre conseguir:

> "*the game is largely about having to make choices between too many things, without enough raises, and usually under time pressure.*"

This is the entire crux of how Sequences in 7th Sea are intended to work.

It isn't a matter of whether or not you can do something. It's the decision of whether or not that thing is the right thing to do at the moment, what your other options are, and what repercussions your decisions have on the world around you.

"Roll to see if you can make the jump" is far less interesting, in my opinion, than "Do you jump and leave the secret documents behind, or do you grab the documents and hope to find another way out?"

Rolar antes de agir:

"Roll then move" was a group decision. I don't remember who posed it first, but it was the ruleset of choice from very early on in the process. John, Rob, and I are all fans of "Dead of Winter" which uses a similar starting point, and it's enjoyable because it eliminates the so-called "whiff factor" almost completely.

This was also when John was really big on abandoning the idea of "chance of failure" in games (he still is, which is a viewpoint I fully share). I'm of the opinion that chance of failure in RPGs should be extremely low, especially if the roll in question is something that I've attempted to make my

character a master of. Chance of failure when you're supposed to be highly competent, in my opinion, deflates drama and harms immersion.

For example... I'm a paladin. I draw my Holy Avenger, glare at the vampire, and tell him that at long last, the light's vengeance has come for him. He killed my daughter, he killed my wife, he killed my father, he killed my best friend... and here and now, his sins have caught up to him. It is time for a reckoning.

Then I roll an 8. I miss.

It wasn't even a terrible miss. I didn't roll a 1, which I might be able to explain away as being so consumed by facing this epic foe that I let something basic slip past my notice. I just... rolled kind of mediocre. It isn't that I'm less effective than I want... it's that I do nothing.

And that sucks.

I far prefer a sliding scale of success, but in practice those can feel like homework. "Okay so I rolled below the success TN, but close enough for a partial success, so that means I do half damage but he gets to attack me..." Bleeeeeeeech.

In this example, if I were playing a system like 7th Sea and I roll badly... well, my paladin gets to only do 3 things, instead of the 6 I expected. That sucks... but it also increases tension and drama. I still get to do stuff, I just get to do less. I still get to feel like a Hero, but now I'm a Hero with my back to the wall as opposed to one that slips on a banana peel.

Sequências dramáticas:

Your interpretation of Dramatic Scenes is, as far as I can tell here, correct. I think in general for more extended or broad Dramatic Scenes the GM can loosen the guidelines for Improvisation (Convince and Tempt might be close enough, but if you suddenly want to sneak by a guard with Hide you'll need to Improvise).

Whether or not a royal ball would be many different scenes is up to the GM. I wouldn't say it's "supposed to be" many scenes, but it could certainly end up working out that way. There's also the option for the Sequence to simply go into another Round -- if the GM feels that there is still drama and intrigue and other things to be gained from the Sequence, they can call for another roll using either a new Approach or the same one. The main important bit with this, however, is not to cut off players that still have Raises to spend. A new Round for a Sequence can only begin when EVERYONE is out of Raises.

How to write a mystery or intrigue scene into a Dramatic Sequence is a much bigger topic than I think I can comfortably and adequately answer within the context of a reddit Q&A post. Maybe I'll do a blog post on it sometime soon.

Novas rodadas de Drama:

In response to your "reroll" thing above, it seems that a lot of people think that Dramatic Sequences only go for one round. This isn't necessarily the case.

Dramatic Sequences operate in Rounds similar to Action Sequences. The main difference is that in an Action Sequence, a new Round happens automatically once everyone runs out of Raises, so long as the circumstances dictate the action is continuing. A Dramatic Sequence only goes into more Rounds if the GM decides the situation warrants it -- such as the circumstances around the scene changing significantly.

For example, you're sneaking through a mansion trying to go unnoticed. Dramatic Sequence with lots of Theft, Hide, and Athletics. Toward the end of the Round, the Heroes discover that there is a secret masquerade meeting of a crazy cult. They use their last remaining Raises to snatch spare masks and enter the masquerade.

The GM declares that this new development is significant enough to justify continuing the Sequence. NEW ROUND. The players can change their Approaches, just like in an Action Sequence. Maybe one of them sticks with Hide -- he's going to keep skulking around. However, another decides to change to Empathy and mingle, trying to get a feel for the mood in the room. The last Hero changes to Notice and wants to fish for gossip and secrets.

The GM informs the players that there are 3 characters present that they might recognize -- they're all wearing masks, of course, but each of these is a different Opportunity. However, these same people might recognize each of them in turn, so that's also 3 chances for them to be spotted as Consequences. Figuring out who the known characters are in the room while simultaneously staying unnoticed is going to cost a lot of Raises, so the players are going to have to give something up if they want to be able to learn anything...

Apostas quando o drama vira ação:

Dramatic Sequences that escalate...

So. How do you approach if your Dramatic Sneak scene turns into a Action Sequence only two resolved raises in the Drama?

Do you..

A) Put aside the Raises and Approaches and zoom into a Action Sequence B) Discard the Raises and roll a Action Sequence? C) Use ALL the gathered Raises on Opportunities?

Also. How do you convey the narrative possiblities in the Dramatic Sequences? My experience is that my players are loath to spend their Raises in Dramatic Sequences, out of fear of being left out?

As far as I can tell, the fact that there are no obvious way to spend their raises makes them insecure, and makes them rely on the narrative and freeform roleplay themselves out of troubles.

Resposta:

I'd go with either B or C.

B was always my imagining of how that worked, but I had never really considered C.

In a Dramatic Sequences, Raises are used to change your circumstances to your advantage, not to take actions. IE--"I spend a Raise to convince the Duke that I'm telling the truth" or "I spend a Raise to sneak across the room without being noticed."

To go talk to the Duke, you don't need to spend a Raise. To walk across the room, you don't need to spend a Raise. You can still participate in Dramatic Sequences with no Raises, but you can longer change your circumstances.

Sequência de ação não é combate:

Action Sequences =/= combat. "Combat" is a state that does not exist in 7th Sea. Combat is a thing that happens during an Action Sequence, probably while other stuff is going on. "Combat" has the same mechanical connotation as "Chase" or "Escape" or... I don't know, "Stealing." There is no such thing, mechanically speaking, as a "Combat Scene." There is only Action, which can involve combat. But if it does, it should involve other things too.

[...]

The reason that Maneuvers are designed the way they are (that if a Maneuver has the effect of others but has a limiting factor on it, and that no Maneuver can be performed twice in a row) is to increase the feel of dynamic combat. IE, it gets rid of "I attack, I attack, I attack." You have to do something different. At the very least, you have to Feint, Slash, Feint, etc., and you sacrifice the Wound output of your Feint rounds in order to stay aggressive. This creates a dramatic

opening for your opponent to choose to simply take the one Wound from Feint and attempt to seize the initiative of the duel from you. So I Feint, then you Slash... now I have a choice to make. Do I Parry your slash (making my Feint not useful) or do I go ahead with my plan and Slash you anyway (taking Wounds in the process)?

I have attempted to create a Disarm Maneuver at least half a dozen times, and it has never been done well. That is the reason why there is no such Maneuver -- in the narrative sense, what does Disarm accomplish? Well... it ends the duel, since they don't have a sword anymore. Or it eats a Raise, forcing them to go get a new weapon. The former kills drama because it's an easy answer to what should be a dangerous situation (and besides, that's accomplished with the Helpless state anyway), and the latter is pretty boring.

Sequência de ação não é combate 2:

So with all this talk of errata, is there any chance of combat getting fixed so people don't have to feel bad for bringing a Swordsman to the table if the rest of the party don't?

I think this is a bit of a misguided question for two reasons.

First, "combat" isn't a thing in 7th Sea 2nd Edition. You'll notice there is no "combat" section in the book. There are "Action Sequences," which includes "fighting stuff" as one of the things that can happen during it. So to say that "combat needs to be fixed" is an inaccurate statement, because "combat" isn't a thing that happens in a vacuum in 7th Sea. If your approach to an Action Sequence is similar to games like D&D ("Alright, you guys enter the room and there's 20 of the Duke's guard here, all with swords drawn. Fight!") then this is an easy line of thinking to fall into, but I believe that this means you're missing BIG and IMPORTANT chunks of the game.

Second, if the introduction of a Duelist (or a Sorcerer, or a spy, or any other kind of archetype) breaks the game to the point that anyone at the table "feels bad" then I think there's a misunderstanding for how the game is intended to function.

(As an aside, it always strikes me as really strange that so many people think Dueling is overpowered. Like, have you even looked at Sanderis?)

Check out the long-form example for Action Sequences in the core book. You'll notice that while the party is fighting against a bunch of Brutes and a Villain, there's other stuff going on. They're trying to get the stone before the Villain does, the Villain blows up a bomb and the room starts collapsing, etc. That Sequence has (if my memory serves) 2 Duelists in it... and it doesn't break.

It doesn't break because the game does not revolve around the Heroes' ability to output or soak damage. It revolves around the Heroes' ability to make decisions on what they want to accomplish -- part of that could certainly be "beating up ALL the bad guys" but that's a valid playstyle choice to make.

If your question is more about Dueling being the only path to power in regards to fighting, since the core book there have been lots of non-Dueling options introduced to the game. There are lots of Advantages that grant situational martial power, as well as a cheaper buy-in Advantage that grants access to some of the Dueling system.

Does that help to address your issue?

Usando observar:

Skills in 7th Sea 2nd Edition are about how the Hero overcomes a challenge.

Using Notice means that you are using your awareness and quick-thinking to deal with the challenge in front of you.

Notice isn't appropriate to every Risk (much like Athletics or Sailing isn't appropriate to every Risk) but you spend Raises on it just like anything else.

Of particular note for Skills like Notice, you can use your Raises to either state a fact that the GM will either confirm or deny, or you can ask the GM a question that they will answer.

For example, let's say that you're at a fancy dinner party. A Dramatic Sequence begins. You choose Notice as your Approach and you get 3 Raises.

You spend the first Raise and say "Who is the Count the most comfortable around? Who does he seem to trust?" The GM tells you that the Count spends a lot of time talking to his advisor, and actually seems to be avoiding his wife.

You spend a Raise and say "Is it true that the Countess is spending most of her time on the arm of a young, up-and-coming Bravo?" The GM can tell you that yes, this is true. The young bravo has recently earned a reputation across the city for cleaning up a few crime organizations. Or the GM can tell you that no, she isn't spending time with any bravo. In fact, she isn't spending time with anyone -- she hovers around the balconies overhead, alone, looking down on the gathered nobles below.

You can spend your third Raise, and ask the GM "Is there anyone here who doesn't seem to fit in? I'm looking for someone who seems particularly out of place, maybe because they have snuck in or they got an invitation at the last minute and don't know why, something like that." The GM can tell you that everyone here (with the likely exception of the Heroes) seems perfectly at ease, as if there are few if any strangers present. Everyone's guard is a little down, they're comfortable here. Or the GM can tell you that yes, indeed, there is someone who stands out to your keen eye -- a servant who seems to spend most of his time hovering around the kitchen door and the stairs. You think he might be looking for an opportunity to slip upstairs -- you know, where the Countess is spending all of her time. Alone.

Riscos fora de sequências:

I get Risks. I get Action Sequences. I get Dramatic Sequences. What I'm curious about is, what about momentary actions of opportunity that maybe aren't so risky, but could be interesting in a "success or fail" manner? For example, you're at a party, and you catch a glimpse of a Villain's known henchman in disguise heading out of the building. If a character is astute enough to see through the disguise, the players now have an opportunity to sneak out after her. If not, they still continue doing what they came to do anyway.

In this case would I...

A. Come up with a couple Consequences and/or Opportunities if I want to make a mechanical check out of it?

B. Assume anything that isn't inherently risky is just a narrative gimme?

C. Handle it another way I'm currently missing?

First, there's no reason why you can't make Risks outside of Sequences. Sequences are meant to encompass larger situations or dangers, while an individual Risk could be called for if something "on the spot" occurs. So while the system isn't necessarily intended to function like this, if something unexpected occurs and you want to roll some dice, you could easily set up "Raise TNs" in order to answer "yes or no" questions. As long as it doesn't become the standard, the system shouldn't break. For example, "Everyone roll Notice+Wits. Tell me if you get at least 3 Raises."

Second, if this occurs in the middle of a Sequence (Dramatic or Action), you can insert Opportunities in the middle of a Round to accommodate unexpected stuff. For example, if the players get into a place where you didn't expect them to and you decide that something is going

on, after they spend their Raise to take an Action you describe what happens, then you can say "Also there is now a new Opportunity to see something unexpected. If you aren't using Notice as your Approach, this Opportunity costs 2 Raises."

Third, if noticing this is a narrative brick wall (IE, if the players don't see the guy then the game will stall) you should simply choose the most likely or fitting character and have it be a gimme. You could simply ask "Who has the most Ranks in Notice?" and allow that Hero to see the disguised henchman without needing dice or a Risk.

Finally, you could offer it as a choice that the players can make by spending a Hero Point without breaking the flow of the game. "By the way, anyone who spends a Hero Point right now will notice a secret."

Exemplo de sequência:

How should this sequence have played out?

We just played out first game. Our characters are chasing a shadowy figure into a warehouse. We're in the warehouse, and my approach is to climb on top of the shelves and spot where the shadowy figure went. Now, there was a hidden room that the villain had slipped into. Would I roll a notice roll to spot where the villain went? How does the GM give me opportunities without giving away where the villain went, without giving away exactly where the villain went in case I failed the roll? Am I seriously misunderstanding a part of this system?

> *"I would advise rereading the Action and Drama Section of the rulebook, especially how risks work on p. 172. An example for the situation described above would be:*
>
> *1. Setting the stage*
> *The GM says "you enter a warehouse. There is no sign of the villain you are looking for. High shelves fill the warehouse, all bulging with sacks and crates"*
>
> *2. Approach*
> *The player says "I want to climb the shelves and spot where the shadowy figure went."*
> *The GM says "that's a risk"*
>
> *3. Gather dice*
> *The GM says "That sounds like a Finesse + notice risk"*
>
> *4. Opportunities and Advantages*
> *You need to spend 1 raise to climb the shelves and find the villain. But the consequence is that it's very dusty up there and you'll sneeze and be discovered. You need to spend 1 raise to avoid sneezing. The warehouse is full of valuable goods. That's an opportunity. You can spend 1 raise to grab something worth 1 wealth*
>
> *1 raise Climbing the stacks and discovering the villain*
> *Consequence be discovered by sneezing. Spend 1 raise to avoid sneezing*
> *Opportunity Valuable goods. Spend 1 raise to get something worth 1 wealth points."*

This is a good example, I think.

MÉTODO

Combinações incomuns:

Skills are not explicitly tied to specific Traits, and vice versa. Panache+Weaponry? Sell me on it. Generally speaking, there are some "common sense" touchstones. If you're wielding a zweihander, you're probably using Brawn, but I can see an argument for Resolve. Finesse is likely to be a stretch.

Basically... if it makes sense in the fiction of the world, it's a thumbs-up to use mechanically.

Improviso:

Let's say I have a character who wishes to swing from a rope to barrel into a brute squad. The gm decides tis is Finesse+ Athletics. If we assume 4&3 respectivly the character will likely have 3 or 4 raises. He crashes in and either deals invest multiple raises for damage or switches to his sword and must spend 2 raises per maneuver.

> *Umm...I personally think your GM might be being a little harsh based on this example. By that I mean, I wouldn't require an extra raise to draw your rapier with a Finesse+Athletics Approach. Now true, sticking to that approach and using a rapier might eat an extra Raise, but all it costs is 1 raise to change your Approach (IIRC) or use Dynamic Approach to just shift on the fly. Granted, I'm only basing this out of this one example. It's also possible your GM is misunderstanding Approach. Approach does not equal action.*
>
> *"How are you going to fight those brutes?" "I'm going to barrel into them, draw my sword and cut them to ribbons." "Ok, so Finesse (or maybe Brawn) and Weaponry. Roll. Ok, now what's your first ACTION?"*
>
> *See that? The swing from the chandelier would be the off skill action. But a generous GM might fold that under your Trait too. Either way, Approach should focus on how you intend to do most of the things you want in a round, not a solitary action in the round.*
>
> *Consider if we swapped things around a bit:*
>
> *"How are you going to fight those brutes?" "I'm going to draw my sword and cut them to ribbons." "Ok, roll. What's your first action." "I jump up on top of a barrel and kick him in the face." "..."*
>
> *When you try to do things outside the scope of your stated intent, THAT'S when the GM should start charging extra raises.*

This is the version that I'd advise using.

The rules for Improvisation are meant to enforce and encourage players to think about their actions, not to punish creativity.

If you choose to use Hide to infiltrate a building, you don't have to pay Improvisation to scale a wall (Athletics), or pick a lock (Theft), or bash somebody over the head from the shadows (Brawl or Weaponry).

You DO need to pay Improvisation if you decide to throw stealth out the window and just brawl your way in, or you corner someone and try to intimidate them into giving you some information. When you STOP being stealthy, that's when you are improving.

REQUINTE

Sem muita exigência:

When I run the game, I personally find that Intent matters very little once you and the players get a grasp for what's going on.

I focus way less on Intent, and way more on Approach. I don't need the player to tell me a specific thing that they plan to do, I want them to just interact with the fiction in a way that tells me they are interested and engaged.

The idea behind Flair is to simply reward people for this. As it says in the book, Flair is a purposefully extremely low bar. ANYTHING beyond "My Approach is Panache plus Intimidate" gains the bonus for Flair.

Não é sobre "qualidade" da descrição

More than likely, yes. Flair is set intentionally low to eliminate the sense of competition between players, and to avoid the "your explanation wasn't good enough for a bonus die" question posed to a GM.

I remember that Scion had this mechanic, but it scaled from 1 to 3 dice. The better your description, the more dice you got. But it ended up kind of backfiring sometimes -- a player might feel discouraged when the GM only awarded them 1 die. I wanted to encourage people to interact with the fiction, but avoid attaching a value statement to it. It doesn't matter "how good" your description is, what's important is that you gave one, which shows you're invested and you're paying attention. :)

VENDA DE DADOS:

Narrador define se compra:

This is correct. The GM does not need the player to agree when they want to buy dice for Danger Points.

The players says "I have 3 unused dice." The GM says "I will buy 2 of them." The player gets two Hero Points. RAW, the player doesn't get to turn the GM down. The GM isn't making an offer, he's making a decision.

Jogadores definem se deixam sobrar dados:

1) Basically as soon as a set "breaks 10" it is closed and a Raise is generated, but there isn't any rule that says you must build that set as efficiently as possible. So let's say you roll 4 dice, and have 10 8 1 3. You can put these dice together to make 1 or 2 Raises, depending on what you want to achieve.

8+1+3=11, set breaks 10, closes. 10=10, set breaks 10, closes.

3+1+8=11, set breaks 10, closes. 10=10, set breaks 10, closes.

8+10=18, set breaks 10, closes. 2 dice remain, which can be purchased.

1+10=11, set breaks 10, closes. 3+8=11, set breaks 10, closes.

8+3=11, set breaks 10, closes. 10=10, set breaks 10, closes. 1 die remains, which can be purchased.

Personally I don't think this particular rule matters all that much; I think in general you can build your sets however you want, and if you want to just cram all your dice into useless sets in order to prevent the GM from buying them, that's your business. If you don't want to make any sets and offer the GM every single die in your 10 die pool, hey go for it.

Sidenote: there's an Advantage in NoT2 (IIRC) that basically forces the GM to buy all of your unused die for one specific roll, which basically gives you a guaranteed BOATLOAD of Hero Points in return for giving the GM a BOATLOAD of Danger Points. Tread carefully.

2) You're right in that dice can only be used in a single set. I only wrote the example the way I did in direct response to the example, which also wrote them that way. So the rolled 10 is a single set that generates a Raise, and the 7+8 makes 15, which generates 2 Raises.

Sidenote: This also breaks the "sets close as soon as they break 10" rule, as they now automatically close at 15. So if I roll a 10 and a 5, and I can't do anything with that 5, I can match it to my 10 for a second Raise within that same set. If I roll 9 1 4, I can add all 3 together to make 15 and create 2 Raises.

Ordem da venda:

Order of operations goes like this...

Player rolls dice.

Player makes Raises using their dice.

Player informs GM how many Raises they have, and how many unused dice they have.

GM buys any number of dice they wish.

It's important to note a few things. First, just because a set exceeds 10, that doesn't mean you can't add more dice to it. If you have a 5, 6, and 1, you can use all of them in a set to make a 12. You don't have to make the 1 unused.

Second, you don't have to make sets if you don't want to. If you have a 5, 6, and 1, you don't have to use the 5 and 6 to make an 11. You can say "I have no Raises, and three unused dice."

HOWEVER

If the GM doesn't buy those dice, YOU CANNOT RETROACTIVELY MAKE SETS OUT OF THEM.

The intention here is that the player is the master of their own destiny, but the GM has the final say. The player sort of bets on whether or not the GM will buy their dice.

"Hmm. I need Hero Points badly. I'm in a sword fight, and I'm really good at it. Hey GM -- I'm willing to completely flubb my Weaponry Risk. I have no Raises, and I have 12 unused dice. How many Hero Points are you willing to give me?"

Any answer that the GM gives is valid. He could say "Have 12 Hero Points, I'll take 12 Danger Points." Or he could say "I'm not buying any of your dice."

But regardless of what the GM says, the player doesn't get to change their mind.

APOSTAS

Realizando manobras diversas

Tripping, Disarming, Pushing over a ledge, and otherwise Hampering

Hi! I know the system is kinda freeform but I was wondering how to simulate these kind of dramatic moments in a fight. Is it just pressure, or is it an action that causes them to be in peril? I'm just curious how to simulate this.

There's lots of ways to interpret this, as everyone here states. The mechanical effect depends on the outcome that the person spending the Raise wants.

Do they want to make it harder for their opponent to recover and hurt them? Pressure. Are they gaining momentum in the battle and pushing it closer to an end? Wounds. Are they trying to create an opening for something specific that they want to accomplish? Opportunity.

Recebendo dano no lugar de outro herói

Rule clarification: Taking Another Hero's Wounds

On page 181 It says "Before another character takes Wounds, you can use your own Raises to take the Wounds instead." This means that you have to use one Raise for every Wound or only one to take it all?

Spend 1 Raise to take all Wounds intended for another Hero.

Ajudando na cena:

I second the general idea here that creating and taking advantage of Opportunities should have an amplified effect. If Player A creates an Opportunity to punch the bad guy in the face and

Player B activates that Opportunity, the bad guy should take a minimum of 2 Wounds (potentially even 3, to reward the teamwork).

In many cases this was difficult to write, since the original concept for Opportunities wasn't so much to amplify a numerical effect as it was to modify the fiction of the world to allow something to happen that was previously impossible.

For example, you don't have a gun. I steal the bad guy's pistol and drop it at your feet -- I use my Raise to create an Opportunity. You activate that Opportunity on your turn, and now something that was previously not true IS true -- you now have a gun.

You could have simply spend a Raise to take his gun yourself, unless that was not allowed in the fiction for some reason -- for example, if you're locked inside a jail cell and the gun is on the table out of your reach.

It's a bit of a sticky situation when you get into the nuts and bolts of quantifying exactly how much a Raise is worth, and whether or not two actions are always equivalent. If I can give myself a gun with a Raise (by stealing it from the Villain's belt, picking it up off the table, or activating an existing Opportunity to grab it), how many Raises is that "worth"? If I seize the gun via activating an Opportunity, should I deal more Wounds with it when I pull the trigger, or is it "enough" that I now have an item that I didn't have before? How much value (in a literal numerical sense) do you apply to modifying the fiction?

These are the questions that keep me up at night. ;)

Ajudando diversas pessoas:
Yes, one Hero can help multiple Heroes. There is no limit to the number of your Hero Points that you can spend to help your friends. However, each friend can only be helped by 1 person.

Criando oportunidades para outra rodada:
There's no reason you can't create an Opportunity and have it claimed the next Round.

Also, I'd probably say that you just move into a new Round then -- and depending on whether or not the Brutes are aware of the Heroes when this begins, it could mean that the Heroes have another full Round to deal with them before the Brutes get to react.

For example...

Sneak sneak sneak. Hero spends a Raise to peek around a corner, and spots a group of guards coming his way. He signals to his friends and they get ready to jump the guards when they round the corner. The Hero spends his last Raise and creates an Opportunity for an ambush. If a Hero activates this Opportunity, they deal some amount of increased Wounds to the guards.

Example two...

Sneak sneak sneak... Hero runs out of Raises, but decides to keep poking around anyway and rounds a corner -- and runs nose-first into the chest of a guard patrol. A new Round begins, but since the Hero literally walked into them and the guards are aware of the Heroes, the GM rules that the guards can act at the end of the current Round.

PRESSÃO

Duração da pressão:
I wouldn't mind a more official answer to a couple of questions I've already raised.
- **How long is Pressure meant to last?**
- **Is there an order damage should be applied?**

Apply the Wounds from Raises first, then the automatic Dramatic Wound last.

Pressure lasts for the next action. Regardless of whether the target Pressured takes that action as normal or does something else and pays an additional Raise to do so, the Pressure is then ended. This is unclear in the text, particularly in the examples, because changing a small rule like that means that the example has to be rewritten nearly from scratch. Trust me on that, I had to do several of these re-writes as a rule changed. It isn't surprising that something slipped through the cracks.

But yes, short answer, Pressure lasts for the next action, and then it's gone. Unless you have some way of extending it with an Advantage or a Sorcery or just spending more of your Raises, etc.

Pressão não controle da mente:

The most direct and rules-enforced thing I would advise in this regard is Pressure.

Pressure is explicitly designed to address the "mind control" aspect of social skills and rolls. If I successfully roll Convince against you, it applies Pressure for you to do what I want -- IE, not doing what I want costs you 2 Raises rather than 1. You can still do whatever you want if you're willing to spend that extra Raise.

This applies to Villains -- IE, if I roll Convince to get a Villain to jump off a cliff (extreme example) and spend a Raise, he DOES NOT HAVE TO DO IT. He can do ANYTHING HE WANTS, but if he doesn't do what I Pressured him to do, that action costs him 1 extra Raise.

This applies EVEN MORE to Hero vs Hero rolls. You can apply Pressure to another character to do what you want, but you can't rob them of their free will with a die roll.

DUELISTA

Usando Parry e Riposte

You can negate a wound spending a raise anytime you still have a rise (even if the villain attacked you on raise 7 and you have only 3 you still can spend it to negate a wound), but can you parry / riposte out of sequence? And if not did you guys imagine any leeway for parrying (like if the villain wont attack you again till your next action you can still parry it [although the "slash" was in a kind of limbo between rise 7 and 3]) ?

My intent was to keep Riposte and Parry only on your turn, but having played more of the game now I don't think it's a particularly big concern or sticking point. I'd probably let people Riposte or Parry whenever they want, but it's important to remember that you can only do them once in this way -- even though it's not your turn, you can't Parry and then Parry and then Parry, because you're doing the same Maneuver over and over. So, it might introduce a little bit of book-keeping in remembering that "Oh I can't Parry this hit because I used Parry really early in the round" but I don't think it's too difficult to keep track of.

Duelistas x Brutos

Duelist does function against Brutes. I meant this in regards to the proposed house rule that they wouldn't, then perhaps you could offer the duelist player the option to buy that functionality back. That was just something off the top of my head that might make them happy enough to agree to at least discuss houseruling to make everyone happy -- I have not at all thought it out.

Duelistas x Brutos - Conceitos iniciais:

Second, Duelists originally could not use their Maneuvers against Brutes, but quite frankly it was less fun. I don't think there's anything wrong with either approach that you want to use.

I disagree with the idea that Duelists make Brutes "completely useless," but even if that were true I'm not sure it's a problem. I don't think Duelists should be particularly challenged by a group of 10 nameless, faceless town guardsmen. Inigo Montoya would be unimpressed by them, and I don't think it's out of tone of the genre for him to effortlessly defeat 10 men of that caliber.

On top of that, I don't think "more Brutes" or "make Brute Squads dangerous" is the answer -- I don't think ANY Hero of a martial bent should be particularly challenged by a Strength 10 Brute Squad. Hell, a Hero with "Reckless Takedown" can deal with them without even having to spend a single Raise and just move on with his day.

Brutes are speed bumps for Heroes, one aspect of a challenging situation rather than the whole of the challenge. This can change when you add in special Brutes (a team of 5 Assassins jumps the Duelist -- they go first when the GM spends a Danger Point, so they just lay a Dramatic Wound on the Duelist before he can do anything).

Would not letting Duelists perform maneuvers against Brutes completely break the game? No, absolutely not. Brutes would simply take more Raises to deal with. I don't think it's a good solution, though -- Duelist Academy is a five point Advantage, in fact the only one that can't situationally be purchased for less than that, so it should pack a BIG punch.

The intention in the core book is that Duelists do indeed lay the smack down on Brute Squads. This is intentional, and in no way an oversight.

Duelistas a origem:

Originally, this wasn't true and Dueling was sort of a "subsystem" that was only applicable versus Villains, but among playtesters this was incredibly unpopular, so we opened it up.

ELABORATION: I don't think there's anything wrong with ruling things the other way and saying that Dueling maneuvers don't function against Brutes, so long as you run it by your player group first and make sure they all know the score. Additionally, there are going to be other Advantages coming pretty soon that give non-Duelists much more impactful ways to influence fights versus Brutes and Villains, but don't step on a Duelist's toes (at least not too much). You can expect to see a few of these in Heroes & Villains.

ESQUADRÕES DE BRUTOS

Dano dos Brutos:

Quick question regarding Brute damage; in the rulebook (p.192) it says "A Squad must deal all of its damage to a single hero." I find this to be a bit harsh, is there a specific reasoning for that? Or do you see a downside to allowing a Brute Squad to split its damage between two (or more) Heroes as long as they are all actively engaged with it?

Squads have to inflict all of their damage to a single target because otherwise the organization of a Squad doesn't matter.

If a Strength 10 Squad can put their 10 wounds wherever they want, there is no mechanical effect for division. It doesn't matter if they are 1 Squad of 10, or 2 Squads of 5, or 3 Squads (1 at 5, 1 at 3, 1 at 2). There's just 10 Wounds floating around.

This also means that the players don't get a say in how the Squad deivides its damage. Players can do straight up numbers reduction, or they can eliminate squads entirely, etc. If the Squad divides their Wounds however they see fit, the players do not meaningfully interact with the Squads in a strategic way. They are just Raise sponges.

Brutos não são pressionados

Brutes don't have Raises to spend in order to take Actions, so in a strict sense they cannot be Pressured since Pressure would have no real effect on them.

They can't spend more of a resource that they don't spend to begin with.

VILÕES

Esquemas:

Schemes are intended to be long-term plans -- the Villain's version of a Story. Escaping a scene isn't a Scheme, it's closer to an Opportunity that only the Villain can activate.

Dano dramático em vilões:

Villains. Those dastardly few..

I need a few clarifications on Villains.

Do they give and gain the same bonuses as the Wound Spiral of the Heroes? In other words, do the Villains suffer from the McClane Effect. Because, in a combat with several villains and several heroes, how the hell do you keep track of that?

Also. There are quite a few Advantages that really doesn't jive well with the way Villains are set up. For one thing, Knacks. They need Hero Points to be activated. I'm just assuming they are what is referred to as a Villain's Special Ability in the section about Danger Points. Secondly, there are a few that does not compute with a Villain.

Villains do not suffer from drawbacks from Dramatic Wounds, aside from becoming Helpless at 4 Dramatic Wounds.

Any effect that requires spending a Hero Point to activate, instead costs Danger Points for a Villain. Similarly, any effect that generates a Hero Point generates Danger Points instead. For example, if you gave your Villain the Valiant Spirit advantage, you start the game with an extra Danger Point.

You're correct in that many Advantages aren't beneficial to Villains. So... don't give them to your Villains? I'm not sure what the problem is.

As for Villain-only Advantages, that's pretty unlikely to happen (although not impossible). GMs have it easy when it comes to mechanics--if you want your Villain to be able to do something, let them do it. Spend a Danger Point, or write a really short little blurb about how if they do X then Y happens.

Players don't have that luxury. Players are limited by the rules as presented to them, either by the book or by their GM. A player who showed up at the table and said "Yeah I wrote my own Dueling Style and my own Sorcery and my own Advantages from scratch" is pretty likely to be told to stop and play by the rules. A GM who does the same for his Villains is just par for the course. Sure, their players might ask to have access to the same stuff ("That dueling style sounds cool, can I learn it?") but this is all up to the GM and how they want to play.

Plus... ya know... Monster Qualities. ;)

More than anything, though, it's extremely important to remember that the Villains are not the stars of the show--the Heroes are. Villains have unique and interesting abilities sometimes, but it is explicitly the job of the Villain to make the Heroes cool, not vice versa. The purpose of giving a Villain a unique ability is letting the players beat it.

Dano dramático em vilões[2]:

I've been thinking about this for a while but I'm not sure if anyone has had any trouble with this. When a hero or villain receive their second Dramatic Wound, the opponent gets a bonus of 2 dice against them.

Now... what happens when there are... for instance, two players against a villain? if a villain is down to their second dramatic wound I would agree that both players get +2 dice but what happens when only 1 player receives their second dramatic wound?

Does the villain gain +2 dice too? If they do that would be unfair because the other player is not wounded. If they don't, then we would be ignoring the fact that one player is wounded. And... even if we are willing to ignore it in this case, what if there is one player against 2 villains or two henchmen?

What do you guys think?

Villains do not gain bonus dice for having Dramatic Wounds, only for facing Heroes who have Dramatic Wounds.

By the same token, Heroes do not gain bonus dice for facing a Villain with Dramatic Wounds, only for having Dramatic Wounds themselves.

So in your example, if one Hero has 2 DW and the other has 0 DW, the Villain gains 2 Bonus dice, Hero 1 gains 1 bonus die, and Hero 2 gains no bonus dice.

Dano dramático em vilões[3]:

Do Villains gain Bonus Dice or Exploding Dice as they gain Dramatic Wounds, and do the Heroes gain Bonus Dice when the Villain is at 2 Dramatic Wounds?

Do Villains gain the benefit of Hard to Kill. That is, if a Villain with a Strength 4 had Hard to Kill, would he have 5 Dramatic Wounds, with 4 Wounds proceeding each?

1. No.
2. Yes.

CORRUPÇÃO

Não é matar, mas o motivo:

Page 203 of the core rulebook.

"If a Hero intentionally causes another character unnecessary pain, it's an evil act. We're not talking about a surgeon who causes temporary pain for longterm health or a dentist who pulls a rotting tooth, we're talking about inflicting pain on a helpless victim."

The closest it comes to this is the use of the word "helpless" here. However, in this context, helpless is not a game mechanic (game mechanics are always capitalized--helpless vs Helpless, corruption vs Corruption). Perhaps a poor word choice that has led to confusion? I'm not sure.

Even going back and looking at it, AT NO POINT DO THE RULES SAY THAT KILLING LEADS TO CORRUPTION. It says that causing undue suffering leads to Corruption, preying on the weak leads to Corruption, letting others fall to harm due to inaction or apathy leads to Corruption, torture leads to Corruption.

BY THE RULES AS WRITTEN, killing people does not get you Corruption (although in the example, the character says "I kill everyone inside" gains Corruption, this is more because he doesn't care who's in there and he is in fact acting as a highway robber at the time).

Matar e corrupção:

The players were all members of a ship crew, and I was the captain. I got into a duel with, basically, the head of a ruthless street gang. After defeating him, he was taunting me. "I will never stop hunting you. I'll make you pay for this. You had better kill me now, or I will kill you!"

I sheathed my broadsword. "I am not going to kill you. I am going to leave the decision of whether you live or die in the hands of the people you have victimized." I gestured to the dark alleyways of the night-time streets of Five Sails. "You've survived because you're strong, and you take what you want from the weak. But right here, right now... you're the weak. And if one of your victims decides to pass judgment on you, as far as I'm concerned, that's justice. Good luck." Then I walked away.

(As a sidenote, what happened next was one of the other players immediately executed him--not because of his crimes or anything of the sort, but to quote him, "NOBODY talks to my captain that way." We all laughed and said that was awesome, and that player INSISTED on taking a Corruption point.)

It may be a fine line to walk, but that isn't inaction. I didn't choose to not get involved in a situation or to let evil continue because I just didn't want to be bothered. I chose a dramatic and poetic end to a conflict.

I don't mean to sound like a jerk, and this isn't directed at anyone specifically. I don't think that anyone would call something like that "inaction."

The Corruption by inaction rule is meant to combat APATHY. "Why should I save the helpless beggar? There's nothing in it for me." This is not what a hero thinks or says. A hero saves the man because he NEEDS SAVING.

That doesn't mean that a hero turns down a payday when it's offered, and it doesn't mean that he always bends over backward to make sure everything is always roses and sunshine.

Some villains deserve to die.

I'm a big Batman fan. In 7th Sea, Batman would not gain Corruption by killing the Joker, so long as it happened during combat, especially after he's captured him a few times.

To quote my favorite DC Animated feature, "Under the Red Hood"...

"Ignoring what he's done in the past. Blindly, stupidly disregarding the entire graveyards he's filled, the thousands who have suffered, the friends he's crippled..."

It isn't the Joker's past crimes that make him worthy of execution. It's the fact that HE WILL COMMIT THEM AGAIN IF GIVEN THE SLIGHTEST OPPORTUNITY.

To kill someone in order to save someone else is not, in my opinion, murder as defined in 7th Sea.

To kill in the heat of combat, or to kill a Villain who is nakedly and loudly defiant and driven to continue to hurt and victimize others, is justified.

But to kill a villain because they annoy you, or because you don't want to deal with them in the future... to kill someone because IT'S MORE CONVENIENT... that's murder. That's the kind of decision a psychopath makes.

7th Sea is not about playing psychopaths.

DIVERSOS

Termos de jogo em maiúsculas:
I understand, but in 7th Sea, game terms are capitalized.

Dicas para iniciantes:
I'm running my first 7th sea game starting very soon. Those of you who are experienced I'm wondering if you could give me 3 peices of advice you wish you had when you started your campaign.

1. Embrace the Dramatic Sequence. Dramatic Sequences are intended to be a powerful engine for "social" and "tense" scenes in the game, and I feel like a lot of people are intimidated by them. Don't be! Look at them exactly like you'd look at a social scene in any other RPG, and let your players mess around with them.
2. Don't be afraid of your Heroes getting beat up or failing. The dramatic tension for 7th Sea comes from the players being put into positions where they have to decide between multiple things that they want, and not being able to have everything. This is contrary to other games that tend to have more of a "win or lose" set-up to challenging players. If you put your players in a position where they can either save their friend or capture the Villain, BUT NOT BOTH, you have succeeded.
3. Don't go into it with a set story that you want to tell. As a 7th Sea GM, your primary task when it comes to writing sessions is to look to the Stories that your players have written and decide which ones they'll bump into and how. You can weave them together into a larger story if you want, and you can (and should) weave them together when it feels right to do so, but don't put the player stories on the back-burner so that you can tell "your story." This ain't that kind of game.

Responsabilidade sobre as regras:
I don't think the core book's shortcomings (which I think are primarily in presentation and explanation) are on John's plate. While it's true that he's by far the biggest veteran on the team, he's not the system lead -- I am. As such, successfully explaining the system to people is a large part of my responsibility, and I made some bad steps and bad decisions.

We were actually working on an updated version of the Quick Start adventure using the core book final rules, but I don't know what happened to it -- maybe it got lost somewhere in the paperwork shuffle?

In the end, it's my responsibility. I'd never written a game before (much less one as big as 7th Sea) and so I made a lot of rookie mistakes. It is very easy for people to point the finger at John (both for things done well and things done poorly--he's the rock star, after all), but the fact of the matter is that his were by far not the only set of eyes that went over the book and not the only one who gave the final version a thumbs up.

So basically... I accept responsibility for the mechanics, both good and bad, and in terms of the rules as well as the explanations on how to implement them. That's my house. ;)

Comentários sobre as regras expandidas de navio:

https://www.drivethrurpg.com/product/207556/Expanded-Ship-Rules

"The extended ship rules are far superior to what I wrote. I'm not ashamed to admit it."

"The skill list was reprinted mostly for player convenience. The only Advantages that are reprinted are ones that a new Nation gains at a reduced cost (Married to the Sea, for example) and that's a blueprint that holds true going forward.

This is mostly due to how we chose to display the reduced cost Advantages on the Advantage, rather than the Nation. Personally, I think it's also helpful to not have to grab your core book to figure out what Aragosta is good at, for example.

I think the only Advantage that was reprinted and DOESN'T follow this rule is Direction Sense, and it was printed again because (1) it fits really well in the book in terms of tone and (2) it fit really well in the book in terms of literal book space. That page had a blank spot on it the exact size of Direction Sense, and rather than leave it blank we decided to put the Advantage there.

Also in regards to naval battles, the more narrative approach reflects my personal taste and how I believe naval battles should be portrayed. There is a much more in-depth naval battle system that is upcoming in Explorer's Society, penned by a well-known designer who I'm almost positive I'm not allowed to talk about. The only reason it wasn't included in PN was a timing issue."

"This is correct -- Ships don't roll dice, the Ship's crew and Heroes roll dice and spend their Raises to protect the Ship, or make the Ship take actions.

Also, while I can't go into details, I can tell you that there are some SUPER COOL new Ship rules coming out soon, and that doesn't make me arrogant because I didn't write the new ones.

I'm also not really sure I can say who DID write them, but I can assure you it wasn't me and the person who did write them is a name that you'll probably recognize."

Vantagens não controlam mentes:

Any function that requires a Hero Point to activate requires consent from the target player when activated. IE, if I use "Disarming Smile" to keep you from fighting, I spend a Hero Point and you can either say "okay it works, I don't fight" and gain that Hero Point, or you can say "No that doesn't work on me" and continue to do whatever you wanted.

The rules are not mind-control, ESPECIALLY when it comes to other players.

I would say, however, that this is probably a bigger problem. Clearly, you aren't having fun, and it's the actions / playstyle of another person at the table that is preventing this.

This is THEIR problem. THEY are the one doing something wrong, NOT YOU.

My advice would be to ask them to stop. "Hey, this isn't fun. Can we not play the game this way?"

If that doesn't work, tell them that the systems lead for the game says that (a) they are playing the game wrong in spirit, (b) they are also playing the game wrong with the direct rules as written, and (c) they're being a real dick about it.

Planejado para falhar:

The game master has written an episode that requires the characters to be captured, so they can then proceed with a dramatic escape from an island, learning all kinds of exciting things in the process.

The initial scene pits the heroes against a ship with superior firepower that was supposed to overwhelm them and lead to the capture and escape sequence.

The heroes, with bold and reckless use of explosives, magic, etc defeat the opposing force thus negating the whole escape scene planned.

Should the game master have:

A. Just narrated the opening scene, skipping dramatic and action sequences, going straight to the meat of the story?
B. Increased the strength of the opposing force, placing the heroes in an impossible situation to drive the story forward?
C. Done something else completely different?
Resposta:

When the GM calls for dice rolls or for the players to respond to something in the game world, he is saying that those circumstances can be changed.

If the GM wants to do a jailbreak adventure, he should simply start the characters in jail.

If he wants to give the players input on the circumstances surrounding their capture, he shouldn't put them in a situation where they roll dice to resist being caught--he should ask them what happened that lead to their capture.

This is something that I very rarely see happen, and so many GMs don't seem to treat it as an option. Don't put your players into a circumstance where you stack the odds against them and then engage the mechanics in such a way that they fail. Instead, approach this narratively--ask the players to tell YOU what happened to lead to their capture.

Often they will surprise you, they'll invent betrayals or bad luck or stacked odds that you would have never thought of. And this is a better solution because the players are active agents in their downfall, which means they can take some joy in it.

It's rare that you have fun while the GM smashes you over the face with his unkillable NPCs, by contrast.

Dano causado por armas de fogo:
Apply the Wounds from Raises first, then the automatic Dramatic Wound last.