

<b>Annotated IPG</b>	<b>IPG 精解</b>
Based on IPG version <i>Shadows over Innistrad</i>	对应 IPG 版本: 《依尼翠暗影》
8 April, 2016	2016 年 4 月 8 日
The Annotated IPG is a line by line deconstruction of each sentence in the IPG. The IPG is a very dense document with very few extraneous words. Each sentence has meaning, and it's the AIPG's goal to call attention to the finer details hidden in those sentences. It can be used as a study guide for L2, a refresher for judges coming back, or to settle judge nerd-fights, but its primary focus is education.	IPG 精解 (Annotated IPG) 是对 IPG 逐字逐句的分析及解释。IPG 是一份非常浓缩的文件, 解释性的额外说明很少。因为文件中的每一句话都是有意义的, 这份 IPG 精解的宗旨在于解析出隐藏于这些字句中的详细细节。它可以用作 2 级裁判的学习材料、为回归的裁判刷新知识、解决裁判间对问题的争论等, 但它最主要的目的是教育。
This document is maintained by Annotated IPG Project led by Bryan Prillaman (L3 from USA). If you found a problem or want to submit a suggestion, please send E-mail to <a href="mailto:bprill.mtg@gmail.com">bprill.mtg@gmail.com</a> .	此文档的 <b>英文版</b> 维护者是美国的 3 级裁判 Bryan Prillaman 带领的 AIPG 团队, 如果你发现问题、或想要提供建议, 请发邮件给 <a href="mailto:bprill.mtg@gmail.com">bprill.mtg@gmail.com</a> 。
Chinese Translation (1 <sup>st</sup> version - BFZ) is done by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yutong Chang</li> <li>• Hao Du</li> <li>• Jiakai Lyu</li> <li>• Ruiming Chen</li> </ul> SOI Update maintained by Hao Du	中文版翻译团队(第一版—BFZ 版本)成员如下: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 常雨桐</li> <li>• 杜昊</li> <li>• 吕家恺</li> <li>• 陈锐鸣</li> </ul> 依尼翠暗影版本文档更新: 杜昊

# 目录

<b>1.0 一般原则</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.1 各式处罚之定义 .....	9
1.2 应用处罚 .....	14
1.3 随机化套牌 .....	18
1.4 倒回 .....	19
<b>2.0 游戏行动失误</b> .....	<b>22</b>
2.1 遗漏触发 .....	24
2.2 额外看牌 .....	42
2.3 非公开牌张失误 .....	46
2.4 再调度失误 .....	55
2.5 违反游戏规则 .....	57
2.6 未维护游戏状态 .....	61
<b>3.0 比赛失误</b> .....	<b>63</b>
3.1 迟到 .....	65
3.2 外来协助 .....	68
3.3 游戏进行过慢 .....	71
3.4 未充分洗牌 .....	74
3.5 套牌 / 套牌登记表问题 .....	78
3.6 违反限制赛流程 .....	86
3.7 违反交流原则 .....	88
3.8 有记号的牌 .....	91
<b>4.0 举止违背运动道德</b> .....	<b>94</b>
4.1 轻微 .....	96
4.2 严重 .....	100
4.3 不当决定胜方 .....	110
4.4 贿赂与赌博 .....	113
4.5 攻击性举止 .....	116
4.6 窃取比赛用品 .....	118
4.7 拖延 .....	120
4.8 作弊 .....	123

<h2>1.0 General</h2>	<h2>1.0 一般原则</h2>
<p><b>Judges are neutral arbiters and enforcers of policy and rules.</b></p>	<p>裁判是中立的裁决者，也是政策与规则的执法者。</p>
<p>This is probably the single most important concept in the document — judges must be neutral. It should be inconceivable that a judge ruled in favor of a player because they are friends or because somehow the judge likes one player more than the other. Being impartial is a fundamental concept in the Magic Judge Code of Conduct. Judges are viewed with respect, in large part, because they are neutral and because they enforce the policy equally.</p>	<p>裁判必须是中立的——这可能是这篇文档中最重要的内容。我们无法想象一位裁判在做出判断时会偏向某位牌手，只是因为他们是朋友或者裁判更喜欢这位牌手。公正是《万智牌裁判行为守则》中规定的裁判行为基础。正因为裁判总是能公正的执行政策，所以大家才会对裁判怀有敬意。</p>
<p><b>A judge shouldn't intervene in a game unless he or she believes a rules violation has occurred, a player with a concern or question requests assistance, or the judge wishes to prevent a situation from escalating.</b></p>	<p>通常情况下，裁判不应干预游戏的进行，但在此数类情况下，裁判应及时介入：裁判认为已有人违反规则，抱有顾虑或疑问的牌手请求协助，或裁判希望防止局势恶化。</p>
<p>Judges are there for the players. Our services are needed when a rule has been violated, a player has some need, or there is a delicate situation like an argument and it's necessary to calm the players down. When their assistance is not needed, judges should not interfere with matches. That means no comments about game actions, no risk of giving advice, and no disruption of the player's concentration. Let players play. Keep in mind this doesn't mean you have to be a robot. You can still chat with players, and joke around with them, just don't interrupt their games.</p>	<p>裁判的存在是为了服务牌手们。当有规则被违反，有牌手需要帮助或有特殊情况发生（比如产生了争吵，需要安抚牌手），裁判就该出动了。当不需要裁判的时候，裁判不应该干扰比赛。也就是说不评论牌手的游戏行动，不给出建议，不中断牌手的思考。让牌手玩自己的。但是注意这并不是让你成为一个规则自动答复机。你依然可以跟牌手闲聊、开玩笑，只是不要打断他们的对局。</p>
<p><b>Judges don't stop play errors from occurring, but instead deal with errors that have occurred, penalize those who violate rules or policy, and promote fair play and sporting conduct by example and diplomacy.</b></p>	<p>裁判并不会阻止游戏失误的发生，而是会去解决已发生之失误，处罚违反规则和政策的牌手，并以身体力行和交际手腕来宣导公平的比赛和运动道德。</p>
<p>Like in many other sports, judges don't prevent mistakes. However, as soon as a game infraction happens, judges step in and apply the necessary corrections and penalties. Players cannot depend on a judge to prevent their illegal actions from occurring, because judges can't foresee the future and game actions happen quickly. In the vast majority of cases, fixing an infraction after it happens restores the correct flow of the game. This policy also holds when watching a match at the end of round or during a Top</p>	<p>正如在很多其他体育项目中一样，裁判并不防止游戏错误的出现。然而，只要当违规发生，裁判就会介入，进行需要的修正及判罚。牌手无法依靠裁判来防止自己做出非法游戏动作，因为裁判无法预知未来而且游戏动作通常进行的很快。在绝大部分情况下，在违规出现之后进行修正，可以让游戏正常的进行下去。在每轮结束时或者八强的盯桌时同样需要遵守这一条。</p>

8.	
It's also important that judges set a good example of behavior. Your attitude and actions have a pronounced impact on the tone of the event. People should see in you the behavior you want in your events.	裁判做出良好的行为举止的表率也是很重要的。你的行为和态度对赛事的氛围有着非常显著的影响。牌手将会从你的行为上读出你所期望的赛事行为标准。
<b>Judges may intervene to prevent or preempt errors occurring outside of a game.</b>	<b>为避免或预防游戏之外的失误发生，裁判可以介入。</b>
While it's next to impossible to see that a game infraction is about to happen, sometimes it's possible to see that an outside-of-game infraction that is about to happen. In these cases, judges should step in and prevent infractions from happening. The "may" in the sentence is not "the judge is allowed to make a choice" but more "The IPG/MTR allows judges to do step in." This underscores the importance of customer service and makes it very clear that judges do not have the choice of whether to intervene and prevent these types of errors. Outside of a game, judges should always intervene to prevent infractions, but we accept that they sometimes won't notice that an infraction is about to happen. Here are a few examples:	虽然发现一个游戏内的违规事件的征兆是几乎不可能的，但是有时可以看出游戏外违规事件的征兆。在这种情况下，裁判应该上前阻止这个违规的发生。IPG 原文中这句话中的“可以”并不是指“裁判可以选择是否阻止”，而是“IPG/MTR 允许才裁判上前阻止”。这强调了服务牌手的重要性，同时明确的说明裁判并不能选择是否要在此时干预并防止此类违规。在游戏外，裁判应该阻止这些违规的出现，但是我们承认有的时候裁判并不能意识到这种违规的征兆。下面是几个例子：
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A judge sees that a player is shuffling his deck after the end of game one, sees that there is a previously exiled creature on the table, and realizes that the player forgot to return it to his deck; the judge steps in and tell the player that he's forgetting to shuffle a card.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 一位裁判看到牌手在第一局与第二局之间洗牌，然而有一张被放逐的生物牌还在桌子上，意识到那位牌手忘记了把它洗进去。裁判上前告诉那位牌手他忘了把那张生物牌洗回去。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In a Sealed Deck tournament, a player gives a decklist to a judge, and the judge notices that the player forgot to write down her basic lands; the judge asks the player to record the basic lands she's playing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 在一场现开比赛中，一位牌手将他的套牌登记表交给裁判，裁判发现该牌手忘了填他基本地的使用量；裁判让该牌手将他的地牌的数量写上。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just before the beginning of a round, a player goes to the judge station and hands in a card (like Pacifism) that belongs to her previous opponent; the judges makes an effort to find where the owner of that card is playing this round, so that they can return it before the game starts with an illegal deck.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 在一轮比赛马上要开始的时候，一位牌手到主席台处把一张属于他上局对手的牌（比如《和平主义》）交给裁判。裁判尽力寻找那张牌的拥有者并把牌还给他，以防他用一套不合法的套牌进行下轮比赛。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before the event, a judge sees a questionable card alter. The judge reminds the player that the Head Judge needs to approve all card</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 在比赛之前，一位裁判看到牌手用了可能有问题的艺术加工牌。他提醒那位牌手他需要在比赛之前先获得主审的允许来使用这些</li> </ul>

alters prior to the event.	牌。
<b>Knowledge of a player's history or skill does not alter an infraction, but it may be taken into account during an investigation.</b>	对某牌手过去作为与游戏技巧的认知不会影响违规的认定,但在调查过程中或会将这些方面考虑在内。
We don't change the infraction based on how good the player is perceived to be. A Game Rule Violation is a Warning regardless of if the player is new or a grizzled Pro. Once you determine what the infraction was, you apply the penalties without any preconceived biases. A player who has a reputation for being shady has his Game Rule Violations fixed the same way as a Level 5 judge playing in the event. Once the infraction is recognized, who the player is has no bearing. However, in determining what infraction was made, a player's history may influence the investigation. For example, a new player misunderstanding how trample works is much more believable than an experienced player, with whom you have discussed trample before on multiple occasions. It's still possible for legitimate errors to be made, but the questions asked in the investigation will be influenced by this knowledge.	我们不应根据牌手的能力或对牌手的印象来改变判罚。当你确定了违规所属的类别,你的处罚应该不掺杂任何先入为主的偏见,一位声名狼藉的牌手和一位参加比赛的 5 级裁判犯下违反游戏规则所面临的判罚同样都是警告。一旦明确了违规是什么,牌手是谁并不会有任何影响。然而,在确定究竟是什么违规的时候,牌手的身份可能会影响调查。例如,一位跟你数次讨论过践踏的老玩家和一位新手都说他自己误解了践踏的规则,显然后者的可信度要高一些。这依然有可能是老牌手犯下的一个正常的错误,但是这些前期的判断将影响你在调查的时候的提问。
<b>The purpose of a penalty is to educate the player not to make similar mistakes in the future.</b>	处罚的目的是为了避免牌手在往后犯下类似的失误。
Penalties don't exist to give sadistic judges the ability to inflict pain on defenseless players. Penalties exist to reduce the chance the error will happen again. A player who receives a penalty for an action is less likely to make the same error in the future. Generally they are meant to be something tangible to reinforce the lesson "I lost a game once for this mistake, and I don't want to lose another game for something I can easily avoid, I will count to 60 every time I write a decklist". The primary purpose of a penalty is not tracking; although that is a convenient and useful byproduct, the purpose is education.	处罚的存在并不是为了让虐待狂裁判去伤害毫无防备的牌手,处罚的存在是为了减少错误再次出现的几率。牌手受到了处罚之后他再次犯下同样错误的可能会减少。通常这意味着给他们上了印象深刻的一课“我因为这个失误而获得一盘负,我不想再因为这个可以轻松避免的问题再输一盘。我以后交牌表之前会数一下到没到 60 张”。处罚的目的并不是持续记录一位牌手的比赛行为(虽然那是个方便的副产物),处罚的目的在于教育。
<b>This is done through both an explanation of where the rules or policies were violated and a penalty to reinforce the education.</b>	为达成此目标,必须向该牌手解释所违反之规则或政策,使处罚有其教育意义。
So in the sentence above we are stressing the importance of education. A penalty alone can't do that. You also have to explain (briefly) what the player did wrong. Otherwise, they might not fully understand what went wrong.	所以这句话我们强调了教育的重要性。仅仅是处罚牌手并不能做到这点,你同时要清楚地向他解释他哪儿做错了。否则,他可能不能完全理解自己错在哪儿。

<p><b>Penalties are also for the deterrence and education of every other player in the event and are also used to track player behavior over time.</b></p>	<p>处罚的效果也包括教育比赛中其他牌手并造成警惕，且会用来持续记录牌手的行为。</p>
<p>We should also note that you don't have to receive a penalty to recognize that you don't want to. If a friend of ours lost an important game because of a penalty, we surely don't want to lose in the same way. We learn from our friend's mistakes as well as from our own.</p>	<p>我们也要记住，有时并不用以获得判罚为代价来认识错误。如果一位朋友因为一个处罚输掉了一场重要的比赛，我们肯定不希望自己不小心干了同样的事情而受到处罚。对我们朋友的处罚同样能使我们防止自己犯错误。</p>
<p>There is a (private) archive of all the penalties, just like the (public) archive of all match results. This archive becomes useful in the case of one player committing a high number of the same infraction. If a player receives a Warning for "Looking at Extra Cards – He revealed his opponent's cards while shuffling his opponent's deck before the beginning of the match" for twenty times in twenty consecutive tournaments, well, wouldn't you believe that he's doing it on purpose and he's doing it only once just because he knows that "the first time is just a warning"?</p>	<p>正如有一个档案（公开的）保存着所有的比赛结果一样，同样有一个档案（非公开的）保存着所有的判罚记录。当一位牌手重复出现了同一个违规的时候，这个档案会非常有用。当一个牌手在 20 个连续的比赛受到了 20 次“额外看牌——在比赛前洗牌时，看到了对手的牌库”的处罚，难道你不认为是因为他知道这样做“第一次只是警告”所以故意这样做的么？</p>
<p><b>If a minor violation is quickly handled by the players to their mutual satisfaction, a judge does not need to intervene.</b></p>	<p>如果违反规则的情况较为轻微，且牌手已以双方均满意的方式进行了快速处理，则裁判无需干预。</p>
<p>Judges should be seen as a benefit to the players, and there are many minor/tiny mistakes that players make and correct themselves over the course of a match without the need for a judge. If the error is tiny, and the players fix it themselves, and are both happy, then the judge does not need to insert themselves into their game.</p>	<p>裁判应当被牌手视为提供帮助的来源。在对局中有很多轻微的错误，牌手犯下这些错误后会自行修正，而无需裁判修正。如果错误很轻微，且牌手自行修正并都对结果满意，则裁判无需介入游戏来干预。</p>
<p><b>If the players are playing in a way that is clear to both players, but might cause confusion to an external observer, judges are encouraged to request that the players make the situation clear, but not assess an infraction or issue any penalty.</b></p>	<p>如果游戏的进行方式虽对双方牌手足够明晰，但在旁观者看来或会混淆不清，则建议裁判去要求牌手让情况更加清楚，而不要给予任何处罚。</p>
<p>Players take certain shortcuts, or use beads to represent odd things, or use the wrong tokens for creatures. These things might be clear to them, but not clear to observers (including judges). If the players understand what's going on, and everything is fine, don't issue a penalty. Just ask them to play in a way that's clearer. Often we get spectators coming to us with problems that aren't really problems. For this reason we must push the players to not only be clear with each other but also to ensure that their actions</p>	<p>牌手可能会采用一些简化流程、使用意义不明的物体来表示某些东西、或使用错误的衍生物等。这些做法也许对于双方牌手均很清楚，但对旁观者（包括裁判）可能就不那么清楚了。如果双方牌手均清楚发生了什么，双方也都能接受，则不要给予判罚，但可以请求牌手用更为清楚的方式进行游戏。我们经常会遇到旁观者叫来裁判报告问题，但最后发现实际上并不是问题，而是理解错误。因此我们必须促使牌手不仅要对手表达清楚，也要对旁观他们游戏的其他人表达清楚。</p>

are clear to anyone who is watching their game.	
<b>In both these situations, the judge should ensure that the game progresses normally.</b>	在上述两种情况中，裁判应确保游戏正常进行。
If the players fix a tiny error themselves or are playing in a way that is clear to them, but not clear to bystanders, stick around and watch and make sure nothing odd is happening like a player is taking advantage of the confusion, or the error doesn't compound itself.	如果牌手自行修正了一个轻微错误，或使用只有牌手双方知道但对旁观者混淆不清的表达方式，裁判应该在桌前稍作停留，并确认没有更严重的事情发生。（诸如牌手利用混淆不清的表达获利、或同样的错误接连不断发生）
<b>More significant violations are addressed by first identifying what infraction applies, then proceeding with the corresponding instructions.</b>	对于较为严重之违反规则情况而言，裁判应先确定适用何种违规，然后再根据相应的处理方式进行处理。
This sentence pulls double-duty. It's a reminder that we do infract in cases larger than "tiny" and that we do not start with the penalty and work backwards to the infraction. We identify what actions occurred, what the infraction is, and then determine the penalty. We do not give people Game Losses because their error seems worth a Game Loss.	这句话确定了两项责任。首先，我们需要对任何比“轻微”违规严重的情况进行判罚；其次，我们不能先确定判罚是什么，再回头找适用的违规。我们应当先判定牌手做了哪些行动，导致了什么违规，再确定判罚。我们不能因为某个错误看起来应该一盘负就给一盘负。
<b>Only the Head Judge is authorized to issue penalties that deviate from these guidelines.</b>	只有主审才有权力不依此方针来作处罚。
When there are multiple judges, the Head Judge is the judge in charge of the entire tournament; the only one who has the authority to determine if a specific penalty doesn't apply well to the current situation. Head Judges are usually the most experienced judges available, and when they decide to deviate it's usually for a good reason.	当多个裁判共同执法时，主审是负责整个比赛的裁判；他是唯一有权利来决定是否需要不进行不依照方针的特殊判罚的人。主审通常由经验最丰富的裁判来担任，他在决定不依照方针行事的时候通常都有充分的理由。
<b>The Head Judge may not deviate from this guide's procedures except in significant and exceptional circumstances or in a situation that has no applicable philosophy for guidance.</b>	除非在重大且特殊的状况中，或是没有可供运用的指导原则，否则主审都不该背离此方针的处理流程。
Of course, although the Head Judge has the authority to deviate any time he or she wants, he or she is also expected to know when it is appropriate to deviate. The main reason for deviation is when a specific situation doesn't fit well in the categories listed in the twenty pages of the IPG. The only case where a deviation is justifiable is when the situation is both significant and exceptional.	当然，虽然主审虽然任何时候都有不依照方针处理的权利，他同样也应该知道什么时候适合自行决定处罚。不依照方针的常见原因是出现了某些没有被包含在这份 IPG 中的特殊情况。只有在出现了重大且特殊的状况时，不依照方针才是公正的处理方法。
<b>Significant and exceptional circumstances are rare—a table collapses, a booster contains cards from a different set, etc.</b>	重大且特殊的状况很少见～桌子垮掉、补充包内含其他系列的牌等等。

<p>Here you have a couple of examples of “exceptional circumstances”. In these cases, we use common sense and we try to find the “best solution” with the players. Both of the examples above are both significant and exceptional. Make sure your situation is both before you consider deviating.</p>	<p>在这里你可以看到几个“重大且特殊的状况”的例子。在这些情况下，我们使用我们的常识去跟牌手一起努力找到最佳解决方案。上面的这两个例子都重大且特殊，在你不依照方针处理之前请确保你遇到的状况也是重大且特殊的。</p>
<p><b>The Rules Enforcement Level, round of the tournament, age or experience-level of the player, desire to educate the player, and certification level of the judge are NOT exceptional circumstances.</b></p>	<p>执法严格度、比赛的回合、牌手的经验高低和年龄、特别想教育该牌手，以及裁判的等级，均不算是特殊状况。</p>
<p>Some of these situations might make it seem like it's OK to deviate, but it's not. You are to enforce policy regardless of whether it's the last round, regardless of if the call is at table 1 or table 101. The opponents might be an exceptionally young age, but that age difference is not significant in terms of policy. The player might be new, and not know that rolling a die to determine a winner is prohibited; that player is still going to be disqualified regardless of whether you think it is 'fair' or not. And finally, being a Level 3+ judge does not bestow upon that judge the right to deviate. In truth, they are held to a stricter standard, as lower level judges are watching and learning from their actions.</p>	<p>一些情况下，不依照方针行事看上去是合理的，但其实不是。你应该严格的依照方针执行，不管这是不是最后一轮，不管这是 1 号桌还是 101 号桌。对手可能是非常年轻的孩子，但是年龄对于执行方针并没有什么影响。牌手可能是刚刚接触万智牌的新人，他并不知道扔骰子决定胜负是被禁止的，他仍然会被取消资格，不管你觉得这是否“公平”。另外，成为一个 L3 或以上的裁判并不会给你更多不依方针行事的权利。事实上，他们会更加严格的遵守标准，因为低级的裁判都以他们为榜样在学习。</p>
<p><b>If another judge feels deviation is appropriate, he or she must consult with the Head Judge.</b></p>	<p>如果其他裁判认为有理由不遵循罚则方针，则必须请示主审。</p>
<p>Just because the Head Judge is the only one that's allowed to deviate doesn't mean a floor judge can't suggest it to the Head Judge. However, as a floor judge, you must never deviate.</p>	<p>只有主审有不依方针行事的权利并不意味着一个巡场裁判不能建议主审如此做。然而，作为一个巡场裁判，你永远不能不依方针行事。</p>
<p><b>Judges are human and make mistakes. When a judge makes a mistake, he or she should acknowledge the mistake, apologize to the players, and fix it if it is not too late.</b></p>	<p>裁判也是常人，也会犯下错误。若裁判确实出现了失误，他应承认错误，向牌手致歉，且如果发现尚属及时，还应该进行修正。</p>
<p>Despite all efforts to train Golden Retrievers, we judges are still only human.</p>	<p>尽管我们已经非常努力的在训练狗狗来进行工作，但是我们裁判仍然都是人类。</p>
<p>For now.</p>	<p>至少现在为止还是这样。</p>
<p>Humans make mistakes. It's a fact of life. No one can be 100% correct all the time, and it is unrealistic to expect otherwise. However, when you do make a mistake, you need to take ownership of it and fix it if you can. Players cannot be allowed to continue thinking that something a judge incorrectly told them is correct. In all cases though, you need to apologize</p>	<p>人总是会犯错，这是人生中一定会出现的。没有人可以总是保证自己 100% 的正确，同时对于他人来说也是个不切实际的期望。然而，当你犯了错误，你需要负起责任尽最大努力去修正他。不可以让牌手认为裁判说的错误信息是对的。在任何情况下，你需要因为你犯的错误向牌手道歉。有时需要立刻这么做，但是有的时候在比赛结束之后再这么做可</p>



<p>to the players for your error. Sometimes it's best to do this right away, sometimes it's less disruptive to do it after the match is over. But apologize to both players as soon as it is possible, and correct the situation. Players are typically very understanding, even when they were on the receiving end of an incorrect call.</p>	<p>能更好。但是立刻向双方牌手道歉，并且修正这个错误，通常情况下牌手们总是会表示理解，即使他们是直接接收到了你错误判罚的人。</p>
<p><b>If a member of the tournament staff gives a player erroneous information that causes them to commit a violation, the Head Judge is authorized to downgrade the penalty.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手是因比赛工作人员提供的错误信息而犯下违规，主审有权将罚则降级。</p>
<p>We expect players to trust their tournament officials, and players need to be able to act on the instructions/information we provide them. It is unfair to penalize them for trusting the people they are supposed to be able to trust. However, this downgrade decision still rests with the Head Judge. For this clause we need two things 1) the judge to provide erroneous information and 2) a violation be the direct result from the faulty information.</p>	<p>我们希望牌手们能够信任他们比赛的裁判，牌手也需要依照我们给出的指示或者信息来行动。因为信任他们应该信任的人而导致自己受到处罚是不公平的。然而这个降级的决定权仍然在主审的手里。这个条款的执行需要两个条件：（1）裁判提供了错误信息；（2）违规是收到错误信息的直接结果。</p>
<p><b>For example, a player asks a judge whether a card is legal for a format and is told yes. When that player's deck is found to be illegal because of these cards, the Head Judge applies the normal procedure for fixing the decklist, but may downgrade the penalty to a Warning because of the direct error of the judge.</b></p>	<p>举例来说，某牌手询问裁判某张牌是否在该赛制中合法时，裁判回答他说“是”；此后当该牌手的这套牌因为这张牌之故被判为非法套牌时，主审应依照正常的规程来修正此套牌登记表，但可以将罚则降级为“警告”，因为是由于裁判的失误直接导致了此违规行为的发生。</p>
<p>Other examples might include:</p>	<p>其他的例子包括：</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downgrading a Game Rule Violation Warning to no penalty if a judge tells a player that she can Harm's Way a Lightning Bolt cast by her opponent back to the opponent's Planeswalker.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>将违反游戏规则的“警告”降级为“注意”，因为裁判告诉一位牌手他可以用险境将一个对手的闪电击的伤害转移给他对手的鹏洛客。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downgrading a Deck/Decklist Problem Game Loss to a Warning if a judge has previously told the player that registering "Jace" on his decklist is fine.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>将套牌/牌表问题的“一盘负”降级为“警告”，因为裁判告诉牌手在牌表上写“杰斯”没有问题。</li> </ul>
<h2>1.1 Definition of Penalties</h2>	<h2>1.1 各式处罚之定义</h2>
<h3>WARNING</h3>	<h3>警告</h3>
<p><b>A Warning is an officially tracked penalty.</b></p>	<p>警告是有正式记录的处罚。</p>
<p>A Warning needs to be tracked and judges should write it down on the back of the result slips (if you are</p>	<p>“警告”需要被记录，裁判也应该将它写在成绩条的背面（如果使用成绩条的话）。记分员将会将这个</p>

<p>using them). Then the Scorekeeper will input the warning penalty into WER to let Wizards of the Coast track the infraction. Both the Scorekeeper and the player need to be aware of the penalty. Scorekeepers can notify you when a player is close to an upgrade, and players need to be aware of how many penalties they have.</p>	<p>警告处罚记录在 WER 内，上报给威世智来记录这次违规。记分员和被警告的牌手都应知道警告的内容。记分员可以在该牌手的判罚接近升级次数的时候提醒裁判，同时该牌手也需要知晓自己已经受到了几个判罚。</p>
<p><b>Warnings are used in situations of incorrect play when a small amount of time is needed to implement the corrective procedure. The purpose of a Warning is to alert judges and players involved that a problem has occurred and to keep a permanent record of the infraction in the DCI Penalty Database. A time extension should be issued if the ruling has taken more than a minute.</b></p>	<p>警告使用于不正确的行动，且需要些许时间来执行修正的流程。其目的是用来针对已产生的问题，警示相关裁判和牌手，并将此违规在 DCI 处罚数据库中留下永久记录。如果解释规则花费超过一分钟的时间，则要给予延长时间。</p>
<p>Warnings are typically issued when judges have to step in to correct a situation. The main purpose of warnings is to give ‘weight’ to the reminder to play more carefully. It’s written down and tracked, therefore it’s significant, but it doesn’t need to be scary.</p>	<p>“警告”是在裁判介入修正问题时常见的处罚。其主要的意义在于给牌手更深的印象，让他们之后更小心些。它将被记录下来并追踪，所以它很重要，但是我们不需要让这件事显得很恐怖。</p>
<p>If fixing the game state has taken more than one minute, give a time extension equal to the time taken, unless the match is in extra turns. You did look at the clock before walking up to the table, right?</p>	<p>如果现在不是额外回合，且修正问题的时候用了一分钟以上的时间时，你需要为这桌补时。你在走向叫裁判的桌子的时候会看一眼时间，对吧？</p>
<p><b>GAME LOSS</b></p>	<p>一盘负</p>
<p><b>A Game Loss is issued in situations where the procedure to correct the offense takes a significant amount of time that may slow the entire tournament or causes significant disruption to the tournament, or in which it is impossible to continue the game due to physical disruption. It is also used for some infractions that have a higher probability for a player to gain advantage.</b></p>	<p>当发生此类情形时，应给予一盘负的判罚：对犯规的修正需花费大量的时间，可能拖延整个比赛进行，或对比赛产生显著的影响；因实质干扰之故导致游戏无法继续进行。此判罚也适用于让牌手因此获利之可能性较高的情况。</p>
<p>Penalties are assigned based on how disruptive the infractions are to the event. Game Losses are assigned to things that take a long time to fix or have a high potential for advantage. Keep in mind this doesn't mean you get to just decide something is a Game Loss because of the potential advantage. This consideration has already been incorporated into the infraction and its upgrade/downgrade paths.</p>	<p>一项违规使用什么处罚取决于它对比赛造成的破坏性后果。一盘负适用于需要长时间来修正或有很高的获利可能性的违规。需要注意的是，这并不是说你可以自己来判断哪个违规因为有获利可能性所以可以给一盘负。这些因素已经写入了各种违规的适用的情况以及可用的处罚升/降级中。</p>
<p><b>A Game Loss ends the current game immediately</b></p>	<p>一盘负处罚会立刻结束目前这一盘游戏，犯下此违</p>

<p><b>and the player who committed the infraction is considered to have lost the game for the purpose of match reporting. The player receiving a Game Loss chooses whether to play or draw in the next game of that match, if applicable. If a Game Loss is issued before the match begins, neither player in that match may use sideboards (if the tournament uses them) for the first game they play.</b></p>	<p>规的牌手在对局纪录上会视为是输掉一盘。如果还有下一盘，则得到一盘负处罚的牌手选择下一盘是否要先手。如果在对局开始之前就得到一盘负处罚，则本盘游戏之所有牌手在第一盘开始之前都不能使用备牌（如果该比赛使用备牌的话）。</p>
<p>If a player gets a Game Loss, that game is over. Board position or “but he was going to lose anyway” doesn’t factor into the decision. The rest of this block tells us what to do for the next game. The player with the Game Loss... lost. So that player gets to decide if he or she plays or draws in the next game in the match. However, if the Game Loss is issued before the first game, the players haven't actually played a game yet, so they don't get a chance to sideboard.</p>	<p>当一位牌手受到一盘负的处罚时，当前的游戏立刻结束。局面的情况或“反正他也要输了”的因素并不在考虑范围内。这段的剩下内容将告诉我们在该牌手接下来的盘中应该怎么做。那位牌手输了一盘，所以下一盘由他来决定先后手。然而如果在对局开始之前牌手得到了一盘负的判罚，牌手们都没有开始对局，所以他们不能在开始对局之前换备。</p>
<p><b>Game Losses are applied to the game in which the offense occurred unless the players have begun a new game or the tournament is between rounds, in which case the loss is applied to the player’s next game.</b></p>	<p>一盘负处罚适用于发生犯规的该盘游戏，倘若牌手已经结束该盘游戏，或是比赛正进行到两局之间，则一盘负适用于该牌手的下一盘游戏。</p>
<p>Game Losses typically apply to the games the infraction takes place in. However, some errors, most notably Deck/Decklist Problems for an improper list, can be assessed between rounds, and have the penalty apply to the next game.</p>	<p>一盘负通常会适用于违规发生的那一盘游戏。然而，有些错误将会在两轮之间解决，判罚将适用于在下一盘游戏，比如最常见的就是套牌/牌表问题的填错了牌表。</p>
<p><b>If simultaneous Game Loss penalties are issued to each player, they are recorded, but do not affect the match score.</b></p>	<p>如果游戏中所有牌手同时受到一盘负之处罚，则这些“一盘负”处罚会记录在案，但不会影响当前对局的成绩。</p>
<p>This covers situations where both players have an illegal deck, or when both players forget to reveal a morph at the end of the game, or other similar circumstances. If we assess both players the Game Loss penalty, only one game in the match will determine the winner. When this occurs it's rather awkward to assess these penalties as only one player is effectively penalized while the other is not, for the same behavior. To remedy this, you record both penalties, end the current game (if it is still being played) and both players continue to the next game. For the purpose of reporting the score, that specific game didn't happen.</p>	<p>这适用于两位牌手套牌都不合法、双方都忘了展示变身的生物牌等等其他的情况。如果我们直接给出一人一个一盘负，那么一盘游戏就会决定这一盘的胜负。这样的话，看上去这个处罚给了最后输的那个人，而不是双方都受到了一样的处罚。为不让这种事情发生，你需要记录这两个判罚，结束当前这一盘游戏（如果问题出现的时候游戏还在进行的话），然后这两位牌手继续进行下一局。在录入成绩时，刚才那特殊的一盘视同不存在。</p>
<p><b>If a player receives a Game Loss at the same time his or her opponent receives a Match Loss, the Game</b></p>	<p>如果某牌手在受到一盘负处罚的同时，他的对手被判以一局负，则此一盘负的处罚将顺延到下一局。</p>

<b>Loss is carried over into the next round.</b>	
Sentences like this are the result of judges constructing corner case scenarios. But what if Abe is up a game when he gets a Match Loss at the same time Ned gets a Game Loss? Now you know. Abe loses the match, and Ned starts next round with a Game Loss.	诸如此类的句子是裁判们考虑了各种案例之后写出的。如果在一局开始时 Abe 得到了一局负，Ned 得到了一盘负怎么办？现在你知道了，Abe 输掉这一局，Ned 在下一轮开始的时候得到一盘负。
<b>Players will still receive a Game Loss if they drop from the tournament; if the penalty is issued between rounds, they will still receive it even though they will not be paired for the next round.</b>	即使此牌手在比赛中弃权，他还是会得到一盘负的处罚；如果是在两场对局间给予此处罚，则即使牌手没有被配对到下一局，他还是会得到此处罚。
Players can't avoid penalties, even if they drop. If they know they are going to lose a game next round as a result of a penalty, so they drop instead, that penalty is still entered in the system.	牌手不能用某种方法避免自己受到判罚，即使退赛也不行。如果他们知道自己的处罚是下一轮一盘负而因此退赛，判罚仍将被录入到系统中。
<b>MATCH LOSS</b>	一局负
<b>A Match Loss is a severe penalty that is usually issued when the match cannot be completed due to timing restrictions or because the match itself has been compromised.</b>	一局负是严厉的处罚，通常用于对局无法于时限内完成或对局本身被干扰无法完成的情况。
Match Losses for anything other than Tardiness are pretty rare. If you are that late, then we will not give you that time back. 'Timing Restrictions', however, don't really apply to extensions given as a result of a call/investigation, i.e. you don't Match Loss someone because an investigation took a long time.	除了迟到之外，一局负是很少见的。如果牌手超过时间限制太多，那么我们并不会其补足这些时间。但是，不要因为裁判呼叫或调查等事务超过“时限”而使用一局负来惩罚牌手。比如：你并不会因为对一个牌手的调查时间过长而给他一局负。
The other situation for Match Losses is in the case of Outside Assistance. The match has been compromised. However, the person committing the Outside Assistance gets the Match Loss. This means that a match can be compromised by Outside Assistance, yet still continue, if the infraction is committed by a spectator.	另外一个会给出一局负的情况是场外援助。比赛已经被干扰了，但是是犯下场外援助的牌手得到一局负。这意味着即使是围观者违规，被场外援助干扰的比赛仍将继续。
<b>Match Losses are applied to the match during which the offense occurred unless the match has already ended, in which case the penalty will be applied to the player's next match. Players will still be issued a Match Loss penalty if they drop from the tournament, though they won't be paired for the next round.</b>	一局负的处罚应该适用于发生违规的该对局，倘若牌手已经结束该对局，则应将一局负适用于该牌手的下次对局。即使此牌手在比赛中弃权，虽然他们不会出现在下一局的配对中，还是会得到一局负的处罚。
Same thing here as for the Game Losses above. If the match has already ended, apply the penalty to the next match. Players can't drop from the event to avoid	跟上面一盘负的部分一样。如果这一局已经结束了，那么这个处罚将应用于下一局。牌手不能退赛来防止自己受到判罚。

a penalty.	
<b>DISQUALIFICATION</b>	<b>取消资格</b>
<b>A Disqualification is issued for activity that damages the integrity of a tournament as a whole or for severe unsporting conduct.</b>	取消资格判决用于伤害比赛之公正性,或是严重举止违背运动道德的行为。
Disqualifications are for the most severe infractions. Don't feel bad about these. Remember, you don't give penalties. Players earn them.	取消资格 (DQ) 用来处理最严重的违规。你对此并不需要对此感到愧疚。记住,并不是因为你他们才得到判罚,而是他们自作自受。
<b>The recipient of a Disqualification does not need to be a player in the tournament. He or she may be a spectator or other bystander. If this happens, he or she must be entered into the tournament in Wizards Event Reporter ("WER") so that he or she may be disqualified and reported to the DCI.</b>	并不是只有参与比赛的牌手才会得到取消资格的处罚。旁观者和其他观众都有可能。如果发生这种情况,则必须使用威世智比赛回报程序 (Wizards Event Reporter, "WER") 将他们输入至此比赛,使之可以被取消资格并回报给 DCI。
The reason for doing so is that DCI need to gather all the Disqualification reports for when they update the suspended players list. If a spectator has done something really bad, the DCI still has the right to ban him or her from taking part in sanctioned events. Get the person's name or DCI number, even if you have to ask around. Remember to collect statements and enter an investigation report.	这么做的原因是,DCI 需要所有的 DQ 调查报告来更新他们的禁赛名单。如果一个旁观者干的事情足够恶劣,DCI 有权利去禁止他参加认证赛事。想办法得到他的姓名和 DCI 号码,即使需要去问周围的人。记住要收集陈述,并且提交调查报告。
<b>Disqualification can occur without proof of action so long as the Head Judge determines sufficient information exists to believe the tournament's integrity may have been compromised. It is recommended that the Head Judge's report reflect this fact.</b>	给予取消资格的处罚可以不需要行为上的证据,只要主审研判有明显的信息,足以相信此比赛的公正性可能受到损害即可。建议主审在回报 DCI 时要反应这个事实。
Magic events are not a court of law, nor an episode of CSI:Miami. You do not need a smoking gun or DNA evidence. The Head Judge does not need to prove that his or her decision is right, he or she just needs sufficient information to justify it. However, if you disqualify without evidence, you need to record that as well. And the investigation committee still has the right to ask the Head Judge to explain why he or she thought the player should be disqualified.	万智牌赛事不是法院,也不是《犯罪现场调查》。你不需要凶器或者 DNA 鉴定结果。主审不用证明自己的决定是正确的,他只需要足够的信息来判定出一个结果。然而,如果你没有证据就将一个牌手取消资格,你需要在报告中提到这点。同时调查委员会有权利要求主审解释为何认为该牌手应该被取消资格。
<b>When this penalty is applied, the player loses his or her current match and is dropped from the tournament. If a player has already received prizes at the time he or she is disqualified, that player may keep those prizes but does not receive any additional prizes or awards he or she may be due.</b>	此处罚生效时,牌手输掉目前正在进行的该局,然后将牌手退出比赛。如果牌手在他被取消资格之前就已获得奖品,则他可以保留那些奖品,但不会再得到其他本来应得的奖品或奖赏。

<p>When a player is disqualified from the tournament, his or her event is over. The results of the matches or games he or she has finished won't be changed, and if the player has already received prizes prior to the Disqualification, he or she gets to keep what has already been received. However, he or she is not given anything he or she is yet to receive. This is mainly to avoid the legal complications of "taking back" something that has already been given.</p>	<p>当一位牌手被取消资格时，他的比赛就结束了。他所有之前完成的对局结果都不会被更改，如果那位牌手在被取消资格之前拿到了奖品，那么他可以保留它们。然而，他不会再拿到任何他还没收到的奖品。这主要是为了防止追回已经发出的奖品可能造成的法律问题。</p>
<p>All Disqualifications should be reported to the Investigations Committee by using the Judge Center. The player's statement and the Head Judge's brief report are needed. The testimonies of spectators are optional.</p>	<p>所有的取消资格都应该使用裁判中心上报给调查委员会，其中必须包括牌手的陈述和主审的报告。报告中也可以包括旁观者的证词。</p>
<p><a href="http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20091207a">http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20091207a</a> Here is a pretty good article on the 'paperwork' aspect of a Disqualification.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20091207a">http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20091207a</a> 上面的链接是一篇关于 DQ“文书工作”非常好的文章。</p>
<p><b>When a player is disqualified during a tournament, he or she is removed from the tournament and does not take up a place in the standings. This means that all players in the tournament will advance one spot in the standings and are entitled to any prizes the new standing would offer. If the Disqualification takes place after a cut is made, no additional players advance in place of the disqualified player although they do move up a spot in the standings. For example, if a player is disqualified during the quarterfinal round of a Preliminary Pro Tour Qualifier, the former 9th place finisher does not advance into the single elimination top 8, but he or she does move into 8th place in the standings.</b></p>	<p>当比赛中有牌手被取消资格时，该牌手会被移出比赛，并且不会出现在比赛排名上。这代表排名比这些牌手低的选手，会因此在排名上前进一位，并获得新排名所应当给予的奖励。如果取消资格的处罚是发生在比赛赛程划分之后，则牌手虽然排名上有进位，但是不会递补来进行后续的比赛。例如，有位牌手在初选专业资格赛的四分之一决赛中被判了取消资格，之前排名在第九名的牌手并不能加入八强的单淘汰赛中进行比赛，但是在最后的排名上会前进到第八名。</p>
<p>This paragraph is to tell judges (and players) what happens when a player is Disqualified. A very common question is "Well, now that a spot in the Top 8 is available, can 9th place get it?" The answer is: if it's after the cut, no you can't.</p>	<p>这告诉了裁判（与牌手），在一位牌手被取消资格之后将会发生什么。一个非常常见的问题：“现在八强里面出现了一个空位，第九名能算进八强么？”答案是：如果比赛赛程已经划分，那么不行。</p>
<p><b>More information about the Disqualification Process may be found at <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/o/disqualification-process/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/o/disqualification-process/</a>.</b></p>	<p>关于取消资格流程的更多信息，可参见： <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/o/disqualification-process/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/o/disqualification-process/</a>。</p>
<p><b>1.2 Applying Penalties</b></p>	<p><b>1.2 应用处罚</b></p>

<p><b>Penalties are included with the tournament report so that a permanent record can be kept in the DCI Penalty Database.</b></p>	<p>所有处罚都必须记录在比赛报告当中，以在 DCI 处罚数据库中留下永久记录。</p>
<p>Penalties need to be entered into the system. For both tracking within the event and for whatever purpose Wizards of the Coast uses them for once they go into the black hole. Mostly this sentence is just here as a gentle reminder to actually enter the penalties for the event into WER.</p>	<p>所有判罚都需要录入到系统中。这样做的原因是为了持续记录牌手在比赛中的行为，以及为了威世智可能因故会使用这些信息。下面的这些话基本都是提醒你将你赛事中的判罚录入到 WER 中。</p>
<p><b>Additionally, any penalty of Game Loss or higher should be reported to the Head Judge, and it is recommended that only the Head Judge issue penalties of this nature (with the exception of Tardiness (3.1) and Deck Errors (3.5)).</b></p>	<p>此外，任何级别高于“一盘负”处罚（含“一盘负”）都必须回报给主审，并建议仅由主审来作这类的判罚（迟到（3.1）和套牌失误（3.5）此两项违规除外）。</p>
<p>Game Losses are a “big deal” and difficult to correct if they are issued by mistake. As a result, it is recommended that the Head Judge (HJ) be consulted prior to giving any Game Loss (GL) or Match Loss. As for Disqualifications, only the Head Judge can give those. The reason Tardiness and Deck Errors get an exception is because there is actually very little judgment involved in a Tardiness Game Loss (and they are extremely common), and the same holds true for Deck Errors. However, if the judge is on a team, it is recommended that they go through their Team Lead. At some events, the Head Judge may modify this policy. A common modification at Grand Prix events is that an Level 3 can issue game losses instead of having to consult the Head Judge. At Pro Tour Qualifiers or StarCityGames Open events it is not uncommon for Team Leaders to have the authority to issue Game Losses.</p>	<p>一盘负是个比较大的判罚，而且如果判错了很难修正。所以我们建议你在给出一盘负或一局负之前请先去咨询主审。同时，只有主审能给出取消资格的判罚。迟到和套牌错误是两个例外，因为相对于其他一盘负的问题而言，判断这两个情况不需要很多信息，并且这些判罚也非常普遍。然而，如果裁判是成小组工作的，那么建议通过小组的组长来向主审反映。在某些比赛中，主审可以更改这条规定。常见的变更是在一场 GP 比赛中，L3 裁判可以代替主审给出一盘负的判罚。在一些 PTQ 或 SCG 的比赛中，组长可以给一盘负的情况也并不少见。</p>
<p><b>Any time a penalty is issued, the judge must explain the infraction, the procedure for fixing the situation, and the penalty to all players involved.</b></p>	<p>作出任何处罚时，裁判都必须对涉及该违规的牌手们解释修正状况的流程，以及其处罚。</p>
<p>If a judge is going to give a penalty to a player, they should take the time to explain what the infraction is, and what the fix is. The Judge should politely and professionally answer any reasonable questions the players might ask. Players called you for help - so be helpful. Make sure the players understand what you are telling them to do. Sometimes they won't understand ‘why’; in those cases, make an attempt to explain, but if the explanation is taking too long, tell the players to continue and remind them they can</p>	<p>裁判在给牌手处罚时，他应该花时间向牌手解释他的违规是什么，以及修正是什么。裁判应当礼貌并专业的回答任何该牌手可能提出的合理问题。牌手呼叫裁判以寻求帮助，所以请专业的帮助他们。确保那位牌手听懂了你说的。有时候他们还是不明白“为什么”，在这种情况下，你应该尝试为他们解释，但是如果解释花费了太长的时间，告诉那位牌手先继续比赛等到对局结束后再跟他继续说明。</p>

speak to you after the match.	
<b>If the Head Judge chooses to deviate from the Infraction Procedure Guide, the Head Judge is expected to explain the standard penalty and the reason for deviation.</b>	如果主审选择不遵循违规处理方针，则主审应解释标准的罚则，以及不遵循的理由。
As the IPG said earlier, only the Head Judge can deviate. If the Head Judge does, it must be explained to the players what the standard penalty is, and why the deviation is being made. This does two things. First, it requires the Head Judge to be able to defend their deviation. If you as Head Judge can't explain it, odds are good you need to re-think your position. Second, the Head Judge should not be teaching players that "this is how it's done all the time". The Head Judge is making an exception, this once, and making that clear to the players, and any other judges that might be watching and learning from the interaction.	正如 IPG 前面说过的那样，只有主审可以不依照方针做出判罚。如果主审这么做了，他必须向该牌手说明原来应有的判罚是什么，然后为何现在这个情况没有按照原有判罚来做。这样做是因为两点。第一，主审需要能够说明不依照方针的原因。如果你作为主审无法解释原因，那么你最好重新考虑一下你的决定。第二，主审不应告诉牌手“任何时候都会这样处理”。只有这一次，主审不依方针做出了判罚，并且跟牌手解释清楚，同时让旁观的裁判观看并从中学习。
<b>Some infractions include remedies to handle the offense beyond the base penalty. These procedures exist to protect officials from accusations of unfairness, bias, or favoritism. If a judge makes a ruling that is consistent with quoted text, then the complaints of a player shift from accusation of unfairness by the judge to accusations of unfair policy. Deviations from these procedures may raise accusations against the judge from the player(s) involved, or from those who hear about it.</b>	有些罚则会在基本的处罚之外，包括额外叙述修正此犯规的流程的叙述。这些流程是用以保护工作人员免于不公正、偏见或是偏袒的指控。如果裁判的规则解释和引用的内容一致，而牌手还有所抱怨，则“指控该裁判不公”此事会转变成“指控方针不公”。裁判若不遵循这些流程，可能会引来相关牌手或是旁观者对裁判的指控。
Some penalties come with an additional fix/remedy. These are typically listed after the Philosophy section in their description. Use them; don't ignore them. They are there to help fix the games as much as is possible. They need to be applied consistently across all events. Not only does it enforce the consistency judges want at the competitive level, it protects them as well. If they are following the document, a player can't (reasonably) claim that they're out to get him or her, or that the judge changed the rules to favor the opponent. When judges deviate, they open themselves up to rumors: "Abe got a downgrade for extra cards in his deckbox, but I didn't because the judge always lets Abe get away with things." The short story is: don't deviate. Don't end up the subject of some forum rant.	一些判罚附带了额外的修正及补救措施。它们一般是列在这些判罚的原则部分后面，不要忘记使用它们。它们能够尽最大可能的修复游戏状态，也需要在各种比赛中始终如一的执行。这不仅能够保持竞争级赛事的判罚的一致性，还能保护裁判。如果裁判严格遵循方针，牌手就不能（合理的）控诉裁判对他们不公，或者裁判更改规则以让他们的对手获利。如果裁判不依照方针行事，牌手可能就会开始私下说：“牌手甲在他盒子里放了跟比赛无关的牌吃了一个警告，但是我放了就一盘负，这都是因为裁判偏袒牌手甲。”简单来说：依照方针行事，就不会成为喷子们在网上群起而攻之的对象。
<b>These procedures do not, and should not, take into</b>	<b>这些流程不会也不该考虑游戏进行过的部份、游戏</b>



<p><b>account the game being played, the current situation that the game is in, or who will benefit strategically from the procedure associated with a penalty.</b></p>	<p>目前的状况,或是谁会因此流程与所连带的处罚而得到策略上的好处。</p>
<p>Often judges question this line. When we are called to a table, don't we have to take into account the current game state? Yes and No. We as judges are allowed to take game state into account when determining if an infraction occurred. It helps us know what questions to ask. For example, if investigating someone for Stalling, then the current match record is extremely important. However, once we determine the infraction, we no longer consider those factors when it comes to applying the fix. When enforcing the additional fix, it doesn't matter if that fix decides the game or if it allows a player to benefit strategically from an error. Any time there is an error, someone is going to gain some information from it. We do not ask judges to make assessments of exactly what that will be, as this definitely cannot be done with any consistency.</p>	<p>经常会有裁判对这一条有疑问:当我们被叫到桌前,我们不用考虑游戏状态么?答案是:有时候用,有时候不用。我们在判断是否违规、违规是什么的时候可以将游戏状态列入考虑。这能够帮助我们明白应该问牌手什么问题。例如,调查某人是否拖延时,当前对局的状态就非常重要。然而,当你确定了违规是什么,修正问题时就不再考虑这些因素。当你进行修正时,一位牌手是否能从判罚中获得利益就并不重要了。每当一个错误发生时,总会有一位牌手从中获取某些额外信息。我们不要求裁判详细评估谁因为错误获利,因为这样做显然无法保证判罚的一致性。</p>
<p><b>While it is tempting to try to "fix" game situations, the danger of missing a subtle detail or showing favoritism to a player (even unintentionally) makes it a bad idea.</b></p>	<p>此流程只是试图要“修复”游戏的状况,遗漏一个小细节或是表现出对某牌手的偏袒(即使不是有意的),都不是好主意。</p>
<p>Judges should stick to the fixes prescribed. They have been tested thoroughly and tend to work in all but the most extreme of corner cases. By trying to create your own "fix", you run the risk of not fixing everything properly and giving one player too much of an advantage. This is especially important for judges who are used to FNM, where they are allowed to be more "creative" with their fixes.</p>	<p>裁判应该坚持依照方针进行修正。这些方针已经被充分的测试,除非出现极其罕见的边缘情形,它们可以应用于几乎所有的情况。如果你尝试用自己的方式去修复问题,你就冒了没有合适地修正、或者给一方过多的优势的风险。对于习惯了 FNM 的执法风格的裁判们更应该重视这个问题,因为一般级别在修正问题时给了裁判更多的“创造空间”。</p>
<p><b>Infractions with the same root cause, or multiple instances of the same infraction that are discovered at the same time, are treated as a single infraction.</b></p>	<p>对于基础根据相同的违规,或是同时发现多次触犯了多次违规的情况,应视作一次违规进行处理。</p>
<p>This covers the case where judges come up to a table and find multiple errors. In many cases the errors are separate; like doing a deck check and finding marked cards and a 59 card deck. While those might both be found at the same time, they do not have the same root cause. However, sometimes multiple errors share the same root cause - such as players thinking heroic triggers off abilities, and repeatedly using equipment to trigger heroic. In that case, the root cause is the same, making it one infraction. If they did</p>	<p>这条适用于当裁判被叫到桌前时发现了许多问题的情况。有时 these 问题是相互无关的。比如套牌检查时,一套牌里同时出现了 59 张牌和有记号的牌的问题。虽然这些问题被同时发现,但它们的起因不一样。然而,有时多个问题可能有着相同的起因。比如牌手认为勇行可以被异能触发,于是反复启动武器的佩戴异能来触发勇行。在此情况下,由于多个问题的起因是相同的,就应当把它们当做同一个违规来处理。即使该牌手这样做了三次,也当做是一次违规来处理、修正和升级。</p>

<p>this three times, treat it as a single infraction for the purposes of fixing it and upgrades.</p>	
<p>If the infractions are different infractions, yet have the same root cause, apply all appropriate fixes, despite giving the single infraction. Keep in mind that legally drawing a card off an illegally cast spell is <b>not</b> two infractions.</p>	<p>如果这些违规是不同的违规，但具有相同的起因，进行所有适用的修正，但只给出一个判罚。记住因为不合法施放的咒语正确结算而抓了牌，并不算是两个违规。</p>
<h3>1.3 Randomizing a Deck</h3>	<h3>1.3 随机化套牌</h3>
<p><b>The remedy for some infractions in this document includes shuffling the randomized portion of the deck.</b></p>	<p>本文档中某些违规的修正方式包含将套牌已随机化的部分洗牌。</p>
<p>Some infractions in the IPG tell you to shuffle or randomize a deck as part of the fix; if they do, use these instructions.</p>	<p>IPG 中的一些违规告诉我们，作为修正的一部分，要将套牌洗牌或随机化。如果需要如此做，请参照以下的指示。</p>
<p><b>This requires first determining whether any portion of the deck is non-random, such as cards that have been manipulated on the top or bottom of the library, and separating those. Check with both players to verify this, and check the graveyard, exile, and battlefield for deck manipulation cards, such as <i>Brainstorm</i> and cards with the scry mechanic.</b></p>	<p>利用此种方式进行修正时，首先需要确定套牌中是否包含非随机的部分，例如牌库顶部或底部已被调整过顺序的牌张，然后将这部分放在一边。询问双方牌手来确认此事，然后检查他们的坟墓场、放逐区和战场，看看是否有可以操作牌库的牌，像是脑力激荡/<i>Brainstorm</i> 和拥有占卜机制的牌。</p>
<p>When we instruct a player to randomize their deck, we don't want to lose parts of the deck that have been seen and intentionally ordered. Be sure to ask the players if any cards are known, but given player memory is not infallible; check all the zones for cards and effects that might have ordered or unordered (like fetch lands) parts of the library.</p>	<p>当我们指示牌手随机化套牌时，我们并不想让套牌中原本已知的部分也被随机化。请确保在修正时询问牌手是否牌库中有已知位置的牌，但牌手的记忆并非万无一失；记得检查所有区域中可能会影响牌库的一部分或打乱牌库顺序（例如找地地）的牌或者效应。</p>
<p><b>Once the deck has been shuffled, any manipulated cards are returned to their correct locations.</b></p>	<p>在完成套牌的洗牌之后，将已调整过顺序的牌张放回原本的位置。</p>
<p>Separate the cards that are known, have the players shuffle the part that is unknown, then add the known cards back to where they are supposed to be.</p>	<p>将已知的牌分开，让牌手将未知的部分洗牌，然后将已知的牌放回它们应该在的位置。</p>
<p><b>Shuffles performed by a judge as part of a remedy are not considered shuffles for game purposes.</b></p>	<p>作为修正方式由裁判执行的洗牌，不属于游戏意义上的洗牌。</p>
<p>Sorry <i>Cosi's Trickster</i>. Also, these shuffles aren't performed by a judge. They are directed by a judge. It's a bad idea for judges to shuffle the deck as it opens us up to blame if the player then draws poorly. Let the players shuffle and present.</p>	<p>抱歉，寇希诈术师。并且，这些洗牌并不是由裁判来执行，而是在裁判的指导下进行。裁判来洗牌并不是一个好主意，如果这位牌手接下来抓的很烂，可能会让裁判遭受指责。让牌手洗牌，然后呈现套牌。</p>

<b>1.4 Backing Up</b>	<b>1.4 倒回</b>
<b>Some infractions in this document permit the judge to consider the possibility of a backup.</b>	本文档中的某些违规允许裁判考虑进行倒回。
These infractions are IPG 2.5 Game Rule Violation, IPG 2.3 Hidden Card Error, and IPG 3.7 Communication Policy Violation.	允许倒回的违规是 IPG 2.5 违反游戏规则、IPG 2.3 额外抓牌、以及 IPG 3.7 违反交流原则。
<b>Due to the amount of information that may become available to players and might affect their play, backups are regarded as a solution of last resort, only applied in situations where leaving the game in the current state is a substantially worse solution.</b>	由于此举可能会向牌手透露信息，且牌手可能由此改变游戏行动，因此“倒回”应作为最后的处理手段，仅适用于“保留当前游戏状态反而结果更糟”的情形。
Probably a whole article can be written on this topic, and fortunately, <a href="#">one has been</a> . In short, don't be quick to backup. You need to take into consideration what actions the players have taken since, what information has been revealed, and the possibility of making things worse. We don't always have to backup. It's not “backup if you can, else leave everything alone” it's “leave things alone unless it's really really worse than backing up. Remember, both players are responsible for the game state. No matter how messed up things have gotten, both players had opportunities to prevent it.	这句话可以展开写一整篇文章了。幸运的是，已经有人 <a href="#">写过了一篇</a> 。简短来说，不要贸然决定倒回。裁判需要考虑牌手已经执行的动作、哪些信息已经泄露、以及倒回会不会让问题更糟。裁判不是一定要执行倒回。并不是“能倒就倒，倒不了才保持原样”，而是“如果保持这样的话实在糟糕了，所以只能倒回”。注意，双方牌手都应该尽力保持游戏状态正确。不管场面变得多么乱，两位牌手都有机会来避免错误发生。
<b>A good backup will result in a situation where the gained information makes no difference and the line of play remains the same (excepting the error, which has been fixed). This means limiting backups to situations with minimal decision trees.</b>	良好的倒回结果应是：双方牌手获得的信息与此前一致，游戏进行的过程没有区别（错误已被修正）。这意味着倒回仅适用于存在最小决策树之情形。
This is a nice way of saying that the backup was minimally impactful. For example, the active player casts Terror on a White Knight, and the White Knight is put in the graveyard. In this case a rewind is quick and clean and doesn't impact any decisions. But now lets add to the scenario. Let's say the active player cast the Terror to remove a blocker and then attacked with his entire team. In this case more decisions have been made. A rewind may be acceptable, but it may alter the attack. Finally, the active player cast Terror on the Knight, attacked. The opponent blocked. Combat tricks were used on both sides. In this case, too much information has been revealed. Backing up to the point of error would drastically impact the flow	换句话说，倒回的影响应该尽可能小。例如，主动牌手对白骑士施放了惊骇，白骑士现在在坟场。在这种情况下倒回是很干净的，并不会影响任何决定。现在我们来加入一些新的信息。比如说主动牌手施放惊骇来去除一个阻挡者，然后用所有生物进攻。在这种情况下，牌手做出了更多的决定。倒回可能是可以接受的，但是这可能会改变进攻的决定。最后的例子里面，主动牌手用惊骇杀了白骑士以后进攻。对手阻挡了。两边都使用了战斗 trick。这种情况下，泄露的信息太多了。如果倒回到错误发生的时间点，会极大的改变这个回合牌手思考的流程。牌手做出的决定越少，倒回可以接受的可能性就越大。

<p>of the turn. The fewer decisions, the more likely a rewind is acceptable.</p>	
<p><b>Only the Head Judge may authorize a backup. At large tournaments, they may choose to delegate this responsibility to Team Leaders.</b></p>	<p>只有主审可允许进行倒回。在大型比赛中，主审可委派领队承担此许可职责。</p>
<p>This shouldn't come as a surprise. Any time you are about to do something that cannot be easily reversed (such as an erroneous Game Loss, or a mangled rewind) the Head Judge must be consulted first. At big events, such as a Grand Prix or StarCityGames Opens, the Head Judge may allow Team Leaders to authorize backups. If this is the case, this will be communicated during the judge meeting. Now, this does not mean that if you feel a backup is a good idea, you can't request a backup from the Head Judge.</p>	<p>看到这条不应该感到惊讶。在任何时候，当你要做出一些较难修正回来的事情时（比如错误的一盘负，或者有问题的倒回）你需要先咨询主审。在大型比赛中，比如 GP 或 SCG 公开赛，主审可能会允许各组的组长做这些决定。如果是这种情况，那么这些事项将会在赛前裁判会议的时候宣布。但是如果你觉得倒回是个好主意的话，你当然也可以向主审提出要求。</p>
<p><b>To perform a backup, each individual action since the point of the error is reversed, starting with the most recent ones and working backwards. Every action must be reversed; no parts of the sequence should be omitted or reordered.</b></p>	<p>执行倒回的流程如下：从最近的行动开始逐步回退，还原做过的所有行动，直到游戏来到发生失误的时间点为止。所有的行动都必须还原；不得省略或重排一连串行动当中的若干步骤。</p>
<p>Ask the players what happened. You should have a clear understanding of each action that needs to be reversed before you start doing a backup. There should be no "I'm not sure what lands were tapped" or "I don't remember if he attacked with that creature or tapped to use its ability". Undo each action, in order. You don't get to skip anything or switch stuff around. You must return exactly to the point of error, exactly the way it happened. This is to protect you as much as the players. If you rewind everything in reverse order, the players can see and understand what is going on.</p>	<p>向牌手询问发生了什么。在倒回前，你应该让自己清楚的理解你需要倒回的每一个动作。不能出现“我不确定这个地是横着的还是竖着的”或“我忘了这个生物是启动异能横的还是进攻横的了”的情况。依次倒回每一个动作。不能略过任何一个或者打乱顺序。你必须精确的倒回至错误发生的时点。这将同样保护你和牌手。如果你依原次序倒回，牌手将会看到并理解发生了什么。</p>
<p><b>If the identity of a card involved in reversing an action is unknown to one of the players (usually because it was drawn), a random card is chosen from the possible candidates.</b></p>	<p>如果在还原行动时，涉及到有牌手无法辨认之牌张（通常是因为该牌被抓上手），则从可能的牌张中随机选择一张。</p>
<p>Rewinding through a card draw can make people nervous. It's really not that complicated, but still shouldn't be done lightly. If backing up through a card draw, put the card back where it came from. If the specific card isn't known to all players, put a random one back. Now, as a point of clarity, if you find yourself wanting to shuffle <b>after</b> returning a random card from a players hand as part of a rewind, you are probably doing more harm than good at this point with the</p>	<p>倒回抓牌动作可能会让人很紧张。虽然倒回抓牌并不是很复杂，但仍然不能轻易对待。如果在抓过牌之后进行倒回，那么把那张牌放回原处。如果那张牌并不是对所有牌手可见的，那么将一张随机的牌放回去。注意，如果在此之后，你发现在把牌放到牌库顶后还需要洗那位牌手的牌库，那么你遇到的情况可能并不适合倒回。把牌手的一张手牌洗回牌库实在是和游戏非常有破坏性；下面会介绍如何倒回洗牌。</p>

<p>rewind. Shuffling away a random card from a player's hand is pretty much the definition of “disruptive”, but we will see below we can get around that.</p>	
<p><b>Shuffles are reversed by a single shuffle of the random portion of the library after the rest of the backup is complete. A card that became legally known to a player after the error was committed is not considered random and is returned to the appropriate location after the shuffle has been completed.</b></p>	<p>曾进行过的洗牌，可待其他部分的倒回完成之后，由对牌库的随机部分进行一次洗牌来回退。在发生失误之后规则上某牌手该知道其位置的牌张不属于随机部分，且应在完成洗牌之后移回相应的位置。</p>
<p>How do we rewind through a shuffle? Shuffle again. How do we rewind through multiple shuffles? Just a single shuffle. Try not to get carried away. Remember to pay attention to known cards and if they are supposed to “survive” the shuffling. The last line, about cards that became legally known, applies to cards drawn that are put back. If they are legally drawn after the error, they are legally known by one of the players. Since exactly which card was drawn is probably lost, we are going to put back a card at random, and we don't want to shuffle them away. This policy has an odd interaction with scry (which could also be legally known) which is likely unintended and will hopefully be fixed in the next policy update.</p>	<p>该怎么倒回洗牌？再洗一遍。该怎么倒回多次洗牌？只需要洗一次。记住要留意牌库中是否有已知部分，它们不应该被一起洗掉。最后一行，关于应该已知的牌的部分，适用于抓过又放回去的牌。如果这些牌是错误发生后合法抓起的，牌手会合法地知道这些牌是什么。因为无法确认抓的是哪一张牌，我们应当把一张随机的牌放回去，并且我们也不想把它们洗掉。这条方针与占卜异能（这个异能也会让你合法地知道某些牌）有比较奇怪的互动，这种互动可能是无心而为之，希望在下次方针更新的时候能够得到更新。</p>
<p><b>Backups involving random/unknown elements should be approached with extreme caution, especially if they cause or threaten to cause a situation in which a player will end up with different cards than they would once they have correctly drawn those cards. For example, returning cards to the library when a player has the ability to shuffle their library is not something that should be done except in extreme situations.</b></p>	<p>涉及随机 / 未知元素之倒回应谨慎处之，在进行倒回会导致或极可能导致牌手最终手牌内容与正常完成抓牌动作之结果不同的情形下尤甚。举例来说，除极特殊情况外，在牌手能够将牌库洗牌的情况下，不应将牌放回牌库中。</p>
<p>So, any time you are messing around with returning random cards from a player's hand you run the risk of drastically changing the game. For example, the player has been holding on to a specific card since his opening draw. In a rewind, that card gets randomly put on top of the library. Then when we proceed forward, the opponent mills a card. Or we return a useless card to the top of the library, and they crack a fetch land to shuffle it away.</p>	<p>任何你把一张随机的手牌放回牌库顶的倒回都可能彻底改变本盘游戏。例如，一位牌手手牌包括一张之前展示过的好牌，如果我们将随机一张牌放到牌库顶的话，他的对手可能在游戏继续的时候决定磨掉该牌手的牌库顶牌。或者，如果我们放的是一张没用的牌的话，该牌手自己可能掰掉一块找地地把那张牌洗进牌库。</p>
<p><b>Some remedies state a simple backup may be performed. A simple backup is backing up the last</b></p>	<p>某些修正方式注明“可进行简易倒回”。简易倒回是指倒回最后完成（或正在执行）的一个游戏动作，</p>

<p><b>action completed (or one currently in progress) and is sometimes used to make another portion of the proscribed remedy smoother.</b></p>	<p>有时用于保证列明之修正方式的其他部分能够顺利执行。</p>
<p>Game Rule Violation and Hidden Card Error mentions that a simple backup may be done before applying a partial fix if it makes sense. This describes what a simple backup is. Simple backups are limited to one action, and exist just to make other fixes have intuitive results.</p>	<p>违反游戏规则和非公开牌张失误这两项违规中提到，在适用某些部分修正之前，如果合适的话则可以进行简易倒回。这一句说明了什么是简易倒回。简易倒回仅限用于倒回一个动作，且这种倒回方式的存在只是为了让其他修正方式能得到符合直觉的结果。</p>
<p><b>A simple backup should not involve any random elements.</b></p>	<p>简易倒回不应涉及任何随机元素。</p>
<p>If you are backing up through a shuffle or returning random cards from the hand to the library or anything of the sort, we are no longer in the realm of “simple”. Stop.</p>	<p>如果倒回涉及到洗牌、将随机的牌移回手牌或洗回牌库这样的情形，这就不再属于“简易”的范畴。不要使用简易倒回。</p>
<p><b>2.0 Game Play Errors</b></p>	<p><b>2.0 游戏行动失误</b></p>
<p><b>Game Play Errors are caused by incorrect or inaccurate play of the game such that it results in violations of the Magic Comprehensive Rules.</b></p>	<p>游戏行动失误是以不正确或是不精准的行动来进行游戏，而导致违反《万智牌完整规则》的结果。</p>
<p>This is the first of three broad categories of infractions. This covers unintentional violations of the Comprehensive Rules —errors in actually playing the game, and not violations of tournament policy or other negative behavior.</p>	<p>这是三大类违规行为的第一类。这类违规包含的是游戏中无意中违反 CR 造成的违规，而非违反比赛方针或犯下其他负面行为。</p>
<p>These are errors committed by at least one player during a match by unintentionally violating a Comprehensive Rule. Game Play Errors can occur for many reasons. Players get tired, get distracted, play too fast, or don't know the cards or the rules that apply to a complex situation well enough. These situations are not exceptional, which is why Game Play Errors are a common category of error.</p>	<p>这些失误是由于至少一位牌手在比赛中无意违反《万智牌完整规则》中的某一条而造成的。游戏行动失误（GPE）发生的原因可能有很多：牌手累了，分心了，打得太快，不熟悉牌或不够了解某些复杂情况下的适用的规则等。不幸的是，这些情况非常容易发生，这就是为什么 GPE 这类失误十分常见。</p>
<p><b>Many offenses fit into this category and it would be impossible to list them all.</b></p>	<p>许多违规都属于此类情况，但不可能全数详列。</p>
<p>Given the complexity of the game, it is impossible to make a list of all the types of errors that can occur, so we, as judges, don't try. We want this document to be understandable and learnable. If we list everything, and handle all special cases, this document would be hundreds of pages long and unusable. Instead, we divide these errors into general categories, known as</p>	<p>鉴于万智牌游戏的复杂性，将所有可能发生的错误之类型一一列举是不可能的。所以我们作为裁判，也不打算尝试去列举。我们希望这份文件是可以被理解和学习的。如果我们列举了所有东西、顾及了所有特殊情形，这份文件就可能几百页长，无法使用。因此，我们将这些错误进行大致的分类，也就是 IPG 中定义的 6 种游戏行动失误。</p>

the six Game Play Errors defined by the IPG.	
<b>The guide below is designed to give judges a framework for assessing how to handle a Game Play Error.</b>	以下的方针是设计给裁判参考的构架,用来决定如何处理游戏行动失误。
While it may be difficult, at first glance, to see which category that some particular infraction falls into, careful reading of the entire infraction — the definition, philosophy, and remedy, can help make the determination.	虽然某些违规第一眼看上去很难将其归类,但经过对违规的仔细阅读——包括定义、原则、修正等——可以帮你确定违规的类型。
<b>Most Game Play Error infractions are assumed to have been committed unintentionally.</b>	大部分游戏行动失误的违规都假设该违规是无意间发生的。
Errors committed intentionally, of course, may fall into a different category altogether: Unsporting Conduct — Cheating. However, it's important to notice that not all game errors are cheating. In fact, very few actually are.	故意犯下的违规,显然属于另一种违规:举止违背运动道德~作弊。很重要的一点,是记住并非所有游戏错误都是作弊。(事实上,只有极少部分才是作弊)
We like to assume players are nice, and when we walk up to a table, we aren't accusing people of cheating. That might change once we ask a few questions, but when we start out, our baseline assumption is that we are dealing with an honest mistake.	我们通常会假设牌手是正直的,当我们走到桌前,我们并不指责任何人在作弊。也许我们问了几个问题后会改变想法,但是当我们开始时,我们的基础假设是我们正在处理一个诚实的错误。
<b>If the judge believes that the error was intentional, he or she should first consider whether an Unsporting Conduct — Cheating infraction has occurred.</b>	假如裁判认为系蓄意造成该失误,则应该先考虑此违规是否属于“举止违背运动道德~作弊”。
This is the other side of the coin; even if the task of a judge is always to help the players, we must never forget that they can lie or cheat to get an advantage. The experience and advice of more experienced judges can help to frame the situation correctly and to find out if a player was aware of committing an offense or not.	如同硬币的另一面,即使帮助牌手是裁判的任务,我们也决不能忘记他们可能会通过撒谎以及作弊来获取优势。经验以及来自经验更加丰富裁判的建议可以帮助正确分析情形,并推断出牌手的违规是否明知故犯。
<b>With the exception of Failure to Maintain Game State, which is never upgraded, the third or subsequent penalty for a Game Play Error offense in the same category should be upgraded to a Game Loss. For multi-day events, the penalty count for these infractions resets between days.</b>	除了始终不会升级的“未维护游戏状态”之外,第三次或更多次犯下同类型游戏行动失误,均应升级为一盘负。对于历时多日的比赛而言,牌手当天的此类违规处罚累犯计数会在一天的比赛结束之后清零。
We want players to learn something from their mistakes and take care to not commit them again in the future. If a player repeatedly makes mistakes, the Warning is not doing its job of reinforcing the lesson, and therefore we must increase the severity of the penalty to a Game Loss. When giving a Game Play	我们希望牌手从错误中学到教训并在未来小心不再犯。如果一个牌手重复犯错,警告已经不足以加强教训,因此我们必须增加判罚的严厉程度到一盘负。当我们给予一个牌手游戏行动失误判罚时,一定要询问他们此前有没收到同种判罚。历时多日的比赛会在每日重置判罚累计次数是因为无论几轮

<p>Error to a player, be sure to ask if they have received the infraction before. Multi-day events reset between days because it was determined to be unfair that the upgrade path was held at three regardless of the number of rounds in an event — it's much easier to accumulate three Game Play Errors over a fifteen round Grand Prix than a five round Grand Prix Trial. Finally, note that this is the third or subsequent penalty, not Warning. If a player has received two Game Rule Violations that have been upgraded to Game Losses, and they commit a third Game Rule Violation, that is still upgraded to a Game Loss as well.</p>	<p>的比赛都是三次累积升级是不公平的——在 15 轮的 GP 上累积三次游戏行动失误远比在 5 轮的 GPT 上容易。最后，注意第三次及之后的判罚没有警告。如果一个牌手已经获得了两次升级为一盘负的违反游戏规则，接着犯下了第三次违反游戏规则，这依然还是升级为一盘负。</p>
<p>Regarding Failure to Maintain Game State infraction be prepared for some players to not understand why they are getting a Warning. “But judge, I didn’t do anything wrong?” Take a few seconds to explain to the player why he or she is getting the Warning, and if he or she still wishes to discuss it, you can talk about it after the match. While they still get the Warning, we do not upgrade this infraction as we do other tournament errors. This is because we do not want players to fear calling a judge. Being awarded a Game Loss because my opponents made play mistakes and I didn’t catch it feels bad. And, if this is the third time that my opponent has made a play mistake that I didn’t catch over the course of the event, I might be reluctant to call a judge and have my Failure to Maintain Game State upgraded, so I choose to pretend that I didn’t notice. We don’t want our policy to encourage cheating.</p>	<p>对于未维护游戏状态这个判罚，很多牌手不理解为什么他们要吃到警告：“裁判，我没做错啥啊？”请花费一点时间跟牌手解释一下为什么他会得到这个判罚，如果他仍然想要讨论这个问题，请让他们在对局结束后再讨论。虽然他们吃了警告，但与其他很多判罚不同，我们不会将这个判罚升级。这是因为我们不想让牌手对叫裁判产生恐惧感。因为对手犯下游戏错误却自己吃到一盘负是非常差的体验。假如 FTMGS 要升级的话，我可能会在第三次对手犯错而我没有当场发现的时候不愿意主动叫裁判，为了避免我的判罚被升级，我还不如假装自己没看到这个错误。这样做如同鼓励作弊，而我们并不想让方针鼓励作弊。</p>
<p>If we don’t upgrade this penalty, though, why give Warnings at all? There are two reasons: the first is that the act of receiving a Warning is generally enough to remind a player to pay more attention. The second is so we can track them. If a player tends to get Failure to Maintain Game State a lot, and the related error is always in his favor, this gives judges the ability to track these infractions - and when added to the larger infraction database, we can track across events too.</p>	<p>从另一方面讲，如果我们不升级判罚，那为什么还要给这个判罚呢？有两个原因：一是警告判罚通常足以引起玩家的注意，让他们进行游戏时多加小心。二是我们可以追踪这些判罚。如果某牌手总是获得一大堆 FTMGS，而相关的错误又通常是对他有利的，这让裁判能追踪该牌手的行为。并且，把这些判罚加入判罚数据库之后，我们也可以在多场赛事中持续追踪牌手的行为。</p>
<h2>2.1 Missed Trigger</h2>	<h2>2.1 遗漏触发</h2>
<p>Penalty</p>	<p>处罚</p>
<p>None</p>	<p>无</p>



DEFINITION	定义
<p><b>A triggered ability triggers, but the player controlling the ability doesn't demonstrate awareness of the trigger's existence the first time that it would affect the game in a visible fashion.</b></p>	<p>某个触发式异能触发, 但于该异能将首度对游戏产生可见影响时, 操控该异能的牌手未能表明自己认识到此触发的存在。</p>
<p>To quote the Comprehensive Rules: 603.1. Triggered abilities have a trigger condition and an effect. They are written as “[Trigger condition], [effect],” and begin with the word “when,” “whenever,” or “at.” They can also be expressed as “[When/Whenever/At] [trigger event], [effect].” A triggered ability is said to “trigger” whenever the above-mentioned [trigger condition] has been met.</p>	<p>引用 CR 603.1: 触发式异能具有触发条件和效应。其格式为“[触发条件], [效应]”, 且由“当”、“每当”或“在”等词开头。它们也可以被展开为“[当/每当/在][触发事件], [效应]”。当前述提到的[触发条件]满足时, 触发式异能就会触发。</p>
<p>Generally speaking, the point at which a player needs to demonstrate awareness of a triggered ability is after it has triggered, but no later than when that ability would “first matter.” For triggers with physical actions, a verbal acknowledgement of the trigger is not sufficient; the physical actions must be performed at the correct time. There are thousands of triggers in the game, and they each work a little differently. Some require targets, some require choices made by opponents, some have physical actions on resolution, some are invisible, etc., so when a trigger “first matters” is not something that can be defined in a single sentence. We'll revisit this phrase throughout this section.</p>	<p>通常来说, 牌手需要表明自己认识触发存在的时点是在其触发后、且在该触发式异能将要“第一次产生作用”之前。对于产生实际动作的触发, 口头确认是不够的; 必须要在正确的时间做出该动作。游戏中有数千种各不相同的触发式异能。有些需要目标、有些需要对手做出选择、有些在结算时需要做实际动作、而有些的效果是不可见的, 等等。所以何时“第一次产生作用”用一句话很难解释清楚。我们将在这一部分中进行详细分析。</p>
<p><b>The point by which the player needs to demonstrate this awareness depends on the impact that the trigger would have on the game:</b></p>	<p>根据不同的触发对游戏产生之影响不同, 牌手需要表明自己认识触发存在的最迟时点也有所差异:</p>
<p>This is another way of saying that in order to figure out whether or not a player has missed a trigger, you must first consider what the ability does. The point at which the ability first matters depends on which of the below four categories that ability belongs to. Note that this is intended to be an exhaustive list — all triggered abilities in the game may be categorized in one of the following ways.</p>	<p>这是用另一种方式来说, 要判断牌手是否遗漏了触发, 首先应该先看这个触发式异能会做什么事情。该异能第一次产生作用的时点取决于这个异能属于以下四类中的哪一类。注意, 下面的分类涵盖了游戏中所有的触发式异能, 你一定可以为某异能找到其所属的类型。</p>
<p>• <b>A triggered ability that requires its controller to choose targets (other than 'target opponent'), modes, or other choices made when the ability is put onto the stack: The controller must announce those choices before they next pass priority.</b></p>	<p>• 对于需要其操控者选择目标(注记“目标对手”者除外)、模式, 或具在将异能放进堆叠时便需作出决定之其他选择的触发式异能而言: 其操控者必须在其下一次让出优先权之前宣告该些决定。</p>

<p>These are triggered abilities that first matter as they are put onto the stack. In order to avoid missing these triggers, the controller of these abilities must remember to make the choices involved with these right away.</p>	<p>这些触发式异能第一次产生作用的时候就是它们放进堆叠的时候。这些异能的操控者必须记住要立即做出这些选择，才能避免忘记这些异能。</p>
<p>Examples: Advocate of the Beast, Archaeomancer, Blightcaster</p>	<p>例如：野兽拥护人、古语术士、枯灵法师</p>
<p>For the purposes of triggered abilities, the choice of a “target opponent” is automatically assumed in a two-player game. The controller is not required to explicitly make this choice to avoid missing the trigger. A player isn’t off the hook just yet, though — he or she will still need to demonstrate awareness at some later point according to whichever of the three remaining groups the effect fits into. Also, the opponent is not assumed to be the target when the trigger requires a “target player,” even if its “obvious” that you want to target the opponent.</p>	<p>触发式异能中，“目标对手”的选择在两人游戏中是默认的。其操控者不需要明确做出此选择来避免遗漏触发，但是这并不代表牌手就可以不管这个异能了，这个异能是否遗漏还要看它属于其他三类中的哪一类，并以该类的判定标准来判定。对于“目标牌手”而言，对手不会自动成为该触发的目标，即使这个异能你很“显然”想要以对手为目标。</p>
<p>• <b>A triggered ability that causes a change in the visible game state (including life totals) or requires a choice upon resolution: The controller must take the appropriate physical action or acknowledge the specific trigger before taking any game actions (such as casting a sorcery spell or explicitly taking an action in the next step or phase) that can be taken only after the triggered ability should have resolved.</b></p>	<p>• 对于会对游戏的可见状态（包括牌手的总生命）产生影响，或是需要在结算时作出决定的触发式异能而言：其操控者在执行只有在该触发式异能结算完毕之后才有可能进行的任何游戏动作（例如施放法术咒语，或明确执行了下一个步骤或阶段中的动作）之前，就必须作出与此类触发式异能相对应的实际动作，或表明自己认识此触发的存在。</p>
<p>These are triggered abilities that first matter at resolution. In order to avoid missing these triggers, the controller of these abilities must remember to make the choice or take the visible action when the trigger would resolve (or prompt the opponent to do so). The player may also avoid missing the trigger by making it clear to the opponent what outcome will be taken when the trigger resolves. Saying ‘Trigger’ is not sufficient. You need to clearly indicate what the specific trigger is.</p>	<p>这些是结算时第一次产生作用的触发式异能。其操控者必须记住在这些异能将要结算时做出选择或作出实际动作（或提示对手如此做），才能避免忘记这些异能。牌手也可以向对手清楚地表示该触发式异能结算会产生什么样的结果，来避免遗漏这个触发。说“触发”是不够的。你需要清楚地表明这个触发是什么。</p>
<p>Examples: Ainok Guide, Burning Earth, Abzan Skycaptain</p>	<p>例如：犬人向导、燃烧土地、阿布赞空队长</p>
<p>As it turns out, this is by far the most common type of triggered ability in the game. Most triggered abilities involve obvious visible actions such as drawing cards, moving objects from zone to zone, or modifying the state of permanents. Note that life totals are considered part of the visible representation of the game — this implies that triggered abilities that cause</p>	<p>这是游戏中最常见的触发式异能。大多数触发式异能都涉及明显的实际动作，例如抓牌、将物件从一个区域移到另一个、或更改永久物的状态。注意，总生命视为游戏的可见表示之一，这意味着让牌手受到伤害或获得生命的触发式异能产生作用时，牌手应当在记血纸上写下新的生命值。</p>

<p>a player to take damage or gain life first matter at the point that a score pad should be updated.</p>	
<p><b>Note that passing priority, casting an instant spell or activating an ability doesn't mean a triggered ability has been forgotten, as it could still be on the stack.</b></p>	<p>请注意，让过优先权、施放瞬间咒语或起动物能这类动作并不表明牌手已遗忘触发式异能，因为在此情况下该触发式异能可能仍在堆叠之上。</p>
<p>When making this determination, a lot of benefit of the doubt is given to players — they usually have to go well out of their way to show that they've missed a trigger. For example, if a player casts a spell during upkeep, it is assumed that upkeep triggers are still on the stack, not missed.</p>	<p>在确定是否是此种情况时，牌手通常会得到很多疑点利益（即假定牌手是没有忘记的）——在这种情况下牌手要遗忘一个触发可是真心很不容易的。例如，如果牌手在维持施放一个咒语，我们会假定维持的触发仍在堆叠上，而非被遗忘。</p>
<p>• <b>A triggered ability that changes the rules of the game: The controller must acknowledge the trigger or prevent an opponent from taking any resulting illegal action.</b></p>	<p>• 对于改变了游戏规则的触发式异能而言：其操控者必须认识此触发，或在对手执行因此变为不合法的动作时阻止之。</p>
<p>These are triggered abilities that first matter at the point at which an opponent would first take what would otherwise be an illegal action. In order to avoid missing these triggers, the controller of these abilities must announce the trigger at the correct time and/or actively prevent an opponent from taking an action that wouldn't be possible had the triggered ability resolved.</p>	<p>这些触发式异能第一次产生作用的时点是对手将第一次作出因此异能而不合法的动作之时。这些异能的操控者必须在合适的时机宣告异能，或主动阻止对手作出因此异能而不合法的动作，才能避免忘记这些异能。</p>
<p>Examples: Brine Elemental, Lavinia of the Tenth, Wall of Frost, Pyreheart Wolf</p>	<p>例如：盐湖元素、第十区的拉温妮、霜墙、葬火心狼</p>
<p>Players are under no obligation to assume the resolution of a triggered ability controlled by an opponent that has not yet been acknowledged. Players are welcome to behave as if it an unacknowledged triggered ability belonging to an opponent was forgotten, but they must expect to be stopped by that opponent if they begin to take an action that the resolution of the triggered ability rendered illegal.</p>	<p>牌手没有责任默认由对手操控但却没有声明的触发式异能已经结算。牌手可以假设某个由对手操控的未声明的触发式异能已被遗忘，但牌手将要作出因这些异能而成为非法的动作之前，对手必须主动阻止，才说明这个异能对手没有遗忘。</p>
<p>For example, suppose Abelard attacks Nutella with a Pyreheart Wolf and doesn't immediately mention his trigger. Nutella is allowed to try to declare her animated Mutavault as a blocker. If Abelard does not speak up about this blocking assignment being illegal before taking a later action or continuing with combat, Abelard has missed his trigger.</p>	<p>例如，Abelard 使用葬火心狼攻击 Nutella，但没有立即提到其触发式异能。我们允许 Nutella 将他的易形地窖变成生物去试图阻挡。如果 Abelard 在此时不表明这次阻挡非法，而继续采取其他动作、或进行下一个战斗步骤，Abelard 就遗忘了这个触发。</p>
<p>If a player chooses to perform this "Missed Trigger gambit," so to speak, he or she risks giving away information like the identity of cards in his or her hand</p>	<p>如果牌手想要“赌”对手忘了异能，他便需要冒着一些风险，诸如暴露其手牌内容或游戏意图。更糟的是，他可能需要做出一些原本不想做的游戏动作。</p>

<p>or intended plays. Worse yet, a player banking on a forgotten trigger of this type may lock himself or herself into plays he or she would otherwise not want to take. In the above example, if Abelard prevents Nutella from blocking with her Mutavault, Nutella would not get to undo the activation of Mutavault's ability and would not get a "refund" for the mana spent.</p>	<p>例如上面的例子中，如果 Abelard 阻止了 Nutella 用易形地窖阻挡，Nutella 无法撤销启动易形地窖的异能，也不会将支付的法术力倒回。</p>
<p>• <b>A triggered ability that affects the game state in non-visible ways: The controller must make the change known by the first time the change has an effect on the visible game state.</b></p>	<p>• 对于会以不可见的方式对游戏状态产生影响的触发式异能而言：其操控者必须于此类触发首度对游戏的可见状态造成影响时，让所有人知晓影响为何。</p>
<p>These are triggered abilities that aren't immediately visually apparent, but would first matter at some point after resolution. Examples include causing a creature to gain some ability, giving a creature a power and toughness bonus (but not a counter), or dealing damage to a creature. Each of these is an example of an effect that isn't usually represented visually.</p>	<p>这些触发式异能不会立即产生可见影响，但会在结算后的某个时间点第一次产生作用。例子包括使生物获得某些异能、给生物力量/防御力修正（而非指示物）或对生物造成伤害。这些例子都是通常不会产生可见表示的效应。</p>
<p>However, the result of these effects may cause some later visible change to the game state. For example, suppose Norville controls an Aether Flash at the time that Anise casts a 3/3 Hill Giant, and neither player mentions the trigger. If, later that turn, Norville deals 1 additional damage to Anise's creature, Norville will have not missed his Aether Flash trigger if he prompts Anise to put her creature into the graveyard at that time. In this case, Aether Flash's trigger first matters at the point when Anise's creature receives lethal damage.</p>	<p>但是，这些效应的结果可能接下来会导致游戏状态的可见变化。例如，Norville 操控乙太闪光（每当一个生物进入战场时，乙太闪光对其造成 2 点伤害。）Anise 施放了 3/3 的山丘巨人，两位牌手都没有提及触发。如果在该回合中，稍后 Norville 对 Anise 的生物又造成的 1 点伤害，若 Norville 提示 Anise 将该生物放进坟场，Norville 便没有遗漏乙太闪光的触发。在这个例子中，乙太闪光的触发是异能第一次产生作用的时点便是 Anise 的生物获得致命伤害之时。</p>
<p>Examples: Boros Elite, Steppe Lynx, Zhur-Taa Ancient, Emrakul, the Aeons Torn.</p>	<p>例如：波洛斯精兵、草原山猫、筑塔族祖兽、万世创伤伊莫库</p>
<p>This is something that people get hung up on, and will be addressed in more detail below. But the default assumption of the opponent should be that the trigger happened when it was supposed to.</p>	<p>这类异能经常让人混淆不清，下面还会有进一步的说明。但对手的默认假设应当是触发式异能在其应当发生作用的时候发生。</p>
<p><b>Once any of the above obligations has been fulfilled, further problems are treated as a Game Play Error — Game Rule Violation.</b></p>	<p>只要牌手履行了上述各项义务的任意一项，由此产生的其他问题便应按照“游戏行动失误~违反游戏规则”来处理。</p>
<p>As convenient as it may be for judges to consider previously acknowledged but problematically-executed triggered abilities to be missed, they must nonetheless be treated as a different infraction.</p>	<p>对于牌手已表明其存在、但错误执行的触发式异能来讲，裁判应该用另一个违规来进行处理，而非将其当做遗漏触发（虽然看起来很方便）。</p>

<p>For example, suppose Acetone attacks Neutrino with an unblocked Arbor Elf equipped with Sword of Feast and Famine. During the combat damage step, Acetone untaps his lands but both players forget about Neutrino discarding. Even if this is noticed during the post combat main phase, this must be treated as a Game Rules Violation by either rewinding the game or applying the appropriate partial fix, and not by simply asking Neutrino if she'd like the discard ability to be placed on the stack. It is also a Game Rules Violation if you acknowledge a trigger at the proper time or earlier, and then, because of multiple things on the stack, you forget to resolve it.</p>	<p>例如，Acetone 使用佩带了丰饷剑的乔木妖精攻击 Neutrino，且没有被阻挡。在战斗伤害步骤，Acetone 重置了他的地，但两位牌手都忘了 Neutrino 没有弃牌。即使这件事在战斗后行动阶段才被发现，这也必须以违反游戏规则（GRV）进行处理，要么进行倒回，要么适用合适的部分修正，而不能询问 Neutrino 是否将弃牌异能放进堆叠。如果你在合适的时间（或更早）表明了触发式异能的存在，但因为堆叠上的东西太多而忘记了结算该异能，这也属于 GRV。</p>
<p><b>Triggered abilities that do nothing except create delayed triggered abilities automatically resolve without requiring acknowledgment. Awareness of the resulting delayed trigger must be demonstrated at the appropriate point.</b></p>	<p>对于只会产生延时触发式异能，而没有其他效应的触发式异能而言，此类触发会自动结算，牌手不需特别指出此类触发的存在。牌手必须在恰当的时点，表明自己认识到因此产生之延时触发式异能的存在。</p>
<p>The first sentence implies that it is impossible to miss, for example, Grave Betrayal's triggered ability. However, the second sentence means that the delayed triggered ability itself, which makes a visible change to the game state, may be missed if not acknowledged by the time it would first matter. If Ned's creature dies while Abe controls a Grave Betrayal, the trigger happens. However Abe can still miss the resulting delayed trigger by later passing the turn without returning the creature to the battlefield or otherwise calling attention to the ability. This is a concession to the way players play. The delayed triggers creation isn't "relevant" but its resolution is.</p>	<p>第一句话说明牌手不可能遗漏诸如坟场叛行这样的触发式异能。但是，第二句话说明，产生的延迟触发式异能会对游戏状态产生可见影响，所以如果其操控者没有在其第一次产生影响之时表明了该异能的存在，它便会被遗漏。如果于 Abe 操控坟场叛行的时候，Ned 的生物死去，该触发式异能自动结算。但 Abe 仍然可能会在没有将该生物移回战场（或以其他方式表明对该异能的注意）就让过回合，从而遗漏该触发式异能产生的延迟触发。这是对牌手游戏方式的一种妥协。延迟触发的创造并不重要；延迟触发的结算才是关键。</p>
<p><b>Triggered abilities that do nothing except create one or more copies of a spell or ability (such as storm or cipher) automatically resolve, but awareness of the resulting objects must be demonstrated using the same requirements as described above (even though the objects may not be triggered abilities).</b></p>	<p>对于只会产生咒语或异能之一或数个复制品，而没有其他效应的触发式异能（例如风暴或暗码）而言，此类触发会自动结算，但牌手仍需依照上文所述的要求，在相应时点表明自己认识到由此产生之各物件的存在（就算此类物件不属于触发式异能也是一样）。</p>
<p>For example, the storm ability of Empty the Warrens is not considered missed even if the spell's controller does not specifically announce the trigger before passing priority after casting the spell. However, if that player then forgets to put the additional Goblins onto the battlefield before moving on with his or her turn, the storm trigger would be considered missed after all. Again, this is a concession to the way players actually play Magic.</p>	<p>例如，即使净空繁殖地的操控者在施放咒语并让过优先权之前没有宣告其风暴异能，我们也不认为他遗漏了这个触发。但是，如果该牌手忘记将多产生的鬼怪放进战场就继续进行其他行动，我们便认为牌手遗漏了这个风暴触发。这也是我们对牌手游戏方式妥协的结果。</p>

<p><b>If a triggered ability would have no impact on the game, it's not an infraction to fail to demonstrate awareness of it.</b></p>	<p>如果某个触发式异能不会对游戏造成影响，则就算牌手没有认识到此触发的存在，也不会算作违规。</p>
<p>Triggered abilities that don't matter are few and far between. When determining whether or not a triggered ability would have no impact on the game, you should not take into account how likely an opponent is to perform some optional action permitted by the ability. For example, a tapped Desecration Demon should still have its triggered ability acknowledged and the opponent should be prompted for choice of a sacrifice even though Desecration Demon is already tapped.</p>	<p>不造成影响的触发式异能十分罕见。判断一个触发式异能是否对游戏没有影响时，不应考虑对手采取该异能允许对手所做的一些可选项的可能性。例如，对于一个已横置的渎圣恶魔，其操控者仍应表明它的触发式异能，并提示对手是否选择牺牲生物。</p>
<p><b>For example, if the effect of a triggered ability instructs its controller to sacrifice a creature, a player who controls no creatures isn't required to demonstrate awareness of the ability.</b></p>	<p>举例来说，若某触发式异能的效应要求此异能的操控者牺牲一个生物，则未操控生物的牌手并不需要特别指出该触发的存在。</p>
<p>Another example of a triggered ability that would have no impact on the game may occur in a scenario in which a player attacks with only a Chasm Drake. The Chasm Drake itself is the only legal target for the ability, but giving a Chasm Drake a second instance of flying would be redundant. So, this trigger would not matter and intentionally ignoring it would not be an infraction.</p>	<p>对游戏没有影响的触发式异能的另一个例子是牌手仅操控一个深峡龙兽（每当深峡龙兽攻击时，目标由你操控的生物获得飞行异能直到回合结束）并用其进行攻击。深峡龙兽本身是其异能的唯一合法目标，但再次赋予深峡龙兽飞行异能又没有作用。所以这个触发对游戏没有影响，即使故意忽略这个异能也没有违规。</p>
<p><b>Similarly, a player demonstrating awareness of an optional trigger with no visible effect is assumed to have made the affirmative choice unless the opponent responds.</b></p>	<p>类似地，如果某牌手表明自己认识到无可见效应之非强制性触发的存在，则除非对手有回应，否则便应视为其已选择依可选项行事。</p>
<p>This is the old 'may' trigger. If a player points out an optional trigger, and it has no visible effect, when it resolves, it's assumed that they chose to for the 'may' part to happen. However, this assumption only holds unless the opponent responds. If they do, then you have to specify if you did or didn't choose the 'may'. This is relevant in formats with Eldrazi Mimic and Dismember.</p>	<p>这就是通常说的“可以”触发。如果牌手指出了一个可选的触发、且这个触发结算时没有可见的效应，我们假定该牌手会让“可以”的部分生效。然而，这种假定只有在对手没有响应时才有效。如果对手响应了，那么牌手必须说明“可以”的部分是否生效。这在具有拟态奥札奇和肢解的赛制中是有意义的。</p>
<p><b>Judges do not intervene in a missed trigger situation unless they intend to issue a Warning or have reason to suspect that the controller is intentionally missing his or her triggered abilities.</b></p>	<p>除非认为应给予警告，或有理由怀疑异能的操控者蓄意遗忘自己的触发，否则裁判在观察到牌手遗漏触发时不应干预比赛。</p>
<p>This is another very important detail to keep in mind when observing a match as either a spectator or judge. Simply asking a player if he or she</p>	<p>这是另一个非常重要的细节，当你作为旁观者或裁判观看比赛时一定要记住。询问牌手是否表明了触发式异能，这个问题本身便是对该异能的提醒。更</p>

<p>acknowledged a triggered ability is itself a reminder of that ability. Worse still, calling attention to a particular triggered ability before it would first matter provides an opportunity for a player to acknowledge it then. Depending on the circumstances, making this mistake could be perceived by an opponent as a lack of impartiality or even as significant coaching. Furthermore, if a spectator makes this mistake, it could be considered Tournament Error — Outside Assistance. Clearly, this should be avoided.</p>	<p>糟的是,如果在触发式异能第一次产生作用之前让牌手注意到该异能,会使该牌手有机会在合适的时机表明这个异能。根据情况的不同,对手可能会认为犯下这种错误是你不够公正,甚至在教牌手打牌。此外,如果旁观者犯下此错误,可以认为是比赛失误——外来协助。显然这种做法应该避免。</p>
<p>The only exception to this, of course, is when a judge needs to issue a Warning or investigate a player for Cheating. The needs of the tournament — specifically, ensuring its integrity — exceed those of an individual match.</p>	<p>当然,唯一的例外是裁判需要判处警告、或需要调查牌手是否作弊的情况下。对于整个比赛——特别是保证比赛的公正性——而言,其重要性要高于某一场对局的重要性。</p>
<p><b>范例</b></p>	<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>
<p><b>A. Knight of Infamy (a 2/1 creature with exalted) attacks alone. Its controller says “Take two.”</b></p>	<p><b>A. 恶名骑士/Knight of Infamy (2/1 生物, 具颂威异能) 单独攻击。其操控者说“中两点。”</b></p>
<p>(Whenever a creature you control attacks alone, that creature gets +1/+1 until end of turn.) In this scenario, this ability first matters during the combat damage step. This is a triggered ability that affects the game state in non-visible ways. By indicating the Knight is attacking for 2 damage, the player has missed her trigger, even if she is stating the knight is attacking for 2 prior to the combat damage step.</p>	<p>(每当一个由你操控的生物单独攻击时,该生物得 +1/+1 直到回合结束。)在此例中,这个异能在战斗伤害步骤第一次产生作用。这是一个以不可见方式影响游戏状态的触发式异能。该牌手表示骑士造成 2 点伤害,意味着他遗漏了触发,即使他在战斗伤害步骤之前如此声明也是如此。</p>
<p><b>B. A player forgets to remove the final time counter from a suspended spell and then draws a card during his draw step.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手忘记从已延缓的咒语上移去最后一个计时指示物,并在其抓牌步骤中抓了一张牌。</b></p>
<p>(At the beginning of your upkeep, if this card is suspended, remove a time counter from it) In this scenario, this ability first matters before the player draws for the turn. This is a triggered ability that causes a change in the visible game state. Once the player draws a card, he has advanced the game past the point where the visible game state would first be altered had the trigger resolved.</p>	<p>(在你的维持开始时,若此牌被延缓,从它上面移除一个计时指示物)在此例中,这个异能在牌手抓本回合的牌之前第一次产生作用。这是一个对游戏产生可见影响的触发式异能。一旦牌手抓了牌,游戏进程便已经进行至可见游戏状态本应因为触发式异能的结算而被改变的时间点之后。</p>
<p><b>C. A player casts Manic Vandal, then forgets its triggered ability by not choosing a target for it. He realizes this only after casting another spell.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手施放了疯狂莽夫/Manic Vandal,但并未为其触发式异能选择目标,遗忘了此触发。等到施放另外一个咒语的时候,他才发现自己遗忘了此触发。</b></p>
<p>(When Manic Vandal enters the battlefield, destroy target artifact.) In this scenario, this ability first</p>	<p>(当疯狂莽夫进战场时,消灭目标神器。)在此例中,这个异能在牌手让过优先权之前第一次产生作</p>

<p>matters before the player passes priority. This is a triggered ability that requires its controller to choose targets.</p>	<p>用。这是一个需要其操控者选择目标的触发式异能。</p>
<p><b>D. A player forgets to exile the Angel token created by Geist of Saint Traft at end of combat. She realizes the error when declaring blockers during the next turn.</b></p>	<p>在战斗结束的时候，牌手忘记放逐圣沙弗的游魂/Geist of Saint Traft 产生的天使衍生物。等到下一个回合宣告阻挡者的时候，她才发现这个失误。</p>
<p>In this scenario, this ability first matters before the player indicates that she has moved past the combat phase. This is a delayed triggered ability that causes a change in the visible game state.</p>	<p>在此例中，这个异能在牌手表明战斗阶段已过之前第一次产生作用。这是一个导致可见游戏状态产生变化的延迟触发式异能。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p>原则</p>
<p><b>Triggered abilities are common and invisible, so players should not be harshly penalized when forgetting about one.</b></p>	<p>触发式异能属于常见异能，且其机制较为隐蔽，因此不应在牌手忘记处理该类异能时即对其采取严厉的惩罚措施。</p>
<p>It's pretty easy to forget triggers, there are a lot of them and there is often no visual component to them. They are also typically beneficial, and the ones that aren't, the opponent is motivated to be aware of. Furthermore, triggered abilities have sort of a "natural" handling if they're forgotten — most of the time, they can simply just not happen without any additional cleanup or situation-specific remedy being needed.</p>	<p>人们非常容易忘记触发式异能。触发式异能很多，却通常没有可见的方式去提醒它们的存在。通常来说触发式异能是有利的，而对于不利的触发式异能，对手也有动力去注意它们。此外，处理忘记触发式异能时有一种很自然的办法——大多数时候，可以直接不做额外修正，就当它们没发生过即可。</p>
<p><b>Players are expected to remember their own triggered abilities; intentionally ignoring one may be Unsporting Conduct — Cheating (unless the ability would have no impact on the game as described above).</b></p>	<p>牌手应记得属于自己的触发式异能；蓄意忽略触发式异能的行为应视作“举止违背运动道德~作弊”（除非该异能如上文所述，对游戏没有任何影响）。</p>
<p>So, while forgetting your trigger is not to be harshly penalized, intentionally missing your trigger is much more serious. Note the subtle usage of the word "may," in the sentence above. If you suspect a player of cheating, read the definition of Cheating to see if it applies. Another exception to this being Unsporting Conduct — Cheating is if the player in question were not aware that intentionally ignoring one's own triggered abilities is against the rules.</p>	<p>即使忘记触发式异能不应被严厉的处罚，故意遗漏触发是更加严重的情形。注意这里使用了“may”（可能）一词。如果你怀疑牌手作弊，请先阅读作弊的定义，并分析是否符合作弊的判断条件。如果当事牌手并不知道故意忽略自己的触发式异能是规则不允许的行为，也不应视作“举止违背运动道德~作弊”。</p>
<p><b>Even if an opponent is involved in the announcement or resolution of the ability, the controller is still responsible for ensuring the opponents make the appropriate choices and take the appropriate actions. Opponents are not required</b></p>	<p>就算在异能宣告或结算的时候，需要对手进行相应选择，该异能的操控者也应对此负责，确保对手作出恰当的决定或执行了合适的动作。对手不需指出不由自己操控的遗漏触发，不过如果他们希望指出的话，也可以如此作。</p>



<p><b>to point out triggered abilities that they do not control, though they may do so if they wish.</b></p>	
<p>Remembering one's trigger is always the responsibility of the player who controls the ability. This is usually, but not always, the controller of the object that has the ability. It doesn't matter that the triggered ability may allow an opponent to take an optional action — the controller of the trigger is responsible for remembering it and prompting the opponent to make a choice. Examples include things like Frost Titan, Desecration Demon and Rhystic Study.</p>	<p>记住自己的触发式异能永远是其操控者的责任。其操控者通常（但不一定）是具有该异能的物件之操控者。触发式异能是否允许对手采取某些可选动作与此没有关联——触发式异能的操控者有责任记住这个触发，并提示对手作出选择。例子包括冰霜泰坦、渎圣恶魔和 Rhystic Study（琉晶研究）。</p>
<p>One of the many skills tested in Magic is the ability of players to remember their own triggered abilities. Players should not be punished for the inabilities or poor memories of their opponents.</p>	<p>万智牌游戏考验牌手的很多技能之一便是记住自己的触发式异能。牌手不应因没有记住对手的触发式异能而受到惩罚。</p>
<p>Why might a player want to remind an opponent of his or her triggered ability? It's possible that the triggered ability might be subjectively bad for that opponent. For example, suppose Absinthe is at 1 life and controls a Dark Confidant whose triggered ability has been missed several times earlier in the game. Given the player's now low life total, Novocain would have a high incentive to make sure that the trigger happens when it's supposed to.</p>	<p>什么时候牌手会想要提醒对手操控的触发式异能呢？可能这个异能对手是不利的。例如，Absinthe 还有 1 点生命，并操控了一个黑暗亲信。Absinthe 在游戏过程中已经遗漏了很多次黑暗亲信的触发式异能。因为他的生命值太低了，其对手 Novocain 便有更大的动力确保这个异能会如常发生。</p>
<p><b>Triggered abilities are assumed to be remembered until otherwise indicated, and the impact on the game state may not be immediately apparent.</b></p>	<p>除非有迹象表明触发式异能已遭遗忘，否则应视作牌手始终记得触发式异能的存在，同时触发式异能对游戏状态产生的影响也有可能不会即刻显现出来。</p>
<p>Triggered abilities are assumed to be remembered not only by both the player and opponent, but also by any judges watching the match. By failing to acknowledge a triggered ability by when it would first matter, the player effectively disproves this assumption. This sentence also answers the question of "How can I tell if my opponent missed his exalted trigger?" You are to assume it happened until you have evidence that it didn't. This is an important point. Just as you can acknowledge a trigger happened earlier than required, you can also indicate the trigger didn't happen earlier than required. For example, if you untap with a Kragma Butcher and say nothing indicating the trigger, it is assumed to be a 4/3. However, the controller can indicate earlier than combat damage that he forgot the trigger. Attacking</p>	<p>不仅应当假设牌手和对手记得触发式异能的存在，对于观看对局的裁判，也应假设他们记得这些异能。如果牌手没有在某个触发式异能将要第一次产生作用时表达该异能，他就打破了这个假设。这一句话也回答了下面这个问题：“我怎么知道对手忘记了他的颂威触发？”你应当假设颂威触发了，直到你获得了对手忘记这个触发的证据。这是很重要的一点。如同你可以在所要求的时点之前表达某个触发一样，你同样可以在这个时点之前表现出触发没有发生。例如，如果你操控的夸格玛屠夫（每当夸格玛屠夫成为未横置时，它得+2/+0 直到回合结束。）重置了，却没有说明这个触发，我们假设它是一个 4/3 生物。但是，操控者可以在战斗伤害之前表现出忘记了这个触发。如果场上有陷阱桥的时候宣告它攻击，可能表明这个触发被遗漏了。如果问这个生物的力量是多少，回答“它是 2/3”说明这</p>

<p>with an Ensnaring Bridge on the battlefield might indicate its trigger was missed. Answering “what's that creature's power?” with “it's a 2/3” is an indication it was missed.</p>	<p>个触发已经被遗漏了。</p>
<p><b>The opponent's benefit is in not having to point out triggered abilities, although this does not mean that they can cause triggers to be missed.</b></p>	<p>对于对手而言, 虽然无须指出触发式异能这点对己有利, 但这并不意味着可以主动致使他人遗漏触发。</p>
<p>To repeat an earlier annotation, players are never responsible for remembering their opponent's triggers. Players are allowed to remain quiet about triggers controlled by an opponent being missed, even if the triggered ability would do something harmful to its controller. There is never a time when a player should be issued an infraction, be it Unsporting Conduct — Cheating, Game Play Error — Failure to Maintain Game State, etc., for either accidentally or intentionally not calling attention to an opponent's missed trigger. Players do not have to help their opponents beat them; however, they cannot trick their opponents into missing triggers.</p>	<p>重复刚才的一段注解, 牌手永远没有责任记住对手的触发。我们允许牌手在对手的触发被遗漏时保持沉默。无论是举止违背运动道德~作弊、还是游戏行动失误~未维护游戏状态, 还是什么其他判罚也好, 牌手永远不应该因为无意或故意地不注意对手的遗漏触发而吃到这些判罚。牌手没有理由帮助对手击败自己; 但牌手不允许诱导对手遗漏触发。</p>
<p><b>If an opponent requires information about the precise timing of a triggered ability or needs details about a game object that may be affected by a resolved triggered ability, that player may need to acknowledge that ability's existence before its controller does.</b></p>	<p>如果对手要求知道某个触发式异能的确切触发时机, 或需要了解可能会受到已结算之触发式异能影响的某个游戏物件的详细信息, 则该牌手便可能需要在该异能的操控者尚未表明自己认识到该异能存在的情况下, 提前指出这个触发式异能。</p>
<p>Suppose Amaranth controls Cathedral of War and attacks with her single 2/2 Bear Cub, proceeding through to the declare blockers step without mentioning the triggered ability. After declaring blockers, Niles considers casting Shock targeting the unblocked Bear Cub.</p>	<p>假设 Amaranth 操控战事圣堂 (颂威) 并使用一个 2/2 幼熊进行攻击。她直接进入了宣告阻挡者步骤, 而并没有提及触发式异能。在宣告阻挡者之后, 对手 Niles 考虑对这个未被阻挡的幼熊施放电震。</p>
<p>Niles has two options — he could simply cast Shock, targeting the Bear Cub, hoping that Amaranth forgot about the trigger. However, by doing so, Niles risks Amaranth acknowledging the trigger by afterward not putting the Bear Cub into the graveyard. In other words, just because Amaranth didn't explicitly announce her trigger doesn't mean she's yet missed it — the point at which the trigger would first matter in this case would be after Shock resolves. So, if Niles were to attempt this ploy, he risks wasting his Shock.</p>	<p>Niles 有两个选择。要么他以幼熊为目标施放电震, 希望 Amaranth 忘记触发。如果他这么做, 他便冒着 Amaranth 记住这个触发, 不将幼熊置入坟墓场的风险。换句话说, Amaranth 即使没有声明这个触发, 也不说明她就遗忘了——在此例中, 触发第一次产生作用的时点是电震结算以后。如果 Niles 想要这样冒险的话, 他可能会浪费他的电震。</p>
<p>Alternatively, Niles could first ask Amaranth what Bear Cubs current power/toughness is. This is derived information, so Amaranth isn't required to answer,</p>	<p>要么 Niles 可以先问 Amaranth 幼熊现在的攻击力和防御力是多少。这是推断信息, Amaranth 并不必回答这个问题。但如果她回答了, Niles 便会知</p>

<p>but if she does, Niles knows if the trigger was missed or not.</p>	<p>道触发是否被遗忘。</p>
<p>This may seem somewhat unsatisfactory to Niles, since asking questions about the toughness of the Bear Cub will probably remind Amaranth about her trigger and give her one last opportunity to acknowledge it. However, as the IPG says, “triggered abilities are assumed to be remembered until otherwise indicated.” The policy isn’t designed to let Niles trap Amaranth, it’s designed to reflect the way players actually play the game.</p>	<p>这对于 Niles 可能不怎么有利，因为询问幼熊的防御力可能会提醒 Amaranth 的触发。这会给她一个机会来表达这个异能。但是 IPG 说，“应视作牌手始终记得触发式异能的存在。”方针的编写意图并非是为了让 Niles 给 Amaranth 下套，而是为了反映牌手实际打牌的方式。</p>
<p><b>A player who makes a play that may or may not be legal depending on whether an uncommunicated trigger has been remembered has not committed an infraction; their play either succeeds, confirming that the trigger has been missed, or is rewound.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手做出的某个游戏动作，其结果需根据是否记得未进行过沟通的触发式异能才能判断是否合法，则这位牌手的行为并未触犯任何违规；他们这一游戏动作或就此成功～同时确认该触发确已遗漏～或会被倒回。</p>
<p>It isn't up to the opponent to confirm whether or not a player has missed their trigger before making a play that may be illegal. For example, if Anna is attacking with Pyreheart Wolf, it is not illegal for Nolan to block the wolf with one creature. When that block is proposed, it is up to Anna to indicate the illegality of the block or not, and this will determine if the play needs to be rewound.</p>	<p>对手在做游戏动作之前没有责任确认是否牌手遗忘了触发，即使这些触发的结算会导致这些游戏动作成为不合法。举例来说，如果 Anna 使用葬火心狼攻击，Nolan 使用一个生物进行阻挡它并非不合法。当 Nolan 提出阻挡时，Anna 有责任表示阻挡是不合法的。如果 Anna 如此表示了，那么这个动作会被倒回。</p>
<p><b>Players may not cause triggered abilities controlled by an opponent to be missed by taking game actions or otherwise prematurely advancing the game.</b></p>	<p>牌手不得通过执行游戏动作或其他贸然推进游戏进程的手段，以致使对手遗漏由其操控的触发式异能。</p>
<p>This sentence has a lot of philosophical weight, and provides guidance on how to deal with triggered abilities controlled by one player that trigger during another player’s turn. Triggered abilities fitting this description deserve some special consideration. Generally speaking, the active player — that’s the player whose turn it is — controls the flow of the game by taking each turn-based action as he or she moves through that turn’s steps and phases. Magic players rarely explicitly pass priority, most of the time just shortcutting through nearly all of the technical rigmarole.</p>	<p>这句话有很多原则上的分量。它提供了如何处理在一位牌手的回合中另一位牌手操控的触发式异能的指导。符合这种条件触发式异能需要特殊对待。通常来说，主动牌手控制游戏的进程，因为他们要按照回合中阶段和步骤的顺序来执行回合动作。牌手很少声明自己让过优先权，略过大部分繁杂的规则叙述，而通常只是采取简化方式来进行游戏。</p>
<p>The reason that policy allows for players to acknowledge triggers just after an opponent takes a game action that would otherwise cause the trigger to be missed is precisely because players do not usually prompt their opponents for actions before moving ahead with their turns. For example, players</p>	<p>方针允许牌手在对手执行会使触发式异能被遗漏的游戏动作之后立即表达触发，正是因为牌手在进行自己的回合时，通常不会提示对手做动作。例如，牌手通常会从行动阶段直接进入宣告攻击者，而并不问对手是否想要做任何事——诸如宣告战斗开始时的触发等。</p>

<p>will often proceed straight from their main phase to declaring attackers without asking the opponent if he or she wants to first do anything — such as announcing any beginning of combat triggers.</p>	
<p>The Missed Trigger policy was written to address the way that players already play the game and not the other way around.</p>	<p>遗漏触发的方针是为了适应解决牌手实际打牌的方式而写的，而非严格按照 CR。</p>
<p>A player that says nothing about his or her opponent's Braids, Cabal Minion trigger before attempting to draw for the turn hasn't committed an infraction. If an opponent speaks up about the trigger as soon as the card is drawn, the trigger has not been missed.</p>	<p>例如，牌手没有表示对手的柯帮干部布蕾德的触发，就抓了本回合的牌，并没有犯下违规。如果对手在牌手抓牌之时就立即表示了触发，这个触发便没有被遗漏。</p>
<p><b>During an opponent's turn, if a trigger's controller demonstrates awareness of the trigger before they take an active role (such as taking an action or explicitly passing priority), the trigger is remembered.</b></p>	<p>在对手的回合中，如果触发的操控者在他们担任主动角色之前（例如进行游戏动作或明确让过优先权）表明自己认识到触发存在，便视作他们记得此触发。</p>
<p>This sentence simply further clarifies what has been stated above. If a player has a trigger that would happen on an opponent's turn, that player has to actively "miss" it, they can't be moved past the point of acknowledging the trigger by the active player's actions in their own turn. It is also to prevent players from trying to use a loophole in the policy to rush past their opponents trigger, so that they can deny their opponent the trigger. This sentence closes the perception of that loophole. You cannot force your opponent to miss his or her trigger.</p>	<p>这句话进一步说明了上面的方针。如果牌手操控一个将在对手回合触发的异能，不能因为主动牌手（即对手）因为其回合中的行动越过了表达触发的时点，就判断牌手遗漏了这个触发。这也避免了牌手试图利用方针中的漏洞，快速进行游戏以越过对手的触发时点，来阻止对手的异能触发。这句话填补了漏洞的可能性。你不能强迫对手忘记触发。</p>
<p><b>The Out-of-Order Sequencing rules (MTR section 4.3) may also be applicable, especially as they relate to batches of actions or resolving items on the stack in an improper order.</b></p>	<p>次序不当的行事顺序之相关规则（MTR 第 4.3 节）亦应纳入考量，因为这部分规则与未以恰当顺序进行一系列动作或结算堆叠上的多个物件有关。</p>
<p>From MTR 4.3: Due to the complexity of accurately representing a game of Magic, it is acceptable for players to engage in a block of actions that, while technically in an incorrect order, arrive at a legal and clearly understood game state once they are complete.</p>	<p>引用 MTR 4.3：由于要想准确进行一盘万智牌游戏十分复杂，因此牌手在进行一组动作的时候，即便严格说来次序不当，但只要在动作全部完成之后仍能呈现出合法及清晰游戏状态，便是可以接受的。</p>
<p>All actions taken must be legal if they were executed in the correct order, and any opponent can ask the player to do the actions in the correct sequence so that he or she can respond at the appropriate time (at which point players will not be held to any still-pending actions).</p>	<p>所有动作在其以正确顺序执行的情况下必须都是合法的，并且任何对手都可以在任何时候要求牌手以正确顺序执行动作，以便他可以在合适的时间响应（此时不要求牌手继续执行先前尚待执行的动作）。</p>

<p>An out-of-order sequence must not result in a player prematurely gaining information which could reasonably affect decisions made later in that sequence.</p>	<p>次序不当的行事顺序不能导致牌手提前获得可能影响后续行动决定的信息。</p>
<p>This means that, in certain situations, players may acknowledge a trigger as part of a block of actions, some of which may technically be later than the point at which the trigger would first matter, without the trigger being missed.</p>	<p>这意味着在一些情况下,牌手可以在一系列行动之后表达某个触发,且这系列行动中的一部分严格来说本应在触发第一次产生影响之后才会发生,而不会被视为遗漏触发。</p>
<p>For example, a player may, in quick succession, sacrifice Pitchburn Devils to pay the cost of his Carrion Feeder's activated ability, then put a counter on the Carrion Feeder, and then say "you take 3," without Pitchburn Devils's trigger being considered missed. If the player takes these actions all at once without leaving an opportunity for the opponent to indicate responses or provide additional information, this should usually be ruled a legal out-of-order sequence of actions.</p>	<p>例如,牌手可以快速连续地为腐食怪(牺牲一个生物:在腐食怪上放置一个+1/+1 指示物)牺牲燃沥青魔鬼(当燃沥青魔鬼死去时,它对目标生物或牌手造成 3 点伤害),在腐食怪上放置一个+1/+1 指示物,然后再说“打你 3”,而不会被视为遗漏触发。如果牌手一次性执行了这些动作,而没有留给对手表示回应或提供额外信息的机会,这通常在判决时应视为合法的次序不当的行事顺序。</p>
<p>A player could not, however, remove the last counter from a Rift Bolt, then draw for the turn, and then say "I'll Rift Bolt your creature." Even if the player performs these actions in quick succession and without the opponent saying anything, he or she would still have gained the knowledge of the card drawn for the turn before choosing his Rift Bolt target. This should usually be ruled a Missed Trigger.</p>	<p>但是,牌手不能从时缝之雷(延缓 1,对目标生物或牌手造成 3 点伤害)上移除最后一个指示物,然后抓本回合的牌,再说“我要用时缝之雷打你的生物”。即使牌手快速连续地执行这些动作,对手也还来不及说话,他仍然还是从本回合抓的牌中获得额外信息之后,再选择时缝之雷的目标。这通常在判决时被视为遗漏触发。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>If the triggered ability specifies a default action associated with a choice made by the controller (usually "If you don't ..." or "... unless"), resolve it choosing the default option.</b></p>	<p>如果该触发式异能指示指定了某个预设的动作,且此动作包含其操控者应作的某个选择(通常是“若你未如此作...”或“除非...”),则结算之并认为牌手选择执行此预设的动作。</p>
<p>"Oh, you drew before paying your echo cost? That's cool, just sacrifice your guy now" is the way that casual players have handled this kind of error for years — this piece of policy has significant precedent. Indeed, much of policy is built around the pre-existing habits and expectations of players. The above sentence is one of the most clear-cut examples of this in the entire IPG. Examples: Masticore, Pact of Negation, Transguild Promenade.</p>	<p>“哦,你付返响费用之前就抓牌了?抱歉,牺牲了吧”在过去数年中,这便是娱乐牌手们修正此类错误的方法——这也是制定这项方针时所参考的先例。事实上,很多方针都是根据牌手的习惯和期望而制定的。上面这句话是 IPG 中最清晰易懂的例子之一。例如:异狮、逸散条约、跨公会步道。</p>
<p>We will see the next two sentences detail how to "resolve it".</p>	<p>下两句话会详细说明如何“结算之”。</p>

<p><b>If the triggered ability is a delayed triggered ability that changes the zone of an object, resolve it.</b></p>	<p>如果该触发式异能属于会改变某物件所在区域的延时触发式异能，则结算之。</p>
<p>This type of triggered ability, known as delayed zone-change triggers, frequently exist in order to “clean things up.” While this type of trigger includes a lot of delayed sacrifices of tokens (Kiki-Jiki, Mirror Breaker, Thatcher Revolt, Geist of Saint Traft, etc.), it also includes many abilities that are utterly vital to the continued use of the associated object. For example, the delayed triggered abilities that return Ætherling and Obzedat, Ghost Council to the battlefield are included in this category. These triggers are necessary for the creatures’ controllers to be able to continue using them that game. This will be an important concept shortly.</p>	<p>这类触发式异能通常称作改变区域的延迟触发，经常在做“清理性工作”的异能中出现。这类异能不仅包括牺牲衍生物的延迟触发（例如裂镜奇奇几奇、屋匠起义、圣沙弗的游魂等），还包括一些为了使相关物件能够持续使用而至至关重要的异能。例如，将乙太精怪和欧节达鬼影议会移回战场的延迟触发式异能就属此类。为了让其操控者能在该盘游戏中继续使用这些生物，这些触发应当存在。关于这类异能稍后会讲到一个重要的概念。</p>
<p>We will see in the next description details on how to “resolve it”.</p>	<p>下一句话就会提到如何“结算之”。</p>
<p><b>For these two types of abilities, the opponent chooses whether to resolve the ability the next time a player would get priority or when a player would get priority at the start of the next phase.</b></p>	<p>对于这两类异能而言，其结算的时机由对手来选择：在下次将有牌手获得优先权时结算，或是在下一个阶段开始时当有牌手将获得优先权时结算。</p>
<p>So the opponent's choice is for the trigger to occur “now” or “in a moment.” “Never” is not an option for these types of triggers.</p>	<p>对于这两类异能，对手的选择是它们“现在”结算，或者“一会儿”结算。对手不能选择“不结算”。</p>
<p>Note that policy allows for the object to be returned when a player would get priority at the start of the next phase, and not step. The timing option here allows for a bit of control over creatures appearing and disappearing from the battlefield mid-combat. Putting the control in the hands of the opponent is acceptable because the opponent isn’t the one who missed his or her trigger, and this allows the opponent to minimize the impact of the player “suddenly” remembering the trigger.</p>	<p>注意方针允许物件在下一个阶段（而非步骤）牌手将获得优先权时移动。这个时机的选项可以稍微控制生物在战斗中出现或消失的情况。将选择权交给对手是可以接受的，因为遗漏触发的人并不是对手，这样做也能让对手尽量减少牌手“突然记住”触发带来的影响。</p>
<p>Resolving a delayed zone-change trigger that returns a creature to the battlefield at the start of the next phase means that if a player notices his or her own missed trigger during his or her opponent’s end step, the opponent may choose to have the creature remain exiled until the player’s upkeep. That means this creature will have summoning sickness and won’t be able to attack that turn. Of course, an opponent can still opt to have that creature returned to the battlefield when a player got priority during that end of turn step if he or she really wanted to.</p>	<p>结算一个在下一个阶段开始时将生物返回战场的延迟触发意味着，如果牌手在对手的步骤注意到了遗漏触发，对手可以选择让这个生物在该牌手的维持再移回战场。这意味着这个生物会召唤失调，该回合不能攻击。当然，对手也可以让它在他的回合结束阶段下一次牌手获得优先权时移回战场，如果他真的想如此做的话。</p>

<p>Finally, wherever the opponent chooses to place the trigger, it is resolved immediately, without using the stack. This is to prevent responding to these triggers that should have already happened. You wouldn't want a Slaughter Pact trigger placed on the stack, then the player casts a card draw spell in response to dig out a Stifle, would you?</p>	<p>最后，无论对手如何选择把异能放在什么时候，该异能会立刻结算而不使用堆叠。这是为了防止本应发生的触发被牌手响应。你肯定不想让屠杀条约的触发放进堆叠，然后牌手响应施放抓牌咒语去掏一张阻抑，对吧？</p>
<p><b>These abilities do not expire and should be remedied no matter how much time has passed since they should have triggered.</b></p>	<p>这两类异能的持续时限均不会结束，且不论从其原本应触发的时间起过去了多久，均应进行修正。</p>
<p>Notably, the opponent gets to choose the “when,” but not the “if.” One reason for this has to do with the fact that many zone-change triggers are, as pointed out above, utterly vital to the continued use of the associated objects. If an opponent got to choose whether these triggers happened at all, this infraction might be a little too harsh on players who, for example, suddenly find their Ætherling exiled forever just because they forgot to return it last turn. From the previous section: “Triggered abilities are common and invisible, so players should not be harshly penalized when forgetting about one.” So, policy has to have some special consideration here.</p>	<p>注意，对手能选择的是“何时”而非“是否”放进堆叠。这样处理的一个原因是很多改变区域的触发式异能对于持续使用相关物件是至关重要的。如果对手可以选择这些触发是否发生，对于那些忘了上回合把乙太精怪移回场，结果发现乙太精怪因此被永远放逐的牌手而言，这个判罚会显得过重了。上一段中说：“触发式异能属于常见异能，且其机制较为隐蔽，因此不应在牌手忘记处理该类异能时即对其采取严厉的惩罚措施。”因此，方针不得不作出一些特殊的考虑。</p>
<p>Also of interest is that even though these abilities don't expire, players are still under no obligation to remind the opponent of their existence. A player is perfectly within policy by remaining quiet for several turns despite having noticed that his opponent's Obzedat, Ghost Council never returned from exile. And don't forget the triggers on Pact of Negation and his buddies. The default action will be resolved even if it's remembered two turns later.</p>	<p>有意思的是，即使这些异能的持续时限不会结束，牌手仍然没有义务提醒对手这些异能的存在。牌手对于对手的欧节达鬼影议会呆在放逐区好几个回合没回来保持沉默是完全符合方针的。逸散条约这类异能也是一样。即使在两个回合后才想起来，预设动作仍然会结算。</p>
<p><b>If the triggered ability was missed prior to the current phase in the previous player's turn, instruct the players to continue playing.</b></p>	<p>以前一位牌手之回合中相同的阶段为限，如果发生遗漏异能此事的时机早于此限，则令牌手继续游戏。</p>
<p>If it's been more than a turn since the trigger was missed, the ability is skipped with no further resolution. Remember, though, that if that ability were detrimental for the controlling player, he or she should still receive a penalty no matter how long it's been.</p>	<p>如果遗漏触发以后过了一个回合以上，那么异能便会被忽略，也不会再结算。但是要记住，如果异能对于其操控者是不利的，无论过了多久，该牌手仍然应该获得警告判罚。</p>
<p><b>If the triggered ability creates an effect whose duration has already expired, instruct the players to continue playing.</b></p>	<p>如果属于该触发式异能产生之效应的持续时限已结束的情况，则令牌手继续游戏。</p>

<p>For example, if the missed triggered ability lasts “until [some amount of time]” or “for as long as [some condition],” then the ability has a duration. If a Missed Trigger is not noticed until after the amount of time has elapsed or the condition is no longer true, the ability is skipped with no further resolution.</p>	<p>例如，遗漏的触发式异能具有“直到[时限]”或“只要于[条件]的时间内”，此异能便具有持续时限。如果直到该时限结束、或提及的条件不再成立，该触发式异能都没有被注意到，该异能便会被忽略，也不会再结算。</p>
<p>Examples: Battlegrace Angel, Colossal Whale, Nivix Cyclops</p>	<p>范例：战华天使、超巨鲸、尼米斯独眼巨人</p>
<p><b>If the triggered ability isn’t covered by the previous two paragraphs, the opponent chooses whether the triggered ability is added to the stack.</b></p>	<p>如果该触发式异能不属于前面两段所述之情况，则由对手选择是否要将该触发式异能加入堆叠。</p>
<p>So, run through the checks above. If none of them fit, this is our default.</p>	<p>如果经过检查，异能都不符合上面的情况，那么下面就是预设的解决方法。</p>
<p>The opponent should be explicitly asked if he or she would like the ability to go on the stack. Judges should not just assume that players won’t want triggers harmful to them or helpful to an opponent to be skipped, no matter how silly asking might seem.</p>	<p>裁判应当明确询问对手是否想要将该异能放进堆叠。即使问起来可能显得很愚蠢，裁判也不能默认牌手一定想让对其不利或对对手有利的异能被略过。</p>
<p><b>If it is, it’s inserted at the appropriate place on the stack if possible or on the bottom of the stack.</b></p>	<p>如果要将异能加入堆叠，则将该异能插入堆叠中其原本应处的位置（若能如此作）或是堆叠底。</p>
<p>One case in which it might not be possible to insert the trigger in the appropriate place on the stack is if some of the other abilities that triggered at the same time as the Missed Trigger have since resolved and are no longer there.</p>	<p>有一种不能将异能插入原本应处的位置的情况是，另一些与其同时触发的异能已经结算并不在堆叠里。</p>
<p><b>No player may make choices involving objects that would not have been legal choices when the ability should have triggered.</b></p>	<p>牌手在为该异能作选择时，不得涉及于此异能原本应触发的时点尚不在相应区域当中的物件。</p>
<p>When placing missed triggers on the stack, players may make choices only about objects that could have been chosen had the trigger not been missed. Because there is one-turn expiration on placing missed triggers on the stack, it’s unlikely that many permanents have moved around in the interim. For this reason, remembering which objects were in which zones shouldn’t be too taxing to either player’s memory.</p>	<p>在将遗漏的触发放进堆叠时，牌手只能做出如果该堆叠没有遗漏的情况下可以做出的选择。因为将异能放回堆叠只有一回合的时效，通常不太可能在这段时间内有很多永久物改变区域。因此，记住哪个物件在哪个区域应该不会耗费双方牌手过多的记忆。</p>
<p><b>For example, if the ability instructs a player to sacrifice a creature, that player can't sacrifice a creature that wasn't on the battlefield when the ability should have triggered.</b></p>	<p>举例来说，如果该异能令牌手牺牲一个生物，则该牌手不得牺牲于此异能本应触发之时点尚不在战场上的生物。</p>
<p>If a player unintentionally misses his or her own Smokestack trigger (At the beginning of each player's</p>	<p>如果牌手无意中忘记了他自己的烟囱的触发(在每位牌手的维持开始时，烟囱上每有一个油烟指示</p>



<p>upkeep, that player sacrifices a permanent for each soot counter on Smokestack), but this is not noticed until after the player has moved into his first main phase and played a land, the player should receive a Warning and the opponent should be asked if he or she would like the trigger to go on the stack. If the trigger is placed on the stack, then the player may not choose the land he or she just played for the turn as one of the permanents to sacrifice.</p>	<p>物, 该牌手便牺牲一个永久物。), 但直到该牌手的战斗前行动阶段下了一块地以后才注意到, 该牌手应当获得一个警告, 并且裁判应当询问对手是否想让该触发进入堆叠。如果该触发被放进堆叠, 该牌手不得在结算烟囱的异能时选择牺牲他这回合刚下的这块地。</p>
<p><b>Upgrade: If the triggered ability is usually considered detrimental for the controlling player the penalty is a Warning.</b></p>	<p><b>升级: 如果该触发式异能属于“通常认为对其操控牌手不利”, 则罚则为警告。</b></p>
<p>“Usually detrimental” triggers are often all-downside triggers that have been added to some card in order to balance out some other above-the-curve stats or other beneficial effects. Other times, “usually detrimental” triggers are ones that “clean up” a game state by causing the controller to sacrifice some temporarily-created tokens or to give a momentarily nullified permanent back to an opponent.</p>	<p>“通常认为对其操控牌手不利”的触发通常是全为负面的异能, 这些异能通常加在一些高于曲线属性或其他正面效应的牌之上, 以进行平衡。另一些“通常不利”的异能是用于“清理”游戏状态的异能, 例如使其操控者牺牲一些临时创造的衍生物、或将暂时去除的永久物还给对手的异能。</p>
<p>Furthermore, “usually detrimental” means that you should consider the card associated with the trigger in a vacuum and not take into account any game-specific information in order to determine whether or not a trigger is detrimental. Toby Elliott once said (<a href="#">on his blog</a>) that one guideline for making this determination is to ask yourself: “If the trigger didn’t exist, would the card be played?” If the answer is no, then the ability is probably not detrimental.</p>	<p>进一步说明, 你可以在不涉及任何具体游戏信息的情况下考虑这张牌, 来判断一个异能是否是“通常认为对其操控牌手不利”。Toby Elliott 曾(<a href="#">在其博客上</a>)说明了如何进行这种判断: “如果这个触发不存在, 这张牌会更好还是更差?” 问问自己这个问题, 如果答案是“更差”, 那这个异能一般不是不利的异能。</p>
<p>In theory, all triggered abilities in Magic could be classified as either detrimental or non-detrimental — in fact, a small group of judges are endeavoring to accomplish this very thing with the <a href="#">Missed Trigger Guides project</a>.</p>	<p>理论上, 万智牌中所有的触发式异能都可以分成有利或不利的。有一群裁判致力于这件事情, 你可以在这里查看他们的成果: <a href="#">遗漏触发指南</a></p>
<p><b>The current game state is not a factor in determining this, though symmetrical abilities (such as Howling Mine) may be considered usually detrimental or not depending on who is being affected.</b></p>	<p>在判断异能性质时, 不应考虑当前的游戏状态, 但对于对等触发的异能而言 (例如嚎叫的矿井/Howling Mine), 则可根据当前受其影响的牌手来判断此异能是否属于通常认为之不利异能。</p>
<p>When determining if a trigger is ‘usually detrimental,’ we do not look at the game state. A Dark Confidant trigger at 20 life is the same as a Dark Confidant trigger at 1 life. This is because we want consistent rulings and there is no way to take game state into account and have every judge answer the same way.</p>	<p>当判断触发式异能是不是“通常不利”的时, 我们不考虑游戏状态。黑暗亲信的异能在 20 生命与 1 点生命时没有区别。这是因为我们需要判决的一致性, 而游戏状态千变万化, 并且每个裁判可能都会对游戏状态做出不同的判断。</p>

<p>However, we are allowed to consider symmetrical abilities differently based on who is affected. What exactly is a symmetrical ability? Symmetrical abilities are triggered abilities that meet two conditions. They:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. are likely to trigger multiple times per game, triggering for different players</li> <li>2. have the same effect on both players.</li> </ol>	<p>但是,我们可以根据所影响的牌手来判断对等触发的异能是否是通常不利的。什么是对等触发? 对等触发需要满足两个条件: 1. 每盘游戏会触发多次, 并对不同的牌手都会触发; 2. 对于每位牌手会产生同样的效应。</p>
<p>Examples include Howling Mine, Sulfuric Vortex, and Burning Earth. A symmetrical ability may either do something positive to both players, or do something negative to both players, but would never do something positive to one player and negative to the other player. Furthermore, a symmetrical ability must have its effect on each player during separate instances of the same ability. For example, Sire of Insanity's triggered ability (At the beginning of each end step, each player discards his or her hand.) is not symmetrical.</p>	<p>这类异能的例子有: 嚎叫的矿井、硫磺旋风、燃烧土地等。对等触发异能可能对双方牌手都是有利的, 也可能对双方牌手都是不利的, 但从不会对其中一位牌手是有利的而对另一位牌手是不利的。并且, 对等触发异能在每次触发时, 都应当只影响其中一位牌手。例如, 疯狂君父的触发式异能(在每个结束步骤开始时, 每位牌手弃掉其手牌。)不是对等触发异能。</p>
<p>If a player misses a symmetrical trigger that would be either bad for him or her or good for an opponent, he or she should receive a Warning.</p>	<p>如果牌手遗漏了对其不利或对对手有利的对等触发, 他应当得到警告判罚。</p>
<h2>2.2 Looking at Extra Cards</h2>	<h2>2.2 额外看牌</h2>
<p>Penalty</p>	<p>处罚</p>
<p>Warning</p>	<p>警告</p>
<h3>DEFINITION</h3>	<h3>定义</h3>
<p><b>A player looks at a card they were not entitled to see.</b></p>	<p><b>牌手看到了他们不应能够检视的牌。</b></p>
<p>This infraction is pretty easy to commit. Any time that a library is touched, it is possible that a card will be dropped, or flipped over; or when drawing two cards may get stuck or picked up together.</p>	<p>这种违规是相当容易犯的。当你接触牌库时, 有可能会碰掉一张牌, 或者翻开一张牌; 又或者在你抓牌时抓了两张并看到了下一张的牌面。</p>
<p>Generally, when we are talking about Looking at Extra Cards, we are talking about a player seeing the face of some card in his or her own deck. However, you might also see some cards in your opponent's deck while shuffling it.</p>	<p>一般来说, 当提及额外看牌时, 我们是在说牌手看到了自己套牌的某些牌的牌面, 但是, 你也有可能洗对手套牌时看到其中的某些牌。</p>
<p>Be careful not to confuse this infraction with the Hidden Card Error infraction. In particular, the Hidden Card Error infraction covers situations where you are looking at some number of cards on the top of your library and you look at too many of them. So, in this</p>	<p>请小心, 不要将这个违规与非公开牌张失误混淆。具体来说, 非公开牌张失误包含了你检视牌库顶数张牌时检视了过多牌的情形。在这种情况下虽然你是额外看了牌, 但违规却不是额外看牌。头疼吗? 我是挺头疼的。</p>

<p>specific case, you are looking at extra cards, but you aren't Looking At Extra Cards. Does your brain hurt? Mine does.</p>	
<p>For clarification, dropping a card while shuffling your own library is not Looking At Extra Cards. Just put the card back and continue to randomize your deck.</p>	<p>澄清一下, 在洗你自己的牌库时掉落一张牌并不是额外看牌。将牌放回牌库继续随机化即可。</p>
<p>Observing the face of a card your opponent dropped or flipped is also not Looking at Extra Cards. There are two reasons for this: 1) If a player could drop a card and get their opponent a Warning, they are going to messy-shuffle their way into a top 8. 2) MTR 3.12 allows players to reveal hidden information to their opponent that they are entitled to know.</p>	<p>观察到你对手掉落或者翻开的牌面同样也不是额外看牌。原因有两点: 1)如果牌手可以掉落一张牌而使对手获得警告,他就可以胡乱洗牌将自己送入8强。2) MTR3.12 允许牌手展示自己知悉的隐藏信息给对手知道。</p>
<p><b>Players are considered to have looked at a card when they have been able to observe the face of a hidden card, or when a card is moved any significant amount from a deck, but before it touches cards in another set. A set is a physically distinct group defined by a game rule or effect. It may correspond to a specific zone, or may only represent a part of a zone. This includes errors of dexterity or catching a play error before the card is placed into his or her hand.</b></p>	<p>当牌手能够观察到非公开牌张的牌面,或是将一张牌移动至离牌库有显著距离、但还没有接触到其他牌叠,他就算是看了一张牌。所谓牌叠,是指由游戏规则或效应规定,有显著区隔的牌张组合。牌叠此概念可能对应某一特定区域,也可能只包含某一区域当中的一部分。这包含手脚笨拙所导致的失误、或是在将牌置入手牌之前发现的失误。</p>
<p>This sentence defines the boundaries of Looking at Extra Cards. But it has to be taken within the context of Hidden Card Error. As mentioned in the section above, Hidden Card Error claims some of the space Looking at Extra Cards used to have. When you are manipulating a set of cards from the top of the library, and you manipulate too many of them, that's considered Hidden Card Error now.</p>	<p>这句话定义了额外看牌的边界。但我们也要考虑是否适用非公开牌张失误。正如上面所提到的,非公开牌张失误占领了一些原本属于额外看牌的阵地。现在当你操纵牌库顶的一些牌却操纵多了时,这现在属于非公开牌张失误。</p>
<p>For the purpose of Hidden Card Error, once the drawn cards have significantly left the library as part of a draw, they can no longer be considered Looking at Extra Cards.</p>	<p>在界定额外看牌或非公开牌张失误时,一旦所抓取的牌在抓取时已经显著离开了牌库,便不再适用额外看牌。</p>
<p>Looking at Extra Cards covers when you knock over a card, drop a card while shuffling, start to draw a card when you shouldn't, and milling or dredging too many cards. It does not cover looking at 8 cards from Dig Through Time, or a scry 2 when it should have only been a scry 1. Milling and dredging are covered by Looking at Extra Cards because the cards are being placed into a public zone, while Dig Through Time is covered by Hidden Card Error because the cards never enter a public zone.</p>	<p>额外看牌适用于你不小心碰掉了一张牌、洗牌时掉了一张牌、当你不应抓牌时却开始抓牌、磨掉了或者发掘了太多牌。历时挖掘看到了8张牌、占卜1的时候却执行了占卜2,不属于额外看牌。磨牌库和发掘归在额外看牌的原因是这些牌张放进了公开区域,而历时挖掘归在非公开牌张失误是因为这些牌从未进入公开区域。</p>

<p>If you've seen the face of a card you aren't supposed to and you haven't added it to another group, it's Looking at Extra Cards. The "moved any significant amount from the deck" is there so the judge doesn't have to deal with the "did they/didn't they see the card" question. If it's a "significant" amount away, it's Looking at Extra Cards.</p>	<p>如果你看到了不应该看到的牌的牌面、但还没有将其加入其他牌叠，这便是额外看牌。“将一张牌移动至离牌库有显著距离”这个叙述使裁判不用纠结于“他们是否看到了牌”的问题。只要离开显著距离，就是额外看牌。</p>
<p>The discussion of what a 'set' is, is found in the definitions of Hidden Card Error. It's here to say that once the card you are just looking at is added to a set of cards, you aren't looking at it anymore, and the infraction is no longer Looking at Extra Cards but rather Hidden Card Error.</p>	<p>在非公开牌张失误的定义一节讨论了什么是“牌叠”。在这里要说的是，一旦你额外看到的牌已经加入了其他牌叠，那么这便不再属于“看牌”，违规应该是非公开牌张失误，而不是额外看牌。</p>
<p><b>Once a card has been placed into his or her hand, the offense is no longer Looking at Extra Cards.</b></p>	<p>一旦将牌放进手中，该牌手的犯规便不会是额外看牌。</p>
<p>As mentioned before, there is a big difference — from an infraction standpoint — between Looking at Extra Cards and Hidden Card Error. Despite that large difference, the line between Looking at Extra Cards and Hidden Card Error is a bit blurry. This sentence is better read as 'Once a card has been placed into his or her hand, the offense cannot be Looking at Extra Cards. In truth, the infraction stops being Looking at Extra Cards when the cards significantly leave the top of the library.</p>	<p>如前文所述，额外看牌与非公开牌张失误在违规立场上有显著差别。尽管有差别，额外看牌与非公开牌张失误之间的界限仍然有一些模糊不清。这句话最好解读为“一旦将牌放进手中，该牌手的犯规便不能是额外看牌。”事实上，当牌张显著离开牌库顶的时候，违规就不再是额外看牌了。</p>
<p><b>A player is not considered to have looked at extra cards when he or she places a card face down on the table (without looking at the card) in an effort to count out cards.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手为计算牌张数量而将牌张面朝下地置于桌面上（没有看牌），这并不算是额外看牌。</p>
<p>Sometimes players put cards on the table face down before drawing them, for the purpose of counting the cards or for thinking before putting the cards into the hand. This is not forbidden and judges should not penalize it. In this situation the difference is that the player does it intentionally and takes care about not seeing any cards improperly. This statement also applies to the Hidden Card Error infraction.</p>	<p>有时牌手在抓牌前将牌面朝下的置于桌面上以计算数量或在放入手牌前思考。这并不是被禁止的，裁判也不该惩处此类行为。这种情况与额外看牌的不同是，牌手有意识地做出这样的动作，并且小心不会看到任何不该看的牌。在考虑非公开牌张失误时同样应当注意这一点。</p>
<p><b>This penalty is applied only once if one or more cards are seen in the same action or sequence of actions.</b></p>	<p>在同一动作或同一系列动作中看到了一张牌或数张牌，此处罚也只适用一次。</p>
<p>We don't penalize a player for each card seen if all the cards are seen during the same game action or sequence of game actions.</p>	<p>如果这些看到的牌是在同一个或同一系列游戏动作中看到的，我们并不会为每一张看到的牌都惩罚一次牌手。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p>范例</p>

<p><b>A. A player accidentally reveals (drops, flips over) a card while shuffling her opponent's deck.</b></p>	<p>A. 牌手在洗对手套牌时意外地翻开（掉落，翻转）一张牌。</p>
<p><b>B. A player pulls up an extra card while drawing from his deck.</b></p>	<p>B. 牌手抓牌时多带起了一张牌。</p>
<p><b>C. A player sees the bottom card of her deck when presenting it to her opponent for cutting/shuffling.</b></p>	<p>C. 牌手在将套牌给对手洗或切时看到了牌库底的牌。</p>
<p>Example B, this last update, was the victim of an unfortunate editing error. Please consider 'pulls' up, as 'lifts up, but not so much that it could reasonable be considered separate from the library'. Other examples could be: A player flips over an extra card while resolving a cascade ability. A player flips over extra cards when milling his or her deck, and this is noticed immediately.</p>	<p>这次更新的例子 B 很不幸是编辑错误的结果。请将“带起”理解为“将牌拿起，但没有达到应视为离开牌库的距离”。其他一些例子：牌手在结算倾曳异能时多翻开了一张牌。牌手在磨牌库时额外翻开一张牌，并立刻发现。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p>原则</p>
<p><b>A player can accidentally look at extra cards easily and this infraction handles situations where a dexterity or rules error has led to a player seeing cards they shouldn't have.</b></p>	<p>牌手容易不慎看到多余的牌。此违规用于处理牌手因手脚笨拙或规则失误导致其看到本不应看到之牌张的情况。</p>
<p>Players touch their decks a lot. They touch to shuffle, they touch to draw, they touch to search. And every time a deck is touched, there is the possibility that you are going to see something you shouldn't. Since it is easy to do, easy to notice, and easy to fix, a Warning is the appropriate penalty.</p>	<p>牌手经常接触他们的套牌。他们洗牌、抓牌、搜寻牌库时都会接触套牌。每当牌手接触套牌时，都有一定概率看到不该看到的东西。鉴于此行为容易发生，容易发现也容易修正，警告是恰当的处罚。</p>
<p><b>Once those cards have joined another set, the infraction is handled as a Hidden Card Error or Game Rule Violation.</b></p>	<p>一旦相关牌张已加入其他牌叠中，便应按照“非公开牌张失误”或“违反游戏规则”来处理此违规。</p>
<p>We all know that drawing is different from looking but sometimes the line is not easy to see. The line here is when the card we are looking at is added to another set of cards, either the hand, or seven other cards from dig through time. Keep in mind that for this infraction, we do allow you to use your judgement a bit when it comes to "I meant to pick up one card and instead I picked up two." That's not "adding to a set" just yet.</p>	<p>我们都知道抓牌不同于看牌，但是有时他们的界限并不容易区分。界限在于额外看到的牌是否加入了其他牌叠。这个牌叠可能是手牌，也可能是历时挖掘看到的其他 7 张牌。当你处理这类违规时请牢记，在判断“我本想拿起一张牌时拿起了两张牌”这类情形时你可以使用你的判断力。仅凭这一点还不能算是“加入了牌叠”。</p>
<p><b>Players should not use this penalty to get a "free shuffle" or to attempt to shuffle away cards they don't want to draw; doing so may be Unsporting Conduct — Cheating.</b></p>	<p>牌手不应该利用此处罚来得到“免费洗牌”，或是企图将不想抓的牌洗到别处去；如此会被视为是“举止违背运动道德~作弊”。</p>
<p>This point involves judge ability to understand if a</p>	<p>判断这一点需要裁判具有阅读牌手是否在说谎的</p>

<p>player is lying. Some players know that the additional fix for Looking at Extra Cards is a shuffle, so they might “accidentally” peek at a card in order to try to get a shuffle. This is Cheating, and helps to emphasize the point that we need to determine if there are any known cards before we apply the additional fix. When you arrive at the table ask both players some questions to get a sense of what is really happening.</p>	<p>能力。有些牌手知道额外看牌的额外修正是洗牌，所以他们可能会“不小心”偷看到一张牌以试图获得洗牌。这是作弊，并且这也强调了我们在进行额外修正前确定是否有已知的牌。当你到达桌前时，问双方牌手一些问题以了解实际发生了什么事情。</p>
<p><b>Players also are not allowed to use this penalty as a stalling mechanism.</b></p>	<p>牌手也不应该将此处罚当做拖延的手段。</p>
<p>Shuffling a deck requires some time, and players know this. As judges we must prevent players taking advantage of the time limit and understand when a player is trying to do that. This is also considered cheating, but will be very hard to discover. If it is close to the end of the round, stick around and watch if you suspect this may be the case.</p>	<p>洗牌库需要一定的时间，而牌手们知道这点。作为裁判我们必须防止牌手用这个判罚来获得时间优势，并在牌手试图这么干的时候发现他的意图。这也算作作弊，但是很难被发现。如果本轮时间快到了，而且你怀疑很有可能属于这种情况，你应当留在附近观察。</p>
<p><b>The deck is already randomized, so shuffling in the revealed cards should not involve excessive effort.</b></p>	<p>由于套牌都已经充分随机化，所以将展示的牌洗回去并不会造成太大的影响。</p>
<p>This means that the player doesn’t have to waste time by shuffling as he or she would for the pregame procedure. A few mash shuffles or 3-5 riffle shuffles should be sufficient. The purpose is to “lose” the seen cards in the deck.</p>	<p>这意味着牌手不用在洗牌时像进行游戏前流程时一样大费周章。几次插洗或 3-5 次鸽尾式洗牌（扑克牌洗法）就足够了。其目的是让被看见的牌在牌库中“失踪”。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p>进一步的修正</p>
<p><b>Shuffle the random portion of the deck, including any previously unknown cards that were accidentally seen.</b></p>	<p>牌手必须将套牌已随机化的部份洗牌，包括所有先前不知道但不小心被看到的牌。</p>
<p>See IPG 1.3 on the details on how to randomize a deck. But a summary is: figure out what cards are legally know from things like scry or cascade, and, leaving those cards where they are supposed to be, shuffle any cards left over. If the cards accidentally seen were previously known (like from Brainstorm) you don’t have to do this.</p>	<p>关于如何随机化套牌，参见 IPG 1.3 节。总的来说，确定牌库中有哪些牌是牌手合法知道的（例如因为占卜或倾曳异能所致），并且将这些部分放在他们应当在的位置，然后将剩余的部分洗牌。如果额外看到的牌本身就是合法知道的（例如因脑力激荡所致），则无需做此修正。</p>
<p><b>2.3 Hidden Card Error</b></p>	<p><b>2.3 非公开牌张失误</b></p>
<p>Penalty</p>	<p>处罚</p>
<p>Warning</p>	<p>警告</p>

DEFINITION	定义
<p><b>A player commits an error in the game that cannot be corrected by only publicly available information and does so without his or her opponent's permission.</b></p>	<p>牌手在游戏中发生失误,但此类失误仅凭可公开获知的信息无法修正,且牌手进行触犯此失误的行动时未得到对手的许可。</p>
<p>Most Game Play Errors can be observed by both players. The window might be small, but it's visible. Failing to discard a card, casting a spell for the wrong mana; these are things you can see. All the information is out in the open. This isn't an infraction for those type of errors. This is for when an error occurs and at the point of the error, the opponent has lost the ability to detect how things went wrong, and has no insight into how to fix the game.</p>	<p>绝大多数的游戏行动失误对双方牌手都是可见的。有时发现错误的时机可能很短,但仍然存在可见的时机。例如忘记弃牌、支付错误的法术力施放咒语等;这些都是能看到的部分。信息是公开的。这项违规不是关于这类失误的。这项违规适用于在失误发生时对手没有能力察觉什么地方出了问题,也无法知晓如何修正游戏状态的一类失误。</p>
<p>Now, the second clause of that sentence talks about the opponent's permission. In that case, the opponent is given warning that something is about to go wrong, and agrees to the action. In this case, we do not want to overly penalize the player as the error was 'visible' to both players, or incentivize the opponent to "agree" to an action that will get his opponent a harsher penalty. In that case, consider a Game Rule Violation instead.</p>	<p>这句话的后半段提到了对手的许可。所谓对手的许可,是指对手本应察觉到有些事情会出错,但却同意了牌手做出了错误的行动。这一句是想要表明,我们不应因为双方牌手都可以“看到”失误的发生而过分惩罚牌手,也不应鼓励牌手故意”允许“某些行动发生,以期对手获得更加严厉的判罚。因此,在此情况下我们应该考虑违反游戏规则,而不是非公开牌张失误。</p>
<p><b>This infraction only applies when a card whose identity is known to only one player is in a hidden set of cards both before and after the error.</b></p>	<p>仅在只有一位牌手知晓内容之牌张在发生失误前后均处于非公开牌叠当中的情况下,此违规才适用。</p>
<p>In this case, hidden locations are the hand, the library, face down cards on the battlefield and face down cards in exile. Unknown cards are when one or more of the players don't know what the cards are. Note that the identity of the top card of the library is unknown, but the location of the top card is public, something that isn't always obvious, so a tutor effect that searches for a specific card and puts it on top of the library is putting the card into a "known" position.</p>	<p>我们这里说的“非公开位置”指的是手牌、牌库、战场上牌面朝下的牌、以及放逐区中牌面朝下的牌。未知牌张指的是一个或多个牌手不知道这些牌是什么。注意其中一点,牌库顶牌是什么属于未知的信息,但牌库顶牌的位置是双方都知道的。因此,一个搜寻特定牌并将其放在牌库顶的导师效应是将该牌放到了一个“已知”的位置。</p>
<p><b>A set is a physically distinct group defined by a game rule or effect. It may correspond to a specific zone, or may only represent a part of a zone.</b></p>	<p>所谓牌叠,是指由游戏规则或效应规定,有显著区隔的牌张组合。牌叠此概念可能对应某一特定区域,也可能只包含某一区域当中的一部分。</p>
<p>This is specifically referring to cards which instruct a player to manipulate or look at cards in a hidden zone. Examples of this are the cards looked at when Anticipate resolves, or when Dig Through Time resolves. In both of these cases the set is the number</p>	<p>这个定义特别指代的是指示牌手操纵或检视隐藏区域时涉及的一系列牌。例如在预先考虑或历时挖掘结算时所检视的那些牌。在这两个例子中,牌叠便是正在被操纵或抓起的数张牌。</p>

of cards being manipulated or drawn.	
<b>This infraction does not apply to simple dexterity errors, such as when a card being pulled off the library sticks to another card and is seen or knocked off the library. The cards themselves must be part of a distinct set.</b>	此违规不适用于单纯因手脚笨拙导致的失误,例如从牌库抽取牌张时不慎粘连或碰翻其他牌张而看到牌面等情况。此违规仅针对处于有显著区隔之牌叠中的牌张本身。
These lines are here to give a distinction between when a player action should be considered Hidden Card Error versus Looking at Extra Cards. If we go back to Dig Through Time as an example, if a player resolving this spell looks at eight cards rather than seven, we have the wrong number in the set. This is Hidden Card Error, as the set contains a card it should not, and that set is hidden. If, however, during the resolution of Dig Through Time, a player looks at seven cards, but knocks the eighth card off the deck while picking up those seven, then that eighth card is not a part of the set, and should be treated as a Looking at Extra Cards infraction.	这句话是用来区分牌手的行为是属于非公开牌张失误还是额外看牌的。我们再拿历时挖掘举个例子,如果牌手在结算该咒语时检视了八张而不是七张牌,牌叠中的牌数量便是不正确的。这就是非公开牌张失误,因为牌叠中有一张牌是不应该在这个牌叠中的,且该牌叠是非公开的。然而,如果在历时挖掘结算过程中,牌手检视了七张牌,却不小心在拿起这七张牌时把第八张牌碰掉了,那么这第八张牌便不是牌叠的一部分,且应该使用额外看牌处理该违规。
Additionally, if I go to scry one card, and I accidentally pick up two, I have potentially committed Looking at Extra Cards. This line does require a bit of common sense, as defining an exact technical line between Hidden Card Error and Looking at Extra Cards is problematic.	进一步说,如果我应该占卜一张牌,却不小心拿起了两张牌,我可能也犯下了额外看牌。由于定义非公开牌张失误和额外看牌之间的明确界限可能会带来更大的问题,判断这两个违规的界限需要一定的常识判断力。
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<b>范例</b>
<b>A. A player draws four cards after casting Ancestral Recall.</b>	<b>A. 牌手施放 Ancestral Recall 之后抓了四张牌。</b>
<b>B. A player scries two cards when he should only have scried one.</b>	<b>B. 牌手在只该占卜一张牌的情况下占卜了两张牌。</b>
<b>C. A player resolves a Dark Confidant trigger, but forgets to reveal the card before putting it into her hand.</b>	<b>C. 牌手结算了黑暗亲信/Dark Confidant 的触发,但在将牌张置入手中之前忘了展示。</b>
<b>D. A player has more cards in his hand than can be accounted for.</b>	<b>D. 牌手的手牌数量比其应有的数量多。</b>
<b>E. A player casts Anticipate and picks up the top four cards of her library.</b>	<b>E. 牌手施放预先考虑/Anticipate, 并拿起了其牌库顶的四张牌。</b>
<b>F. A player, going first, draws for his turn.</b>	<b>F. 先手的牌手在第一回合开始时抓了牌。</b>
Some of these examples look like the infraction Looking at Extra Cards. The important distinction is that if a player ends up with more cards than they are supposed to, either in their hand, or in a set of cards	其中的一些范例看起来很像额外看牌。关键的区别在于牌手得到了较应得数目为多的牌(不论是手牌还是他们将要执行动作的一堆牌),违规便应当是非公开牌张失误。如果牌手只是翻起了、或因为手



<p>they are performing an action on, then it falls under the Hidden Card Error infraction. If they've only seen one or more extra cards because the card has been flipped over or some other dexterity issue that reveals a card to the player then treat the infraction as Looking at Extra Cards.</p>	<p>脚笨拙导致看到了一张或多张牌,按照额外看牌处理违规。</p>
<p>Example C only applies if the player remembers the Dark Confidant trigger and doesn't reveal the card before putting the card into their hand. If the player draws for the turn before remembering, it's treated as a missed trigger.</p>	<p>例子 C 只在牌手记得黑暗亲信的触发,但却在将牌放进手里之前没有展示时才是非公开牌张失误。如果牌手在想起触发之前就先抓了本回合的牌,这属于遗漏触发。</p>
<p>Example F looks an awful lot like it might fall under Mulligan Procedure Error, but it does not because the error occurs after the game has begun. Drawing a card on the opening turn while on the play is an example of adding a card that should not be added to a hidden zone, and thus falls under Hidden Card Error.</p>	<p>例子 F 看起来非常像再调度失误,但却并不是。因为失误发生在游戏已经开始之后。在你先手时抓了第一回合的牌是一个将不应该加入隐藏区域的牌加入其中的例子,因此它应该是非公开牌张失误。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>Though the game state cannot be reversed to the 'correct' state, this error can be mitigated by giving the opponent sufficient knowledge and ability to offset the error so that it is less likely to generate advantage.</b></p>	<p>虽然犯下此失误之后,没有办法将游戏状态倒回至“正确”的状态,但此类失误也有弥补之法,即是让对手充分获取信息,依其意愿来减轻失误造成的影响,从而使牌手较难从中渔利。</p>
<p>The player with the extra cards has gained information, and that information has been potentially commingled with other cards. Being able to see other information you aren't supposed to and potentially make decisions or take action on the information or use those resources (cards) is a big deal. We can't fix it. But we can mitigate it. Your opponent couldn't witness the error. But by allowing the opponent to participate in the fix, we eliminate any advantage gained from the error, and still provide a strong incentive not to attempt to cheat.</p>	<p>多牌的牌手获得了不应有的信息,并且这个信息可能和其他牌的信息混在一起。能够看到你不应看到的信息、且可能基于这个信息作出决定、采取行动或使用这些资源(牌)是一件大事。我们无法修正信息的获取,但我们可以抵消它带来的影响。虽然对手没有见到错误发生的时刻,但我们可以让对手参与到修正中,来阻止因违规带来的优势,与此同时还能有效地鼓励牌手不要试图作弊。</p>
<p><b>If cards are placed into a public zone, then their order is known and the infraction can be handled as a Game Rule Violation.</b></p>	<p>如果牌张被置入公开区域,这样就能够知晓其顺序,之后便可依照“违反游戏规则”处理此违规。</p>
<p>If cards are revealed for something like a mill effect, where both players can see what's happening, the infraction isn't Hidden Card Error, because the cards aren't hidden. For a mill effect, order is not lost. The information is revealed to everyone and order is maintained. Sounds like all players have all the</p>	<p>如果涉及到的牌是被展示出来的(例如磨牌库),双方牌手都能看到发生了什么,那么违规就不是非公开牌张失误,因为这些牌不是非公开的。对于磨牌库效应来说,顺序还没有乱,信息展示给了所有牌手,顺序也能确定,因此所有牌手都有相同的信息,裁判也不用担心其中一位牌手比另一位获得了</p>

<p>knowledge, and the judge doesn't have to worry about one player having information the other doesn't. In this case, go to the Game Rule Violation infraction.</p>	<p>更多的信息。在此情况下，使用违反游戏规则这项违规。</p>
<p><b>Order cannot be determined from card faces only visible to one player unless the card is in a uniquely identifiable position (such as on top of the library, or as the only card in hand.)</b></p>	<p>如果仅有一位牌手能看到牌面，便无法确定牌张之顺序，但牌张处于可唯一辨识之位置时（例如牌库顶、手上唯一的一张手牌）除外。</p>
<p>This sentence is in here to prevent arguments about which card was the extra card drawn, or what the third card picked up on a scry 2 was. Unless it was visible to both players, you have to treat the cards like they were mixed up. Note, this is different from some cases of Looking at Extra Cards, where the cards are still being separated from the library where there is a clear order. The line between Looking at Extra Cards and Hidden Card Error is when the cards leave the library and the card faces are only visible to one player.</p>	<p>这句话是用来防止牌手争论哪张是额外抓的牌、或占卜 2 时看到的第三张牌是哪张。除非这张牌对双方牌手都可见，否则你必须将这些牌视为混在一起。注意，这与额外看牌的一些情形（牌在与牌库离开了一定距离的情况下仍然保持了清楚的顺序）有区别。额外看牌与非公开牌张失误的界限在于牌是否离开了牌库并且其牌面只对其中一个牌手可见。</p>
<p><b>Be careful not to apply this infraction in situations where a publicly-correctable error subsequently leads to an uncorrectable situation such as a Brainstorm cast using green mana. In these situations, the infraction is based on that root cause.</b></p>	<p>但应注意，如果是原本可通过公开方式修正的失误引致无法修复之状况的情形（例如利用绿色法术力来施放脑力激荡/<b>Brainstorm</b>），不要适用此违规。应根据这类情形的根本原因来适用对应的违规。</p>
<p>Look at the root cause. Just because we are now in a spot where information has been lost doesn't mean we started out this way. Another example would be the case of casting Elvish Visionary for UU, and then the player draws a card when the enters the battlefield trigger resolves. Once that card is drawn, that information is lost, but the original problem was the casting of the spell incorrectly and visible to both players.</p>	<p>寻找根本原因。即使现在信息已经泄露，也并不意味着问题的原因是由信息的泄露造成的。另一个例子是使用 UU 施放了妖精幻视师，然后牌手因其进战场触发抓了一张牌。一旦这张牌抓起来了，信息便泄露了，但造成问题的原因是不正确地施放了咒语，而这个原因是双方牌手都可见的。</p>
<p><b>Information about cards previously known by the opponent, such as cards previously revealed while on the top of the deck or by a previous look at the hand, may be taken into account while determining the set of cards to which the remedy applies.</b></p>	<p>对手已知的牌张信息，诸如先前在牌库顶展示过的牌、或检视过的手牌，可以在确定应当修正的牌叠内容时加以考虑。</p>
<p>Even though the contents of a previously revealed hand are not public information, the knowledge of those cards, when agreed upon by both players (such as from notes taken about the hand) may be useful in reconstructing as correct a game state as possible. There is a "may" here, however. If there is doubt or disagreement about what has been revealed some</p>	<p>即使先前展示的内容并非公开信息，对这些牌张的双方牌手都同意的知晓（例如根据手牌内容做的笔记）在尽可能地修复游戏状态时可能会有所帮助。但是，这里有一个“可以”。一旦牌手对先前几个回合展示了什么产生了怀疑或不一致，你又不能确认该部分牌叠的正确性，你仍然可以将整个牌叠作为应修正的部分进行修正。</p>

<p>turns back, and you aren't confident that the set is correct, you may treat the entire set as the grouping to which to apply the remedy.</p>	
<p><b>Always operate on the smallest set possible to remedy the error. This may mean applying the remedy to only part of a set defined by an instruction. For example, if a player resolves <i>Collected Company</i>, picks up three cards with one hand and then four cards with the other, the card causing the infraction is part of the set of four cards and should be removed from there.</b></p>	<p>在修正此失误时,应始终尽量从牌张数量最少的牌叠入手。这可能意味着仅对叙述规定之牌叠一部适用修正。举例来说,如果某牌手在结算征召军伍/<i>Collected Company</i> 时用一只手拿起了三张牌,再用另一只手拿起了四张牌,则引致此违规的牌张便是四张牌的这部分牌叠,应从该处移除牌张。</p>
<p>This section really just enforces that we use common sense to restore the game without too much disruption. In the example given, the player should have looked at six cards on resolution, but looked at seven. Because of the physical way that action was performed, however, it is clear that the first three cards were correct and maintained a clear distance from the other, physically distinct set of four cards. This allows us to apply the fix to that smaller set (four cards versus seven) without advantage gained or lost unduly. Be sure to gain a full understanding of the actions taken with the cards in question before determining if a smaller set will be appropriate (ensure sets didn't touch or mingle).</p>	<p>这一部分再次强调了我们应该使用常识判断力来尽量恢复游戏状态,减少对游戏的干扰。在上述的例子中,牌手在结算时应该检视六张牌却检视了七张。但是,由于牌手执行该指示使用了这样的动作,我们可以明确前三张牌是正确的、且与其他四张牌保持了清晰的距离。因此我们可以对一个较小的牌叠执行修正,又不会有牌手因此获得或失去利益。请确保你在决定是否对较小的牌叠执行修正前,完全理解牌手使用的动作(保证牌叠之间没有接触或混淆)。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>In cases where the infraction was immediately followed by moving a card from the affected set to a known location, such as by discarding, putting cards on top of the library, or playing a land, a simple backup to the point just after the error may be performed.</b></p>	<p>如果属于违规发生后会立即将牌张从相关牌叠移至已知位置,例如弃牌、将牌置于牌库顶或是使用地,则可以简易倒回至错误刚发生的时点。</p>
<p>This portion of the remedy exists so that the actions taken to mitigate advantage may be applied to all of the cards that should have been involved. A simple backup allows for the set of affected cards to be reconstructed in order for the game to be restored as fairly as possible. This type of action is most likely to arise when a player mistakenly puts too many cards directly into their hand, then makes a play or completes some other action before realizing the error has occurred. In this case, consider the benefits of that simple backup before applying the remedy, so that the card set is as correct as possible. This is not a</p>	<p>这部分修正可以让接下来抵消牌手潜在获利的修正尽量应用于所有受影响的牌张。简易倒回可以修复应当修正的牌叠,使得游戏状态的修复尽可能地公平。这种情况通常发生于牌手错误地多抓了牌,然后在意识到错误之前又做了其他游戏动作。此时应当在应用修正之前先考虑简易倒回,使得应修正的牌叠尽可能地正确。这并不是倒回到错误发生之前,请记住,这个倒回是用来让非公开牌张失误接下来的修正更加正确的,而不是倒回到非公开牌张失误发生之前的。</p>

<p>backup to before the error, though, so make sure it is used to restore the set for which the remedy of Hidden Card Error is applied, not to backup to before the Hidden Card Error happened.</p>	
<p>An example of this would be if someone draws 4 cards from a Brainstorm, puts 2 cards on top of their library, then the error is detected. We will return those two cards to the hand before applying any other fix.</p>	<p>举个例子，某牌手脑力激荡抓了 4 张牌，然后在牌库顶放了两张牌，然后才发现了失误。我们应当先将这两张牌放回手牌，再应用其他修正。</p>
<p><b>If the set of cards that contained the problem no longer exists, there is no remedy to be applied.</b></p>	<p>如果存在问题之牌叠已不存在，则无需应用修正。</p>
<p>If, during a series of game actions, the affected set of cards has been lost by shuffling them away, and the set cannot reasonably be reconstructed, then there is no set left to which we can apply the remedy. The infraction still exists in this case, and a penalty issued.</p>	<p>如果，在一系列的游戏动作之中，受影响的牌叠已经被洗走而不存在，那么这个牌叠便无法还原，因此便不再存在可以应用修正的牌叠。尽管如此，违规仍然存在，我们仍然要给予判罚。</p>
<p><b>If the error put cards into a set prematurely and other operations involving cards in the set should have been performed first, the player reveals the set of cards that contains the excess and his or her opponent chooses a number of previously-unknown cards. Put those cards aside until the point at which they should have been legally added, then return them to the set.</b></p>	<p>如果错误属于未进行本应对相关牌叠中的牌张执行其他行动的情况下，便先行将牌张置入该牌叠中的情形，则该牌手展示包含过量牌张的牌叠，其对手从中选出先前未知的牌张。将这些选出的牌张放在一旁，直到进行到他们应能合乎规则地加入牌叠之后，再将他们移回牌叠。</p>
<p>This is really saying that you can address a complicated situation such as that of “looting” instead of “rummaging.” If a card gave an instruction such as ‘discard a card: draw a card,’ but the player resolves ‘draw a card, then discard a card,’ then we have this remedy available. Since the hand now contains a card that shouldn’t be there, but a discard still needs to occur. Since one route to advantage here is the ability to discard the card just drawn, we allow the opponent to identify the card “to be drawn,” and set it aside before applying the remedy. Then, once the remedy has been applied, we return the card to the hand/set, and continue from there.</p>	<p>这句话是告诉你如何解决诸如应当“掠夺”时却执行了“翻拣”这种复杂的问题。如果一张牌指示牌手“弃一张牌：抓一张牌”，但牌手结算的是“抓一张牌，然后弃一张牌”，我们就应该使用这种修正方式，因为手牌中现在包含了一张不应在其中的牌，但我们仍然要弃一张牌。因为如果让牌手现在弃掉刚抓的牌可能就会带来优势，我们现在让对手来确认哪张牌是“应当抓起来的”，然后在执行修正之前将其放在一旁。等修正完成之后，我们将这张牌放回原来的手牌/牌叠，然后从此继续。</p>
<p><b>If the set contains more cards than it is supposed to contain, the player reveals the set of cards that contains the excess and his or her opponent chooses a number of previously-unknown cards sufficient to reduce the set to the correct size. The cards chosen are treated as excess cards (see below.)</b></p>	<p>如果牌叠中包含的牌张数量较其应有数量为多，则该牌手向对手展示包含过量牌张的牌叠，其对手从中选出适量之先前未知的牌张，修正牌叠中的牌张数量。选出的牌便属于过量牌张。（请参见下文。）</p>
<p>This is the commonly termed “Thoughtseize” fix. The player with too many cards in the set reveals that set</p>	<p>通常把这种修正方式称为“攫取思绪”修正。牌叠中多了牌的牌手将该牌叠展示给对手，然后由对手</p>

<p>to the opponent, and they choose which card is to be the “excess card(s).” This allows the game to continue while offsetting the very large advantage of an extra card or cards being in hand or another set. What we do with these excess cards is discussed below. If this seems like a large drawback, recall that this used to be dealt with by issuing a Game Loss, so this remedy still allows for the game to proceed, while mitigating that large potential advantage. If it still seems like a large drawback, don’t put extra cards in your hand.</p>	<p>来选择哪张是“多余的牌”。这样做可以让游戏继续进行，又不至于让多了牌的牌手获得巨大的优势。下面会讲到我们会如何处理这些多余的牌。如果你认为这个负面影响很大，想想看在以前这类违规对应的判罚是一盘负，而这种处理方式在抵消了巨大的潜在优势的同时，还能允许游戏继续。如果你还是觉得负面影响太大，那就别多抓牌啊。</p>
<p><b>If the error involves one or more cards that were supposed to be revealed, the player reveals the set of cards that contains the unrevealed cards and his or her opponent chooses that many previously-unknown cards. Treat those as the unrevealed cards for any required actions. If the cards chosen would not legally be in the set as a result, they are treated as excess cards.</b></p>	<p>如果错误涉及原本应展示而如今未展示的一张或数张牌张，则该牌手展示包含未展示之牌张的牌叠，其对手从中选出等量之先前未知的牌张。如有其他后续行动，这些选出的牌张视同未展示。若这些牌张原本就无法合乎规则地包含在相应牌叠中，则他们便属于过量牌张。</p>
<p>This is, essentially, the same remedy as mentioned directly above, only this time the cards are not, by default, excess. It allows for cards put into a hidden zone whose characteristics should have been checked before they moved to that zone. An example of this is Domri Rade’s 1st ability, which reads “+1: Look at the top card of your library. If it’s a creature card, you may reveal it and put it into your hand.” If the card is put into the hand without being revealed, we can remedy that by revealing the unknown set (this case, the hand) and allowing the opponent to choose which card should be treated as the “revealed card(s).” This doesn’t always lead to those cards being treated as excess cards, but it may, depending on the required actions. If, for instance, the opponent chooses a non-creature card in that Domri example, that card no longer fits legally in the set (the hand) and should be treated as an excess card. If the opponent chose a creature, however, then it belongs legally in the set, and remains in the hand.</p>	<p>这一条跟上面那条提到的基本上是一样的处理方式，但唯一的不同是，这一条中提到的牌不是多余的。一些异能使得牌在进入隐藏区域之前，先验证牌的某些特征，例如多密雷德的第一个异能：“+1：检视你的牌库顶牌。如果它是生物牌，你可以展示之并将其放入手中。”如果该牌未经展示便放进了手中，我们可以展示未知牌叠（在这个例子里就是手牌）然后让对手从中选择“应当展示的牌”来进行修正。这并不一定会导致这些牌被视为多余的牌，这取决于对手的选择。在上面的多密例子中，如果对手选择了一张非生物牌，那么这张牌便无法合乎规则地属于这个牌叠（手牌）并应当视为多余的牌。如果对手选择了一张生物牌，那么，这张牌便可以合法的属于这个牌叠，并且留在手牌中。</p>
<p>Now there are two other neat situations this paragraph gives us. If the player reveals their hand and all the cards are creature cards, nothing gets shuffled away. The next neat part deals with the ‘Treat those as the (un)revealed cards for any required action.’ Let’s say I drew a card from Dark Confidant and I didn’t reveal it, or lose the life. When I reveal my hand, my opponent will choose which card was the</p>	<p>这一段还有两个很合理的细节。如果牌手展示了其手牌，其中全部都是生物牌，那么就没有牌会被洗走。另一部分说明了如何处理“将这些牌视为未展示（应当展示）的牌来进行必需的行动”。例如我因黑暗亲信抓了一张牌，却没有展示它，也没有失去生命。当我展示手牌时，对手将从中选择一张本应展示的牌，然后我会根据对手的选择失去相应的生命。</p>

<p>card that was supposed to be revealed, and I will lose the life based on that choice.</p>	
<p><b>Excess cards are returned to the correct zone. If that zone is the library, they should be shuffled into the random portion. The player does not repeat the instruction or partial instruction (if any) that caused the infraction.</b></p>	<p>将过量牌张移回其原本所处区域。如果将移回的区域为牌库，则应将其洗回随机的部分。牌手不再重复执行导致此失误之全部或部分规则叙述(若有)。</p>
<p>This line just tells us exactly what we do with those cards from above that have been determined to be excess. Once excess cards have been identified, and other remedies as spelled out above dictate, we return the excess cards to the zone they came from. If that zone is the library, we do this by shuffling them into the random portion. It's important to note that this is not followed by repeating the action that caused the infraction. If the player drew an extra card, for instance, then had that card identified by the opponent through the remedies above, once the card has been returned to the proper zone, we don't repeat that draw.</p>	<p>最后这句话告诉我们如何处理那些先前被判定为多余的牌张。一旦我们确定了多余的牌张是什么，且其他的修正都已完成，我们就将这些多余的牌张返回它们原本的区域。如果该区域是牌库，我们将其洗入牌库的随机部分。很重要的一点，是在此之后，不会再重复进行造成违规的游戏行动。例如牌手多抓了一张牌。一旦通过以上的修正方式确定了多余的牌并将其返回原本区域之后，我们不会再重复这次抓牌。</p>
<p><b>Upgrade: If a face-down card cast using a morph ability is discovered during the game to not have a morph ability, the penalty is a Game Loss. If the player has one or more cards with a morph ability in hand, has not added cards to his or her hand since casting the card found in violation, and has discovered the error themselves, the upgrade does not apply and they may swap the card for a card with the morph ability in hand.</b></p>	<p>升级: 如果曾以变身异能施放之牌面朝下的牌张在游戏过程中发现实际上不具变身异能, 则处罚为一盘负。如果牌手手上有一张或数张具变身异能的牌, 而且自施放引致违规之牌张后未曾将其他牌张加入手牌, 同时又是自己发现的失误, 则不适用此升级, 可将手上任一此类牌张与此引致违规之牌张交换。</p>
<p>In all but a very few cases, Magic is set up so that both players can see what is going on. Both players are responsible for the game. If you pay the wrong mana for a spell, I can see that. If you put more counters on a creature, I can also see that. When it comes to accidentally casting a card as though it had the morph ability the opponent cannot verify that the face down card has morph. For example, playing a Highland Game thinking it is a Temur Charger is an upgraded Hidden Card Error.</p>	<p>除了极少数情况下, 万智牌对局中双方牌手都能知道游戏中发生了什么事。双方牌手都需要为游戏负责。如果你错误地支付了咒语的法术力, 我能看见。如果你在生物上放了过多的指示物, 我也能看见。但当你不小心施放了一张没有变身异能的牌时, 我是没法判断出来这张牌是否具有变身异能的。例如, 把高地猎物当做铁木尔战马 morph 施放属于应当升级的非公开牌张失误。</p>
<p>We also now have a specific option to ignore this upgrade if the player discovers it themselves and hasn't had any opportunity to add cards to their hand since casting the card. If these conditions are met, rather than upgrading to a game loss, we issue the normal warning and swap the 2 cards.</p>	<p>我们现在也有了明确的选项可以忽略这个升级。如果牌手自行发现了错误, 并且在施放这张牌之后还没有任何机会将牌放入手中, 我们就可以如常给以警告, 并将两张牌进行交换, 而不应用升级。</p>

<b>2.4 Mulligan Procedure Error</b>	<b>2.4 再调度失误</b>
Penalty	处罚
Warning	警告
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player makes an error during the mulligan process. This infraction does not apply to errors made once pre-game procedures are complete.</b>	牌手于再调度流程中出现失误。游戏前程序已完成后再发生的失误便不再适用此违规。
While this infraction is called Mulligan Procedure Error, it can apply before any mulligans have been taken. Most of the errors are listed in the examples. Once all the pre-game procedures are complete, any other error is going to be a different infraction, drawing a card when on the play is a Hidden Card Error for example.	虽然这个违规称作再调度失误,它也可能会在没有人执行再调度之前发生。大多数的失误情形都列举在了范例中。一旦所有的游戏前流程进行完毕,所有的失误就应当是其他的违规,例如在先手的第一回合抓了牌就属于非公开牌张失误。
<b>Trivial process errors that provide no advantage, such as declaring an intent to mulligan early, are not an infraction.</b>	流程细节上的失误如不会带来优势(例如提前表明再调度之意图),便不属违规。
Try not to overthink this infraction. If a player does something wrong that isn't listed in the examples, compare the impact of that error and decide if it's trivial or not.	应用此违规时不要想得太多。如果牌手犯下了没有在例子中列举的失误,与例子进行对比,来判断该失误是否属于细节上的失误。
Examples: •A player on the draw declares that they will keep before the player on the play •One player puts a Leyline onto the battlefield before their opponent finishes their mulligans	例如: •后手牌手在先手牌手之前宣布保留起手 •牌手在对手完成再调度之前,将一个地脉放进战场
Technically these are procedural errors, but at this time in the match the impact is very low and should not be treated as an infraction.	技术上来说这属于流程错误,但在对局的这个阶段,这种错误的影响非常小,不应视为违规。
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<b>范例</b>
<b>A. A player draws eight cards at the start of the game (instead of seven).</b>	<b>A. 牌手在游戏开始的时候抓了八张牌(应为七张)。</b>
<b>B. A player draws seven cards at the start of the game (instead of six) after taking a mulligan.</b>	<b>B. 牌手在游戏开始时再调度之后抓了七张牌(应为六张)。</b>
<b>C. A player keeps her hand, sries, then mulligans again.</b>	<b>C. 牌手保留起手,却在占卜之后又进行再调度。</b>
<b>D. A player chooses to not take a mulligan then takes</b>	<b>D. 牌手先选择不进行再调度,后在看见对手再调</b>

<p><b>a mulligan after seeing his opponent choose to take a mulligan.</b></p>	<p>度后也进行再调度。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p>原则</p>
<p><b>Errors prior to the beginning of the game have a less disruptive option—a forced mulligan—that is not available at any other point during the game. However, players should not be incentivized to sit on the infraction until mulligan procedures are completed so that they can ‘discover’ the error at a point where it becomes a Hidden Card Error if they believe that is to their advantage. To encourage the offending player to report their error as early as possible, they are given their choice of remedy before the game begins.</b></p>	<p>较之游戏中的其他时点,在游戏还没开始便发生的失误,还可以采用强制再调度这种影响较小的方式来修正,而其他时点就无法做到这点。然而,不应鼓励牌手因此隐瞒违规,待到完成再调度之后再之后的时点“发现”对手的错误,好让违规演变成“非公开牌张失误”并期望从中获利。为鼓励触犯违规的牌手尽早报告自己失误,在开始游戏之前他们会有机会来选择如何进行修正。</p>
<p>It can be quite easy to make an error in the pre-game procedure, drawing too many cards the most common one, so we give the player the option of either revealing their hand (as with Hidden Card Error) or choosing to mulligan. As they will not be able to choose to mulligan if this is discovered after the start of the game there should be less chance a player will wait until then to discover this error.</p>	<p>在游戏前流程中很容易犯错,其中又以抓多牌为最常见的一种错误。我们让牌手来选择展示其手牌(类似非公开牌张失误的处理方式)或是继续再调度。由于游戏开始之后再发现这个问题的话牌手无法选择再调度,一般来说牌手不会等到游戏开始之后再发现这个错误。</p>
<p><b>If a player looks at the top card of his or her library after taking a mulligan, it is assumed that they have chosen to keep their hand unless they make it very clear that they intend to mulligan again, either verbally before looking or by picking up multiple cards from the top of their deck.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手在进行再调度之后检视了其牌库顶牌,则除非其明确表示希望再调度(在检视之前便口头说明,或再从其牌库顶拿起数张牌),否则便视为其已选择保留起手。</p>
<p>Players who mulligan have the opportunity to effectively Scry 1 after all players have kept their opening hand. It can be very hard for the opponent or a judge to know whether looking at the top card of the library is the player taking that scry or seeing what the next card is going to be before taking another mulligan. If they haven’t said anything, then the default assumption is that they are keeping their hand and are performing the scry action. If they pick up and look at more than one card it should be obvious that they are not keeping their hand.</p>	<p>再调度过的牌手有机会在所有牌手保留起手牌之后占卜1。对手很难判断检视牌库顶的动作是该牌手想要继续调度,还是进行占卜1。如果牌手没有明确说明,默认视为该牌手保留了起手牌,并执行占卜1的动作。如果牌手拿起了多于一张牌,那么显然他没有保留起手牌。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p>进一步的修正</p>
<p><b>If the player has too many cards in hand, he or she may choose to reveal his or her hand, and his or her</b></p>	<p>如果牌手的手牌数量过多,则他可以选择展示其手牌,并让对手从中选择一张洗回牌库。如果所抓的</p>



<p><b>opponent chooses a card from it to be shuffled back into the library. If more than one excess card was drawn (for example, eight cards drawn during a mulligan to 6) his or her opponent continues removing cards until the correct number has been reached.</b></p>	<p>过量牌张多于一张（举例来说，再调度到 6 张之后抓了八张牌），则其对手继续如此从其手上选择牌，直到手牌数量正确为止。</p>
<p><b>If cards are not removed from the hand this way (either due to an error that didn't lead to too many cards, or by the player choosing not to reveal), that player takes an additional mulligan.</b></p>	<p>如果未以此法从手上移除牌张（也许因为出现的失误并非多抓牌，或因为牌手选择不展示），则牌手再进行一次再调度。</p>
<p>If the error were examples C or D, the player does have the correct number of cards in hand, so the only option for the player is to mulligan again. The other examples will result in too many cards, so the player can choose which of the remedies to take. The two options are pretty straightforward: reveal their hand and have the opponent choose the excess cards to shuffle back, or take another mulligan.</p>	<p>如果失误是范例 C 或 D 的情形，牌手手中的牌张数量是正确的，所以唯一的选择是让该牌手再进行一次再调度。其他的例子中牌手的起手牌多了，所以牌手可以选择采用哪种修正方式。这两种选择也非常简单：展示手牌让对手选一张洗回去，或者再进行一次再调度。</p>
<p>Make sure the player knows how many cards to mulligan to. If they mulliganed to 6 but drew 7, they should now be mulliganing to 5. If they mulliganed to 6, scribed, then mulliganed to 5, they should now be mulliganing to 4.</p>	<p>请确认牌手知道他们应该再调度到几张牌。如果他再调度到 6 张却抓了 7 张，他应当再调度到 5 张。如果他再调度到 6，占卜 1，然后又再调度到 5，他应当再调度到 4 张。</p>
<p><b>Players may continue taking mulligans after the remedy has been completed.</b></p>	<p>牌手可在完成修正后继续进行再调度。</p>
<p>Whichever remedy is performed, if the player still doesn't like their hand they can continue the mulliganing process.</p>	<p>无论采用哪种修正，如果牌手仍然对起手牌不满意，他仍然可以继续再调度。</p>
<p><b>2.5 Game Rule Violation</b></p>	<p><b>2.5 违反游戏规则</b></p>
<p>Penalty</p>	<p>处罚</p>
<p>Warning</p>	<p>警告</p>
<p><b>DEFINITION</b></p>	<p>定义</p>
<p><b>This infraction covers the majority of game situations in which a player makes an error or fails to follow a game procedure correctly. It handles violations of the Comprehensive Rules that are not covered by the other Game Play Errors.</b></p>	<p>此违规涵盖了大多数关于牌手发生失误，或是没有正确的执行游戏程序而造成的游戏状况。这也用来处理违反完整规则、且未包含在其他游戏行动失误中的违规。</p>
<p>"Game Rule Violation" does not refer to any particular type of error. Rather, Game Rule Violations are</p>	<p>“违反游戏规则”不指代任何特定类型的错误。然而，违反游戏规则明确定义为所有不能归类为其他</p>

specifically defined as errors that aren't another infraction. Newer judges will sometimes talk about how "mis-resolving a spell" is a Game Rule Violation. In actuality, resolving a spell improperly could result in one of several different infractions, such as Looking at Extra Cards (e.g. forgetting that Courser of Kruphix left the battlefield) to Hidden Card Error (e.g. mis-reading Divination and drawing three cards).	违规的错误。新裁判有时会讨论“错误地结算一个咒语”是否应当是违反游戏规则。事实上，不正确的结算咒语可能会导致另一些违规，像是额外看牌（如忘记了克罗芬斯的骏马已经离开战场）及非公开牌张失误（看错了卜卦的叙述而抓了 3 张牌）等。
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	范例
<b>A. A player casts Wrath of God for 3W (actual cost 2WW).</b>	<b>A. 牌手支付{三}{白}来施放神之愤怒/Wrath of God（正确费用为{二}{白}{白}）。</b>
<b>B. A player does not attack with a creature that must attack each turn.</b>	<b>B. 牌手没有让每回合都必须攻击的生物来进行攻击。</b>
<b>C. A player fails to put a creature with lethal damage into a graveyard and it is not noticed until several turns later.</b>	<b>C. 牌手没有将受到致命伤害的生物放进坟墓场，且在数个回合之后才发现。</b>
<b>A Phyrexian Revoker is on the battlefield that should have had a card named for it.</b>	<b>非瑞克西亚断念妖/Phyrexian Revoker 在战场上，当初应为其说一张牌名时却没有说。</b>
<b>E. A player casts Brainstorm and forgets to put two cards back on top of his library.</b>	<b>E. 牌手施放脑力激荡/Brainstorm，却忘记将两张牌放回牌库顶。</b>
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	原则
<b>While Game Rule Violations can be attributed to one player, they usually occur publicly and both players are expected to be mindful of what is happening in the game. It is tempting to try and "fix" these errors, but it is important that they be handled consistently, regardless of their impact on the game.</b>	虽然违反游戏规则通常是归咎于其中一位牌手，但此类情况通常是公开地发生，且双方牌手都应留意游戏中所发生的事情。处理者应尝试去“修复”这些失误，但很重要的是：不论这些失误对游戏有多少影响，处理方式都必须一致。
Consistency is a core tenet of the IPG. Even though there are thousands of judges adjudicating tournaments across the world, it is important for each of these tournaments to be run and judged to the same standard. For this reason, we strive to handle penalties neutrally. Fundamentally, both players are responsible for maintaining a proper game state. Our core role as judges is not to "correct" or "fix" the players' mistakes, but to dispassionately interpret and apply the fixes prescribed by the IPG.	一致性是 IPG 的核心原则。以同样的标准执法世界各地的比赛是很重要的事，即使这些比赛由数以千计的不同裁判来执法。因此，我们致力于处理处罚的中立性。从根本上来说，双方牌手都有责任保持正确的游戏状态。作为裁判，我们的核心作用不是改正或者修复牌手的错误，而是冷静地解释并应用 IPG 中规定的修正。
<b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b>	进一步的修正
<b>If the infraction falls into one of the following categories, and only into that category, perform the</b>	<b>如果该违规属于下列情形之一，且不属于其他情形，便使用对应的方式进行修正，若能进行简易倒</b>

<p><b>fix specified unless a simple backup is possible:</b></p>	<p><b>回，则简易倒回：</b></p>
<p>So right here we are going to have a list of partial fixes. You do them first. If you can't, then you evaluate if you need to do a back up or leave alone. However, if the backup is trivially simple, (ex. a single action) and makes for a more organic fix, the Head Judge may authorize the back up. See 1.4 Backing Up for more information about back ups.</p>	<p>以下是部分修正的列表。首先按照列表进行对照，看是否能应用其中的一条。若无法应用，那么你可以考虑倒回或者保留当前状态不修正。但是，如果倒回非常简单（例如，只有一个动作）且能非常好地修复游戏状态，主审可以授权倒回。关于倒回，参见 IPG 1.4 节。</p>
<p>A recent change here is that you can't mix partial fixes. If the error fits more than one of these categories, you'll need to move ahead to the next part of the fix. If there are multiple fixes within the same bullet point, you're still fine to use that partial fix.</p>	<p>一个最近的改动是，你不能混用部分修正。如果失误属于一种类别以上，你必须使用下一部分的修正方式（即倒回或不做修正）。如果在同一类别中满足了多个修正条件，你仍然可以使用这种部分修正。</p>
<p><b>• If a player made an illegal choice (including no choice where required) for a static ability generating a continuous effect still on the battlefield, that player makes a legal choice.</b></p>	<p><b>• 如果某牌手为某个在战场上之静止式异能产生的持续性效应作出的选择不合法（包括在需要作选择时未如此作），则该牌手重新作出一个符合游戏规则的选择。</b></p>
<p>This partial fix refers to cards such as True-Name Nemesis, Voice of All or a Siege from Fate Reforged™, which require the choice of a player or color as they enter the battlefield. The reasoning for this is similar to why we apply state-based actions — it is impossible for these cards to exist on the battlefield without a choice being made for them, so we correct that immediately. While this could lead to the perception of advantage for one player, such errors always occur publicly, so it is in both player's interest to be attentive.</p>	<p>这种部分修正是指像真名宿敌、万物使者或是龙命殊途™中的围攻牌，这些需要于其进场时选择牌手或颜色之类选项的牌。这样做的原因与我们执行状态动作的原因差不多——这些牌没有做出选择的话就无法进入战场，所以我们应当立刻纠正。虽然这可能会让人产生其中一个牌手会获得优势的看法，但错误是公开发生的，所以双方牌手都需要注意。</p>
<p>So, if Nick casts Doom Blade on Albert's Voice of All, we can have Albert chose a color now. If Albert chooses Black, Doom Blade is now illegal. Then, we can do a simple backup to just before Doom Blade was cast.</p>	<p>如果 Nick 对 Albert 的万物使者施放送终刀锋，我们可以让 Albert 立即选择一个颜色。如果 Albert 选择了黑色，送终刀锋的施放便是非法的。然后我们便可以使用简易倒回，回到送终刀锋被施放之前的时刻。</p>
<p><b>• If a player forgot to draw cards, discard cards, or return cards from their hand to another zone, that player does so.</b></p>	<p><b>• 如果某牌手忘记抓牌、弃牌或忘记将牌从手上移至其他区域，则该牌手如此作。</b></p>
<p>Players will generally be able to determine with high accuracy if they forgot to draw or discard cards. Note that this partial fix does not expire, even if the error was many turns ago.</p>	<p>牌手如果忘了抓牌或者弃牌他们一般都能较为准确地确定。注意，这种部分修正没有时效限制，即使错误是数回合前发生的，也应执行修正。</p>
<p><b>• If an object is in an incorrect zone either due to a required zone change being missed or due to being put into the wrong zone during a zone change, the identity of the object was known to all players, and</b></p>	<p><b>• 如果在改变某物件所处区域的过程中，由于遗漏要求的区域改变或将之置入错误区域，最终导致该物件所处的区域不正确，且该物件为所有牌手均可辨识、移动此物件不会对游戏状态造成影响，则将</b></p>

<p><b>it can be moved with only minor disruption to the state of the game, put the object in the correct zone.</b></p>	<p>该物件放入正确区域。</p>
<p>There is a lot going on in this sentence, so let's deconstruct it. "Object in the incorrect zone due to a required zone change being missed" : This is for where a creature was supposed to die and didn't, or a card was supposed to be milled and didn't, Or a creature that is supposed to be bounced and isn't.</p>	<p>这句话很长，我们来一点一点消化它。“由于遗漏要求的区域改变...导致该物件所处的区域不正确”：生物本应死去但却没有死去，或者一张牌本应被磨掉但却没有，或者一个生物本应被移回手上却没有，都属于这种情况。</p>
<p>-“or due to being put into the wrong zone during a zone change”: Most commonly this is when a card is supposed to be put in the graveyard, but is put in Exile, or vice versa. It technically, doesn't apply to mill because of the next sentence.</p>	<p>“在改变某物件所处区域的过程中..将之置入错误区域”：最常见的情况是一张牌本来应该进坟场，但却放进了放逐区（或反过来）。严格来说这不包括磨牌库，原因如下一句所说。</p>
<p>-“the identity of the object was known to all players”: Generally this means going from a public zone to some other zone, but can include cards revealed from the top of the library, or cards revealed for a duress. All players have to know what the card was. Not just where it was, but what it was.</p>	<p>“该物件为所有牌手均可辨识”：这说明物件是从公开区域移动到其他区域，从牌库顶展示牌、或因为逼从而展示的牌也可以属于此范畴。所有牌手都必须知道这张牌是什么，而不仅仅是它在哪。</p>
<p>-“and it can be moved with only minor disruption to the game state”: Things disappearing from the battlefield tends to be disruptive. Be sure to look at what decisions have been made based on that card being on the battlefield. If it's a creature that should have died tucked in with the lands, removing it isn't very disruptive- unless it's a mana producer and it has been used as a land for a turn or three.</p>	<p>“移动此物件不会对游戏状态造成影响”：通常战场上有东西消失，就会对游戏状态产生影响。请务必检查根据该物件在战场上这个信息，牌手已做出了什么决定。如果一个生物本应死去，却混在一堆地里面，将他拿掉可能并没有什么影响，除非这是一个产费生物，且已经用它产了好几回合费。</p>
<p>Additionally, this partial fix does NOT include fixing things that shouldn't have moved but did. For example, a 4/4 with 3 damage is put into the graveyard, and later discovered that it shouldn't have been. This partial fix does not include returning it to the battlefield.</p>	<p>此外，这种部分修正不适用于修正某物件本不应移动却移动了的情形。例如。一个 4/4 生物受到了 3 点伤害却被置入了坟墓场，稍后才发现它本来不应死去。这种部分修正不支持将它移回战场。</p>
<p><b>• If attacker or blocker order has not been declared, the appropriate player orders them.</b></p>	<p><b>• 如果未宣告攻击者或阻挡者的次序，相对应的牌手宣告之。</b></p>
<p>This is seldom relevant. Most times, when there are multiple blockers, it's clear what the intent is, and there is no real interaction. However, it can become relevant, and we now have this partial fix. Ned may get upset that Abe gets to declare blocking order in the middle of resolving spells; when it suddenly becomes relevant, however, most of the time it becomes relevant as a result of Ned casting a spell. If Ned is doing something that makes blocking order</p>	<p>通常来说攻击者或阻挡者的次序都没什么用。绝大多数时候，有多个阻挡者时，牌手的意图都很明确，也没有实际互动。但是，这些次序有时可能会产生影响，因此也就有了这部分提及的修正方式。如果主动牌手 Abe 可以在结算咒语的过程中宣告阻挡者的次序，Ned 可能会很不高兴；但通常来说，正是因为 Ned 施放了某些咒语，阻挡者的次序才会突然对游戏有所影响。如果 Ned 想要做一些可能会让阻挡者次序产生影响的事情，他不能假设对手</p>

relevant, he cannot assume that whatever blocking order favors him the most is the correct one. He has the responsibility to clarify the ambiguity prior to it becoming relevant.	采用的就是对他最有利的那种次序。他有责任在做事情导致阻挡者次序产生影响之前首先厘清次序是什么。
<b>Otherwise, a backup may be considered or the game state may be left as is.</b>	若属于其他情况，则可以考虑进行倒回，或保留当前游戏状态不做修正。
So, we look to see if any of the partial fixes apply, and if not, we either rewind or dont. Please see 1.4 Backing Up for information on if it's appropriate to back up.	所以，我们先看看是否有任何一个部分修正能够适用，如果没有，我们可以选择是否倒回。关于如何确定倒回是否恰当的信息，请参阅 IPG 1.4 节。
<b>For most Game Play Errors not caught within a time that a player could reasonably be expected to notice, opponents receive a Game Play Error — Failure to Maintain Game State penalty.</b>	如果没有牌手在预期其能注意到失误的合理时段内指出游戏行动失误，则所有对手均犯下了“游戏行动失误~未维护游戏状态”此违规。
This is simply the definition of Game Play Error — Failure to Maintain Game State, and goes back to the concept that keeping the game in a legal and clear state is both players responsibility.	这就是游戏行动失误~未维护游戏状态的定义。它涉及的概念就是双方牌手都有责任去维护合法、清晰的游戏状态。
<b>If the judge believes that both players were responsible for a Game Rule Violation, such as due to the existence of replacement effects or a player taking action based on another players instruction, both players receive a Game Play Error – Game Rule Violation. For example, if a player casts Path to Exile on an opponent's creature and the opponent puts the creature into the graveyard, both players have committed this infraction.</b>	如果裁判认为双方牌手在本次违反游戏规则的过程中均有责任,例如是由于现存的替代性效应而导致违反游戏规则,或是某位牌手根据另一位牌手的说明执行行动,则双方均会犯下“游戏行动失误~违反游戏规则”违规。例如,如果牌手向对手的生物施放流放之径/Path to Exile,且该对手将此生物放进坟墓场,则双方牌手均犯下本违规。
As always, both players are responsible for maintaining a clear game state. If my card tells you to take an action, and you do it incorrectly, who's fault is it? Yours for doing the action incorrectly, or mine for not making sure my spell resolved correctly? Turns out, in this case, it's reasonable to say we are both equally at fault. Its important to realize this is only for active effects. If player A forgets to pay 1 more when casting a shock because he forgot about player N's Thalia, Guardian of Thraben, that is not considered an active effect on player N's part. In that case, the error is on player A's shoulders, and player N should get a Failure to Maintain Game State.	一如既往地,双方牌手都有责任维护清晰的游戏状态。如果我的牌要求你做一个动作,而你做错了,那是谁的错?是你错误的动作还是我没有确保咒语正确结算?事实上,我们有理由说,在这种情况下双方都是有过错的。应当注意,这一条只对主动效应有效。如果牌手 A 在施放电震时忘了为牌手 N 的瑟班守护者莎利雅额外支付 1 点费用,这并不属于牌手 N 的主动效应。在这种情况下,错误应由牌手 A 承担,而牌手 N 则获得未维护游戏状态的处罚。
<b>2.6 Failure to Maintain Game State</b>	<b>2.6 未维护游戏状态</b>
Penalty	处罚

Warning	警告
<b>DEFINITION</b>	定义
<b>A player allows another player in the game to commit a Game Play Error, and does not point it out immediately.</b>	牌手容许游戏中的其他牌手犯下了游戏行动失误，且未立刻指出该错误。
There are actually several things going on here. The first is that a player committing a Game Play Error can never earn Failure to Maintain Game State. The only person that can get Failure to Maintain Game State is the opponent. A player earns Failure to Maintain Game State when he or she does not catch an error made by the opponent. Also note that if a player points out the opponent's error right away he or she does not earn this infraction. For example, if Abe casts Wrath of God for RRRW and Ned notices before any further actions are taken, Ned will not receive Failure to Maintain Game State.	这句话实际上包含几方面内容。首先就是违反游戏规则的牌手永远不会获得未维护游戏状态处罚。唯一可能获得未维护游戏状态处罚的是他的对手。牌手在未发现其对手违反规则时获得未维护游戏状态。另外请注意，如果牌手立刻指出了对手的错误则不会获得此违规。例如，如果 Abe 支付 RRRW 施放神之愤怒，Ned 没有进行任何其他动作就立刻注意到了这点，那么 Ned 不会获得未维护游戏状态。
<b>If a judge believes a player is intentionally not pointing out other players' illegal actions, either for his or her own advantage, or in the hope of bringing it up at a more strategically advantageous time, they should consider an Unsporting Conduct - Cheating infraction.</b>	如果裁判认为牌手系出于“此状况对己方有利”，或是“希望等到战略上对己方更有利的时候再提出”这一类的考量，而蓄意未指出其他牌手之违规行为，则应考虑适用“举止违背运动道德~作弊”之违规。
Generally we think of Cheating as actively and intentionally doing something against the rules and for an advantage. However, it may also be Cheating to notice your opponent doing something against the rules and not call a judge, or to only call a judge when it is to your advantage. For example, Abe controls a Juggernaut and forgets to attack with it. Ned says nothing, because he doesn't want to take the damage. Depending on Ned's knowledge of game rules and player responsibilities, this may be Cheating.	一般来说，我们认为作弊是主动地、故意地违反规则并寻求获益。但是，发现对手违规而不呼叫裁判，或是在对你有利时才呼叫裁判一样有可能是作弊。例如，Abe 操控攻城巨车但是忘了用它攻击。Ned 什么都没说因为他不想受到伤害。根据 Ned 对游戏规则和牌手责任的了解情况来判断，这有可能是作弊。
<b>Not reminding an opponent about his or her triggered abilities is never Failure to Maintain Game State or Cheating.</b>	未指出对手之触发式异能的行为不属于“未维护游戏状态”或“作弊”。
This is a very important exception to the “you must point out your opponents errors” rule. Missed triggers are handled differently. A player is allowed to not point out his or her opponents' missed triggers. Since it is allowed, it cannot be an infraction. See the Missed Trigger section for more details.	这是对于“你必须指出你对手的错误”这条规则的一个重要例外。遗漏触发的处理方式不同。规则允许牌手不指出其对手的遗漏触发。既然这是允许的，那自然不是违规。查看遗漏触发部分以获得更多细节。

范例	EXAMPLES
<p><b>A. A player's opponent forgets to reveal the card searched for by Worldly Tutor. It is not noticed until the end of turn.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手对手忘了展示处世导师/Worldly Tutor 所搜寻的牌。但到了回合结束才被注意到。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player does not notice that his opponent has Armadillo Cloak on a creature with protection from green.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手没注意到对手的穿山甲外衣/Armadillo Cloak 结附在了具反绿保护异能的生物上。</b></p>
<p>In both of these cases, the player's opponent committed a Game Rule Violation, and the player didn't notice it right away.</p>	<p>在这两个例子中, 该牌手对手违反了游戏规则而该牌手没有立刻发现。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>If an error is caught before a player could gain advantage, then the dangers of the ongoing game state becoming corrupted are much lower.</b></p>	<p><b>如果失误能在有牌手能够藉此获得优势之前发现, 则对于接下来游戏状态的伤害就会减少许多。</b></p>
<p>This is really just a fancy way of saying "the sooner an error is caught, the less likely it is to cause a large problem." It should be a fairly obvious statement.</p>	<p>这只是“错误越早被发现, 越不容易造成大问题”的另一个说法。这很显然是一句正确的话。</p>
<p><b>If the error is allowed to persist, at least some of the fault lies with the opponent, who has also failed to notice the error.</b></p>	<p><b>如果失误持续下去, 对手必然也有错, 因为他也没有去注意到该失误。</b></p>
<p>The key point here is that both players are responsible for the game state. If the opponent is being observant, he or she can help catch a player's error before the problem becomes more severe. It doesn't matter who gained an advantage from it. Note that there are some situations where one player controls the effect, and the other player takes the action, but did so in a way that caused an error. In this case, please refer to the Game Rule Violation section, as there are some cases where both players have committed the same infraction.</p>	<p>这里的关键点在于, 双方牌手都要为游戏状态负责。如果对手足够敏锐, 他可以在错误变的更严重前发现它。谁从中获得优势并不重要。请注意在某些情况下一个牌手操控效应, 而另一个牌手采取行动, 却以错误的方式采取了这些行动。在这种情况下, 请参阅违反游戏规则部分, 其中某些例子是双方牌手同时犯下违规。</p>
<p><b>3.0 Tournament Errors</b></p>	<p><b>3.0 比赛失误</b></p>
<p><b>Tournament errors are violations of the Magic Tournament Rules.</b></p>	<p><b>比赛失误指的是违反《万智牌比赛规则》之违规行为。</b></p>
<p>Just as Game Play Errors are violations of the Comprehensive Rules, Tournament errors are a violation of the Magic Tournament Rules. However, not every violation of the tournament rules results in an infraction.</p>	<p>正如游戏行动失误是对《万智牌完整规则》的违反, 比赛失误违反的是《万智牌比赛规则》。然而并不是所有违反比赛规则的行为都是违规。</p>

<p><b>If the judge believes that the error was intentional, he or she should consider Unsporting Conduct — Cheating. (Previous versions of the MIPG made reference in each section about how to handle an intentional violation; with the exception of Slow Play, all intentional violations are now evaluated as potential Unsporting Conduct — Cheating.)</b></p>	<p>假如裁判认为牌手蓄意造成该失误，则应该首先考虑适用“举止违背运动道德～作弊”此违规。（先前版本的《违规处理方针》于下文各节当中均提及应蓄意违反各类违规的处理方式；在现版本当中，除了“游戏进行过慢”之外，所有蓄意违反本节当中其他违规的行为均应按可能违反“举止违背运动道德～作弊”的情况进行处理。）</p>
<p>This note covers cases where the player is breaking a tournament rule intentionally. The player might be cheating, but it might not meet the definition of cheating in the IPG. Be sure to review IPG 4.8: Cheating before taking action.</p>	<p>这一条说的是牌手蓄意违反万智牌比赛规则的情况。那位牌手有可能是作弊，但是可能并不满足IPG中“举止违背运动道德～作弊”的定义。请在做出决定之前回想一下IPG 4.8: “举止违背运动道德～作弊”的内容。</p>
<p><b>If a player violates the Magic Tournament Rules in a way that is not covered by one of the infractions listed below, the judge should explain the appropriate procedure to the player, but not issue a penalty.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手违反了《万智牌比赛规则》，但又不符合下列各项违规之定义，则裁判应向该牌手说明正确的规程，但不需给予处罚。</p>
<p>Only the more serious Magic Tournament Rules warrant a penalty. These rules can be quite disruptive to the overall flow of the tournament, causing the event to go longer than needed and/or can give a player a significant advantage. If a violation to the Magic Tournament Rule is not considered detrimental to the overall flow of the event, then a penalty is not needed and the judge will simply educate the player on a corrective action.</p>	<p>只有较为严重的违反《万智牌比赛规则》的情形应当给予判罚。这类情况会扰乱比赛的整体流程，使得比赛所花费的时间增加，或会使牌手获得显著的优势。如果某种违反《万智牌比赛规则》的行为不会对比赛的整体流程产生负面影响，那么便无须给予判罚，裁判只需对牌手进行教育，并指导牌手如何做是正确的。</p>
<p><b>Continued or willful disregard of these rules may require further investigation.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手继续违反相关规则，或有意无视之，则可能需要进一步的调查。</p>
<p>Although not all Magic Tournament Rules are penalized, even the slightest disruption repeated over and over again can still slow down an event. If this happens, an investigation may be required to see if the disruption is being done to intentionally disrupt the event or maybe a player simply needs further coaching.</p>	<p>尽管不是所有违反《万智牌比赛规则》的行为都会受到处罚，再轻微的干扰重复了一遍又一遍的话仍然会拖慢比赛进程。如果这种情况发生，裁判可能需要调查这是因为有人有意破坏比赛进程，亦或只是有某个牌手需要进一步教育。</p>
<p><b>A second or subsequent Warning for a Tournament Error offense in the same category is upgraded to a Game Loss.</b></p>	<p>如果是第二次或更多次犯下同类型的比赛失误而受到警告，则升级为一盘负。</p>
<p>Tournament errors are typically more disruptive and less “easy to make” than Game Play Errors. As a result, the second instance of a warning for a Tournament Error in the same category is upgraded to a Game Loss. All subsequent instances in the same category are also game losses. We do not keep upgrading until</p>	<p>比赛失误对比赛产生的破坏性，以及犯下此失误的难度都要高于游戏行动失误。因此第二次或更多次犯下同类型的比赛失误而受到警告，将被升级为一盘负。而后续犯下的同类型的比赛失误将继续是一盘负。我们将不会继续升级处罚直至取消资格。</p>



we get to a Disqualification.	
<b>For multi-day events, the penalty count for these infractions resets between days.</b>	对于历时多日的比赛而言，牌手当天的此类违规处罚累犯计数会在一天的比赛结束之后清零。
As with Game Play Errors, there is more of a chance that someone might repeat a Tournament Error over a 15 round Grand Prix than a 5 round Grand Prix Trial, resetting the penalty count reflects this.	与游戏行动失误相同，在 15 轮的大奖赛上牌手重复比赛错误的概率比在 5 轮的大奖预选赛上更高。清零处罚计数会更加公平。
<b>3.1 Tardiness</b>	<b>3.1 迟到</b>
Penalty	处罚
Game Loss	一盘负
<b>DEFINITION</b>	定义
<b>A player is not in his or her seat at the beginning of a round, or has not completed tasks assigned within the time allocated.</b>	牌手并未在一局比赛开始时坐在自己的座位上，或未能在规定的时间内完成指定的任务。
There are many parts of a Magic Tournament that revolve around time — 20 minutes for this, 10 minutes for that. Players are given sufficient time to accomplish tasks, and failure to complete these tasks within the time limits slows the event down. Most of the explanation of why this is an infraction is in the Philosophy section.	万智牌比赛中有很多时间相关的规定——20 分钟用来干这个，10 分钟用来干那个。这些规定给了牌手充足的时间来完成对应的工作，而不能按时完成将会拖慢整个比赛的进程。大部分解释这种行为为何属于违规的话题属于下面的“原则”部分。
<b>If a round begins before the previous round would have ended (due to all players finishing early), tardiness does not apply until the scheduled end of the previous round.</b>	如果某局的开始时间早于前一局比赛原本预计结束的时间（由于所有牌手都提前完成对局），则要等到前一局比赛预计结束的时间之后，才会开始适用“迟到”违规。
This happens rarely at competitive events, but occasionally all the match results are in with 10 minutes remaining on the clock. Round started at 1:00, and at 1:40, everything is done. Let's go ahead and start the next round! The problem here is that the announced end time was 1:50. It's unrealistic to expect a player who finished early and ran to get some food to know that the round is starting early. Therefore, even if you start the next round at 1:43, people aren't actually late until 1:50. When they show up, give the appropriate time extension based on the 1:43 start time, but the penalty based on the 1:50 start time. This means that it's possible that starting a round early won't result in any actual saved time, but it's still more likely to do so than not.	这种情况在竞争级的比赛中不太常见，但偶尔也会出现：在这轮结束前 10 分钟前所有桌都完成了比赛。比赛一点钟开始，在一点四十分的时候，所有桌都打完了。那么我们赶快开下一轮吧！但是问题是之前通知的结束时间是一点五十分，期望所有这轮打完跑去吃饭的牌手知道下轮提前开始是不切实际的。因此，即使你在一点四十三分开始下一轮，牌手在一点五十之前回来都不能算作迟到。他们回来之后，基于这轮的实际开始时间给他们适当的延长时间，同时，迟到的判定将从一点五十分开始。这意味着，提前开始下一轮可能并不能实际节省时间，但是这样做总比不做更有可能节省时间。

<p><b>A player is not tardy at the start of a round if he or she has notified a judge of a delay, provided the delay is not excessive. Extra time may be given in these situations.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手在一局比赛开始时已通知裁判会有所耽搁，则只要他并未耽搁过量的时间，则他就不算迟到。在此类情况中可给予补时。</p>
<p>There are times when things happen that will prevent a player from getting to their seat at the start of the round. This often occurs when a player finishes a match in turns and needs a bathroom break. If they take the time to advise of a delay and the delay is not going to be too long, it is fine to allow this and where necessary provide some extra time.</p>	<p>有时牌手会因为遇到一些事而不能在一轮开始时准时到达座位。这很常见，例如牌手刚刚在上一轮数回合打完，又十分需要上个厕所。如果牌手向裁判咨询能否耽搁一小会，并且耽搁的时间并不长，裁判可以允许此类要求，并且如果需要的话给予加时。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player arrives to her seat 5 minutes after the round begins.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在一局开始 5 分钟后才到他的座位。</b></p>
<p>If a player isn't in his or her seat when the round starts, he or she is tardy. As we will see below, the Tournament Organizer/Head Judge may allow some additional time before this penalty is assessed, but 5 minutes is outside what is reasonable to allow.</p>	<p>如果一位牌手在一轮开始的时候并未出现在他的座位上，那么他迟到了。正如后面即将提到的，比赛主办人或者主审可能会多等几分钟，给这位牌手一些机会，但是 5 分钟已经超出了容许的范畴。</p>
<p><b>B. A player hands in his decklist after the time designated by the judge or organizer.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手在裁判或主办人规定的时间之后才交出套牌登记表。</b></p>
<p>Again, time limits are in place for a reason. Players are expected to turn in lists at the appropriate time. Allowing them additional time to tweak their deck gives them an advantage.</p>	<p>再次重申，时间限制的存在是有原因的。牌手应该在适当的时间内提交牌表。给予牌手额外的时间，从而让其有可能修改套牌，将会使他们有额外的优势。</p>
<p><b>C. A player loses his or her deck and cannot find replacement cards within the first 10 minutes of the round.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手遗失了他的套牌，且必须在对局开始之后找寻替代的牌。</b></p>
<p>In addition to being on time for a match, a player is expected to be on-time, with his or her stuff. You need to be able to start playing. Both the player and the deck need to be there in order to start playing. Now in this case, if a player loses a card or two, and calls us and informs us at the beginning of the round, there is a clause in the IPG that allows us to downgrade — if a “player commits an offense and calls a judge over immediately and before he or she could potentially benefit...” This clause is probably going to apply, and allow the Head Judge to downgrade to a Warning without it being a deviation. Inform the player that he or she has 10 minutes to find the cards or replace them with basic lands (see Deck/Decklist Problem), otherwise he or she will receive the upgraded</p>	<p>牌手除了应该准时进行对局以外，还应该保管好自己的物品。你需要让自己能够开始对局。为了开始对局，牌手和套牌都应该准时到场。在这种情况下，如果牌手丢了一两张牌，然后在下一轮开始的时候及时叫了裁判，那么就有一条可以让我们降级处罚的条文——“如果牌手犯规后自行发现此状况，并且立刻在自己可能从犯规中获益之前通知裁判...”这条方针有可能可以应用，让主审可以将处罚降级为警告而不算作不依方针行事。同时应当告知这位牌手他有 10 分钟的时间来找回他遗失的牌，或将其换为基本地（参见套牌/套牌登记表问题），若超过此时限则将受到升级的迟到判罚（一局负）。</p>

Tardiness (Match Loss) penalty.	
<b>D. A player sits at an incorrect table and plays the wrong opponent.</b>	<b>D. 一位牌手坐错桌，并且跟错误的对手进行对局。</b>
While you can try to make an argument that the player was on time, he or she still wasn't in the right place. I can be on time too, if I can be at the concession stand when time is called.	虽然牌手可以争论说自己“准时到达”，他还是没有准时到达正确的地方。你可以尝试跟他这么说：反正我是到了，那如果在比赛开始的时候我在摊位那里也算是没迟到咯？
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>原则</b>
<b>Players are responsible for being on time and in the correct seat for their matches, and for completing registrations in a timely manner.</b>	<b>牌手有责任准时抵达正确的对局桌，以及在规定的时间内完成登记。</b>
We want players to be on time. Players should not be sitting around waiting for their opponents to show up. It's unfair to the people who follow the rules. Also, because matches are 50 minutes, if a player is late, we give a time extension so that they have 50 minutes. This means the tournament as a whole can be delayed. Judges like the trains to run on time, so we treat Tardiness very seriously. We give it a Game Loss, so that players treat it seriously as well. If Tardiness was just a warning, there wouldn't be much incentive to be in your seat at the start of the round after you decided to go and get food.	我们希望牌手可以守时。牌手不应该坐在桌前等待他的迟到对手出现。这对于遵守规则的牌手是不公平的。同时，因为对局时限是 50 分钟，如果一位牌手迟到了，我们要补时以保证他们有 50 分钟进行对局。这意味着整个比赛都可能会被拖慢。裁判更希望比赛这趟列车能够准点到达，因此会非常严肃地对待迟到。迟到将得到一盘负，这样牌手们也会更加严肃对待迟到。如果迟到只是警告的话，离开赛场跑去吃饭的牌手可能会产生“晚回去一点也没事儿”的想法。
The same logic applies to turning in decklists. Players respond to incentives. And a Game Loss for not completing decklist registration is an incentive to be on time.	上面所说的同样适用于上交牌表。不吃到一盘负会成为牌手的动力，让他们准时的上交牌表。
<b>The Tournament Organizer may announce that they are giving the players some additional time before a penalty is issued. Otherwise, the penalty is issued as soon as the round begins.</b>	<b>比赛主办人可以自行决定判处“迟到”此违规的额外等待时限，并向参赛牌手宣布。否则，在此局开始的同时就要给予一盘负的处罚。</b>
Occasionally a Tournament Organizer (or Head Judge) will allow players a bit more time to get to their seats. This is generally used when there is something odd with the venue that hinders players moving around (too many people for the store, pairings in choke points, having to use a second room, etc.). If this is the case, it is announced at the beginning of the event, and doesn't change. The length of the additional time is also variable. It used to be set to 3 minutes, but now Tournament Organizer s have options. However, it is not recommended you go over 3 minutes. If there was no “grace period”, the penalty is earned at the	比赛主办人（或者主审）偶尔会给牌手更多的时间来找到自己的座位。这通常会出现在比赛环境有些问题，导致牌手难以在场地中走动的时候。（比如：店里人太多场地过于拥挤；张贴配对的位置无法容纳太多人；比赛场地由多个房间组成等等）。在这种情况下，你需要在比赛开始的主审宣告时声明，同时比赛过程中不能更改。额外时间的长度可以自行决定。以前这个选项固定是 3 分钟，不过现在比赛主办人可以自行选择。然而，最好不要超过 3 分钟。如果在比赛开始时没有这种特殊说明，那么每轮开始没有到达座位的牌手都算是迟到。

beginning of the round.	
<b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b>	<b>进一步的修正</b>
<b>The players are given a time extension corresponding to the length of the tardiness.</b>	<b>根据迟到耽误时间的长短，给予牌手相应的补时。</b>
If the tardy player does show up, give the match an extension, even if there is a Game Loss. The players still get the 50 minute match that they paid for. They probably won't need it, but they still get it.	如果一位迟到的牌手后来赶到了，即使已经给出了一盘负，也需要给他那桌进行补时。这一桌仍然应有 50 分钟来完成比赛。虽然一般不需要，但是还是得给。
<b>A player not in his or her seat 10 minutes into the round will receive a Match Loss and be dropped from the tournament unless he or she reports to the Head Judge or Scorekeeper before the end of the round.</b>	<b>如果牌手在一局开始 10 分钟之后才入座，则将得到一局负的处罚；且除非他在该局结束之前向主审或记分员报到，否则将视为从比赛中弃权。</b>
At the 10 minutes into the round, the player gets another Tardiness penalty, with a penalty of a Match Loss. It's assumed that the player isn't coming back, so please mark that the player is dropping on the match slip. It is best practice to let the player who got the win fill out the slip, with the judge marking "No Show" for the player who didn't show up in the drop column, and putting the judges name on the line for the players signature who didn't show up.	在一轮开始的 10 分钟后，迟到的牌手将得到另一个迟到判罚，这次的处罚是一局负。同时我们可以认为这为牌手不会回来了，所以在成绩条上的退赛一栏做上标记。最佳做法是：让赢得此局的牌手在成绩条上签字，然后裁判在迟到的牌手右面的“退赛”那栏写上“No Show”，再在该牌手签名处签裁判自己的名字。
For more information: <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/</a>	更多信息请参见： <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/</a>
<b>3.2 Outside Assistance</b>	<b>3.2 外来协助</b>
Penalty	处罚
Match Loss	一局负
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player, spectator, or other tournament participant does any of the following:</b>	<b>牌手、旁观者或是其他参与比赛的人出现下述行为：</b>
• Seeks play advice or hidden information about his or her match from others once he or she has sat for his or her match.	• 牌手在已经入座准备开始对局之后，寻求关于自己对局之游戏建议或未公开信息。
As soon as a player has sat for a match, he or she is not allowed to get instructions or information about the match from other people. Casual chat is not forbidden, unless such chats include information which may benefit the player's match. This does not	当一位牌手在对局中就座之后，从其他人那里获取有关对局的额外信息或指导便是不允许的。并不禁止闲聊，除非闲聊中包括有可能让这位牌手在对局中获益的信息。外来协助这一条并不包括在配对表前，摊位前以及走廊里抽烟时向其他人寻求建议。

<p>include asking for advice at the pairings board or dealer booth, or outside while smoking a cigarette. Players are going to chat about decks they played against or think they have to play against. We cannot control what they talk about in the restroom.</p>	<p>牌手们总是会讨论他的套牌以及他们可能即将对抗的套牌。我们控制不了牌手在厕所里聊什么。</p>
<p>• <b>Gives play advice or reveals hidden information to players who have sat for their match.</b></p>	<p>• 在牌手已经入座准备开始对局之后, 给予牌手游戏建议或未公开信息。</p>
<p>This scenario often happens to a spectator or a player who is watching a friend playing after just finishing his or her own match. Especially for players who are still in the tournament, such behavior should be punished and the Match Loss should be issued. Keep in mind we are talking about “play advice.” “Don’t forget to attack” is play advice; “Quit, so we can go get food” is not play advice - although both may result in the game ending.</p>	<p>这种情况多出现在一位牌手打完之后来围观朋友的时候。特别是这两位牌手都还在比赛中的时候, 这种行为属于外来协助而且将获得一盘负的处罚。注意我们在讨论的是“游戏建议”, “别忘了踹”——这个是游戏建议; “你赶快投了, 咱们吃饭去吧!”——这个不是, 虽然这两句话可能都会导致游戏结束。</p>
<p>• <b>During a game, refers to notes (other than Oracle™ pages) made before the official beginning of the current match.</b></p>	<p>• 在游戏之中, 参阅在此对局开始之前所记录的笔记 (Oracle 牌张内文叙述页面除外)。</p>
<p>The form notes take can be varied, but is typically on paper. While looking at these notes between games is OK, during a game it is not permitted. As an exception, official Oracle text is allowed to be checked at any time during the match. Typically players will just call a judge, but if someone has a printout of all the oracle text of all the cards in the set, they can use it as long as they are quick.</p>	<p>笔记有很多种形式, 不过一般都是记在纸上的。在两盘之间看这些笔记是被允许的, 然而在一盘之中不行。但是有个例外, 牌手可以在盘中查看官方的牌张 Oracle。一般来说牌手会叫裁判来问 Oracle, 但是如果真的有人把环境内的所有牌的 Oracle 打印出来带着, 也是可以使用的, 只要他能保证查阅速度够快。</p>
<p><b>These criteria also apply to any deck construction and draft portions of a limited tournament. Additionally, no notes of any kind may be made during a draft. Some team formats have additional communication rules that may modify the definition of this infraction.</b></p>	<p>这些准则也适用于限制赛中构组套牌及轮抽的部份。此外, 轮抽当中不能做任何种类的笔记。某些团队赛制的比赛中包含了额外的交流规则; 这可能会修改此违规的定义。</p>
<p>During a Limited Format event, either sealed events or drafts, players in the deck construction or draft portions shall be treated as though they were “in a match”, and any behavior which fits the definition above is regarded as “Outside Assistance.” Asking what to draft, or how many Forests should be played, or “Did you force White?” are examples. For some formats, such as Two-Headed Giant and Team Tournaments, team members can discuss decks and strategies between themselves, and Outside Assistance does not apply.</p>	<p>在限制赛事中, 包括轮抽和现开, 牌手在组牌或者轮抽过程中都将被视为在“对局中”, 所有符合上面所述的违规的行为都将被视为“外来协助”。比如: 询问抓什么, 应该加多少树林, 或者“你要强行抓白么? ”。在某些赛制中, 比如双头巨人或者团队现开, 队伍成员之间可以讨论组牌和战术, 这时“外来协助”就不再适用。</p>

<p><b>Notes made outside the current match may only be referenced between games, and must have been in the player's possession since the beginning of the match.</b></p>	<p>在当前对局以外时间记录的笔记，只能在两盘游戏之间参阅，并且此牌手开始对局时便应该已持有该笔记。</p>
<p>These notes may be things like strategies for sideboarding for different matchups. A note taken in game one can be checked during game two. The "beginning of the match" is the line because there has to be one, and there makes the most sense. Players can't go online between games and look up sideboard strategy.</p>	<p>这些笔记可能是换备指导等战术信息。在第一盘记录的笔记在第二盘进行中可以查阅。因为必须要有一条分割线，我们把这条线划在“开始对局时”，因为这个时间点最为合适。牌手不能在两盘游戏之间上网查阅换备指导。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. During a game, a player references play notes that were created before the tournament.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在游戏中参阅他在比赛之前作好的游戏笔记。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A spectator points out the correct play to a player who had not solicited the information.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 旁观者在某牌手没有要求的情况下为他指出正确的行动。</b></p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>Tournaments test the skill of a player, not his or her ability to follow external advice or directions. Any strategy advice, play advice, or construction advice from an external source is considered outside assistance.</b></p>	<p>比赛测试的是牌手的技术，而非接收外来建议或指导的能力。任何来自外部来源的策略建议、行动建议或是构组建议都视为是外来协助。</p>
<p>A game is between two players. Not a player vs. another and his buddy, or Google, or the Twittiverse. Outside Assistance can be a word, a piece of paper or a gesture; it can be a request for information. If it can be seen to have offered the player strategic, play or construction advice then it should be regarded as outside assistance. Keep in mind though (and this is controversial in some circles) that asking or telling a player the results of another match is not Outside Assistance, even if that information is used to end the game.</p>	<p>»» 对局是两个牌手之间的，而不是牌手 A vs 牌手 B 和他愉快的小伙伴们，或百度/营地。外来协助可以是一个词，一张纸，甚至一个手势；也可以是对信息的请求。任何向牌手提供战术、游戏动作及套牌构组方面建议的行为都应被视为外来协助。需要注意，询问或告诉对局中的牌手比赛中其他对局的结果并不属于外来协助（并且这点现在仍有争议），即使这个信息会使得这盘游戏直接结束。</p>
<p><b>Visual modifications to cards, including brief text, that provide minor strategic information or hints are acceptable and not considered notes. Detailed instructions or complex strategic advice may not be written on cards. The Head Judge is the final arbiter on what cards and notes are acceptable for a tournament.</b></p>	<p>牌上面的图样加工，包括间接地提供轻微策略信息的简短文字，均可以接受且不会认定为笔记。详细指示或复杂的策略建议不能写在牌上。在比赛中，主审是判定哪些牌与笔记可以接受的最终仲裁者。</p>
<p>Some players write notes on cards, which may contain some strategic information. Several words, a mark, or</p>	<p>一些牌手会在牌上写一些字，这有可能包括战术信息。牌面上的几个词，标记或者画是可以接受的，</p>

<p>a picture are tolerable, but sentences may be beyond the line. Examples include dots on the face of sideboard cards, or “attack with me” on a Ball lightning, or a Trinket Mage altered to be examining a specific artifact (the intended target). If you are not sure whether such visual modification is acceptable, ask the Head Judge.</p>	<p>但是在牌上写上句话可能就不行了。例如在备牌的牌面上画几个点、写着“用我踹”的暴雷链球、或者写着某个神器名字的琐物法师。如果你不确定一张牌上的图样加工是否可以接受，请去问主审。</p>
<p><b>Spectators who commit this infraction may be asked to leave the venue if they are not enrolled in the tournament.</b></p>	<p>没有参与比赛的旁观者若是犯下此违规，可以要求他离开会场。</p>
<p>For the players who are still in the tournament, Outside Assistance may be the Sword of Damocles which prevents them offering advice or seeking suggestions from others. However, spectators do not need to worry about the potential punishment because they do not have a “next match” for a Match Loss to apply to. In these case, judges should ask the spectators to leave the venue politely; this provides a warning to other spectators who can’t help talking about the current match when they are watching others.</p>	<p>对于比赛中的牌手来说，“外来协助”这项就像悬在头顶的达克摩斯之剑一样提醒着他们不要寻求其他人的建议。然而，旁观者显然没有这种顾虑，因为对于他们来说并没有比赛可以“一局负”。这种情况下，裁判应该礼貌的请他离开会场。这对于其他旁观者来说是一种警示，让他们不会犯下同样的错误。</p>
<p>Not being enrolled in the tournament doesn't protect you from this infraction. If a spectator commits this infraction and is not enrolled in the tournament, enroll them, assign the infraction, then drop them from the event.</p>	<p>没有参加比赛并不能防止自己受到此判罚。如果一位旁观者犯下了外来协助，将他加入比赛，录入判罚，再将他退赛。</p>
<h3>3.3 Slow Play</h3>	<h3>3.3 游戏进行过慢</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Penalty</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">处罚</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Warning</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">警告</p>
<h4>DEFINITION</h4>	<h4>定义</h4>
<p><b>A player takes longer than is reasonably required to complete game actions.</b></p>	<p>牌手在超过完成游戏中动作所需时间超过了合理的时长。</p>
<p>Players are required to play at a reasonable pace, but what is a reasonable pace? It's not really defined anywhere. There is no explicit number of seconds to make a decision. If we say “taking longer than 30 seconds to make a decision is slow play,” then players can legally take 29 seconds to make every decision, and we have just legalized Stalling. Making a slow play call as a judge is subjective, therefore judges have to</p>	<p>牌手应该在合理的时间内进行游戏动作，但是什么样才是合理？在这里并没有一个明确的数值，没有规定说必须多少秒之内做出决定。如果我们说“思考 30 秒及以上没做决定将得到游戏进行过慢”，那么每位牌手将有合法的 29 秒时间去做决定，同时使得“拖延”合法化。游戏进行过慢依靠裁判的主观判断，因此裁判必须尽其所能的来判断这是否是游戏进行过慢。有两种裁判们在用的方法：</p>

<p>use their best judgment when making them. Two methods judges have reported using are:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you have had time to assess the board, figure out what to do, and then get bored, it's Slow Play</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>如果你有时间观察场面信息,并想出这个局面如果是你会怎么打,接着你感到无聊了,那么这个时候就属于游戏进行过慢;</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you start wondering if you should give Slow Play, you should have already given it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>当你开始考虑是不是该给游戏进行过慢的判罚时候,那你就应该给了。</li> </ul>
<p><b>If a judge believes a player is intentionally playing slowly to take advantage of a time limit, the infraction is Unsporting Conduct — Stalling.</b></p>	<p>如果裁判相信牌手是蓄意进行过慢,来取得时间限制上的优势,则此违规应为“举止违背运动道德~拖延”。</p>
<p>Players can be playing slowly without realizing it and unintentionally. If they are playing slowly with the specific purpose of eating up time on the clock (either to cement the win, or force a draw, or for other reasons) then it's not Slow Play, it's Stalling (i.e. cheating). Keep in mind they are very difficult to tell apart.</p>	<p>牌手有时确实会在无意识、并非故意的情况下玩的过慢。如果牌手故意减缓自己的行动速度来蚕食剩下的游戏时间(包括巩固自己的优势、拖平、或者任何其他原因)那么就不是游戏行进行过慢,那是“举止违背运动道德~拖延”,是作弊行为。但是请记住它们与游戏进行过慢之间很难分辨。</p>
<p><b>It is also slow play if a player continues to execute a loop without being able to provide an exact number of iterations and the expected resulting game state.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手在重复执行系列动作时,不能准确说出该操作反复进行的次数及最终所期望的游戏状态,此情况亦属于游戏进行过慢。</p>
<p>This is one of those sentences that whole articles can be written about. Most loops have a finite ending — I do X 10 times, but stop early if Y happens. Using the rules for shortcuts as found in the MTR, you must also be able to explain the specific end state. There are many loops out there where they will reach a certain condition “eventually.” Eventually is not a specific number. These loops end states are also not specific enough. You cannot perform the loop “Mill myself until the last 2 cards in my library are Emrakul” because you can't specify how many times you will need to loop to get to that state. You could loop “A million times!” but there is still a chance it won't happen until the million and first. Fine, I loop 2 Million times! There is still the chance it won't happen. It doesn't matter how small the chance of failure is; if it's there, you can't loop.</p>	<p>这句话展开了写可以写出一大篇文章。大部分的循环都有一个有限的次数——我进行 X 动作十次,但是如果发生了 Y 事件的话就提前停止。但是 MTR 中的关于简化的规则表示,你必须同时能够说出明确的结束状态。也有很多循环有可以“最终”达成明确的结束状态。但是“最终”并不是一个准确数字。你不能进行这样的循环:“磨我自己的牌库,直到我牌库里只剩两张伊莫库”,因为你不能准确说出需要达成这个结果所需的次数。你可以说“来一百万次!”,但是这样仍有几率无法达成所说的状态。“好吧,再来 1 百万次!”但是状态未出现的可能性仍存在。不管无法达成状态的可能性有多大,只要有,你就不能进行这样的循环。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player repeatedly reviews his opponent's graveyard without any significant change in game state.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在游戏状态没有大幅改变的情况下,不停地检视对手的坟墓场。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player spends time writing down the contents of an opponent's deck while resolving Thought</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手在思想溢血/Thought Hemorrhage 结算时,花时间将对手套牌的内容全部写下来。</b></p>



<b>Hemorrhage.</b>	
<b>C. A player takes an excessive amount of time to shuffle his deck between games.</b>	<b>C. 在两盘游戏之间，牌手花费了过多的时间来洗牌。</b>
<b>D. A player gets up from his seat to look at standings or goes to the bathroom without permission of an official.</b>	<b>D. 牌手离开座位去检视排名，或是没有工作人员的允许而前往洗手间。</b>
Examples A,B,C, and D all are all cases of unnecessary and excessive actions that do not progress the game. For Example D, if a player has to leave the game for a restroom break, he or she should seek permission from a judge. Upon return, a time extension will be issued. Keep in mind that you should always let the player go to the bathroom. The penalty is not because you went to the bathroom, it's because you left your opponent and didn't tell a judge.	例子 A、B、C、D 都是牌手进行了过多的、不必要的且不推动游戏进行的动作。在例子 D 中，如果牌手需要离开对局去厕所或者休息一下，那么他应该向裁判申请。等他回来的时候，为那桌补时。记住，裁判应该允许牌手去洗手间。判罚不是因为牌手去了洗手间，而是因为你离开座位而没有通知裁判。
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>原则</b>
<b>All players have the responsibility to play quickly enough so that their opponents are not at a significant disadvantage because of the time limit.</b>	<b>所有牌手都有迅速进行游戏的责任，以让对手不会因为时间限制而有明显的不利。</b>
In some professional sports taking advantage of the clock is a legal strategy. In Magic, we want matches to be determined by actually playing the game, not the clock. Time is a shared resource between players, and we do not want one player to consume more time than is reasonable to complete his/her actions. Complex combos may require more time to perform actions because there are more actions to perform, however wasted time is taking time from the opponent. Both players are expected to play at a pace that allows the match to conclude in the allowed time.	在某些专业体育项目的规则中，利用时间来取得优势是符合规则的战术。但是在万智牌中，我们希望比赛的结果取决于万智牌的对战，而不是时间。时间是双方牌手共享的资源，我们不希望其中一位牌手占据超过合理范围的时间来进行游戏动作。复杂的组合技有很多动作需要完成，因而可能需要更多的时间，但在双方共享对局时间的游戏中，浪费时间就是从对手那里夺取时间。双方牌手都应该按照合理的步调进行游戏，让比赛在合理的时间范围内结束。
<b>A player may be playing slowly without realizing it. A comment of "I need you to play faster" is often appropriate and all that is needed.</b>	<b>牌手可能会无意间进行游戏过慢。对牌手说“我希望你能进行的快速一点”通常就够了，而也只需要如此处理。再进一步的进行过慢就必须给予处罚。</b>
A player who is deep in thought may not be aware that he or she has used a lot of time. People are bad at estimating time and might think it's only been ten seconds when it's been fifty. In these cases it's OK to step in a give a little nudge to play faster. This nudge is not a formal penalty or a Warning, it's a 'caution.' If the player makes his or her play quickly and continues at a reasonable pace, everything is fine. It's also worth noting that some judges don't start with a caution.	一位陷入沉思的牌手可能意识不到自己用了太多的时间。人们并不擅长计算时间，可能你以为过了 10 秒，其实已经是 50 秒了。在这个例子中你可以上前给他一点提醒让他进行的快一些。这个提醒并不是一个正式的处罚或者一个“警告”，他是一个“注意”。如果那位牌手采取了行动，后面动作的进行也恢复到了正常步调，那么就就行了。值得一提的是有些裁判并不从“注意”开始，这也是可以的。

This is also OK.	
<b>Further slow play should be penalized.</b>	再进一步的进行过慢就必须给予处罚。
If a player has already been cautioned to make decisions, and doesn't make a decision in a timely manner, or the next decision is also slow, then the next step will be to issue a Warning. If a Warning has already been issued, then a second resulting Warning will be upgraded to a Game Loss (with the Head Judge's concurrence). When giving a Warning, double check with the player whether this is the first time a Slow Play Warning has been issued for today's tournament.	如果一位牌手已经被要求“注意”该作出决定了，但是之后还是没有及时作出决定，或者下个决定做的依然很慢，那么就需要给出“警告”。如果他已经因此获得过“警告”，那么第二个警告将会被升级为“一盘负”（在主审的同意下）。在给出游戏行进过慢的警告判罚之前，请确认这位牌手是否在今天的比赛中获得过同样的警告。
<b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b>	进一步的修正
<b>An additional turn is awarded for each player, to be applied if the match exceeds the time limit.</b>	若对局超出时间限制的话，双方牌手会各得到一个延长回合。
There is no way to quantify how much time has been lost in the match because of a player playing slowly. Instead of giving a time extension, the remedy is to add an additional turn for each player if the match goes to time.	没有办法来度量一位牌手缓慢的动作消耗了对局中的多长时间。作为补时的替代，补救措施是在比赛时限已到后为每位牌手延长一个回合。
<b>This turn extension occurs before any end-of-match procedure can begin and after any time extensions that may have been issued.</b>	此延长回合会先于对局结束流程发生，且会在已有的任何补时结束之后才开始计算。
Those turns have to be put somewhere.	这个补的回合总得找个地儿放。
<b>No additional turns are awarded if the match is already in additional turns, though the Warning still applies.</b>	正在进行延长回合的对局不该再给予延长回合，不过还是要给予警告。
If a game has gone to time after a time extension, and players are in the five extra turns for end of match procedures, then no extra turns will be given for slow play because you aren't "on the clock" anymore.	如果一桌已经在数回合了，那么给出游戏行进过慢判罚就不需要再补额外的回合，因为他们已经不计时时了。
For further reference on Slow Play, see this article: <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/12/25/slow-play/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/12/25/slow-play/</a>	更多关于游戏进行过慢的信息，参见这篇文章： <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/12/25/slow-play/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/12/25/slow-play/</a>
<b>3.4 Insufficient Shuffling</b>	<b>3.4 未充分洗牌</b>
Penalty	处罚
Warning	警告

DEFINITION	定义
<p><b>A player unintentionally fails to sufficiently shuffle his or her deck or portion of his or her deck before presenting it to his or her opponent or fails to present it to his or her opponent for further randomization. A deck is not shuffled if the judge believes a player could know the position or distribution of one or more cards in his or her deck.</b></p>	<p>牌手在将自己的套牌交给对手之前,非蓄意地未将其套牌或套牌某部分充分洗牌;或是未能将自己的套牌交给对手进行进一步随机化。如果裁判相信牌手可以知道其套牌中某些牌的位置或是分布情况,便可认为牌手未将此套牌洗牌。</p>
<p>When players shuffle their decks, the purpose is to lose track of individual cards in the deck and put the deck into an unknown order. If you believe it is possible for a player to know the rough position of a card or cards within a deck (i.e. the player knows which quarter a particular card is in, or hasn't shuffled enough to break up a spell, spell, land order) then the deck is not shuffled enough. The exact number of shuffles needed isn't something we can accurately specify, as it can change based on the number of cards to randomize, but if you feel a deck might not have been shuffled thoroughly enough then it probably fits this infraction. Once a player has shuffled his or her deck for any reason, that player is responsible for presenting the deck to the opponent for further randomization. Failure to do so falls under this infraction.</p>	<p>牌手洗自己的套牌是为了让套牌排列成随机顺序,使得其中牌的分布变为未知。如果裁判相信牌手可以知道其套牌中某些牌的大致位置(比如牌手知道某一张牌在套牌的哪一段里,或者没有充分洗牌,套牌中仍是“咒语-咒语-地”的顺序),便可认为牌手未将此套牌充分洗牌。我们无法规定准确的洗牌次数,因为这个数字基于需要随机化的牌的数量,但是如果你觉得套牌没有被充分的洗过,那么此违规便可能适用于这个情况。一旦牌手因为任何原因洗牌,在洗牌完成后他便有责任呈现套牌,将套牌交由对手进行进一步随机化。未能如此做属于此违规的范畴。</p>
<p>Generally this infraction occurs because the player is lazy, has bad shuffling habits, or their mind is just elsewhere while shuffling. However, if you believe the player intentionally did not shuffle thoroughly, consider USC—Cheating.</p>	<p>通常出现这种违规是因为牌手犯懒,或者洗牌习惯不好,亦或者他洗牌的时候走神儿了。不管怎样,如果你相信牌手是故意不充分洗牌,那么请考虑“举止违背运动道德~作弊”。</p>
EXAMPLES	范例
<p><b>A. A player forgets to shuffle his library after searching for a card.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在搜寻一张牌之后忘了洗他的牌库。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player searches for a card, then gives the deck a single riffle-shuffle before presenting the deck to her opponent.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手搜寻一张牌,然后只作一次交错洗牌(riffle-shuffle)就将牌库交给对手。</b></p>
<p><b>C. A player fails to shuffle the portion of his deck revealed during the resolution of a cascade ability.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手没有将因结算倾曳而展示的部分牌库洗牌。</b></p>
<p>The first example is pretty simple, “Oops, I forgot to shuffle.” You would think things like this never happen, but with a lot going on in the game it's possible. The second example is probably the more</p>	<p>第一个例子很简单,“诶?我忘了洗牌。”你可能认为这事儿是不可能发生的,但是如果游戏中发生了很多事情,这确实是有可能发生的。第二个例子更多的是出现在比赛经验不足的牌手身上,或者打牌</p>

<p>common one seen among inexperienced players, or players in a hurry — those who just give the deck a quick one-two-cut. The third example is just an extension of the first, where someone doesn't shuffle a portion of the deck, or a pile of cards that are required to be shuffled, either because they forget or because they don't think they have to.</p>	<p>很着急的牌手。第三个例子算是第一个例子的延伸，牌手忘了洗一部分的牌库，或者忘了洗一小堆牌，这一般是因为牌手忘了或者认为这不是必须的。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p>原则</p>
<p><b>Players are expected to shuffle their deck thoroughly when it is required and are expected to have the skill and understanding of randomization to do so.</b></p>	<p>牌手在有必要和被要求时，必须要彻底地将其套牌洗牌；且应要有随机化的技术和对何谓“随机化”的认知。</p>
<p>This is a card game. It requires manipulation of cards. It is the player's responsibility to be able to randomize those cards, and it is reasonable to expect this behavior from them.</p>	<p>万智牌是卡牌游戏，需要操作卡牌。将自己的套牌随机化是牌手的责任，这是对牌手非常合理的要求。</p>
<p><b>However, as the opponent has the opportunity to shuffle after the player does, the potential for advantage is lowered if tournament policy is followed.</b></p>	<p>由于对手在该牌手洗牌之后也有机会洗牌，若是能够确实遵守此项比赛方针，则牌手得到利益的可能性会降低。</p>
<p>It's easy to try and take advantage of insufficient shuffling, from trying to manipulate the entire deck and its mana distribution, to just trying to manipulate one or two cards' general position in the deck. The penalty used to be a Game Loss to reflect the potential for advantage. This meant that many new or lazy players would get Game Losses because they didn't know any better/didn't think shuffling was a big deal. However, now, the opponent is required to shuffle the library when the deck is presented. This virtually eliminates the potential for advantage. With that rule in place, we are comfortable with the standard penalty now being a Warning.</p>	<p>试图不充分洗牌以获利是一件很容易的事情，比如操纵牌库里的法术力分布，或者把一两张牌放到牌库里的特定位置。因为获利的可能性很高，曾经这种判罚是一盘负。但是这就意味着很多新手或者犯懒的牌手将得到一盘负，只是因为他们不知道/不认为洗牌是一件很重要的事情。然而现在，每位牌手的对手需要在他洗完牌之后再洗一次牌。这样就消除了获利的可能性。在这条规则出现后，我们很高兴的看到这个违规的标准处罚变成了警告。</p>
<p><b>Any time cards in a deck could be seen, including during shuffling, it is no longer shuffled, even if the player only knows the position of one or two cards. Players are expected to take care in shuffling not to reveal cards to themselves, their teammates, or their opponents.</b></p>	<p>只要可能看见套牌内容，包括洗牌之间，即使牌手只知道一两张牌的位置，该套牌都会不再是随机化。牌手在洗牌时必须注意不要将牌展示给自己、队友或是对手看。</p>
<p>The cards within the deck should not be revealed to anyone while it's being randomized, otherwise it's not random (even if the majority of the deck is). If you riffle shuffle ten times, then riffle shuffle one time face up to bend the cards the other way, it's not</p>	<p>在随机化的过程中，套牌中的任何牌都不能被展示给任何人，否则这样就不算是已经随机化（即使套牌的大部分已经随机）。如果你进行十次鸽尾式洗牌（即通常洗扑克牌的方法），最后一次洗牌时为了让弯掉的牌弯回来而牌面朝上洗，那么就跟没洗</p>

<p>shuffled anymore, and you have to start again. In Team games, shuffling away from yourself but towards your teammate is also bad. Shuffling so your opponent can see your cards is not a good idea strategically, but doesn't receive a penalty.</p>	<p>一样,你必须重新开始洗牌。在团队赛中,洗牌时自己没看到却让队友看到了同样也是不行的。用你对手能看到牌的洗牌方式洗牌,从战术上来讲并不是一个好主意,但是这并不会让你受到判罚。</p>
<p><b>A player should shuffle his or her deck using multiple methods. Patterned pile-shuffling alone is not sufficient. Any manipulation, weaving, or stacking prior to randomization is acceptable, as long as the deck is thoroughly shuffled afterwards.</b></p>	<p>牌手应使用多种方式洗牌;只使用有规律的分堆洗牌并不够。如果之后有充分洗过套牌,任何先行的操作、编排或是叠放都是可接受的。</p>
<p>When shuffling, multiple types of shuffles should be used together to ensure randomization. A common "shuffle" is a pile shuffle. This is not shuffling. It is not part of shuffling. It doesn't count. This is because if I know the position of a card before a pile shuffle, I will know it after the pile shuffle as well. Six to eight riffle or "mash" shuffles is sufficient to randomize a deck. Maybe less if just a single card is to be lost in the deck as the result of Black Sun Zenith resolving.</p>	<p>当洗牌时,应该使用多种方式洗你的牌库以保证随机化。常见的一种“洗牌”方式是分堆洗。但是这并不是洗牌,它甚至不是洗牌的一部分,并不算数。这是因为如果我知道在分堆洗之前一张牌的位置,那么我在分堆洗之后还是知道。六到八次的插洗或鸽尾式洗牌就足够使套牌随机化。如果只是为了将一张牌洗进牌库(例如结算黑阳当空时)可能可以少洗几次。</p>
<p>When a player sits down, his or her deck is in some order. It may be sorted alphabetically, or mana weaved or had cards placed in specific places in the deck. While it might raise some concern, all that is fine, so long as the deck is sufficiently randomized afterwards. This is because, so long as the deck is shuffled, any manipulation will be obliterated when the deck is randomized. This randomization is further ensured when the opponent also shuffles the deck. Manipulating a deck prior to sufficient shuffling is really done just for comfort. Manipulating a deck prior to insufficient shuffling is a Warning if done unintentionally, and USC—Cheating if done intentionally.</p>	<p>当一位牌手就座时,他的套牌可能已经按某种顺序排好。可能是拼音顺序,或者已经经过“二一插”,或者将某些牌排在某些特定位置。这可能会让人担心有问题,但是只要这个套牌在之后的洗牌中被充分的随机化就没关系。这是因为,只要经过充分的洗牌,任何事先的操纵都会被充分随机化所破坏。对手的洗牌能够进一步保证这种随机化。因此,在充分洗牌之前排好顺序只能起到自我安慰的作用。排顺序之后不充分洗牌的情况,无意的是警告,故意的是“举止违背运动道德~作弊”。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>Shuffle the random portion of the deck thoroughly.</b></p>	<p><b>对套牌的随机部分充分洗牌。</b></p>
<p>The remedy is simple — have them shuffle the cards. You should take some time to quickly explain what kinds of shuffling are necessary and why they're necessary, as well as reminding the other player to shuffle their opponents deck as well. As a general practice, judges do not perform the shuffle, players do. This prevents the judges from getting involved if sleeves become broken during the shuffle, or if a card falls out. It also prevents the judge from getting</p>	<p>补救措施很简单——洗牌就好了。你应该简略快速的解释一下哪种洗牌方式是必须的,为什么是必须的,同时提醒另一位牌手也要好好洗其对手的套牌。通常来讲,请让牌手洗牌,裁判不要执行洗牌。这样能够防止出现牌套破损或者牌掉出来时,会涉及到帮他洗过牌的裁判。同样这也可以防止牌手指责裁判“你帮我洗完之后我掏的就好烂。”。</p>

blamed if the player draws poorly following the shuffle.	
Keep in mind that some of the cards might be ordered within the deck, so their position should be maintained if they weren't supposed to be included within the shuffle. When trying to fix the insufficient shuffling problem, it's a good idea to take a look at both player's graveyard as well as the permanents on the battlefield. Asking questions about the known cards in the library is also necessary. Try to take that into consideration whenever you're dealing with shuffling.	要注意的是，可能在牌库中某些牌的位置是已知的，所以在修正的时候需要将它们保持原位置。当你要修正不充分洗牌时，先看看两位牌手的坟墓场与场上的永久物是个非常好的习惯。询问牌手牌库中是否有已知部分同样是必要的。当你处理洗牌的时候，记得将这些因素考虑进去。
<b>3.5 Deck/Decklist Problem</b>	<b>3.5 套牌 / 套牌登记表问题</b>
Penalty	处罚
Game Loss	一盘负
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player commits one or more of the following errors involving deck contents or registration:</b>	<b>牌手发生了下列与其套牌内容或登记有关的一项或多项失误：</b>
Note that “or more” means that if a player is discovered to have made more than one of these mistakes at the same time, they should all be treated as just one instance of this infraction with the player receiving only a single penalty.	需要注意的是“一项或多项”指的是如果裁判发现一位牌手的套牌和牌表同时出现了多个错误，那么这些错误将被视为一次违规来处理，牌手只会受到一个判罚。
<b>The deck or decklist contains an illegal number of cards for the format.</b>	<b>套牌或登记表之牌的张数违反该赛制规定。</b>
The MTR stipulate that decks must contain a minimum number of cards in both Constructed and Limited formats – 60 cards for Constructed, and 40 cards for Limited. Playing with fewer can lead to a deck being statistically more likely to draw a particular card, which provides an unfair advantage to the player. This cannot be permitted.	MTR 规定，套牌拥有牌张数量下限——构筑 60 张，限制 40 张。套牌牌张数量小于下限会使得牌手抓到特定牌的几率增加，这会为牌手提供优势。这是不能允许的。
<b>The deck or decklist contains one or more cards that are illegal for the format.</b>	<b>套牌或登记表上包含对此赛制而言不合法的牌。</b>
Formats are kept separate for a reason – power-level, card availability, and diversity's sake are some concerns that lead to allowing different cards in different kinds of tournaments. Playing with cards that are not legal in the format can provide an	分赛制是有理由的：出于对牌的强度、可用性以及多样性的考虑，不同的赛制使用不同的牌池。使用非赛制内的牌为牌手带来了优势。即使他用的牌不能给他带来优势，也同样是违规的。

<p>advantage. Even when no advantage is being gained by using illegal cards, the infraction is the same.</p>	
<p><b>A card listed on a decklist is not identified by its full name, and could be interpreted as more than one card. Truncated names of storyline characters (legendary permanents and Planeswalkers) are acceptable as long as they are the only representation of that character in the format and are treated as referring to that card, even if other cards begin with the same name.</b></p>	<p>登记表上的牌并非使用正确的完整名称，且可能意指的牌不只一张。故事角色(传奇永久物或鹏洛客)的名字缩写是可接受的，只要在此赛制中含有该名称的合法卡片只有一张。就算其他卡片的名称具有相同的开头，这些简写被视为该合法卡片的名称。</p>
<p>In the case of storyline figures, it is often easy to see which card a player means. If a player lists “4 Emrakul”, that player is unlikely to be talking about Emrakul’s Hatcher, despite it beginning with the same series of letters. In this case of Legendary Permanents and Planeswalkers, there is an exception to the requirement that cards be listed by their full name, but the card names still need to be uniquely identifiable.</p>	<p>对于故事角色的情况，通常我们很容易能明白牌手指的是哪张牌。如果一个牌手在牌表上写着“4 伊莫库”，那么他基本不可能指的是伊莫库育恶兽，虽然其英文名称中开头的一个词是一样的。在传奇永久物和鹏洛客的例子中，你可以写他们的简写（而无需像其他牌一样必须写全名），但是写的名字仍然需要能够唯一地辨识出来。</p>
<p>Listing “4 Jace” on a Legacy decklist, for example, may still not good enough, since there are multiple representations of “Jace” that are legal in the format. If judges allowed a player to list “4 Jace” without it being considered an infraction, a player could take advantage of the ambiguity by swapping between Jace, Memory Adept and Jace, the Mind Sculptor as necessary to gain an advantage without fear of ever receiving a Game Loss.</p>	<p>再比如，在薪传比赛的套牌登记表上写“4 杰斯”并不满足要求，因为在薪传赛制中有许多个“杰斯”。如果因为裁判允许牌手写“4 杰斯”而不算违规的话，那位牌手便可以利用这个模糊的漏洞来任意替换自己套牌中的“心灵塑师杰斯”和“记忆专家杰斯”而不用担心会得到一盘负。</p>
<p><b>The contents of the presented deck and sideboard do not match the decklist registered.</b></p>	<p>拿来比赛的套牌和备牌之内容，与套牌登记表上所登记的内容不符。</p>
<p>If the deck and decklist are not the same, the player could potentially modify his or her deck on the fly. This can normally be caught through the process of deck checks, and decklists are there so that players can have a written record of what they intend to play. If it is inaccurate, there is little point in the decklist existing at all.</p>	<p>如果套牌与套牌登记表不符，牌手便有可能随时修改其套牌的内容。这通常会在套牌检查过程中被发现，这也就是我们要求牌手登记牌表的意义：记录下牌手用来参加比赛的套牌之书面记录。如果我们允许牌表上登记的内容不准确，那么牌表也就失去了其存在的意义。</p>
<p><b>Sideboards are considered to be a part of the deck for the purpose of this infraction. If sideboard cards are missing, make a note of this, but issue no penalty.</b></p>	<p>在处理此违规时，备牌会视为套牌的一部分。此违规情况不包含其他牌手在登记现开赛牌池时发生的登记错误，同时此错误应在裁判确认后更正。若备牌确已无法找到，请记录此问题，但无需给予处罚。</p>
<p>If sideboard cards are wrong or inaccurate, a penalty may be merited due to the potential for advantage.</p>	<p>如果备牌与牌表上填写的不符，那么因为这会带来潜在的获利可能性，所以我们应该给予判罚。相反</p>

<p>Conversely, losing sideboard cards cannot provide an advantage – in fact, it is a disadvantage – so we do not need to add insult to injury by applying a penalty as well. Players can't spend unreasonable amounts of time searching for replacement sideboard cards, but "found" sideboard cards after this measure has been implemented may be added back into the deck.</p>	<p>的, 备牌丢失并不能带来优势, 事实上带来的是劣势。所以我们不必给他们雪上加霜的处罚。牌手不能花费不合理的时间去搜寻自己备牌的替代品, 但是在判罚之后找回自己的备牌是可以考虑让他把这些牌加回去的。</p>
<p>Note that often times in limited events, players trade, throw away, or file in with the rest of their collections all cards from their pool that are not in their main deck. This behavior should not be penalized but rather handled by the above instructions.</p>	<p>需要注意的是, 在限制赛中, 牌手经常把自己牌池中不在主牌的牌拿去跟人交易、扔掉或者塞到自己的牌本牌盒里。这种行为并不需要被处罚, 而应该用上面所述的方式来处理。</p>
<p><b>This infraction does not cover errors in registration made by another participant prior to a sealed pool swap, which should be corrected at the discretion of the judge.</b></p>	<p>此违规情况不包含其他牌手在登记现开赛牌池时发生的登记错误, 同时此错误应在裁判确认后进行调整。</p>
<p>Sealed pool registration issues, as written, should be handled at the discretion of the judge. Note that registration errors committed by the player registering the deck (such as the registration of the wrong card) should normally be considered a Limited Procedure Violation. In such a case, the player who received the deck should not receive the penalty for this infraction.</p>	<p>如上所述, 现开赛牌池登记问题需要在裁判的协助下来修正。注意登记错误的责任在于登记牌池的牌手 (比如登记了一张没有的牌), 通常会被认定是“违反限制赛流程”。在这个例子中, 拿到这个牌池的牌手不应该受到这个判罚。</p>
<p><b>Cards that are obviously not part of the deck (e.g. cards in different sleeves, tokens) are ignored when determining deck legality.</b></p>	<p>在确定套牌是否合乎规则时, 忽略明显不属于套牌的牌张 (例如装在不同牌套里的牌张、衍生物等)。</p>
<p>If your card is in my deck, and it's obvious from the back of the sleeve that it doesn't belong in the deck, then I don't get a penalty. Also, tokens aren't cards, so they don't count anyway. Don't forget to make sure they still have a 60 card deck after you remove the offenders; that part is still illegal.</p>	<p>如果你的牌混进了我的套牌, 并且从牌套的背面就能明显看出这不是我套牌里的牌, 那么我不会获得判罚。此外, 衍生物不是牌, 所以它们也不算数。请不要忘记在移除这些导致问题的牌之后, 确认牌手仍有 60 张的套牌; 如果这部分不符合规则, 仍然是非法的套牌。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player has 59 cards in her deck, but 60 listed on the decklist.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手的套牌中有 59 张牌, 但登记表上登记了 60 张牌。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player in a Legacy tournament lists Mana Drain (a banned card) on his decklist.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 在薪传赛中, 牌手在他的登记表上登记了 Mana Drain (此为禁用牌)。</b></p>
<p><b>C. A player has a 56-card decklist. His actual deck contains 60 cards, with four Dispels not listed.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手的登记表上有 56 张。该牌手的套牌实际上有 60 张, 其中四张云散/Dispel 没有登记。</b></p>
<p><b>D. A player has a Pacifism in his deck from a previous opponent.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 牌手把上一局对手的和平主义/Pacifism 放入自己套牌中。</b></p>



<p><b>E. A player lists ‘Sarkhan’ in a format with both Sarkhan, the Dragonspeaker and Sarkhan Unbroken.</b></p>	<p>E. 牌手的登记表上登记了“萨坎”，而该赛制中龙语者萨坎/Sarkhan, the Dragonspeaker 和重获新生的萨坎/Sarkhan Unbroken 这两张牌均可使用。</p>
<p><b>F. A player looking at her sideboard during a game fails to keep it clearly separate from her deck.</b></p>	<p>F. 牌手在游戏中检视备牌，但未能将备牌与套牌清晰分离。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p>原则</p>
<p><b>Decklists are used to ensure that decks are not altered over the course of a tournament.</b></p>	<p>套牌登记表是用以确定套牌内容没有在比赛过程中变动。</p>
<p>As explained above, the decklist is a written record of what the player intends to play throughout the day. It’s important that judges have access to a reliable record of a player’s deck for investigations.</p>	<p>正如上面所说的，牌表是为了记录牌手今天用的套牌是什么而登记的书面记录。在裁判调查套牌时，有一份可靠的记录是非常重要的。</p>
<p><b>Judges and other tournament officials should be vigilant about reminding players before the tournament begins of the importance of submitting a legal decklist and playing with a legal deck.</b></p>	<p>裁判和工作人员在比赛开始前，应该主动提醒牌手须登记合法的套牌登记表，也要以合法的套牌来进行比赛。</p>
<p>Communication with the players involving announcements like, for example, “check your decklists to ensure that you have at least 60 cards in your main deck and up to 15 cards in your sideboard” can negate a lot of the errors that would occur in a given tournament. Decklists are often a rushed, last-minute job on the player’s behalf, and so providing extra time during a players meeting to check for last-minute issues can prevent many of these errors.</p>	<p>可以用公告的方式来提醒牌手，比如“请检查你的牌表确保有 60 张以上的主牌，和最多 15 张的备牌”，这种公告能够避免之后可能出现的很多错误。以牌手的角度而言，交牌表总是一项匆匆进行、赶在最后才完成的任务，因此在牌手会议中留出一点时间来让牌手检查一下牌表能够避免出现很多牌表问题。</p>
<p><b>A player normally receives a Game Loss if his or her decklist is altered after tournament play has begun.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手在比赛开始之后因故须更新牌表，他通常会受到一盘负之处罚。</p>
<p>This sentence is to reinforce that when parts of this infraction require that the decklist be changed to match the deck that is being played the Game Loss penalty should also be issued. The only time a Game Loss should not be issued is when the situation matches a downgrade.</p>	<p>这句话是用来强调，这项违规需要修改牌表来符合套牌内容时，应当同时给予一盘负处罚。只有当情况适用降级时，才不用给予一盘负处罚。</p>
<p><b>Penalties for errors discovered during a deck check are issued immediately. Other decklist penalties are issued at the start of the next round to minimize the disruption to the match currently being played and provide consistency in case some players have finished playing their match before the penalty can be administered.</b></p>	<p>在套牌检查过程中发现的套牌登记表错误，以及套牌本身错误的处罚，应立即执行。其他套牌登记表失误的处罚，则应等到下一局开始才执行，这会让目前进行的对局受到最少的干扰，也可以让处罚维持一致性，因为某些牌手可能在受到处罚之前就已结束对局。</p>
<p>If an error is discovered during a deck check, whether a problem with the deck or the list, the penalty is</p>	<p>如果在套牌检查时发现了错误，无论是套牌错误还是牌表错误，判罚都应立即给出。在比赛中，裁判</p>

<p>issued immediately. At events, judges will also check lists for legality outside of deck checks. If a problem is found with a list outside of a deck check, then the penalty should be assessed at the start of the next round. This is mostly for consistency. If we check a list and find a problem with 10 min remaining the the round, the current match may still be in progress, or may have finished. If it's still going, that game loss will likely end the match. This means the penalty can effectively be harsher based on where in the stack of decklists the player's list was. To balance this, we assess the penalties at the beginning of the next round. Now, this doesn't apply if you feel the deck is illegal; for example, a Modern Decklist containing a Sol Ring.</p>	<p>除了常规的套牌检查之外也会检查牌表。如果在牌表中发现了问题，那么判罚将在下一轮开始时给出，这主要是为了保持判罚的一致性。如果你在一轮开始之后 10 分钟发现一个牌表有问题，那么现在这一桌对局可能在进行，也可能已经结束。如果对局还在进行，那么你给出的一盘负的判罚将有可能直接结束这一局游戏。这意味着，牌手吃到这个判罚的严重程度取决于他牌表在一摞牌表中的位置。为了平衡这点，我们将这个判罚延后至下一轮开始的时候再给出。但是，如果你觉得牌手的套牌是不合法的，那么可以立刻给出判罚；比如说，一张摩登的牌表中出现了太阳指环。</p>
<p><b>Ambiguous or unclear names on a decklist may allow a player to manipulate the contents of his or her deck up until the point at which they are discovered. The Head Judge may choose to not issue this penalty if they believe that what the player wrote on their decklist is obvious and unambiguous, even if it is not the full, accurate name of the card. In Limited events, the Head Judge may choose not to issue this penalty for incorrectly marked basic land counts if they believe the correct land count is obvious. This should be determined solely by what is written on the decklist, and not based on intent or the actual contents of the deck; needing to check the deck for confirmation is a sign that the entry is not obvious.</b></p>	<p>登记表上模棱两可或是不明确的名称，会让牌手有机会在被发现之前操作他们的实际套牌内容。但在主审审认为牌手所登记的信息明确且无歧义的情况下，就算牌手在套牌登记表上写下的名称并非牌张之准确全名，主审也可以选择不予处罚牌手。在限制赛中，如果牌手错误地标记了基本地的数量，但属于主审认为可明显推知其正确地牌数量的情况下，主审也可以选择不予处罚牌手。主审在进行此判断时应仅根据套牌登记表上书写的内容来进行，不得参考套牌的意图或实际组成来确定；倘若需要检查套牌来进行确认，便表明所登记的牌名不够明确。</p>
<p>Writing down ambiguous or incorrect card names can be a player attempting to cheat. They could be attempting to give themselves some flexibility to modify their deck to match the field, while claiming they just took a shortcut writing down the name. Checking and confirming the cards in the deck against the decklist in this situation causes unnecessary work for the deck check team. These instances must involve the head judge working-out what the card could be, and then working-out whether or not there are cards that could be played, confused, or otherwise interfere with the naming of this card, and then finally looking at the deck itself. This is a lot of effort for the judges, while it is not a lot of effort for the player to fill out a list correctly.</p>	<p>写了模糊的或错的牌名的牌手可能说明牌手在试图作弊。他们可能是在尝试给自己的套牌留出一定的调整空间，同时声称自己只是图方便写的简称。检查确认这种牌张并与牌表进行核对会给套牌检查组带来很多不必要的工作量。这种情况需要主审来判断这张牌可能是什么，然后考虑这个名字是否有其他牌可以使用，可以跟它混淆的牌，最后还要进行套牌检查来确认。这对于裁判是很大的工作量，而上交正确的牌表对于牌手来说并不困难。</p>
<p>However, some errors are purely clerical and extremely obvious. In those cases, the HJ is allowed</p>	<p>然而，有一些错误明显是纯粹的书写错误。在遇到这种情况时，主审可以选择不给判罚，甚至警告都</p>

<p>to choose not to issue a penalty. Its not even a warning. If the error is obvious, there is truly no question of what the card is. There is not even a reason to check. However, not all judges see 'obvious' the same way. Some tend to be a little too loose and free with what obvious means. To determine if obvious is obvious enough, use these guidelines: If you have to spend time debating if it's obvious, it's not obvious. If you have to actually check the deck to see what they are really playing, it's not obvious enough. For example "U/B Shockland" is obvious card, so is Temple of B/G. I do not need to look at the actual deck to know what either of those are. Same with 'Bob'. 'Goyf' is riskier, but the author feels that is just on the side of 'ok'.</p>	<p>不用。如果错误太明显，那么它所指的牌应该会很明显，甚至连套牌都不用去检查。但是，并不是所有裁判所认为的“明显”都是一样的。一部分人可能对于“明显”的标准太宽松了。去判断牌名是否足够“明显”，你可以使用下面这些标准：如果你需要讨论一下这个牌名是否明显，那么不够明显。如果你需要检查他的套牌来确认是哪张牌，那么不够明显。举例来说“蓝黑新圈”或者“黑绿占卜地”是一个可以接受的写法，我不需要去查他的套牌就能知道这张牌是什么。“Bob”（黑暗亲信的呢称）也是一样。而“耶夫”就不那么靠谱了，但是笔者认为这些仍勉强算在“够明显”的那一类。</p>
<p>Now what about a situation where the player writes down the wrong card name, such as Temple of Malady in the B/G deck that physically runs Temple of Malice, and it is caught during a deck check. Is it a clerical error? Probably. Is it obvious that the meant Temple of Malice? Not by looking solely at the decklist. So this scenario would not be eligible for a downgrade.</p>	<p>写错牌名的情况也是会有的，比如在一套黑绿套牌里把疫病殿堂写成了恶意殿堂，然后在套牌检查的时候被发现了。这是笔误么？有可能。但是能够明显看出应该是疫病殿堂么？只看牌表的话无法断定。因此这个情况下不能降级处罚。</p>
<p>Toby Elliot wrote a wonderful blog detailing what is and is not to be considered 'obvious' and it is located on his blog at: <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/05/27/of-course-they-do-it-must-be-obvious/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/05/27/of-course-they-do-it-must-be-obvious/</a></p>	<p>Toby Elliot 就“哪种算明显，哪种算不明显”写了一篇非常好的博文： <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/05/27/of-course-they-do-it-must-be-obvious/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/05/27/of-course-they-do-it-must-be-obvious/</a></p>
<p><b>If the sideboard is not kept sufficiently separate from the deck during play, it becomes impossible to determine the legality of the deck. Additionally, if there are extra cards stored with the sideboard that could conceivably be played in the player's deck, they will be considered a part of the sideboard unless they are:</b></p>	<p>如果在游戏中备牌不能和套牌作充分的区隔，便不可能去判定套牌的合法性。此外，如果有额外的牌和备牌摆放在一起，且明显的可以使用于该牌手的套牌中，则那些牌也会视为是备牌的一部份，但下列这些牌除外：</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Promotional cards that have been handed out as part of the tournament.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 在比赛过程中分发的特制纪念牌。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Double-faced cards represented by checklist cards in the deck.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 在套牌中已用列表牌来表示的双面牌。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Double-faced cards being used to represent the back face of cards in the deck.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 用于表示套牌中某些牌之“黑夜”面的双面牌。</li> </ul>
<p><b>These cards must not be sleeved in the same way as cards in the main deck and/or sideboard.</b></p>	<p>这些牌张不可与属于主牌和 / 或备牌的牌使用相同的牌套。</p>
<p>It is important that the sideboard is kept physically far</p>	<p>将备牌与主牌显著区分开是非常重要的。同时，在</p>

<p>enough away that it doesn't become mixed with the player's library. Cards in a deckbox that could conceivably be used in the deck can be suspicious, and provide an opportunity for the player to cheat by being added to the deck in between games. We want to remove this opportunity and so cards in the deckbox are considered to be part of the sideboard unless explicitly excepted. It can be a good idea for a supplementary announcement involving cards in deckboxes to be issued so that we can curb this behavior.</p>	<p>牌盒里面的可用牌是很可疑的,这给了牌手作弊的机会,他们可以在两盘中间方便的把这些牌换进套牌里。我们想要杜绝这种可能性,所以除了例外中的情形以外,这些牌也会视为是备牌的一部份。做主审宣告的时候可以强调一下盒内不要放无关的牌,可以减少这种事情的发生。</p>
<p>Players that present their sideboard by removing it from their deck box and identifying it to the opponent at the start of the match should not receive this penalty, even if there are other cards remaining in the deck box that don't fit one of the above exceptions. Players should be encouraged to get into this habit.</p>	<p>如果牌手在游戏开始时将自己的备牌拿出牌盒,并告知对手这是备牌,那么即使他牌盒里还有其他的牌也不应受到上面所说的判罚。应该鼓励牌手养成这样的习惯。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>Remove any cards from the deck that are illegal for the format or violate the maximum number allowed, fix any failures to de-sideboard, restore any missing cards if they (or identical replacements) can be located, then alter the decklist to reflect the remaining deck.</b></p>	<p>移除所有不合法、或是违反最大张数限制的牌,之后还原备牌,复原遗失牌张(若牌手能够找回该牌或找到与该牌相同的替代卡牌),然后将登记表按照修正后的套牌组成进行更改。</p>
<p>To fix the error, we want to ensure that the player is playing what they intended to play – we do not force the deck to match the decklist; instead we alter the decklist to reflect the deck. The deck that a player has presented is more frequently what he or she intended to play.</p>	<p>为了修正这个问题,我们需要去确认牌手正在用的套牌是什么样的——我们不会把套牌改成牌表那样,而是将牌表改成套牌那样。牌手所呈现的套牌更可能是他所期望的套牌形态。</p>
<p>When restoring missing cards, a “reasonable amount of time” should be given to the player to attempt to find replacement copies, however exactly how much time to give is at the discretion of the head judge. Our best practices suggest that if the player can find replacement cards and be back in his seat with a restored deck and ready to play in under 10 minutes, we should allow him or her to do so and then provide the appropriate time extension. If a player requires an amount of time such that an extension of greater than 10 minutes would be required, this may be too long, and Tournament Errors - Tardiness penalties may at that point apply.</p>	<p>当出现需要为丢失的牌寻找替代品时,应该给予牌手“合理的时间”去想办法弄到那张牌,而“合理的时间”是多长则由主审来决定。我建议如果一位牌手在 10 分钟之内能够弄到这些牌并且返回赛场准备好继续比赛,那么我们应该允许他这样做并给他补时。如果他需要用 10 分钟以上的的时间,那么可能就过长了,这可能会让他得到“比赛失误~迟到”。</p>
<p><b>If the remaining deck has too few cards, add basic</b></p>	<p><b>如果需要补充牌才能让套牌总张数合法,则用基本</b></p>

<p><b>lands of the player's choice to reach the minimum number.</b></p>	<p>地补充。</p>
<p>Sometimes, when judges fix a deck by removing illegal cards, they cause it to violate the minimum number of cards required for the format. This does not create a separate Deck/Decklist Problem! To fix this, judges can add basic lands of the player's choice to his or her deck, so that it becomes playable. This may also happen if cards have been lost and replacements cannot be found.</p>	<p>有时候, 当裁判将套牌中不合法的套牌移除时, 会导致套牌总数低于规定的最小套牌张数。这并不会产生另一个“比赛失误~套牌 / 套牌登记表问题”! 这种情况下, 裁判让该牌手选择任意基本地加入他的套牌中, 使套牌合法。这种做法也可以适用于某些牌丢失, 并且找不到替代的牌的情况。</p>
<p><b>This change may be reverted at a later point if replacements for lost cards are found.</b></p>	<p>如果牌手在稍后时段找到了遗失牌张的替用品, 则他可以撤销用基本地补充套牌此更正。</p>
<p>If lost cards are found, it's ok to remove the additional basic land cards and allow the player to play with the cards that are supposed to be in their deck.</p>	<p>如果稍后找到了丢失的牌, 可以接受让牌手移除替代用的基本地牌, 并用本应在其套牌中的那些牌继续比赛。</p>
<p><b>If the deck and decklist both violate a maximum cards restriction (usually too many cards in a sideboard or more than four of a card), remove cards starting from the bottom of the appropriate section of the list.</b></p>	<p>如果套牌和登记表都违反了最大张数限制(通常是备牌总数超过 15 张或者是同一种卡片使用超过 4 张), 则从登记表中相对应区域的最下方开始移除牌张。</p>
<p>Allowing a player to pick and choose which cards they want to remove from their deck or decklist, or especially sideboard, allows them a massively unfair advantage. It is necessary instead to apply a consistent approach.</p>	<p>允许牌手在移除时任意选择移除的牌会让他们获得许多不公的优势, 特别是移除多的备牌的时候。上述这种能统一执行的处理方法是很有必要的。</p>
<p><b>Downgrade: If a deck is discovered to be missing cards after initial presentation and shuffling, and the missing cards can be located, the Head Judge may downgrade the penalty to a Warning and shuffle those cards back into the deck. If the missing card(s) are in the current opponent's deck, shuffle them into their owner's deck and issue Warnings to both players. If the missing card(s) are with the sideboard and it isn't the first game, choose the ones to be shuffled into the deck at random from all sideboard cards.</b></p>	<p>降级: 如果牌手在首次呈出并洗牌之后发现套牌遗失牌张, 且能够找到所缺之牌, 则主审可以将此判罚降级为警告, 并将这些牌洗回套牌中。如果所缺的牌在当前对手的套牌中, 则将之洗回其拥有者的套牌, 并判处双方牌手以警告。如果所缺的牌在备牌当中, 且当前并非首盘游戏, 则从所有备牌中随机选择对应数量的牌张洗回牌库。</p>
<p>This covers the times when a player either drops a card and it's only noticed once a game has started or has set aside some cards to indicate exiled but then forgets to shuffle them back into their library when the game ends. If the missing card is a sideboard card (in games after game 1) we can't really let players run that angle, so you get a random sideboard card.</p>	<p>这涵盖了牌手掉了一张牌却在游戏开始后才发现、或牌手将一堆牌放在一旁以示它们被放逐却在游戏结束时忘记将其洗回牌库时的情形。如果缺失的那张牌是张备牌(并且在第一盘游戏之后)我们不能让牌手随意选择, 因此牌手会得到一张随机的备牌。</p>
<p>It also covers some weird situation where the</p>	<p>这一条也涵盖了牌手的牌洗进了对手牌库的特殊</p>

<p>opponent's card is in the other player's library. In that case, you just put the cards back, you may issue the warnings to both players and continue on. Technically, you don't have to downgrade, but if you don't, you are a big jerk.</p>	<p>情况。在这种情况下，你只需将牌放回去，然后对两位牌手都给予警告判罚，然后让牌手继续游戏。理论上来说，你不是必须要降级，但如果你不降级，你就是个大混蛋。</p>
<p><b>Downgrade: If a player, before taking any game actions, discovers incorrect cards in their deck and calls attention to it at that point, the Head Judge may issue a Warning, fix the deck, and, if the player has drawn their opening hand, instruct the player to mulligan. The player may continue to take further mulligans if desired.</b></p>	<p>降级: 如果牌手在进行游戏行动前发现自己套牌的张数有误, 并立即通知裁判, 则主审可以判以警告, 修复套牌, 同时如果该牌手已经抓了起手牌, 则让牌手进行再调度。该牌手之后依然可以选择要执行再调度。</p>
<p>One of the philosophies we have as Magic judges is that we can reward, or at least, not punish, players for calling themselves on mistakes before they can hope to gain advantage from them. If a player discovers an error before the point listed (taking a game action), they can hope to get a downgraded penalty and forced mulligan instead of the normal game loss. This is because of the idea above – they called it on themselves before they could potentially gain much of an advantage (abusing the decklist error, perhaps). Note that the IPG explicitly states that the Head Judge must be to the one to do this!</p>	<p>万智牌的裁判哲学中有一条, 就是我们可以奖励或者至少不惩罚那些在自己能获利之前主动叫裁判的牌手。如果牌手在进行游戏行动前发现了自己的失误, 他们可以期望自己的一盘负处罚会被降级成警告加上强制再调度。因为他们在有获利可能性(比如滥用牌表错误)之前就叫了裁判。但是别忘了 IPG 明确指出只有主审才能降级处罚!</p>
<p>If a player takes a mulligan and notices a Deck/Decklist Problem at that point, this should still be considered a player "drawing an opening hand." So, the head judge may still apply this downgrade.</p>	<p>如果一位牌手在再调度之后意识到了自己的失误, 这个仍会被认为是“进行游戏行动前”, 所以主审仍然可以考虑给予牌手降级。</p>
<h3>3.6 Limited Procedure Violation</h3>	<h3>3.6 违反限制赛流程</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Penalty</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">处罚</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Warning</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">警告</p>
<h4>DEFINITION</h4>	<h4>定义</h4>
<p><b>A player commits a technical error during a draft or a sealed deck build.</b></p>	<p>牌手在轮抽或构组现开套牌过程当中犯下了技术性失误。</p>
<p>A technical error in this situation means any error that is involved with the drafting process. When this infraction is given out, the scenario is normally, but not always, a timed draft. This means that we have some serious time constraints to complete the draft within. Technical errors like this cause delays, and at</p>	<p>技术性的失误指的是任何在轮抽过程中出现的错误。这个违规通常是(但并不是所有都)在计时的轮抽比赛中, 这意味着我们对于完成那场轮抽有着严格的时间限制。这样的技术性失误会造成整个轮抽进程被拖慢, 或者类似的情形在 GP 的第二天, 这将让整个比赛中的所有的时间被耽误。</p>

<p>something like Grand Prix Day 2 draft, will cause the entire room to be held up.</p>	
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player passes a booster to his left when it is supposed to go to his right.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在该往右手边传时，将补充包传向左手边。</b></p>
<p>If a player does this, it can have a cascade effect on the rest of the draft – either it is caught immediately by a player either side of the offending player, or the booster is picked up and used to make picks, further complicating the problem.</p>	<p>如果有牌手这么做了，这将会像连锁反应一样影响整个轮抽：有可能这个错误立刻被其他牌手发现，或者被另一位牌手拿起来看到正面甚至从中抽选一张，使问题更加复杂化。</p>
<p><b>B. A player exceeds the amount of time allotted for a pick.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手没有在指定时间内选好牌。</b></p>
<p>A timed draft is timed so that the draft can be carried out in an efficient and timely manner, in addition to the added benefits of coordinating multiple drafts at once. If a player exceeds the time limit, that player is again causing a delay to the draft, which is not a thing that should go un-noticed.</p>	<p>计时的轮抽的目的在于缩短时长，使轮抽变得高效，还可以同时协调多个轮抽。如果牌手超过了限时，那么他就拖慢了轮抽的进程，这不是一个可以忽略不计的事情。</p>
<p><b>C. A player starts to put a card on top of his pile, then pulls it back.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手先将牌放到自己的牌堆，之后又将该牌拿回来。</b></p>
<p>This is a large concern, as when a player does this, it can look to other players, spectators, and judges as though the player has taken more than one card from the booster pack. This has one of two resolutions – the player is “allowed” to take these two cards, or the time of tournament officials is taken up by a “non-issue”. Either of these are bad for the tournament integrity – they can increase the chance of mixing cards from the pack with cards that are already selected. Players are instructed in timed drafts to select a card at a specific point – not doing this at that point can fall under issue b) above.</p>	<p>这是一个大问题。如果有牌手这么干了，在其他牌手、旁观者和裁判看来，这位牌手可能从这一包中拿了一张以上的牌。这种情况有两种处理方式：“允许”那位牌手保留那两张牌，或者裁判们的时间被“不是问题的问题”占用。这两种方式都会危害比赛的公正性，因为这会增加把补充包里的牌和抽选过的牌混到一起的几率。在计时的轮抽赛中，牌手应该在指定的时间点之前选择牌，没有照做的牌手将归于上面所述的例子 B。</p>
<p><b>D. A player does not note one of the cards she was registering before the deck swap.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 牌手在进行套牌交换前登记牌张时遗漏某张牌未登记。</b></p>
<p>In this case, we tell players to mark cards in the correct spot on the checklist. Errors made while registering a list are easy to make. If the error is detected before the swap, judges are to correct the error and move on; no penalty is needed. However, after the swap, the effort to correct such errors increases.</p>	<p>这个例子中，我们应当告诉牌手要正确的登记自己的牌池。在登记过程中很容易出现错误。如果在牌池交换之前就发现了错误，裁判修正错误之后继续即可，不需给出判罚。然而交换牌池后，修正这个问题的工作量就变的大得多。</p>

<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	原则
<b>Errors in Limited procedures are disruptive and may become more so if they are not caught quickly.</b>	限制赛流程中的失误会造成比赛中断, 且不及早发现会影响更剧。
This includes instructions provided for both Draft and Sealed; The draft, the registration and the construction. During a limited event there are many moving parts that need to be kept moving in order to have a smooth transition into swiss rounds. Problems can have a ripple effect and get larger if not detected and corrected right away. For example, a player mis-marking a Heliod's Emissary as Heliod, God of the Sun while registering a deck could cause judges to spend time tracking down the player who registered the deck and confirm what card was actually in the pool. Such errors can add up among dozens sometimes even thousands of players in a short time. It is vital that players pay attention to, and follow instructions during these critical parts of the event.	这涵盖了轮抽赛和现开赛中的轮抽、登记牌表与组牌。在限制赛中, 有许多步骤需要在瑞士轮开始之前完成, 只有保证这些步骤有序进行才能保证后续比赛的顺利展开。这期间出现的问题如果得不到及时妥当的处理将会对后面的比赛产生连锁性的影响。比如一位牌手在登记牌表的时候把赫利欧德的密使登记成了太阳神赫利欧德, 那么可能会导致裁判花费大量的时间去寻找登记牌表的牌手并弄清到底这张实际是什么牌。在几十人甚至几千人的比赛中, 这种问题可能同时出现很多。在比赛的这些关键部分中, 牌手能够注意并遵循指令是非常重要的。
<b>Announcements prior to the draft or the specific tournament rules for the format may specify additional penalties for Limited Procedure Violations.</b>	轮抽前的说明, 或是此赛制特定的赛场规则, 可能会指明违反限制赛流程的额外处罚。
Format-specific notices may change the way that this penalty is applied – for example, there may be supplementary announcements and reminders about removing tokens and basic land cards. For Modern Masters drafts, it is possible that the draft is interrupted by the presence of a foil in each pack. For draft formats involving Innistrad and Dark Ascension drafts, the Head Judge may wish to announce a specific way to handle double-faced cards with regards to this infraction. It allows some additional instruction or leeway – based on the decision of the Head Judge – to be given. This sentence basically gives the judge the power required to make a draft occur in a specific way if needed.	与赛制有关的通知可能会影响这个判罚的适用范围。比如一个补充公告提醒牌手们在轮抽的时候把衍生物与基本地从包里拿出来。对于摩登大师轮抽赛, 有可能轮抽会因为每包一张的闪卡而中断。在包含依尼翠或者黑影笼罩系列的轮抽赛中, 主审可能决定宣布用一个特殊的方式来处理双面牌。根据主审的决定, 可能会产生一些额外的指令或者可以宽松处理的空间。IPG 中的这句话实际上赋予了裁判在必要的情况下更改比赛中轮抽规则的权利。
<b>3.7 Communication Policy Violation</b>	<b>3.7 违反交流原则</b>
Penalty	处罚
Warning	警告



<b>DEFINITION</b>	定义
<b>A player violates the Player Communication policy detailed in section 4.1 of the Magic Tournament Rules. This infraction only applies to violations of that policy and not to general communication confusion.</b>	牌手违反了于《万智牌比赛规则》之第 4.1 节详述的牌手交流原则。此违规仅适用于违反了前述原则的情况，一般情况下的沟通不清并不适用此违规。
If there was an award for the most incorrectly given infraction, Communication Policy Violation would have a shelf in its Living Room cluttered with them. It is a common misconception that any time there is a miscommunication between players it's a CPV. It was so commonly misunderstood that in Feb 2013 the infraction was renamed from "Player Communication Violation" to "Communication Policy Violation" to help drive home the point that we are talking a specific policy violation and not general problems with player communication. This infraction covers violations of the Communication Policy in the Magic Tournament Rules (section 4.1) which is summarized in the philosophy section below.	如果 IPG 有个“最多误用奖”的话，违反交流原则得的奖杯绝对能摆满一书架。一个常见的误读是：只要牌手之间的交流出现了误解那么就是违反交流原则。这个误读实在太常见了，以至于在 2013 年 2 月这条从“牌手交流违规”更名为“违反交流原则”，这样能够帮助裁判理解这一条针对的是违反一条特定的方针，而不是一般的牌手间交流问题。这项违规囊括了违反 MTR 4.1 中所述的交流原则的行为，这些行为被总结在了接下来的原则部分中。
<b>EXAMPLE</b>	范例
<b>A. A player is asked how many cards he has in his hand and answers "Three." A few moments later, he realizes that he has four.</b>	<b>A. 牌手被问及手牌有几张，回答“三”。片刻之后，他发现应该是四张。</b>
<b>B. A player claims she hasn't played her land for the turn, but it is determined that she had and forgot.</b>	<b>B. 牌手主张他本回合还没使用过这回合可使用的地，但是经判定只是他忘记自己已使用过。</b>
In the first example, we have a situation where a player was incorrect about Derived Information. In the second example, we have the player being incorrect about Free Information. These two types of examples are the most common. Note that neither of these examples involves a situation where one player thought he heard his opponent say something else, or confusion about what step or phase they are in.	在第一个例子中，一位牌手弄错了推断信息。第二个例子中，牌手弄错了自由信息。这两个例子属于此违规中最为常见的类型。注意这两个例子都与下面两种情形无关：一位牌手听错了对手说的一些东西、或者不知道自己处在哪个游戏阶段或步骤中。
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	原则
<b>Clear communication is essential when playing Magic. Though many offenses will be intentional, it is possible for a player to make a genuine mistake and these should not be penalized harshly.</b>	交流通畅是顺利进行万智牌游戏的关键要素。虽然这类违规多为蓄意，但仍有可能牌手犯下的是无心之失；在这种状况下，便不该给予严厉的处罚。
We all agree that playing magic face to face is quite different from playing Magic Online on a computer.	我们都知道面对面的玩万智牌跟你在电脑上玩 Magic Online 是有很大不同的。清楚明白的交流可

<p>Clear communication should help players express their thoughts and ensure that the game can be played. We want players to talk to each other. We want them to communicate. But players are human, and they will make mistakes. For those wrong answers which you believe are unintentional, the player should be given a Warning. We don't want a more severe penalty, because we don't want players scared to communicate with each other for fear of getting a penalty.</p>	<p>以帮助牌手们准确表达他们想要做的游戏动作,让游戏顺利进行。我们希望牌手间能够用语言进行交流。但是大家都是人,都会犯错误。对于你认为牌手因为无心之失而回答的错误答案,应该给予警告的处罚。我们不想给出严厉的处罚,因为我们不想牌手因为怕吃到判罚而惧于跟对手交流。</p>
<p><b>Refer to section 4.1 of the Magic Tournament Rules for a full explanation of the policy. It can be summarized as:</b></p>	<p>欲知牌手交流原则之完整说明,请参照《万智牌比赛规则》之第 4.1 节。此原则可概述如下:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Players must answer all questions asked of them by a judge completely and honestly, regardless of the type of information requested. Players may request to do so away from the match.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 牌手必须完整、诚实地回答裁判询问他们所有问题,无论裁判询问的信息类型为何。牌手可请求在远离对战区域的地方回答问题。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Players may not represent derived or free information incorrectly.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 牌手不得对推断信息和自由信息进行错误表现。</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Players must answer completely and honestly any specific questions pertaining to free information.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 牌手必须完整、诚实地回答有关于自由信息的明确询问。</li> </ul>
<p>The policy is a bit more complicated than the summary above, so I urge you to read it. In short, the Communication policy in the MTR governs what information players must provide their opponents with. A player can withhold some information from his or her opponent, but not from a judge. Judges expect (and can require) players to answer their questions. If you answer a question/or make a statement about free or derived information, it must be correct. If a player is asked about free information, he or she must answer completely and truthfully. If asked about derived information, the player is only required to be truthful to the opponent, but does not have to answer completely.</p>	<p>这个原则其实要比上面总结的复杂一点点,所以我强烈建议你去读一下 MTR 中的相关部分。简单来说, MTR 中的交流原则规定了哪些信息是牌手必须要提供给对手的。牌手可以保留一些信息不告诉对手,但是不能不告诉裁判。裁判期望(并且可以要求)牌手能够回答裁判提出的问题。如果你回答了一个包含推断/自由信息的问题或者叙述了推断/自由信息,那你必须保证你说的是正确的。如果一位牌手被问到了自由信息,那么他必须完整诚实的回答它。如果是问的推断信息,那么牌手对对手的回答只需要诚实,而不必回答的全面。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>A backup may be considered in cases where a player has clearly acted upon incorrect information provided to him or her by his or her opponent. The backup should be to the point of the action, not the erroneous communication.</b></p>	<p>如果明显属于牌手根据对手提供的错误信息采取行动的情形,则可考虑倒回。倒回时应倒回至执行动作的时点,而非产生错误交流的时点。</p>
<p>Sometimes a CPV doesn't matter. Sometimes it does. Typically you, as judge, will only get calls "when it</p>	<p>有些违反交流原则的行为并不会影响局面,但是另一些会。通常来说,裁判只会在交流问题会影响局</p>

<p>matters,” and will need to consider a rewind. If I ask you what the power/toughness of your creature is, and you say “2/3,” I can feel safe attacking with my 3/3. But if we discover during declare blockers that it’s a 3/4, well, I would have done things differently had you answered correctly. I based my decision on information you provided me, since I should be able to expect honest answers about certain things. This wasn’t a case where I made a play mistake or a strategic error. In the the case where it is clear that a player took actions based on the incorrect data, then a rewind, as outlined in section 1.4 Backing Up can be considered.</p>	<p>面的时候才会被叫过去。这时裁判需要考虑是否倒回。如果我问你那个生物是几几的，你说“2/3”，然后我就放心的拿 3/3 人宣攻了。但是在宣告阻挡者时我们发现，这个生物其实是 3/4 的，那么如果你正确回答我的问题我就不会宣攻了。因为我本应期望你对于一些事物的回答是诚实的，因此我的选择是基于你给出的信息做出。这与我出现行动失误或者犯了战术错误是不一样的。如果牌手的行动显然是基于对手给出的错误信息作出的，那么可以根据 IPG 的 1.4 的内容进行倒回。</p>
<h3>3.8 Marked Cards</h3>	<h3>3.8 有记号的牌</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Penalty</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">处罚</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Warning with Potential Upgrade</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">警告（可能升级）</p>
<h4>DEFINITION</h4>	<h4>定义</h4>
<p><b>A player’s cards are marked or oriented in a way that could potentially give an advantage to that player.</b></p>	<p>牌手的牌上有记号或弯折，而且这些记号的模式让该牌手有机会得到优势。</p>
<p>A card should be identifiable only from its front face. Being able to identify what a card is, or what card type it is, from anything other than its front face is an issue. This applies to physical markings, such as scratches, dings, and scuffs, as well as to physical orientation – for example, if all of a player’s lands are turned upside down in his deck. If a single card can be identified side-on (i.e., while mash shuffling), this is also a problem that needs to be fixed by replacing the card, or sleeve, depending on the issue. Please note, this infraction only addresses issues with potential abuse. If we feel there is actual abuse, then we are now considering USC—Cheating.</p>	<p>一张牌应该只能通过看牌面来确认它是什么。如果能从正面以外的地方判断出它是哪张牌，或者牌是什么类别都是不能允许的。这主要涵盖物理磨损的情况，包括抓痕，折痕以及磨损等，也包括牌的方向——例如，牌手套牌中所有地牌的牌套都是倒着放的。如果一张牌在插洗的时候能从侧面认出来，也是不行的，需要将那张牌或者牌套替换掉。请注意，这个违规的判罚是针对于其滥用的可能性。如果你感觉牌手已经在滥用这点来获利，那么我们应该考虑举止违背运动道德～作弊。</p>
<h4>EXAMPLES</h4>	<h4>范例</h4>
<p><b>A. A player has small marks on a few of his sleeves. The markings are on a Mountain, a Loxodon Hierarch, and a Lightning Helix.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手的几张牌套上有小记号。有记号的牌是一张山脉、一张象族大主教/Loxodon Hierarch 和一张闪电螺旋/Lightning Helix。</b></p>
<p>There is not a great argument for a land, a creature, and an instant being a pattern of marked cards. However, cards that are individually marked in this</p>	<p>一张地，一个生物和一个瞬间，这个情形似乎并不是刻意做了记号的牌。然而，这样的单张有记号的牌仍旧是个问题。如果牌手意识到了这个标记，那</p>

<p>fashion are still an issue. If the player notices these markings, that player can make an assumption that “this card in my 60 card deck is a mountain, a Loxodon Hierarch, or a Lightning Helix,” giving the player undue knowledge about what that card might be.</p>	<p>么他看到这个记号的时候就知道这张牌可能是山脉/象族大主教/闪电螺旋，这给了牌手本不应知道的牌库信息。</p>
<p><b>B. A player without sleeves has several foil cards that stand out significantly from the rest of her deck.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 在一副没有用牌套的套牌中，可以明显地辨别出部分闪卡。</b></p>
<p>Foils have a tendency to bend inwards. It is possible, and with bad handling, for these cards to be warped in such a way that they are noticeable. Again, knowing which foils the player has in his or her deck, that player can make a more accurate assumption about what the bent card is. It should be noted that not all foils are marked, and not all bent cards are foils. Let's be very clear here, the fact that your deck contains foils in a specific pattern (all lands, for example) does not mean the deck is marked; the markings arise from the bends (if they exist).</p>	<p>闪卡经常会出现弯曲。如果不妥善保管，这种弯曲可能会严重到在牌库中也能看出来的程度。牌手知道自己套牌中哪张牌是闪的，他就获知了额外的牌库信息。但是需要注意并不是所有闪卡都是弯的，也并非所有弯卡都是闪的。举例的来说，就算你套牌中特定部分都用的闪牌（比如全部都用闪地）也不一定意味着你套牌是带记号的，造成记号的原因是牌弯。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>Sleeves and cards often become worn over the course of a tournament, and, as long as the player is not attempting to take advantage of this, addressing the situation is sufficient in most cases. Note that almost all sleeves can be considered marked in some way; judges should keep this in mind when determining penalties.</b></p>	<p>牌套与牌在比赛过程中经常会持续磨损，并且，只要牌手并不准备藉此获得优势，通常来说只要提醒有此现象便已足够。请注意，几乎所有的牌套都可能在某种标准下被判定为有记号；裁判决定作出处罚时务须谨慎行事。</p>
<p>Tournaments are long, with many larger tournaments involving over 8 hours of actual Magic gameplay. Playing Magic — especially shuffling cards — over an 8 hour period will cause sleeve splits, and it will cause dings, dents, and scuffs. As long as these markings do not make a card identifiable, it is simple enough just to point out this error, give the penalty and get the player to replace the sleeves. Be careful, though — if you stare long enough, you can probably find markings on all but the newest sleeves. This does not mean they are marked.</p>	<p>比赛的时间很长，很多大比赛你实际在玩牌的时间都会超过 8 小时。玩牌（尤其是洗牌）8 个小时经常会造成牌套的损坏，或者在牌套上产生痕迹。只要那个印记并不会使得一张牌是可辨识的，那么只要指出这个问题，给出判罚，让牌手更换牌套就行了。需要注意的是，如果长时间的观察一套牌，你可能会在新换的牌套以外的所有牌套上都能看出痕迹，但是这并不意味着这些牌是带记号的。</p>
<p><b>In cases of marked cards, educating players to shuffle their cards and sleeves before sleeving the cards is very important.</b></p>	<p><b>遇到此类状况时，要教导牌手在上牌套之前务必要先将牌洗过。</b></p>
<p>It's always important to explain why players are getting a particular penalty, but with Marked Cards, you need to explain how to prevent further</p>	<p>向牌手说明他为什么会得到这个判罚是非常重要的，但是在有记号的牌判罚中，你同样需要告诉牌手如何防止继续吃到这个判罚。一般来说你不说的</p>

<p>occurrences. Typically the players won't know anything is wrong until you tell them.</p>	<p>话牌手是不知道问题所在的。</p>
<p>Additionally, there are some additional steps the players should take when sleeving up their deck. For example, players should shuffle their sleeves as well as their decks prior to sleeving, in case some sleeves are slightly shorter than others (this can happen with sleeves from different packs, even if they're sold as identical). If the player shuffles the sleeves first, there may be marked cards, necessitating changes, but it is unlikely to be serious. If the player does not shuffle the sleeves first, it could be that the deck is in one size of sleeves and the sideboard in a different size — a much bigger problem (see below).</p>	<p>在此之外，牌手给套牌上牌套的时候应有一些额外的步骤。比如，牌手应该把他的牌套和套牌都洗一下，因为有的时候牌套的长度会有差异（这可能因为这些牌套出自不同的包里，即使这两包牌套是同一种）。如果牌手在上牌套之前就洗过套牌和牌套，那么这种有记号的牌可能不会被认为很严重。如果没洗过，可能最后你的备牌的牌套会跟主牌有区别，这就是个大问题了（见下文）。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>The player needs to replace the card(s) or sleeve(s) with an unmarked version or, if no sleeves are being used, use sleeves that conceal the markings.</b></p>	<p><b>牌手必须将有记号的牌或是牌套换掉；若是并未利用牌套，则上牌套来盖掉记号。</b></p>
<p>In the event that a player's cards or sleeves are marked, they need to become unmarked. There are often traders at larger tournaments such as Pro Tour Qualifiers, and smaller Grand Prix Trials and other Competitive REL events are often held in a store, where sleeves may be purchased cheaply and quickly. If we are only talking about a few cards, most packs of sleeves come with a few extra, or perhaps the player can swap marked sleeves with unmarked sleeves from the sideboard. This is especially important in events where a player has not sleeved their decks — with the frequency that a deck of Magic cards must be shuffled, unsleeved cards get marked quickly.</p>	<p>当发现牌手使用带记号的牌或牌套时，需要想办法把这些记号去掉。PTQ 以上的大型赛场里通常有售牌的摊位，而 GPT 等其他竞争级比赛一般都是在牌店内举行，这些地方都能很方便的买到牌套。如果只有少量牌有问题，一般来说给一套牌上完牌套都会剩下几张牌套，或者牌手可以把主牌中有记号的牌套跟备牌的没记号牌套换一下。特别对于没有用牌套的牌手而言套上牌套是很重要的——比赛中的洗牌很快会让没有牌套的套牌带上记号。</p>
<p><b>If the cards themselves have become marked through play in the tournament, the Head Judge may decide to issue a proxy.</b></p>	<p><b>如果牌是在比赛中因游戏过程地磨损而有了记号，则主审可以决定给予代牌来使用。</b></p>
<p>If someone trips over and spills water over a player's deck, we don't want it to be the end of that player's tournament because he or she can't play with his or her cards. Cards damaged or marked in the tournament — as well as misprinted limited product — can have proxies issued at the Head Judge's discretion, as outlined in section 3.4 of the Magic Tournament Rules (MTR).</p>	<p>如果路人摔了一跤然后把水洒在了牌手的牌上，我们不希望因为这张牌无法继续使用而影响到牌手后面的比赛。在比赛中因某些原因而出现记号或损坏的牌（包括印刷有问题的限制赛产品）可以由主审做出代牌来替代。（MTR 3.4）</p>
<p><b>If the player is unable to find replacement cards, he</b></p>	<p><b>假如牌手无法得到符合规定的牌，则在此比赛接下</b></p>

<p><b>or she may replace those cards with basic lands; this change may be reverted at a later point if replacements for marked cards are found.</b></p>	<p>来的时段中,他可用基本地来取代这些牌;如果牌手在稍后时段找到了符合规定的牌,可将此更改恢复原状。</p>
<p>If a player can no longer play with certain cards due to them being illegal (for example, the player's four foil Huntmasters of the Fells were bowed, and so can't be used, so the player now has a 56-card deck), the player may replace those cards with other copies of the same card, or with basic land. If the player opt to find replacement cards, please ask them to hurry, and give them 10 minutes before assessing a Tardiness Penalty. If the player adds basic lands instead, the decklist should be changed to reflect what the player is actually now playing, so that they do not receive subsequent Deck/Decklist Problem penalties later in the tournament.</p>	<p>如果牌手套牌中的有些牌不能在接下来的比赛中使用了(比如有四张闪堕者猎师弯了,把它们剔出去之后套牌变成了56张。),那位牌手可以使用同名牌来替代他们,或者拿基本地来替代。如果他们决定去找替代品,请要求他们尽快并给他们10分钟,超过时限则有可能得到迟到的判罚。如果那位牌手决定加入几张基本地,那么他的套牌登记表也应该被相应的修改,这样他们就不会在后面的比赛中受到套牌/套牌登记表问题的处罚。</p>
<p><b>Upgrade: If the Head Judge believes that a deck's owner noticing the pattern of markings would be able to take advantage of this knowledge, the penalty is a Game Loss.</b></p>	<p><b>升级:</b>如果主审相信套牌的拥有者已经注意到记号的模式,且能够利用此信息获利,则处罚为一盘负。</p>
<p>A marking of cards that is a distinguishable pattern is normally more of a problem than the odd scuffed corner. For example, in a case where a player's sleeves are not opaque, double-faced cards such as Huntmaster of the Fells can be seen through the back of them. Because all of the player's Huntmasters of the Fells are marked in this way, it is possible to utilize the upgrade path on this. Other examples include: 11 cards have markings in the corner and 10 of them are land; all reanimation targets in a deck are slightly bent; in a post sideboard deck, sideboard cards are noticeably less scuffed.</p>	<p>一个有规律的记号牌通常情况下要比普通的牌套磨损要严重的多。比如,一位牌手的牌套并不是完全不透明的,看背面便可以识别出牌套里的堕者猎师。因为他所有的堕者猎师都可以这样被分辨出来,所以可以考虑将罚则升级。其他的例子包括:11个翘边的牌套里有10张是地;一套牌里所有的掘坟目标都轻微的弯曲了;在套牌中所有备牌的牌套都显得更新一些。</p>
<h2>4.0 Unsporting Conduct</h2>	<h2>4.0 举止违背运动道德</h2>
<p><b>Unsporting conduct is disruptive behavior that may affect the safety, competitiveness, enjoyment, or integrity of an event in a significantly negative fashion.</b></p>	<p><b>举止违背运动道德</b>是具有干扰性的行为,可能会对比赛的安全、竞争性、乐趣或公平性有严重的负面影响。</p>
<p>This is a general definition of what constitutes "Unsporting Conduct", and it's pretty broad. Some of you might think it covers a lot more stuff than you would have expected - but bear in mind that all these things are vital in to the provision of a good</p>	<p>这是“举止违背运动道德”的一般定义。这个定义相当广泛。有些人可能会认为它覆盖了很多你可能不会预期会遇到的情况,但是请牢记这些方针的存在对于保持良好的比赛体验是至关重要的。作为裁判,我们需要警惕这些可能对牌手产生负面体验的</p>

<p>tournament experience. As judges we need to be watchful for things that can create negative experiences for players, and deal with them as appropriate.</p>	<p>情况，并恰当的处理它们。</p>
<p><b>Being enrolled in the tournament is not a requirement to receive an Unsporting Conduct penalty. Although these guidelines refer to players, other people in the venue, such as spectators, staff, or judges are held to the same standard of behavior.</b></p>	<p>并非只有参赛牌手才可能会得到举止违背运动道德的处罚。此处罚方针虽然只提及牌手，但是赛场内的其他人，例如观众、工作人员或是裁判也都要遵循相同标准的行为规范。</p>
<p>The main purpose of this sentence is to explicitly answer the question, “What do I do if a person not enrolled in my event is doing these things?” There are no distinctions made between tournament attendees when it comes to Unsporting Conduct penalties. If you commit any of these infractions and are not enrolled in the event, you will be added to the event in the Reporter Software and given the appropriate penalty. If a spectator is giving outside assistance, then that is a serious infraction that needs to be tracked. If a spectator is acting aggressively, then that is something that needs to be tracked. You can do something ban-worthy at an event you aren’t enrolled in.</p>	<p>这句话的主要目的在于明确地回答一个问题——“如果一个并非参赛牌手的人在我执法的比赛中做了这些事情，我该怎么办？”举止违背运动道德的判罚对于所有比赛参与者而言是没有区别的。如果有人犯下了这类违规且其并非参赛牌手，裁判应当将违规者添加到 WER 回报软件中，并给予适用的判罚。旁观者给予外来协助是一个需要追踪的严重违规。旁观者有攻击性举止也是需要追踪的事情。没参赛并不能阻止一些人做出方针中禁止的事情。</p>
<p>The next question is, “How do I get their DCI number if they won’t give it to me?” Ask around. Someone will know who the offender is. Be sure to include their unwillingness to provide their DCI number in the infraction notes when you enter the penalty into the system.</p>	<p>接下来的问题是“如果未参赛的违规者不配合，裁判该如何获得他们的 DCI 号码？”答案：请四处打听。有人会知道违规者的身份。在录入判罚时，记得在说明栏中说明该违规者的不配合情况。</p>
<p><b>Unsporting behavior is not the same as a lack of sporting behavior. There is a wide middle ground of “competitive” behavior that is certainly neither “nice” nor “sporting” but still doesn't qualify as “unsporting.”</b></p>	<p>举止违背运动道德和缺乏运动家精神并不一样。“竞争性”的行为有很多的灰色地带，它们确实不“友好”，也非“具有运动家精神”，但也不能算是“举止违背运动道德”。</p>
<p>It’s important to make this clarification. If a player is not being nice to you, that doesn’t necessarily mean he or she is being unsporting. For example, you are not required to say “Good game” after getting crushed, you don’t have to shake hands, your opponent doesn’t have to tell you exactly what a card does, etc. None of these things constitute Unsporting Conduct. A player is allowed to have his or her “game face” on.</p>	<p>澄清这一点是重要的。如果一个牌手并没有表现的很友好，这并不一定表示他违背运动道德。举例来说，我们不能指望牌手在被对手完虐之后说“精彩的比赛”，握手也不是必须的，对手没必要准确地告诉你一张牌能做什么，等等。这些情况都不是举止违背运动道德。我们应当允许牌手在比赛中换上他的竞赛面孔。</p>
<p><b>The Head Judge is the final arbiter on what constitutes unsporting conduct.</b></p>	<p>主审是判定举止是否举止违背运动道德的最终仲裁者。</p>

<p>A floor judge can decide to issue an Unsporting Conduct penalty, but players may appeal this ruling. Just as with many other sections of this document, the Head Judge is the final authority when it comes to determining whether something is Unsporting Conduct. It is also necessary to get the Head Judge's agreement/approval prior to giving any infraction with a penalty of Game Loss or higher, and if it's a Disqualification, the Head Judge should be the one giving it.</p>	<p>巡场裁判可以决定给出一个举止违背运动道德的判罚，但是牌手可以上诉。与这份文件的许多其他部分相同，主审拥有判定是否举止违背运动道德的最终权限。巡场裁判在给予任何违规为一盘负或更严厉的处罚时，获得主审的授权或同意也是必要的。而取消资格的判罚则必须由主审给出。</p>
<p><b>Judges should inform the player how his or her conduct is disruptive. The player is expected to correct the situation and behavior immediately. However, while making sure that the player understands the severity of his or her actions is important, judges should focus first on calming a situation, and deal with infractions and penalties afterwards.</b></p>	<p>裁判必须告知该牌手，其举止会如何对他人造成干扰。该牌手必须立刻改正状况和行为。但是，在确定该牌手已了解其行为的严重性之同时，裁判应该先设法冷静当前局势，之后才去判定违规与处罚。</p>
<p>Sometimes players do not notice that their behavior is being disruptive to the event. They are wrapped up in their own concerns, so the judges have to let them know that what they are doing is causing a problem. After being told, the player should immediately correct his or her actions. However, in order to prevent situations from escalating, the primary focus of judges should be to get the situation under control. Basically, if you have a player who is angry, giving him or her a penalty at that moment will probably make things worse. Get control of the situation, and then worry about infractions.</p>	<p>有时牌手并没有注意到他们的行为对比赛会产生干扰。他们的注意力完全集中于自己的事情，所以裁判应当让牌手知道他/她做了什么事情导致了问题。在被告知后，牌手应当立刻纠正他/她的行为。然后，为了防止事态升级，裁判首先要注意控制当前场面。基本上来说，如果立刻给予一个愤怒的牌手判罚将有可能会让情况变得更糟。先控制事态，然后考虑违规行为。</p>
<p><b>4.1 Minor</b></p>	<p><b>4.1 轻微</b></p>
<p>Penalty</p>	<p>处罚</p>
<p>Warning</p>	<p>警告</p>
<p><b>DEFINITION</b></p>	<p><b>定义</b></p>
<p><b>A player takes action that is disruptive to the tournament or its participants.</b></p>	<p><b>牌手的个人行为对比赛或是参与者产生干扰。</b></p>
<p>Actions can be “disruptive” in multiple ways. We can't write an exhaustive list of everything disruptive because every place in the world where Magic is played has its own rules for civil life. Note that we said “disruptive”, not “offensive”, although offensive</p>	<p>干扰行为可能是多种多样的。我们无法列出一个涵盖所有干扰行为的清单，因为全世界每一个打万智牌的地方都会有自己的文化氛围。注意，干扰并非冒犯，尽管冒犯的言论一般都是干扰性的。IPG 无意去判定一个牌手是否被冒犯，因为这会导致判决</p>



<p>statements are almost always disruptive. The IPG makes no effort to determine if a player is “offended” as that leads to inconsistent rulings and opens up the potential for players to “game the system” by pretending to be more offended than they really are.</p>	<p>的不一致，也会给予牌手利用规则的空间，假装被冒犯的程度比实际严重来使别人获得判罚。</p>
<p>The IPG is applied in the same way for all problems of this type, but each judge must determine what is acceptable or not from their own experience and judgment.</p>	<p>IPG 对于所有此类问题以相同的方式适用。但是每个裁判必须根据他们的经验与判断来决定什么是可以接受的，而什么不能。</p>
<p>Participants have the responsibility to not ruin the enjoyable atmosphere of the tournament, so as judges we must take care to educate players. If Magic is to be a game where people have fun with each other, we must prevent behaviors that damage this. Our goal is to educate the players to be respectful in the tournament and to signal that certain behaviors are not acceptable. While “minor” may be in the title of the infraction, it is still a formal infraction and has an upgrade path. Do not confuse “minor” with how seriously we are to treat the issue.</p>	<p>参与比赛者有责任不去破坏比赛的愉快氛围，所以作为裁判必须留心教育牌手。如果我们想让万智牌成为一个人可以与他人一起娱乐的游戏，我们必须防止做出伤害它的行为。我们的目标是教育牌手在比赛中尊重他人，并且表示某些行为是不被接受的。尽管违规的标题中包含“轻微”，这仍然是一个正式的违规，并且有可能升级。不要因“轻微”忘记我们要非常严肃地对待此类违规。</p>
<p>A player failing to follow a judge's direct instruction is also disruptive; perhaps to the tournament or to the Judges themselves. When a judge tells a player to do something, it is for the good of the event or to enforce a specific policy concern or tournament rule. We don't tell players to change their behavior for the fun of it, or to exercise our authority. Keep in mind there is a reasonable limit to what you can instruct a player to do. We don't tell them “Go stand in the rain for 20 min”, but we will tell them “Quit shuffling in your lap.”</p>	<p>牌手没有听从裁判的直接指示也是干扰行为。这可能是对比赛的干扰，也可能是对裁判的。当一位裁判告诉牌手去做某事时，这是为了比赛的利益或者是执行某个方针或比赛规则。我们不会只为了找乐子或者耍威风而告诉牌手去改变他们的行为。注意，对于什么是裁判能够指示牌手做的，这里有一个合理的限制。例如，我们不能告诉牌手“去雨里站 20 分钟”，但我们会告诉他们不要在腿上洗牌。</p>
<p>Finally, if the disruptive behavior is neither Unsporting Conduct — Major nor Unsporting Conduct—Aggressive Behavior, then it is Unsporting Conduct—Minor.</p>	<p>最后，如果干扰行为既不能归类为举止违背运动道德~严重，也不能归类为举止违背运动道德~攻击性行为，那么它就是举止违背运动道德~轻微。</p>
<p><b>It may affect the comfort level of those around the individual, but determining whether this is the case is not required.</b></p>	<p>这可能会妨碍到该人周遭的舒适气氛，不过是否造成妨碍并非判定的必要条件。</p>
<p>This sentence is included in the IPG because judges can't have personal knowledge of all participants in the venue; it is not important to find out if there actually is a person that is actually being disturbed by the disruptive action for the penalty to apply, and we don't have to look for such a person. However, the converse is actually true as well. Some people can be offended or upset by items below a reasonable</p>	<p>IPG 包含这句话是因为裁判不可能认识比赛中的每一位参与者。找出是否有确实有人受到了干扰性行为的不良影响并不重要，并且我们也没有必要去找到这个人。而且，反过来的情况也是不重要的。一些人可能会被不足以判定为此违规的事物所冒犯、或感到不爽。举例来说，在一场现开赛中，牌手可能会因为对手使用的狂野得胜这张牌的原画而感到不爽，但这并不表示使用这张牌的牌手应该得到</p>

<p>threshold for this infraction. For example, in a sealed event, a player may be upset by the unaltered artwork on Triumph of Ferocity; this does not mean the player using the card should get a warning, or even have to change the card.</p>	<p>一个警告，或者必须更换这张牌。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player uses excessively vulgar and profane language.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手使用过度粗俗不雅的语言。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player inappropriately demands to a judge that her opponent receive a penalty.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手无理地要求裁判去处罚其对手。</b></p>
<p><b>C. A player appeals to the Head Judge before waiting for the floor judge to issue a ruling.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手在巡场裁判作出判罚之前就上诉至主审。</b></p>
<p><b>D. A player throws his deck on the ground after losing a game.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 牌手在输掉游戏后将套牌摔向地面。</b></p>
<p><b>E. A player leaves excessive trash in the play area after leaving the table.</b></p>	<p><b>E. 牌手离开座位时将过多的垃圾留在游戏区域。</b></p>
<p><b>F. A player fails to follow the request of a tournament official, such as being asked to leave the play area.</b></p>	<p><b>F. 牌手未遵从比赛工作人员的要求，例如请离比赛区域。</b></p>
<p>These examples give a view of what types of behavior are unacceptable. However, remember that the line between Unsporting Conduct – Minor and normal competitive behavior is understandably gray, as regional customs and standards of behavior vary widely. Additionally, as discussed in section 4.0, a lack of sporting behavior is not the same thing as unsporting behavior. There are a wide range of behaviors that, while not sporting, do not fall under this infraction. For example, refusing to shake an opponent’s hand after a match does not fall under this infraction. When evaluating a situation for Unsporting Conduct – Minor, go back to the definition: did the player take an action that is disruptive?</p>	<p>这些例子给我们树立了一个概念，告诉我们哪些行为是不可接受的。但是，要记住举止违背运动道德～轻微和正常的竞争性行为之间的界限是模糊的，因为区域性习俗与行为标准相差很大。此外，如同我们在 4.0 节中讨论过的，缺乏运动家精神与举止违背运动道德并不能混为一谈。有很多行为虽然没什么运动家精神可言，也不属于这个违规的范畴。例如，在赛后拒绝与对手握手并不属于这项违规。当我们评估某个情况是否属于举止违背运动道德～轻微，我们应该遵从定义：牌手的行为是否产生了干扰？</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>All participants should expect a safe and enjoyable environment at a tournament, and a participant needs to be made aware if his or her behavior is unacceptable so that this environment may be maintained.</b></p>	<p><b>所有参赛者都该享有一个安全且舒适的赛场环境，牌手在做出不被接受的行为时就要给予处罚，如此才能维护赛场环境。</b></p>
<p>Unfortunately, not everyone you meet at a</p>	<p>不幸的是，并非每一个你在比赛中遇到的人都能够</p>

<p>tournament is going to have an understanding of basic respect and courtesy. Judges, by stepping in and giving a penalty, are showing the players that certain behaviors are not acceptable. When issuing this penalty, be sure to explain the correct behavior. Education is the most important factor here. The warning is to reinforce the lesson, and to provide documentation if the infraction needs to be upgraded.</p>	<p>理解基本的尊重和礼貌。裁判通过介入并给予判罚，能够向牌手表明其行为是不被接受的。给予此判罚时，请务必解释什么是恰当的行为。教育是最重要的。警告是用于加强教育的，并在违规行为需要被升级时提供判罚记录。</p>
<p>Wearing offensive clothing does not generally fall under this infraction. Wearing clothing is a passive activity, and as such only the most extreme lapses in judgement should be considered for this infraction. Unsporting Conduct – Minor applies either for specific actions or for the failure to perform specific actions. When an article of clothing is deemed reasonably offensive, simply ask the player to remove the shirt/cover it up/turn it inside out, and issue no penalty. Apply the infraction only if the player fails to comply with your directions.</p>	<p>穿着冒犯性的服装通常不属于此违规的范畴。服装一般是被动行为，并且只有最极端的过失才会被考虑适用此判罚。举止违背运动道德～轻微适用于某些行为或者不执行某些行为。如果你认为牌手穿的某件衣物足以构成冒犯，请简单地要求牌手脱去外衣/覆盖/翻过来穿它，且无须给出判罚。只有牌手不遵从裁判的指导时才考虑给出警告判罚。</p>
<p>With regard to the directed instructions, judges have a lot of authority in an event. When a judge directly instructs a player to perform an action, this infraction gives the judge the authority to enforce compliance. This doesn't mean judges can abuse this authority; when judges give direct instructions, it must be for the benefit of the tournament.</p>	<p>说到直接指示，裁判在比赛拥有很多权力。当裁判直接指示一位牌手进行某个动作时，此违规给予裁判让牌手服从的权力。这并不表示裁判可以滥用权力。当裁判进行直接指示时，这必须是为了比赛的利益。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>The player must correct the problem immediately.</b></p>	<p><b>该牌手必须立即更正问题。</b></p>
<p>A player who commits unsporting conduct must be educated that his or her behavior is not acceptable. Regardless of whether or not the player understands how the behavior is unacceptable, he or she is expected to stop.</p>	<p>举止违背运动道德牌手必须接受教育——他/她的行为是不被接受的。不管他们是否能理解为什么他们的行为不被接受，我们期望他们不要继续这样做。</p>
<p><b>Subsequent Unsporting Conduct – Minor infractions, even for different offenses, will result in a Game Loss.</b></p>	<p><b>再次犯下举止违背运动道德～轻微，会导致一盘负；即使是不同类型的违犯也一样。</b></p>
<p>Subsequent USC-Minor infractions are penalized with a game loss. This is to reinforce the importance of maintaining an open and welcoming environment. Note that this infraction is upgraded even if the second infraction is unrelated to the previous infraction. Keep in mind this is also relevant for direct</p>	<p>后续的举止违背运动道德～轻微将得到一盘负处罚。这是为了强调保持一个开放而友好的环境之重要性。注意，即使第二次违规是因为一件和之前的违规无关的事情，这一违规也是会升级的。注意这与你的直接指示也是有关联的。如果你给一个牌手直接指示，要求他们不要做出某些行为，但他还是</p>

instructions. If a judge gives a player a direct instruction to not perform an action, and the player still does, the player will get a warning for USC-Minor. Continuing to do so after the first infraction will result in a game loss.	做了,他便会因为举止违背运动道德~轻微得到一个警告。如果他继续这么做,我们就升级判罚。
<b>If a Game Loss is issued for repeated infractions, and it occurs at the end of a game, it is acceptable for the judge to apply the penalty to the next game instead.</b>	如果因为累犯而给予一盘负,且是在发生在一盘游戏结束时,裁判可以改为在下一盘才让处罚生效。
The reason for this difference in philosophy is simple. Unlike most other infractions, it's possible for a player to commit Unsporting Conduct- Minor after a match has already ended, but before the players have left the table. If a player has already recorded a match loss through the normal course of play, but still manages to commit this error during that same round, applying the Game Loss immediately may fail to have the intended impact on the player, and probably won't help illustrate that his or her actions were unacceptable.	这样做的原则其实非常简单。与大多数其他违规不同,牌手可能会在一局游戏结束之后,但双方牌手还未离开对局桌前时犯下举止违背运动道德~轻微。如果牌手这一局因为正常比赛已经输掉了,却仍在这一轮犯下了这个违规,立即给予牌手一盘负可能无法让判罚起到我们想要的效果,对于教育该牌手其行为之不可接受性也无所助益。
If you want a deeper knowledge about USC you can read this great article: <a href="http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20090810a">http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20090810a</a>	如果你需要更深入地了解举止违背运动道德,你可以阅读下面这篇优秀的文章: <a href="http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20090810a">http://www.wizards.com/magic/magazine/article.aspx?x=judge/article/20090810a</a>
<b>4.2 Major</b>	<b>4.2 严重</b>
Penalty	处罚
Match Loss	一局负
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player takes action towards one or more individuals that could reasonably be expected to create a feeling of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked.</b>	牌手向一人或多人做出易使对方产生受骚扰、威胁、欺侮、尾随感受的不端行为。
In stark contrast to previous revisions of this infraction, USC – Major is no longer defined by its examples. Whereas in the past, a player needed to take one of a very specific set of actions to be considered committing USC – Major, this is no longer the case. This infraction has been expanded to include a wider category of unacceptable behavior.	与此违规之前修订的版本明显不同的是,举止违背运动道德~严重已不再用例子来定义。在过去,一个牌手需要作出特定的一些行为才会被认定为举止违背运动道德~严重。现在有所不同。此违规已经扩展,以归纳一些更广泛的不被接受行为。
For the purposes of identifying this infraction, it is important to consider whether or not a player's	在鉴别这一违规时,非常重要的是要考虑一个牌手的对他人的行为是否有理由让我们认为会使被冒

<p>conduct toward others might reasonably be expected to cause any of the above-listed feelings, and not necessarily that anybody has been actually made to feel any of those ways. For further illustration of this point, please see Sean Catanese's excellent <a href="#">recent blog article</a>.</p>	<p>犯者产生上述感受。是否有人确实产生上述感受并非必要的。为了进一步说明这一点，请看 Sean Catanese 博客中这篇<a href="#">优秀的新文章</a>。</p>
<p>Note that it is possible for a player to commit this infraction by potentially causing these feelings in individuals other than his or her opponent. Participants in other matches, spectators, or tournament officials are all potential recipients of the harmful effects of a player's misconduct. The Match Loss penalty should be applied to the offending player even if the person potentially harmed by his or her actions is not his or her current round opponent.</p>	<p>请注意，牌手有可能使其对手以外的其他人产生上述感受，而犯下此违规。其他对局的参赛者、旁观者或比赛工作人员都有可能是潜在的不良影响受害者。一局负的判罚应当应用在冒犯他人的牌手上，即使可能被伤害的人并非是他当前这一轮的对手。</p>
<p>Finally, it should be pointed out that actual incidents of USC – Major are pretty rare. Local Magic communities tend to be very self-correcting even without the presence of judges. Basic social contract theory applies here; Magic players are humans, first. Most players already refrain from acting in ways that violate the communal agreements of society at large, so instances of this infraction are likewise unusual.</p>	<p>最后，应当指出，实际的举止违背运动道德事件～严重是相当少见的。本地的万智牌社群即使没有裁判在场一般都会自我纠正问题。因为万智牌牌手一定是人类，所以这里适用基本的社会契约理论。大多数牌手已经避免做出触犯社会集体认同的行为，所以此违规的实例是比较不寻常的。</p>
<p><b>This may include insults based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, gender, disability, or sexual orientation.</b></p>	<p>这包括侮辱他人的人种、肤色、宗教、国籍、年龄、性别、残疾或是性取向。</p>
<p>A harassing comment or threatening slur directed at a person that meets the criteria above is unacceptable. Even if a comment is intended to be humorous, it may still be reasonably expected to create one or more feelings of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked. Other players do not deserve to be spoken to in this way and judges are responsible for enforcing the standards Wizards of the Coast has put forth. It doesn't matter if a particular judge personally feels this type of insult doesn't merit a Match Loss, he or she should consider only how others might be expected to react to it.</p>	<p>符合上述标准针对个人的骚扰言论或者威胁言辞是不被接受的。即使牌手说出该言论的目的只是幽默，它仍然可能会造成他人感到受骚扰、危险、欺侮或者尾随。其他牌手不应被这类言论所针对，而裁判有责任执行威世智倡导的标准。个别裁判感觉这类侮辱不应判罚一局负是不重要的，他/她只应考虑其他人会对此有何反应。</p>
<p>Furthermore, the infraction doesn't depend on whether or not anybody was actually made to feel any of these ways. The MIPG has no way to measure or normalize how offended a person is. We, as judges, also do not want a player's level of offense dictating the severity of a penalty as offense is highly subjective.</p>	<p>此外，违规与是否有人确实感到被骚扰、威胁、欺侮、尾随并无关联。IPG 无法衡量或者标准化一个人受到的冒犯的程度。我们作为裁判也不想使用一个牌手受冒犯的程度来指导判罚的严重程度，因为被冒犯的感受是高度主观的。</p>

<p>Similarly, a generic comment that merely annoys or offends another person is not necessarily sufficient for USC—Major. Again, what’s important here is whether or not the action could reasonably create feelings of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked. Here, too, judges must take care to make sure that their own personal likelihood to be offended doesn’t preclude their treating players fairly. Judges should be be mindful to neither over- nor under-penalize for Unsporting Conduct based on their own personal biases.</p>	<p>类似的, 仅仅只是让人厌烦或者冒犯他人的一般言论可能达不到举止违背运动道德-严重这个违规的标准。重复一遍, 重要的是行为是否有可能使人产生被骚扰、威胁、欺侮、尾随的感受。在此裁判必须小心, 不能让自己对冒犯的个人判断妨碍他们对待牌手的公平性。裁判应当留意不能依据自己的个人偏见来重判或轻判违背运动道德的行为。</p>
<p><b>Threats of physical violence should be treated as Unsporting Conduct – Aggressive Behavior.</b></p>	<p>肢体暴力挑衅应依照“举止违背运动道德~攻击性举止”进行处理。</p>
<p>Threats of violence, be they explicit or implied, represent an even more serious category of problems that should be dealt with even more severely. USC – Major does not cover these.</p>	<p>暴力挑衅, 不论明显的或者含蓄的, 都是更为严重的问题, 因此应当更为严格地处理。举止违背运动道德~严重不涵盖此情况。</p>
<p><b>It is possible for an offender to commit this infraction without intending malice or harm to the subject of the harassment.</b></p>	<p>就算作出此类行为的牌手原本主观上无意针对或伤害受骚扰者, 他也可能犯下此违规。</p>
<p>Realistically, most incidents of USC – Major will have come about without malicious intent. Whether or not a player simply used a poorly-chosen word or made an instantly-regretted remark doesn’t matter in determining whether or not the infraction has been committed. If a player does or says something that could reasonably create feelings of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked, even without meaning to, then the damage has potentially already been done and the player should still receive the penalty.</p>	<p>实际上, 大多数举止违背运动道德~严重的实例并非由恶意的企图所导致。一位牌手是否只是简单地使用错误的词语或者立刻感到后悔的言辞对于判定其是否犯下违规并不重要。如果一个牌手做了或说了很可能产生他人被骚扰、威胁、欺侮、尾随感受的事, 即使该牌手不是有意而为, 伤害有可能已经造成了, 所以牌手仍然应当受到判罚。</p>
<p>In fact, if a player committing USC – Major does so with malicious intent, meaning he has acted with the specific intention of creating a toxic environment for others, then the penalty for this infraction should be upgraded to a Disqualification as explained below.</p>	<p>事实上, 如果牌手触犯举止违背运动道德~严重是因为恶意, 这表示他有意图地对他人制造不良环境, 而对此违规的判罚应当如下详述的升级。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p>范例</p>
<p><b>A. A player uses a racial slur against his opponent.</b></p>	<p>A. 牌手诋毁对手的人种。</p>
<p><b>B. A player takes inappropriate photos of another player without express permission.</b></p>	<p>B. 牌手在未征得对方明确同意的情况下拍摄其他牌手的不雅照片。</p>
<p><b>C. A player asks a spectator for a date, is denied, and continues to press the issue.</b></p>	<p>C. 牌手意图约会某位旁观者, 但在遭拒后依然不依不饶。</p>
<p><b>D. A player purposefully obstructs another player</b></p>	<p>D. 牌手故意阻挡其他牌手, 意图寻衅滋事。</p>

<b>with the intent of inducing physical contact.</b>	
<b>E. A spectator uses social media to bully another player.</b>	<b>E. 牌手利用社交媒体欺侮其他牌手。</b>
To help establish the difference between this infraction and some other similarly-seeming, yet fundamentally different errors, here are a few “anti-examples” of behavior that should usually not be considered USC – Major. It may be helpful to refer back to these after reading through some other sections of this annotation.	为了区分此违规与其他看起来类似但根本上不同的违规，下面有一些范例，包含一些通常不被考虑为举止违背运动道德～严重的行为。阅读完此注释的其他部分之后再回顾这些范例是有益的。
<b><u>ANTI-EXAMPLES</u></b>	<b>反例</b>
Z. After losing a game, a player physically threatens his opponent using a racial slur and saying he’ll see him in the parking lot.	Z. 输掉一盘比赛后，一位牌手用种族歧视言论威胁他的对手并要和对手在停车场约架。
While it is true that this certainly could be expected to cause feelings of harassment and threat, this is not USC – Major because it more appropriately meets the definition of USC – Aggressive Behavior. Threatening violence is a more serious concern and so takes precedence.	虽然上述行为确实会产生骚扰和威胁感，这并不是举止违背运动道德～严重，因为这更符合举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止。暴力威胁是更严重的问题，所以优先考虑。
Y. After losing his or her match, a player throws his chair in anger at a group of spectators, but doesn’t actually hit any of them.	Y. 牌手输了一局比赛后愤怒的把椅子扔向一群观众，但实际上没有伤到任何人。
Again, this is not USC – Major. Violence directed toward someone is more properly categorized as USC – Aggressive behavior. Note that a player simply throwing his chair in anger but neither intending to nor actually physically impacting anybody is an example of USC – Major.	再一次，这不是举止违背运动道德～严重。直接针对他人的暴力行为被划分为举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止。注意，如果牌手只是愤怒地扔他的椅子，但既不是有意的也没有实际影响到任何人的情况属于举止违背运动道德～严重。
X. A player refuses to shake her opponent’s hand after losing a close game. The opponent, with no reason to believe otherwise, assumes that the refusal is due to her gender.	X. 一位牌手在差之毫厘地输掉一盘游戏后拒绝与对手握手。他的对手认为对手拒绝的唯一合理理由是因为她的性别。
This is not USC – Major or any other infraction, really. As said in the introduction to USC, unsporting behavior is not the same as a lack of sporting behavior. Refusing a friendly handshake might not be very nice, but it isn’t actually against the rules.	事实上，这不是举止违背运动道德～严重或者任何其他违规。如 USC 的介绍中所说，违背运动道德的行为与缺乏运动精神的行为是不同的。拒绝友好的握手可能显得不友善，但是这并不违反规则。
W. A player opens his sealed pool and exclaims to himself in disgust, “These cards are gay!”	W. 牌手打开他的现开牌池并厌恶的自言自语“这牌池太基佬了”
Once again, this is not USC – Major, but does sound like it may be USC - Minor. While statements like this are sure to offend some people, they are a lot less	这也不是举止违背运动道德～严重，但这可能符合举止违背运动道德～轻微的定义。即使这样的言论很可能会冒犯一些人，但不大可能会导致被骚扰、

likely to cause feelings of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked, as they are not specifically directed at anybody. Merely offending others is not sufficient for meeting the criteria for this infraction; in order for something to be considered USC – Major, it must reasonably potentially cause one or more of these feelings. Note that in issuing the USC – Minor infraction, the player should still be talked to about this behavior and told to knock it off.	威胁、欺侮、尾随的感受。因为这些言论并不直接针对任何人。仅仅只是冒犯他人并不满足此违规的充分条件。一个行为要想被认为是举止违背运动道德~严重,应当可能造成他人一个或多个上述的不良感受。注意,确认举止违背运动道德~轻微违规后,应当教育牌手上述行为是不好的,并要求其不再犯。
V. A player in a losing position repeatedly shouts expletives to himself during his match and is issued a Warning for USC - Minor. During the next round, that player continues to use the same expletives.	V. 牌手快要输掉对局时不断地自言自语地咒骂,因举止违背运动道德~轻微被判警告。下一轮比赛中,牌手仍然继续此行为。
Similarly, this is not USC - Major. Repeated infractions of USC - Minor do not automatically upgrade the infraction to USC - Major. Please refer to the USC - Minor infraction in the MIPG for guidance on dealing with recurrences of that error.	类似地,这不是举止违背运动道德~严重。重复违反举止违背运动道德~轻微的违规行为并不自动升级为举止违背运动道德~严重。请根据 IPG 中关于举止违背运动道德~轻微的指导来处理累犯此违规的行为。
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>原则</b>
<b>A safe environment is a basic expectation of any tournament attendee. Harassment undermines the safety and integrity of a tournament.</b>	安全的比赛环境是所有参赛者最基本的预期。对他人进行骚扰会破坏比赛的安全与公正。
This should pretty much go without saying. Magic tournaments are supposed to be safe, non-threatening, family-friendly affairs.	这是不言自明的。万智牌比赛应当是安全的、无害的、适合家庭参与的事情。
<b>Players who purposefully create harmful or unwelcoming situations in an event are expected to immediately correct the behavior and demonstrate remorse or be removed.</b>	在赛事中故意寻衅惹事的牌手应立即改正并道歉,否则便会被逐出赛场。
Note that there is a distinction between purposefully creating a harmful and/or unwelcoming situation and doing so “with malicious intent.” A player who intentionally takes a harmful action- such as making a harassing off-color remark- might not necessarily have expected any offense by it. It’s possible, for example, for a player to use a particular ethnic slur without knowing its definition or being aware of its vulgar nature. Again, if a player did actually mean specific and longer-lasting harm with his words or actions, the penalty for the infraction should be upgraded to Disqualification as explained later.	注意,故意制造有害或者不受欢迎的情况与不怀好意地这样做是有区别的。牌手故意做出有害行为,比如骚扰他人的下流言辞,可能不是打算冒犯其他人。举例来说,牌手使用了种族歧视词汇,但他有可能并不知道该词汇的含义,或者意识到它的粗俗性质。再一次说明,如果一个牌手有意地使用言语或行为故意对他人造成持久性伤害,那么判罚应当如后文叙述地升级为取消资格。
Determining whether or not a player has demonstrated remorse requires at least a basic level	判定牌手是否懊悔需要一定的专注力与同理心。言辞如“我很抱歉”和“我不应该这样做”是比较好的



<p>of attentiveness and empathy. Statements such as “I’m sorry,” and “I shouldn’t have done that,” are good indications that a player regrets his actions and won’t repeat them. Conversely, statements like “it was just a joke,” or “this is ridiculous,” are potential red flags indicating that a player doesn’t yet understand the harmful implications of his or his or her behavior, or is simply not well-conditioned for participation in a non-threatening environment. Special care should be used by judges to ensure that infracting players disagreeing with or being upset over a match loss penalty are still separately given a chance to show remorse for their actions.</p>	<p>迹象,表明牌手对他的行为表示后悔,并不会再犯。相反的,言辞如“那只是开玩笑啦”或者“你一定是在逗我”都是潜在危险迹象,表明牌手还没有意识到他/她的行为造成的有害影响,或者他目前的状态并不适合在无威胁环境中继续参赛。裁判应当特别小心处理这类违规,保证那些因为不同意一局负判罚或者因为判罚而不爽的违规牌手仍然在稍后有机会对自己的违规行为表示懊悔。</p>
<p>A player not demonstrating sincere remorse should be informed that continuing to not do so will result in his or her Disqualification. An ultimatum like “If you want to continue playing today, you’ll need to convince me that this isn’t going to be a problem again,” may be enough to prompt the regret and humility necessary for the player to be allowed to stay in the event. Note that, “I don’t agree with you, but I’ll stop,” should be an acceptable response.</p>	<p>牌手若没有表现出真诚的懊悔,裁判应该告知该牌手,如果仍不进行道歉将导致他/她被取消资格。诸如“如果你今天想要继续比赛,你需要让我相信你不会再制造麻烦”这样的最后通牒可能足以促使想要继续比赛的牌手感到后悔与羞愧。注意,“我不认同你,但我会停止”是一个可以接受的反应。</p>
<p><b>Because of the confrontational nature of this infraction, judges need to end any match in progress and separate the players.</b></p>	<p>由于出现次违规时双方牌手会在情绪上有所对立,裁判要终止正在进行的比赛,并将涉事双方牌手分开,</p>
<p>Some judicious teamwork may be a useful approach, here. For example, the attending judge might ask to speak to the offending player privately. After he has been escorted from the playing area, another assisting judge might then inform the opponent that she will be receiving a win for the current match, assist her with gathering her belongings, and then ask her to leave the table. Then, after the attending judge has finished explaining the infraction and penalty to the offending player (see below for more on this topic), that judge would be able to escort him back to the playing area to retrieve his belongings without risk of further confrontation.</p>	<p>审慎判断现场情况并开展团队合作可能会十分有效。举例来说,参与判罚的裁判可以要求与做出冒犯行为的牌手私下交谈。在被带出比赛区域后,另一位协助的裁判可以告知对手,她将会得到当前对局的胜利,并且协助她带好她的物品并离开。然后,在参与判罚的裁判向做出冒犯行为的牌手解释完违规和判罚之后(以下有更多关于此主题的内容),该裁判可以带他回到比赛区域取回他的物品。这样做可以避免进一步对抗的风险。</p>
<p><b>Care should be taken not to escalate the situation if at all possible. The offender will be removed from the area to receive the penalty, and education about why the behavior is unacceptable regardless of excuse.</b></p>	<p>同时应尽力进行安抚,保证事态不致升级。裁判应将犯下此违规的牌手带离比赛区域,给予处罚,并教育牌手不管理由为何,都不应该进行这类行为。</p>
<p>Handling aggressive behavior with more aggressive behavior is a poor way to approach a situation, as it</p>	<p>用更具有攻击性的行为来处理攻击性行为是一个糟糕的方法,它会导致情况变得更差。当面对不守</p>

<p>tends to make things worse. When dealing with an unruly player, keeping cool yet remaining firm is usually the best approach. Judges should remove the player from the situation by, for example, asking him or her to step away from the playing area or to come outside to talk. This has the effect of giving the player time to cool off, while providing an opportunity for the judge to talk with him, let him vent, and do whatever else is needed to calm the offending player down.</p>	<p>规矩的牌手时，保持冷静而坚定通常是最佳方式。裁判应当让牌手脱离不好的情形，可运用的方式如请他/她离开比赛区域到一旁谈谈，让他把情绪发泄出来，然后再设法让牌手冷静下来。</p>
<p>It is important for judges to remember to themselves remain calm. When dealing with USC – Major, a judge’s first priority is to de-escalate the situation, which will be difficult or impossible if that judge is angry, upset, or visibly nervous. Assessing the penalty should only be done once everything else is under control.</p>	<p>对于裁判来说，最重要的是记住要保持冷静。当你处理举止违背运动道德～严重时，裁判的第一要务是缓和事态。如果裁判自己就很愤怒、不爽或显得紧张，就很难甚至不可能去缓和事态。只有当事态进入可控的范围内之后，再决定判罚。</p>
<p><b>They may need a few moments to cool down afterwards.</b></p>	<p>此后牌手可能需要一段时间冷静。</p>
<p>Judges should take their time dealing with all players involved in USC – Major- not just the offender. Other players made to feel harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked may also require some brief counseling and/or an explanation of the corrective action being applied to the match and opponent.</p>	<p>裁判应该花时间处理所有涉及到举止违背运动道德～严重事件的牌手，而不仅仅只是冒犯者。其他感到受骚扰、威胁、欺侮或尾随的牌手可能也需要一些简短地建议和/或解释，告知他对手应做出的改正行为、以及当前对局的解决方法。</p>
<p>Because the penalty for this infraction is a Match Loss, it is unlikely that issuing it will result in much delay to the entire event, even when significant time is needed to help the players cool down. Since the match is already over, an extension will usually not be required.</p>	<p>因为此违规的判罚是一局负，给出此判罚一般不会对整场赛事造成太多的拖延，即使让牌手们冷静下来需要花费不少时间。由于对局已经结束，通常是不需要延时的。</p>
<p><b>Apologizing is encouraged, but the desire of the other individuals to not interact with their harasser must be respected.</b></p>	<p>虽然应促使双方谅解，但若受骚扰方表达出不愿再与骚扰方接触的意愿，也应予以尊重。</p>
<p>One of the main reasons why the penalty for USC – Major is a Match Loss is that assessing it immediately disengages the offending player from his or her opponent. It would be unreasonable to expect the female opponent of a player who uses, for example, misogynistic language to continue the match after a judge has intervened. If such an opponent doesn’t want any further contact, this request should be honored. After the penalty is issued, the match is automatically ended, so there’s no need for any further interaction.</p>	<p>举止违背运动道德～严重的判罚是一局负的一个主要原因是，它能够直接让冒犯者与他/她的对手分开来。举例来说，指望女性牌手在对手使用厌恶女性的言语之后还继续比赛是不合理的，即使裁判对不良行为进行了干预。如果对手不希望继续与冒犯者有更多的接触，这一需求应当被尊重。在判罚给出之后，对局自动结束，所以双方没有必要进一步互动。</p>

<p>However, a player eager to apologize is a good indication that he or she is demonstrating enough remorse to be allowed to continue playing after receiving his or her penalty. This is true even if he or she is not given the chance to deliver it.</p>	<p>然而，一位牌手很愿意道歉是一个良好的迹象。他/她表现出足够懊悔的话可以被允许在受到判罚之后继续比赛。即使对手并不想接受致歉也是如此。</p>
<p><b>Officials must investigate these matters as soon as they are brought to their attention.</b></p>	<p>当有人就此行为唤起工作人员注意时，工作人员应尽快对此类事端进行调查。</p>
<p>Note that because the penalty for this infraction is a Match Loss (or Disqualification), as with all penalties greater than a Warning, the head judge should be made aware before it is issued. However, the first priority when dealing with potential USC - Major is de-escalation of the situation through separation of the players and calming of the people involved. Judges should make sure this goal is met before taking further action.</p>	<p>注意，因为此违规的判罚是一局负（或者取消资格），与所有严重程度超过警告的判罚一样，需要在给出判罚前告知主审。然而，处理可能是举止违背运动道德~严重的事件时，第一要务是缓和事态，分开牌手并让涉及到的人们冷静下来。裁判应当在采取进一步动作前确保这一点。</p>
<p><b>If they determine that the infraction does not meet the criteria for Unsporting Conduct – Major, it is still recommended that the players be talked to to avoid future misunderstandings.</b></p>	<p>即便认定有关违规不符合“举止违背运动道德~严重”的定义，也建议向双方牌手进行解释，以免再生误会。</p>
<p>It is expected that players will sometimes become offended or be made otherwise uncomfortable by another player’s actions without those actions being considered to reasonably cause feelings of being harassed, threatened, bullied, or stalked. In such a circumstance, the more appropriate infraction may be, but is not necessarily, USC – Minor. Judges should refer to that infraction to make sure that the player’s behavior matches up to what’s described therein.</p>	<p>有可能发生一种情况，牌手有时因其他牌手的行为被冒犯或感到不适，而这些行为不是易使人感到被骚扰、威胁、欺侮或尾随。在这种情况下，更为适用的违规可能是（但不一定是）举止违背运动道德~轻微。裁判应当参考该违规的条文以确定牌手的行为是否符合该违规的描述。</p>
<p>Fostering a safe, non-threatening, family-friendly environment by talking to players about their unfriendly conduct is highly encouraged. Judges do not need to wait until a player actually commits an infraction before getting involved. Proactivity on the part of judges- by listening for and intervening in intensifying situations- is always a good idea. Furthermore, players should usually be talked to about their own offensive behavior even if they are not receiving a penalty.</p>	<p>我们鼓励裁判与牌手关于其不友好行为进行谈话，来培养一个安全的、无威胁的、适合家庭参与的环境。裁判不需要等待牌手实际违规了之后才介入。裁判积极主动地聆听并介入正在升级的事态总是正确的方式。进一步来讲，牌手做出了冒犯行为，即使没受到判罚，通常也应该接受关于这种行为的谈话。</p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b></p>	<p><b>进一步的修正</b></p>
<p><b>The player must correct the behavior immediately.</b></p>	<p><b>牌手必须立刻改正其行为。</b></p>
<p>The outward display of remorse and a tacit agreement to not repeat the unacceptable behavior</p>	<p>外在表现出懊悔以及默认不再重复不可接受的行为通常就足以视为改正了。如上文所述，道歉是值</p>

<p>is generally all that's necessary for correction, here. As described above, apologies should be encouraged, but they are not usually required.</p>	<p>得鼓励的，但是一般不要求牌手致歉。</p>
<p><b>If the offense occurs at the end of a match, it is acceptable for the judge to apply the penalty to the next match instead.</b></p>	<p>如果违规是发生在一局游戏结束时，裁判可以改为在下一局才让处罚生效。</p>
<p>As a rule of thumb, if a player committing USC – Major has already won (or has not yet lost) the current match, the penalty should be applied to that round, with the judge updating match results as necessary. Conversely, if the player committing the infraction has already lost the current match, the penalty should be deferred to the next round, instead.</p>	<p>如果牌手触犯举止违背运动道德~严重时已经赢得当前对局（或者还没有输），判罚应当应用在这一轮，并且有必要的裁判应当更改对局结果。相反的，若一位牌手违规时已经输掉了当前对局，那么判罚应当改为在下一轮生效。</p>
<p>Note that this represents a very different philosophy from that of most other infractions found in the MIPG. With most other errors, it is usually appropriate to apply the penalty to the game in which the mistake has been made regardless of either player's board position or game record. For example, if a player commits a third GPE – Game Rule Violation, that player should almost always be assessed a Game Loss for the current game even if that player happens to be very far behind on resources, is facing lethal combat damage, or is otherwise about to lose. However, this is not true for USC – Major.</p>	<p>注意，这代表了一个与 IPG 其他违规显得非常不同的原则。对于大多数其他错误而言，通常应用判罚在当前对局中，即犯下错误的对局，而不考虑牌手的场面情况或对局成绩。例如，若一位牌手第三次犯下违反游戏规则，这个牌手触犯违规的牌局应判负，即使这位牌手的资源/场面已大幅度落后，正面临致命战斗伤害，或马上就要输了。然而这并不适用于举止违背运动道德~严重。</p>
<p>The reason for this difference in philosophy is simple. Unlike most other infractions, it's possible for a player to commit USC - Major after a match has already ended, but before the players have left the table. If a player has already recorded a match loss through the normal course of play, but still manages to commit this error during that same round, applying the Match Loss immediately may fail to have the intended impact on the player, and probably won't help illustrate that his or her actions were unacceptable. Some additional dispensation- being able to delay the penalty one round- is necessary to properly deliver justice in this case. Significant errors bear significant penalties.</p>	<p>原理上有所不同的理由很简单。与其他违规不同，牌手触犯举止违背运动道德~严重可能是在一盘比赛结束之后且离开赛桌之前。若一位牌手已经因为普通的原因被判罚一局负，但仍然在同一轮比赛中触犯举止违背运动道德~严重，应用一局负判罚可能无法达到预期的对该牌手的影响，而且有可能无法使其认识到他的行为是不可接受的。一些额外的调整——下一局才让处罚生效——对于执行公正而言是必要的。重大错误应受到严厉判罚。</p>
<p><b>Upgrade: If the offense was committed with malicious intent, the player displays no remorse, or the offense is repeated at a later time, the penalty is Disqualification and removal from the venue.</b></p>	<p>升级：如果牌手作出此类行为时有恶意企图，或是之后未有道歉之意，或是稍后发生累犯，则处罚为取消资格并驱离赛场。</p>
<p>This is an admittedly tricky section of the policy, as the term "malicious intent" isn't especially well-defined.</p>	<p>必须承认方针的这一部分有些复杂，因为“恶意”不好被定义。然而，裁判需要敏锐的洞察力来调查牌</p>

<p>However, what this is getting at is that judges need to use some careful discernment to investigate the intent behind USC – Major infractions in order to determine the appropriate penalty. Players that simply had a temporary lapse in social decorum, were caught up in the heat of the moment, or just miscalculated the implications of their own actions probably haven't committed this error maliciously.</p>	<p>手违规的意图，目的在于决定恰当的判罚。牌手只是在社会礼仪方面一时过失，或一时冲动，或只是错误估计了他们行为的影响，不应当被认定为恶意。</p>
<p>On the other hand, and to quote Sean Catanese, “A player who intends to intimidate or involuntarily control someone else with their actions, yet stops short of being outright aggressive or threatening (USC - Aggressive Behavior), is still actively choosing to harm someone. That player does not belong in a Magic event.” Players fitting this profile should be Disqualified and removed from the venue.</p>	<p>另一方面，引用 Sean Catanese 的话，“牌手意图用某些行为恐吓或胁迫他人，即使这些行为又不完全是攻击性或者威胁性的，仍然是主动伤害他人。这样的牌手不能留在万智牌赛事中”。符合这项定义的牌手应当被取消资格并逐出赛场。</p>
<p>A player taking inappropriate photos of another player because he or she thinks it's funny is probably not acting with malicious intent. A player taking these photos for the purpose of using them to publicly mock the subject probably is. A player continuously asking another player for a date because he thinks he can convince her to change her mind is probably not acting with malicious intent. A player continuing to ask because he knows it makes her feel uncomfortable probably is. A player using a racial slur because he is frustrated and angry is probably not acting with malicious intent. A player using a racial slur that is directed and targeted as an insult probably is.</p>	<p>牌手因为觉得有趣而拍下其他牌手的不雅照片可能不是一种恶意行为。牌手拍下这些照片来为了公开嘲弄他人则是恶意行为。一位牌手不断地邀请另一位牌手与他约会，因为他认为他可以说服她改变主意，这可能不是一种恶意行为。牌手不断地邀请另一位牌手与他约会，因为他知道这样能让她感到不适，则可能是恶意行为。一位牌手因为沮丧和愤怒使用种族歧视言辞可能不是一种恶意行为。一位牌手使用种族歧视言辞直接侮辱对手，则可能是恶意行为。</p>
<p>The necessity to handle these two types of cases differently stems from the fact that penalties have their natural limits. Among other things, penalties serve to educate, and a Match Loss is supposed to help teach the lesson of proper social conduct. However, it's likely that basic education will not be enough to correct a player who has chosen to commit USC – Major maliciously; there may be deeper issues with him or her than simple ignorance. Sometimes Disqualification is the only suitable option.</p>	<p>以不同的处理这两种类型情况是有必要的，来源于判罚本身的局限性。在其他情形中，判罚旨在教育，一局负的目的旨在教育牌手采取合适的社会行为。然而，简单的教育难以有效地纠正牌手恶意触犯举止违背运动道德~严重的行为。他/她的问题可能不仅是无知，而有更深层次的原因。有时取消资格是唯一恰当的选择。</p>
<p>The same can be said about players that neither show remorse nor refrain from repeating the same harmful behavior. Further education will probably not be effective for these players, either, so they should be Disqualified, too.</p>	<p>同样的，对于牌手毫无悔意、并且重复相同的有害行为的情况也是如此。进一步教育可能对这些牌手也是无效的，所以他们应当被取消资格。</p>

For more information, read these articles:	如果想要进一步了解，请阅读以下文章：
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/07/14/m15-policy-changes/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2014/07/14/m15-policy-changes/</a></li> </ul>	<a href="http://blogs.magicjudges.org/seacat/2014/07/14/updating-unsporting-conduct-major/">http://blogs.magicjudges.org/seacat/2014/07/14/updating-unsporting-conduct-major/</a>
<b>4.3 Improperly Determining a Winner</b>	<b>4.3 不当决定胜方</b>
Penalty	处罚
Disqualification	取消资格
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player uses or offers to use a method that is not part of the current game (including actions not legal in the current game) to determine the outcome of a game or match.</b>	牌手利用或提供不属于当前游戏的方法(包括当前游戏中不合法的行动)，来决定某盘游戏或某对局的结果。
As judges, we want players actually playing Magic at our tournaments. This is not only because the point of a Magic tournament is to actually play Magic, but also to uphold Magic’s reputation and position as a game of skill, not chance. This is important for ensuring that Magic isn’t associated with gambling. In addition, game actions that could not be taken legally to come to an agreement about the outcome of the game are not permitted - see example F below.	作为裁判，我们想要让牌手实实在在地在比赛中打万智牌。这不仅是因为万智牌比赛的目的是打牌，也是为了维持万智牌作为一个技巧性比赛的声誉和地位，而不是运气。确保万智牌不涉及赌博是非常重要的。此外，同意用不合法的游戏行动来决定比赛结果的行为也是不被允许的——参见下列的例子 F。
As a result, even just offering to use an outside-the-game-method (or an illegal action within the game) falls into this infraction. Moreover, unlike Unsporting Conduct-Cheating, a player can receive this infraction even if they did not know they were doing anything wrong. Again, this high standard is necessary to ensure that Magic’s global reputation doesn’t become tarnished. (The Investigations Committee that handles suspensions will often be understanding of players who unknowingly violate this section – but that is not the job for the judge who actually responds to the issue at an event!)	因此，即使提供一个比赛外方法(或非法的游戏行动)来决定胜方也是触犯此违规的。此外，不同于举止违背运动道德~作弊，牌手触犯此违规时可能不知道他们做了错事。重复一遍，这项严格的标准对于保证万智牌全球声誉不被玷污是必要的。(负责处理禁赛的调查委员会通常能够理解无意地触犯此违规的牌手，但这不是在赛事中实际应对此行为的裁判的工作!)
What are actions that are “not part of the current game”? The IPG provides some helpful examples:	什么行为不是当前游戏的的一部分？IPG 给了一些有用的例子：
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<b>范例</b>
<b>A. As time is called, two players about to draw roll a</b>	<b>A. 比赛时间结束时，本该平手的两位牌手以掷骰</b>

<b>die to determine the winner.</b>	来决定胜负。
<b>B. A player offers to flip a coin to determine the winner of a match.</b>	B. 牌手提议以掷铜板来决定对局的胜方。
<b>C. Two players arm wrestle to determine the winner of the match.</b>	C. 两位牌手比腕力来决定对局的胜方。
<b>D. Two players play rock-paper-scissors to decide if they should play the match or draw.</b>	D. 两位牌手猜拳决定是否要进行对局或者约和。
<b>E. Two players compare the converted mana costs of the top cards of their libraries to determine the winner of a game at the end of extra turns.</b>	E. 在延长回合结束时，双方牌手比较各自牌库顶牌的总法术力费用来决定游戏的胜方。
<b>F. Two players reveal cards from the top of their libraries to see “who would win” after extra turns.</b>	F. 两位牌手展示各自牌库顶牌，决定延长回合之后“谁会赢”。
While using a random method like a die roll or coin toss is the most common example of an outside-the-game method, employing any method that isn't the requisite game of Magic fits into this category. It doesn't matter if the method is completely random (like a coin or die), has a physical component (arm wrestling), or is even another game entirely (like Tic-Tac-Toe or Yu-Gi-Oh). Another more controversial decision is for players to use “future cards” to determine who would win. At the end of a match, it is fine for players to use current board position to make a case of who should concede to whom; however, they must make a decision based on what they see. Players may reveal cards that they are legally entitled to see, such as their hands. They may not reveal cards that they are not entitled to see within the game, such as cards in libraries. It is not allowed to make an offer like “If I drew another land I would win. If my next card is a land, you scoop to me, else, I'll scoop to you.”	虽然最常见的比赛外方式是使用随机方式，例如掷骰子或硬币是例子，但使用任何比赛所需求牌手进行的万智牌游戏以外的任何方式都属于此类违规。方法是否是完全随机（例如硬币或骰子），是否涉及身体上的竞技（掰手腕），或甚至另一个游戏（例如井字棋或游戏王等），都是无关紧要的。另一个更有争议的情况是牌手使用“未来的牌”来觉得谁获胜。在一局比赛结束时，牌手根据当前的场面局势来决定谁投降是可以的；然而他们必须根据他们所知的情况来决定。牌手可以展示他们可以合法看到的牌，例如其手牌，但不能展示游戏规则不允许看到的牌，例如牌库中的牌。不允许提出“如果我抓到另一张地就能赢。如果我下一张牌是地，你投给我，否则，我投给你”这样的提议。
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>原则</b>
<b>Using an outside-the-game method to determine a winner compromises the integrity of the tournament.</b>	<b>使用游戏之外的方式来决定胜方，会危害比赛的公平性。</b>
As stated earlier, the results of Magic tournaments should be reached only through playing actual games of Magic. Doing otherwise compromises the integrity of the tournament. What does “compromise the integrity of the tournament” mean? It means we have games of Magic that are being determined by some method other than the Magic games the players are supposed to play, and that impacts the results of that	正如之前所述，万智牌比赛的结果应当根据实际的万智牌对局来决定。如果使用其他方式来决定结果，会违背比赛的公正性。这是什么意思呢？这表示有些对局的结果由非万智牌竞技的方式来决定，这将对对局和整场比赛造成不好的影响。这也会影响其他对局以及比赛中其他牌手的排名。掷骰子决定胜者属于利用比赛体系，而非真正打比赛。

<p>match and the tournament as a whole. It affects other matches and other players' standings in the event. Rolling a dice to determine the winner is playing the system, not playing the game.</p>	
<p>So why a disqualification? There are a few reasons. One is that Wizards wants to impose a hard line on anything that makes Magic resemble gambling. Some countries/venues have very strict laws about gambling, and might not allow a Magic event. But why a Disqualification? Why not a match loss or a warning? Let's look at a player's motivation. Two players are tied at the end of the round and are playing in a match where a draw knocks both of them out of Top 8 (or Day 2). If one of them wins, he or she is in. In that case, if they draw or lose, their day is done. So only the most severe penalties will discourage the last ditch effort to make Top 8.</p>	<p>为什么要取消资格呢？原因有几个。一个是威世智极力避免任何会让万智牌看起来像赌博的行为。有些国家或特定场馆对于赌博有着非常严格的法律或规定，可能会因为此类行为而不允许举办万智牌赛事。但是为什么是取消资格？为什么不是一局负或者一个警告？让我们思考一下牌手的动机。两位牌手在一轮比赛结束时打平并且平局将导致双方都参加不了八强淘汰赛或者第二天的比赛。如果其中一人获胜，他/她能得到资格。如果他们打平或者输掉，他们的比赛就结束了。所以只有最严厉的判罚能够阻止他们用这种最后的努力挤进八强。</p>
<p><b>Matches that result in a draw due to time are expected to be reported as such and are not excluded from this penalty if the players use an illegal method to determine the outcome.</b></p>	<p>因时间而以平手收场的对局就该照实回报，以违规方式决定比赛结果的牌手，都必须以此给予处罚。</p>
<p>Draws are a valid result for a Magic game. Trying to avoid a draw doesn't give players an excuse to use an outside-the-game method to determine a winner.</p>	<p>平局是有效的万智牌比赛结果。试图避免平局不是牌手使用比赛外手段决定胜者的借口。</p>
<p>That said, if a player asks his or her opponent to concede because he or she has an overwhelming board position when time is called, that is not Improperly Determining a Winner, because nothing outside the game has actually been introduced into the scenario. Of course, the opponent has every right to refuse, and in that case the match result will simply be determined normally.</p>	<p>虽然如此，若一位牌手在对局时间结束时因为他/她的游戏局势占绝对优势更高而请他/她的对手投降，并不属于不当决定胜方。因为该牌手没有使用比赛外的方式来决定胜者。当然，对手有权利拒绝，这种情况下比赛结果直接根据常规情形决定。</p>
<p><b>In most cases this penalty will be issued to both players, unless the other player calls over a judge as soon as an inappropriate suggestion to determine the winner is made.</b></p>	<p>在大部分的情况下，此处罚会给予双方牌手；除非另一位牌手在对方作出提议以不当方式决定胜方时，就立刻请裁判过来。</p>
<p>Players are always expected to call violations of the rules to the attention of a judge. This applies to Unsporting Conduct penalties just as much as it does to Game Play Errors.</p>	<p>我们总是期望牌手在发现违反规则的情况时主动呼叫裁判。这一点无论对于游戏行动失误还是举止违背运动道德都是一样的。</p>
<p>The IPG doesn't distinguish between the player that offered to use an illegal method and the player who accepted the proposal. Both have committed essentially the same infraction, and they receive the</p>	<p>IPG 不区别对待提出非法方式决定胜者和接受此建议的牌手。他们本质上都触犯了相同的违规，并且他们要受到相同的判罚。尽管调查委员会对两种情况的处理可能有所不同，但双方牌手都危害了比</p>



same penalty. Although the two situations may be handled differently by the Investigations Committee, both players have crossed the threshold of compromising the event, and consequently both must receive disqualifications.	赛，因此都必须被取消资格。
But why? Doesn't it seem harsh that the player hearing the offer gets the same penalty as the one making the offer? It does, until you realize that not enforcing the requirement to immediately call a judge leads to the possibility that a player can be seriously considering the offer, or even accept it — perhaps with just a nod or some other signal — then claim that they were going to refuse when a judge is called.	但是为什么？是不是听到提议的牌手要受到相同的判罚看来太严厉了？虽然看起来是这样，但如果你意识到不要求牌手必须立刻呼叫裁判，将导致牌手可能会认真考虑不当决定胜方的提议，甚至是接受它——可能只是点头或者其他的方式——然后在裁判被叫来时声称他们准备拒绝提议。
As with any DQ, you need to collect statements from the players.	任何取消资格的判罚都需要收集牌手的陈述。
<b>4.4 Bribery and Wagering</b>	<b>4.4 贿赂与赌博</b>
Penalty	处罚
Disqualification	取消资格
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player offers an incentive to entice an opponent into conceding, drawing, or changing the results of a match, or accepts such an offer. Refer to the Magic Tournament Rules for a more detailed description of what constitutes bribery.</b>	牌手提供奖励来诱使对手认输、约和，或改变对局结果，或是牌手接受对方提出的此类条件。若想知道贿赂的详细定义与构成要素，请参照《万智牌比赛规则》的详细叙述。
Where the IPG says “refer to the Magic Tournament Rules (MTR),” it means “everything on the subject of bribery and wagering besides the penalty is in the MTR.” So let's summarize the key points here (please refer to the MTR for full details on the subject). Full articles have been written on what is/is not legal. We are only summarizing here.	IPG 提到“请参照 MTR 中的叙述”，表示“除判罚外，任何关于贿赂与赌博的内容都在 MTR 中”。我们来总结一下这些叙述中的关键部分(全文请参照 MTR 中的相关条款)。关于什么是合法的、什么是不合法的，也有专门的文章进行叙述。这里只是进行简单地总结。
Dropping, Conceding, or agreeing to an intentional draw must not be done in exchange for any sort of reward or incentive. Statements like “I'll scoop to you if I get your FNM promo,” or, “Hey, If I make it into the top 8, I'll be in the money, and I can be pretty generous” are unacceptable. “Hey, I'm hungry, let's ID so we can go get some food before the next round” is not an offer or an incentive, and as such is acceptable.	弃权、投降或者约和都不能以任何形式的奖励或诱因来交换。类似“把你的 FNM 闪卡给我，我就投给你”或者“嘿，如果我打入八强，我进钱圈了，我可以很慷慨哦！”的言论都是不可接受的。“嘿，我饿了，我们约和吧，这样我们可以在下一轮开始前吃点东西”不是奖励或者诱因，所以是可接受的。
If a player is offered a bribe, the player must report	如果一位牌手的对手想要贿赂他/她，该牌手必须

<p>the offer to a judge immediately, or they will receive the same penalty as the player who made the offer. This may seem draconian, but there are several reasons for this. One of the largest is that it increases the risk to the player making the offer if the other player must turn them in.</p>	<p>立刻报告裁判, 否则他们会受到与意图贿赂者相同的判罚。这看起来可能过于严厉, 但这样做是有很多原因的。其中最主要的原因就是这样做会增加提出贿赂的牌手的风险——对手很可能会报告给裁判。</p>
<p>Players can agree to split prizes before or during a match, so long as doing so isn't conditional on a match result.</p>	<p>只要不是用以交换游戏或对局的结果, 牌手可以在对局开始前或对局进行中同意分配奖品。</p>
<p>In the Finals, there is an exception to the Bribery rules that allow players to divide prizes as they wish, so long as it does not include incentives outside of the prize pool. If the final has a prize that is not divisible, like a Pro Tour Invite, then the player who does not receive the “award” prize must drop from the tournament - not concede, but drop.</p>	<p>在决赛中, 规则有一个例外条款, 允许牌手按他们的意愿分配奖品, 只要这不涉及到奖品池之外的奖励。如果决赛有不能被分割的奖励, 例如 PT 邀请资格, 则没有得到此奖励的牌手必须退赛——不是投降, 而是退赛。</p>
<p>Players can use information regarding the results of another match to determine if they want to offer to ID. However, they cannot consult those other matches, or reach an agreement with them.</p>	<p>牌手可以利用其它对局的信息来决定他们是否约和。但是他们不能对其他对局提出建议, 或者与其他对局的牌手达成协议。</p>
<p>In some events, during the single elimination, the players may decide to split all the prizes evenly. This requires the TOs agreement, and must be unanimous amongst the players.</p>	<p>在某些比赛中, 单淘赛阶段牌手可以决定将所有奖品平分。这必须得到 TO 的同意, 并且必须得到所有牌手的同意。</p>
<p><b>Wagering occurs when a player or spectator at a tournament places or offers to place a bet on the outcome of a tournament, match or any portion of a tournament or match. The wager does not need to be monetary, nor is it relevant if a player is not betting on his or her own match.</b></p>	<p>赌博指的是比赛的牌手或是观众对比赛的结果、对局或是比赛和对局的任何部分来下注或提议下注。赌博不一定只指现金形式, 也不论牌手下注的是不是自己的对局。</p>
<p>Wagering is easier to understand. If you wager on anything in the event, you are gambling, and that is not allowed in sanctioned events. Once people wager anything on the outcome of the games within the event, if judges don't act upon that by removing the players from the event then they run the risk of damaging the image of Magic as a whole, beyond that single event. There have been cases where events like Friday Night Magic were shut down by local law enforcement because they felt it was breaking gambling laws. This is the kind of thing Wizards doesn't want people to think of when they think of their game, so this is why there is such a zero-tolerance policy.</p>	<p>赌博理解起来就容易一些了。如果你对赛事的任何事下赌注, 你就是在赌博, 而这是认证比赛所不允许的。一旦人们用任何东西做赌注, 来赌比赛中对局的结果, 若裁判不将牌手移出比赛, 便有可能伤害万智牌游戏的形象, 而不仅仅是一场比赛。曾经有 FNM 被地方执法部门停办的案例, 因为他们触犯了有关赌博的法律。威世智不愿意人们将万智牌视作赌博, 所以这也是为什么这是一个零容忍的政策。</p>

EXAMPLES	范例
<p><b>A. A player in a Swiss round offers his opponent \$100 to concede the match.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在瑞士轮的对局之中，提供 100 美金来让对手认输。</b></p>
<p>This is an example of buying a win, and is not allowed. It's an unfair advantage that basically would allow the person with the biggest wallet the ability to buy victories.</p>	<p>这是一个买赢对手的例子，而这是不允许的。允许有钱人买到胜利是不公平的。</p>
<p><b>B. A player offers his opponent a card in exchange for a draw.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手愿意给对手一张牌，用以交换平手。</b></p>
<p>This is an example of an incentive determining the outcome of the results. It's not exactly as enticing as that one hundred dollar bill above, but it's still not fair to everyone else that someone can use something else to influence the outcome of their matches.</p>	<p>这是一个用奖励决定比赛结果的例子。这没有上个例子的 100 美金那么有诱惑力，但用某些东西影响比赛结果仍然是不公平的。</p>
<p><b>C. A player asks for a concession in exchange for a prize split.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手要求平分奖品来交换认输。</b></p>
<p>Remember that players can agree to divide prizes — perhaps because they're friends, or they feel bad about what happened to someone else in the event — but not if the split or exchange is contingent upon any kind of match result. Saying you will concede for a prize split is illegal. However, a legal scenario is: you offer a prize split, then, once it's accepted, you ask your opponent to concede or you concede. In this scenario, the prize split was not dependent on a concession, despite the fact that once the prize split was agreed, one player no longer wanted to play.</p>	<p>记住牌手可以同意分配奖品。这或许是因为他们是朋友，或者他们对于他人的遭遇感到难过。但平分或交换奖品是根据任何比赛结果来决定的话则不行。牌手说他/她会为了平分奖品而认输是非法的。然而，一个合法的情况是，你提出奖品平分，然后，对手同意之后，你请你的对手投降或者你投降。在这个情形中，奖品平分不是根据认输来决定的，尽管事实上双方同意奖品平分以后，一位牌手不想继续玩了。</p>
<p><b>D. Two players agree that the winner of the match will be able to choose a rare card out of the other person's deck after the match.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 两位牌手同意赢得对局的人可以对手的牌库中拿走一张稀有牌。</b></p>
<p>Even something like “a soda for the draw” or “a foot rub at home later” is something that's now affecting the decisions of the players, regardless of the intent of that offer. It could be a “joke” between two players, but we'll never know if that's true or not.</p>	<p>即使类似“一瓶苏打水就约和”或者“晚点回家脚底按摩”的一些提议都会影响牌手的决定，不管提议的意图如何。这可能是牌手之间在开玩笑，但我们不知道这是真的还是假的。</p>
<p><b>E. Two spectators place a bet on the number of games that will be needed to decide a match.</b></p>	<p><b>E. 两位观众下注，赌某对局要打几盘才会结束。</b></p>
<p>This is a great example of wagering that you might not have immediately thought of.</p>	<p>这是一个很好的关于下赌注的例子。你或许不会立刻想到它。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>

<b>Bribery and wagering disrupt the integrity of the tournament and are strictly forbidden.</b>	<b>贿赂和赌博会干扰比赛的公平性，必须严格禁止。</b>
By offering any incentive for the results of a match, or placing incentive on the outcome of the match, players have tainted the integrity of the event, and created an unfair play environment where results are decided by nothings other than games of Magic. Because this can be so damaging and difficult to catch, it's penalized with a Disqualification, and even the act of not reporting this could result in a penalty if a player were offered a bribe. It doesn't matter if they had no intention of ever accepting the offer, if the offer wasn't serious, or if the person making the offer is the player's friend. Once the offer is out there, there's no way to tell if it was or wasn't influencing the player's decision. And there's no way to know if that person will or won't make that same offer again to someone else.	为了比赛结果而提供任何奖励（贿赂），或者根据比赛结果提供奖励（赌博），牌手便玷污了比赛的公正性，并且制造了一个不公平竞赛的环境——比赛结果是根据万智牌对局之外的东西来决定的。因为这种行为伤害极大并且难以被发现，它的判罚是取消资格，并且收到提议的牌手没有立刻报告的话也会导致此判罚。牌手有没有接受的意图、提议是不是认真提出的、或者提议的人是不是此牌手的朋友，都是无关紧要的。一旦某牌手提出了这种提议，我们无法知道此人是否会对他人再次做出相同的提议。
<b>4.5 Aggressive Behavior</b>	<b>4.5 攻击性举止</b>
Penalty	处罚
Disqualification	取消资格
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player acts in a threatening way towards others or their property.</b>	<b>牌手对他人或是他人的拥有物进行威胁性的行动。</b>
Unsporting Conduct — Aggressive Behavior is pretty clear cut. Unlike Unsporting Conduct Minor and Major, where we issue infractions based on people being made uncomfortable or hurtful/insulting language (in addition to other things), Unsporting Conduct — Aggressive Behavior is based on physical actions or language used to suggest an intent to cause physical harm.	举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止是很容易理解的。对于举止违背运动道德～轻微与严重而言，我们根据可能令人不适的行为或伤害性/侮辱性的言辞（以及一些其他情形）来判定这些违规。不同于它们，举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止是基于肢体动作或有意伤害他人身体的言论。
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<b>范例</b>
<b>A. A player threatens to hit another player who won't concede to him.</b>	<b>A. 牌手威胁要殴打不愿认输的对手。</b>
<b>B. A player pulls a chair out from under another player, causing her to fall to the ground.</b>	<b>B. 牌手将别的牌手所坐的椅子拉开，使该牌手摔在地上。</b>
<b>C. A player makes threats against a judge after</b>	<b>C. 牌手在得到规则解释之后威胁裁判。</b>

<b>receiving a ruling.</b>	
<b>D. A player tears up a card belonging to another player.</b>	<b>D. 牌手撕毁他人拥有的牌张。</b>
<b>E. A player intentionally turns over a table.</b>	<b>E. 牌手故意翻到桌子。</b>
These examples make it pretty clear what Unsporting Conduct — Aggressive Behavior might be. It also includes subtle threats, such as “I’ll be waiting for you in the parking lot when you leave tonight”. You don’t need to get too hung up on specific words — you know a threat when you see one. It’s also important to note that if a player damages their own property, while possibly intimidating, it most likely doesn’t fall under Unsporting Conduct — Aggressive Behavior and rather falls under Unsporting Conduct — Minor — unless they are doing it in a way that constitutes a threat.	这些例子清晰的告诉我们什么是举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止。它也包括微妙的威胁，例如“今晚你离开的时候，我们停车场见！”你没有必要太在意特定的修辞——当你遇到威胁时你自然会意识到。也需要重点注意的是，如果一位牌手破坏他们自己的物品，尽管可能是在恐吓他人，这一般不是举止违背运动道德～攻击性举止，更有可能是举止违背运动道德～轻微，除非他的做法对他人构成了威胁。
<b>PHILOSOPHY</b>	<b>原则</b>
<b>The safety of all people at a tournament is of paramount importance. There will be no tolerance of physical abuse or intimidation.</b>	<b>赛场内所有人的安全是最主要的重点。绝对不宽容身体上的伤害和恐吓。</b>
The reason we issue a disqualification for this type of infraction is because everyone should feel safe at any sanctioned event, and allowing someone to continue in an event after such behavior would discourage players from ever wanting to participate in an event again.	我们对此类违规判罚取消资格的原因是任何人都应该在认证比赛中感到安全。如果允许此类违规者继续比赛将让其他牌手不愿再参加比赛。
<b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b>	<b>进一步的修正</b>
<b>The offender should be asked to leave the venue by the organizer.</b>	<b>比赛主办人必须要求该牌手离开赛场。</b>
Keep in mind that your first priority is to defuse the situation. How to do this depends on the situation. However, you are not a police officer, and are not obligated to get involved physically. When this infraction occurs, that player’s day at the event is over. He or she will be disqualified. Be sure to collect a statement for the investigation committee if the player is willing to give one, and be sure to write your own. It’s also advised that the Tournament Organizer ask the player to leave the venue as soon as possible. An important distinction here is that the Tournament Organizer should be the one to actually make this decision. We can encourage the Tournament	请注意你的首要任务是平息事态。如何做到则需要根据具体情况而定。然而，裁判不是警察，并且没有义务在身体上介入。当此违规发生时，违规牌手的比赛就结束了。他/她将被取消资格。记得要获取该牌手的陈述（如果该牌手愿意的话），并且写好你自己的陈述，供调查委员会使用。建议比赛组织者尽快地请牌手离开比赛场地。一个重要的区别是，比赛组织者应当是实际作出此决定的人。我们可以鼓励比赛组织者作出决定，但我们的管辖权利并不包括比赛范围之外的事情。一旦牌手已经退出比赛，他们就不是我们裁判需要应付的人。

Organizer to make this decision based, but our jurisdiction does not reach beyond the scope of the event. Once the player is no longer involved with the event, they're no longer someone we, as judges, should be dealing with.	
<b>4.6 Theft of Tournament Materials</b>	<b>4.6 窃取比赛用品</b>
Penalty	处罚
Disqualification	取消资格
<b>DEFINITION</b>	<b>定义</b>
<b>A player steals material from the event, such as cards or tournament equipment.</b>	<b>牌手偷拿比赛物品，例如牌或是比赛的配备。</b>
Whether you derive your moral system from the laws of your local jurisdiction, the Ten Commandments, or the Code of Hammurabi, you probably already know that stealing is unacceptable behavior. This type of conduct is just as intolerable at Magic tournaments as it is among society at large. There is a clear line here; in order to receive this penalty, the theft must be of materials from the event. Theft of an enrolled player's EDH deck from his backpack is not Theft of Tournament Material. It is still unacceptable though. Stealing is wrong. Didn't your mom ever teach you that?	不管你来自哪里，信仰为何，当地法律如何，偷窃都是不可接受的行为。这一类行为在万智牌比赛中是不能被容忍的，正如在整个社会之中一样。给出此判罚的依据是偷窃的物品必须是比赛用品。从参赛牌手的背包里偷他的指挥官套牌并不是偷窃比赛用品（即使这一行为也是不可接受的）。偷窃是错误的行为，难道你老妈没教过你这个吗？
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	<b>范例</b>
<b>A. A player in a limited tournament pockets a foil rare that he opened in the sealed pool he is registering.</b>	<b>A. 参加限制赛的牌手在登记现开牌池时，将牌池中一张闪稀有卡私吞。</b>
Example A demonstrates that there is a careful line to walk. The MTR was somewhat recently updated to make it clear that players are now allowed to drop before the swap of sealed deck tournament. If a player cracks something really good that he or she just can't bear to give away, that player always has the option of "retiring early" with the goodies. The tradeoff, of course, is that the player won't be able to play.	例子 A 说明了一个需要注意的细节。MTR 近期某次更新阐明了牌手可以在交换现开牌池前退赛。若一位牌手开到非常好的牌，而他/她不愿意交换出去，该牌手总是有权利提前退赛。当然代价就是该牌手不能参加比赛。
Pocketing a valuable foil rare without dropping, on the other hand, could perhaps be thought of as an attempt by a player to "have his cake, and eat it too."	另一方面讲，将一张高价值闪牌带走而不退赛，这说明牌手试图鱼与熊掌都想兼得。若一位牌手决定保留他/她登记的牌池，则该牌手必须弃权。若该

<p>If a player decides to keep the cards he or she registered, then that player must drop. If the player wants to play, then that player must pass his or her registered pool. Anything else is stealing.</p>	<p>牌手想要继续比赛，则该牌手必须将它/她登记的牌池传出去。留下任何东西都是偷窃。</p>
<p><b>B. A player steals cards from the sideboard of his opponent.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手偷拿对手备牌里的牌。</b></p>
<p><b>C. A player steals the table number from a table.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 牌手偷拿桌号牌。</b></p>
<p>If a table number is missing, odds are it's number 69 or 420.</p>	<p>如果有桌号丢了，说不定丢的是 69 号（你懂的）或者 420 号（隐晦地指代大麻）。</p>
<p><b>D. A player realizes she has a previous opponent's card, but she hides it instead of telling a tournament official.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 牌手发现他误拿了前一位对手的牌，却没有告诉比赛工作人员而藏起来。</b></p>
<p>Example D makes it clear that players who did not intentionally set out to steal something may still end up committing this infraction through later inaction. A phenomenon that's as old as Magic is players forgetting to give their opponents back a creature they took with Control Magic, and instead accidentally scooping and shuffling it in. Doing this is not a problem in and of itself, provided that the player gives the card back or otherwise calls a judge as soon as he or she notices the issue. However, a player noticing that she still accidentally has her last round opponent's Thragtusk in her deck and choosing to stay quiet about it is a big problem, and still meets the definition of this infraction. Think of it as a form of "passive theft."</p>	<p>例子 D 说明牌手即使不是故意要偷窃他人物品也可能因为不作为而触犯违规。自从万智牌问世以来，就经常出现牌手忘记将他们使用魔法操控术操控的生物还给对手，而是不小心洗入自己的套牌这样的问题。只要牌手发现后立刻把牌还回去或者呼叫裁判解决，它并不是个问题。然而牌手注意到她意外的获得了上一轮对手的犄牙兽但选择保持沉默，就会是一个大问题，也符合此违规的定义。这可以被认为是一种“被动偷窃”。</p>
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p>	<p><b>原则</b></p>
<p><b>Players enter a tournament expecting that their materials will be protected.</b></p>	<p><b>牌手加入比赛之后，他们的物品就应该受到保护。</b></p>
<p>As the saying goes, your rights end where others' begin. Players have a right to their own stuff, and thus you have no right to take it. We shouldn't actually need the IPG to tell us this much.</p>	<p>亚伯拉罕林肯有句名言：“你有挥舞拳头的自由，但一旦碰到了我的鼻子，此自由将被终止。”牌手对他们的物品享有所有权，而他人无权拿走。我们不需要 IPG 来告诉我们这一点。</p>
<p><b>This does not absolve the players from their responsibility to keep an eye on their possessions, but they should expect to be able to retain the product they began with or were given for the tournament.</b></p>	<p><b>这并不是免除牌手留意自我财物的责任；但他们必须能够保有开赛时的产品，或是给他们比赛用的物品。</b></p>
<p>Thievery is an ever-present concern, and keeping an eye on one's own stuff is important. Despite constant reminders from judges, TOs, and here even the IPG</p>	<p>盗窃问题始终应当注意，看管好自己的物品是很重要的。尽管裁判和比赛组织者常常提醒，甚至 IPG 也载明，大赛中仍然总是会有一些牌手不幸被偷走</p>

itself, it's rare to get through a large event without at least a few players' weekends getting ruined by stolen bags. While judges should remain vigilant for thieves, players are ultimately responsible for their own possessions.	东西。尽管裁判应当保持对小偷的警惕，保管自己物品责任终究还是在牌手自己。
<b>Other instances of theft not involving tournament materials are the responsibility of the Tournament Organizer, though judges are encouraged to help in any way possible.</b>	其他未牵涉比赛物品的偷窃，便是比赛承办人的责任，裁判也要尽量提供帮助。
This sentence is a little tricky. What happens if a player steals a bag of trade binders, but not a player's deck? Technically, this is not actually Theft of Tournament Materials, although the outcome (the removal of the player from your event) has more-or-less the same consequences. If theft is brought to a judge's attention, the judge should involve the Tournament Organizer. They will deal with removing the individual from the store, or handling police involvement. In such a case, this information still really ought to be reported to the investigation committee through that handy-dandy "Investigations" tab in the Judge Center. For all intents and purposes, a player stealing a bag should be handled in the same way as one who has committed this infraction.	这句话有些微妙。如果一个牌手偷了牌册而不是套牌，理论上讲这确实不是窃取比赛用品，尽管结果（将该牌手驱离赛场）几乎是相同的。如果裁判注意到偷窃行为，应当告知比赛组织者。他们会负责将偷窃者驱离赛场，或者协助警方介入。在这种情况下，仍然应当将信息通过裁判中心的“调查”标签页报告给调查委员会。不论牌手的意图和目的是什么，偷东西的行为都应当按照触犯此违规来处理。
Furthermore, judges are not law enforcement - the term "any way possible" should not include detaining the offender, tarring-and-feathering him, or leaving him tied up in the parking lot of the Gotham City Policy Department. Let's leave the vigilante justice to the superheroes.	此外，裁判不是司法部门，“任何方式”不应当包括拘留偷窃者，折磨拷问他，或者像蝙蝠侠那样把他锁在高谭市警察局的停车场。让我们把社会义务治安官的任务交给超级英雄们吧。
<b>ADDITIONAL REMEDY</b>	<b>进一步的修正</b>
<b>The offender should be asked to leave the venue by the organizer.</b>	比赛主办人必须要求该牌手离开赛场。
Do not pass go. Do not collect \$200. Buh-bye. You get nothing. Make like a tree and split. I may be mixing my metaphors.	游戏结束了，请他们离开吧。就酱！
<b>4.7 Stalling</b>	<b>4.7 拖延</b>
Penalty	处罚
Disqualification	取消资格



<b>DEFINITION</b>	定义
<b>A player intentionally plays slowly in order to take advantage of the time limit.</b>	牌手为了得到时间限制上的优势,故意过慢进行游戏。
This infraction describes situations in which a player is fully aware of the time remaining in the round and he or she attempts to run the clock out in order to win or deny the opponent the time needed to play. For example, a player may count or look through his or her sideboard or graveyard for no strategic reason. Alternatively, the player may act as if he or she is looking for tokens, emblems, or dice, and take an unusual amount of time in doing so.	此违规所述情况是指一位牌手完全了解一轮比赛的剩余时间并且他/她试图消耗掉对手取胜所需要的时间。举例来说,牌手可能并非因战术原因进行清点或查看他的备牌或坟场。或者,牌手装作他正在寻找衍生物、徽记或骰子,并且借此消耗掉通常不需花费的时间。
<b>If the slow play is not intentional, please refer to Tournament Error — Slow Play instead.</b>	如果进行过慢并非蓄意,请参见比赛失误~游戏进行过慢。
Not all players who take a long time to play the game are necessarily doing so intentionally. Magic is a complex game with many factors to be considered. Large cash prizes, invites, GP byes, etc., may provide players with incentive to take their time when thinking about their actions. If it is determined that the player did not have intent to run out the clock, then the infraction is not Unsporting Conduct — Stalling.	并非所有消耗比较多的时间来打牌的牌手是故意要这么做的。万智牌是一项复杂的游戏,需要考虑的因素很多。大额奖金、赛事邀请资格、GP 轮空等等都会鼓励牌手花时间认真地思考他们的行动。如果牌手不是故意要消耗掉时间,那么违规就不是举止违背运动道德~拖延。
The key thing to look for when issuing a penalty for Unsporting Conduct — Stalling is intent. If there wasn't intent on the part of the player, then the appropriate infraction is Tournament Error — Slow Play.	判断举止违背运动道德~拖延的关键点在于牌手的意图。如果牌手不是有意的,适用的违规是比赛失误~游戏进行过慢。
<b>EXAMPLES</b>	范例
<b>A. A player has two lands in his hand, no options available to significantly affect the game, and spends excessive time “thinking” about what to do to eat up time on the clock.</b>	<b>A. 牌手手上只有两张地牌,没有任何选择能够明显地影响游戏,却花时间来“思考”该怎么做以消耗时间。</b>
A player encounters a situation where he or she realizes that there's no significant play available, but knows the opponent has no way of verifying this. The player intentionally acts as though he or she has difficult options to consider in an effort to use up time. Here there is a difference between “bluffing” and stalling. In the case of bluffing, the motivation is not to eat up clock time. However, excessive time ‘thinking’ in order to bluff is slow play.	牌手意识到他/她并无法做出有意义的游戏行动,但他/她知道对手没有办法觉察这一点。该牌手假装他/她面临一个艰难的抉择并需要思考,目的是消耗掉时间。注意,拖延和虚张声势 (bluff) 有所不同。虚张声势的目的不是消耗时间。然而消耗太多时间假装思考来虚张声势属于游戏进行过慢。

<p><b>B. A player is ahead in games and significantly slows down his pace of play so the opponent has little chance to catch up.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手的胜利盘数领先对手，并明显放慢游戏步调，让对手难以挽回劣势。</b></p>
<p>A player wins the first game and realizes that instead of winning a second game, he could waste the time that the opponent would need to catch up by intentionally playing slowly.</p>	<p>一位牌手获得了第一盘的胜利，并意识到他可以故意打的很慢来浪费掉对手所需的用来追平的时间，而不是获得第二盘的胜利。</p>
<p><b>C. A player playing slowly appeals a warning in an attempt to gain advantage by having more time to make a decision.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 游戏进行过慢的牌手抗议他受到的警告判决，藉此争取更多时间来做决定。</b></p>
<p>A player tries to take advantage of a tournament's appeals process in order to steal some extra time to think. For example, with only two minutes left in a match and facing a tough decision, a player appeals a minor ruling knowing that doing so will provide at least five minutes of thinking before the Head Judge can respond to the call. The player knows that his match will afterward receive at least a five-minute extension, so he thinks he can abuse the appeals process as a means of buying time.</p>	<p>一位牌手试图利用比赛的上诉程序来获得额外时间进行思考。距离来说，一局比赛只剩 2 分钟，而牌手面对一个艰难的抉择。一位牌手为了一个小判罚上诉，因为他/她知道这样做能在主审回应呼叫之前获得至少 5 分钟来思考。该牌手知道他的对局会获得至少 5 分钟的加时，所以他认为它可以滥用上诉程序作为获得时间的手段。</p>
<p>Protip - judges can help prevent players from committing this infraction with a little pre-emptive care! Often, a wily player out to commit the above-described infraction will do so by appealing the Warning he's receiving for committing the infraction Slow Play itself. So, if you give a Slow Play warning to a player that he or she then appeals, you should instruct the players to continue playing while you get the Head Judge. By telling the players to continue to play, you'll prevent any possibility of a player getting away with this kind of clock manipulation. And ask another judge to watch to make sure they follow the instructions.</p>	<p>提示——裁判通过一点小小的预防手段可以避免牌手触犯此违规。通常，触犯上述违规的牌手会对因游戏进行过慢得到的警告进行上诉。所以，如果你根据游戏进行过慢给牌手警告，接着他/她若上诉，你应当指示牌手继续打牌，同时你去找主审。通过告诉该牌手继续打牌，你可以避免任何一位牌手用上述方法操控时间的可能性。并且请其另一位裁判关注对局以确保牌手听从指示。</p>
<p><b>D. A player intentionally mulligans slowly before the third game in an attempt to make it harder for his opponent to win in time.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 在第三盘开始之前，牌手蓄意以缓慢的速度进行再调度，好让对手难以及时赢得游戏。</b></p>
<p>After splitting the match 1-1, a player who is playing for a draw against an opponent who needs the win may decide to take his time sideboarding, shuffling, and mulliganing to eat up time in an effort to force the match to a draw.</p>	<p>双方在对局中打平后，一位想要平局的牌手对阵一位需要获胜的牌手时，可能会决定靠更换备牌、洗牌或者调度来消耗掉时间，让对局以平局结束。</p>
<p><b>E. A player losing a game starts slowing down the pace of play in an attempt to run out the clock.</b></p>	<p><b>E. 在游戏中就要输掉的牌手开始放慢游戏步调，想拖延到时间用完。</b></p>
<p>A player knows that he or she is about to lose the</p>	<p>一位牌手知道他即将输掉当前这一盘，但意识到，</p>

<p>current game, but realizes it is possible to draw the match if the opponent is unable to “finish him off” in time. Knowing that a draw is better than a loss, that player begins to slow his or her rate of play to below a reasonable pace to deny the opponent the time needed.</p>	<p>如果对手在规定时间内无法击败他，比赛将会是平局。因为知道平局比输掉更好，该牌手开始不合理地放慢游戏节奏，不给对手足够的时间。</p>
<h2>4.8 Cheating</h2>	<h2>4.8 作弊</h2>
<p style="text-align: right;">Penalty</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">处罚</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Disqualification</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">取消资格</p>
<h3>DEFINITION</h3>	<h3>定义</h3>
<p><b>A person breaks a rule defined by the tournament documents, lies to a tournament official, or notices an offense committed in his or her (or a teammate's) match and does not call attention to it.</b></p>	<p>某人违反了比赛文档中规定的规则，向比赛工作人员说谎，或在注意到自身对局（或队友之对局）中发生了违规情事的情况下却不去寻求解决。</p>
<p>This sentence is an exhaustive list of the situations that can be considered Cheating. If the basic situation does not match one of these three categories, it is not Cheating. Moreover, all intentional violations of the tournament rules fall under the provision of Cheating (except for Slow Play, which is Stalling), and should not be treated simply as upgraded versions of other infractions.</p>	<p>这句话说明了所有可以被考虑为作弊的情况。只要情形不符合上述三类中的任何一类，便不属于作弊。此外，任何故意违反比赛规则的行为都属于作弊（除游戏进行过慢以外，故意游戏进行过慢属于拖延），而不应以其他违规的升级情形进行处理。</p>
<p>The phrases “breaking a rule” and “notices an offense” include violations of the Comprehensive Rules and of the Magic Tournament Rules. Players are required to call a judge when they make an error. Additionally, because both players are responsible for the game state, players are also expected to call a judge when they notice their opponent commit an offense.</p>	<p>“违反规则”和“注意到违规”包括违反完整规则（CR）和比赛规则（MTR）。我们要求牌手在他们犯错时呼叫裁判。此外，由于双方牌手都有维护游戏状态的责任，牌手也应当在他们注意到对手违规时呼叫裁判。</p>
<p>The IPG stipulates that, in team formats, players are also responsible for pointing out offenses in their teammates’ matches. This is because each team advances in the tournament and earns prizes as a group. Accordingly, members of a team are accountable for calling attention to mistakes they notice in their teammates’ matches as well as their own.</p>	<p>IPG 规定，在团队比赛中，牌手也有责任指出队友的对局的违规。这是因为每个团队成员是一起参加比赛并获得奖励的。因此，如同自己的对局，团队成员有责任在他们注意到队友的对局发生错误时呼叫裁判。</p>
<p><b>Additionally, the offense must meet the following criteria for it to be considered Cheating:</b></p>	<p>此外，必须在同时满足下列要素的情况下，才能将上述的违规行为视为“作弊”：</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The player must be attempting to gain advantage from his or her action.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>该牌手确实意图利用自身的行为来获取优势。</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The player must be aware that he or she is doing something illegal.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>该牌手确实知道自己之作为属违规行为,但仍决定如此作。</b></li> </ul>
<p>In Magic, cheating is always a deliberate action, or conscious lack of action. There is no such thing as “accidental cheating”. Accidental errors should be handled by the appropriate infractions found elsewhere in the IPG.</p>	<p>在万智牌中,作弊总是一种故意的行为,或者有意不作为。不存在“意外作弊”。意外的错误应依照 IPG 其他部分处理。</p>
<p>Additionally, if a player is not attempting to gain advantage from his or her action, then the offense is not Cheating. This bullet is sort of weird, generally you think of someone trying to gain an advantage when they cheat, which is exactly the point. If there is no advantage, there is no cheating. For example: Abe, who is at 6 life, attacks with a creature the turn it was summoned. Ned notices, but just takes the damage because he is holding 2 lightning bolts in his hand, and wants to let Abe get in a hit so it doesn't feel so crushed when Ned kills him on his untap. In this case, Ned is not committing an infraction. Be aware though, that because this rule is published where players can see it, some may be tempted to craft stories where it seems like they were just trying to be a 'nice guy.' It is your responsibility to determine as much of the truth as possible.</p>	<p>此外,若一位牌手不是故意要从他的行为中获利,则违规并非作弊。这一点有些奇怪,一般来说,你认为某人作弊时他/她在试图获利。如果没有获利,则没有作弊。举例来说,Abe 的生命值为 6,用一个召唤失调的生物进攻。Ned 注意到了这一点,但他接受了伤害,因为他有两张闪电击在手。他想要 Abe 多打一点时间,这样当他在自己重置之后击败 Abe 时,对方不会感到特别难受。这种情况下,Ned 并没有违规。请注意,由于此规则是公开的,牌手都可以看到它,有些人可能会尝试编造故事来假装自己只是尝试做个“友善的人”。裁判的责任是尽量根据事实来做决定。</p>
<p>A third thing that is not on this list, but is stated in the definition, the player actually has to be breaking a rule. If a player misunderstands a rule, thinks they are doing something illegal for an advantage, but what they are doing is actually legal; That's not Cheating.</p>	<p>定义中提到的但没有在清单中列明的第三点是,牌手确实违反了规则。若一位牌手误解了规则,认为他们为了获利做了某些非法的事情,但实际上他们所做的是合法的,则不是作弊。</p>
<p>The IPG used to define Cheating as a separate category of infractions, including Cheating — Fraud, Cheating — Hidden Information Violation, and Cheating — Manipulation of Game Materials. In January 2013, the IPG was updated to rule these various infractions into a single, streamlined infraction called Unsporting Conduct — Cheating. This makes it easier for judges to determine whether a certain action is Cheating, as the criteria for Cheating are now the same for all types of offenses.</p>	<p>IPG 曾经将作弊定义为一个专门类别,包括作弊~欺诈、作弊~隐藏信息违规和作弊~操纵比赛物品。2013 年 1 月,IPG 更新后将这些违规合并为一个新的违规,称为举止违背运动道德~作弊。这让裁判更容易确定一个行为是否是作弊,因为现在对于任何违规的情形,作弊的标准都是一致的。</p>
<p><b>If all criteria are not met, the offense is not Cheating and should be handled by a different infraction.</b></p>	<p>如果某违规并未同时满足上述两个要素,则该行为便不属于“作弊”,且应依照其他种类之违规进行处理。</p>

<p>The IPG clearly specifies the criteria that must be met for an offense to be Cheating so that judges can more easily identify situations where Cheating has actually occurred. If one or more of the criteria for Cheating is not met, the judge should consider whether a different infraction applies, if any. Do not apply your own definition.</p>	<p>IPG 清晰的阐述了作弊行为的要素，所以裁判可以更容易的确定哪些情况确实是作弊。如果某个情形未满足一个或多个作弊的要素，裁判应当考虑是否应当适用另一种违规。不要自己定义什么是作弊。</p>
<p><b>Cheating will often appear on the surface as a Game Play Error or Tournament Error, and must be investigated by the judge to make a determination of intent and awareness.</b></p>	<p>作弊这类违规表面上看起来通常很类似游戏行动失误或是比赛失误，裁判必须经过调查方得以断定牌手背后之意图及其对规则的了解程度。</p>
<p>The ability to conduct investigations is highly prized by the judge community; it is one of the qualities of Regional Judges, and one that all judges should strive to cultivate. The IPG does not require definite proof of the intent to cheat, but rather expects officials to exercise their best judgment to determine if a player is deliberately breaking a rule to gain an advantage. This sentence is a reminder to remain vigilante and ask questions. This particular skill is a hard one to develop as each potential situation is unique. See:</p>	<p>裁判社群对调查能力高度看重。这是区域（3级）裁判要掌握的能力，也是所有裁判应当努力培养的。IPG 不要求作弊意图的确切证据，但希望裁判能够使用最佳判断，来确定一位牌手是否故意破坏规则来获利。这句话提醒你在调查中，问问题时要保持警醒。调查是一种较难学习的技能，因为每一个可能是作弊的情形都是不同的。参见下面的文章：</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Basics_of_Investigations">http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Basics_of_Investigations</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Basics_of_Investigations">http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Basics_of_Investigations</a></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Investigations_(Seminar)">http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Investigations_(Seminar)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Investigations_(Seminar)">http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Investigations_(Seminar)</a></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://judgecast.com/?p=408">http://judgecast.com/?p=408</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://judgecast.com/?p=408">http://judgecast.com/?p=408</a></li> </ul>
<p>for some initial pointers. Please note, each of these sources were created before Cheating infractions were consolidated.</p>	<p>这些文章是学习调查的入门材料。请注意，这些文章都是在作弊违规未统一前创作的。</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES</b></p>	<p><b>范例</b></p>
<p><b>A. A player alters the results of a match after the match is over.</b></p>	<p><b>A. 牌手在对局结束后更改该次对局的结果。</b></p>
<p><b>B. A player lies to a tournament official about what happened in a game to make his case stronger.</b></p>	<p><b>B. 牌手就游戏中发生的事情向比赛工作人员说谎，以增强己方诉求的严重性。</b></p>
<p><b>C. A player allows her opponent to put a creature into the graveyard even though the creature has not been dealt lethal damage.</b></p>	<p><b>C. 在某生物未受到致命伤害的情况下，牌手仍允许其对手将该生物置入坟墓场。</b></p>
<p><b>D. A player notices that his opponent resolved only half of the triggered ability of Sword of Feast and Famine and decides not to call attention to the error.</b></p>	<p><b>D. 牌手注意到其对手仅部分结算了丰饷剑/Sword of Feast and Famine 的触发式异能，但却决定不去寻求解决此失误。</b></p>
<p><b>E. A player peeks at another player's picks during the</b></p>	<p><b>E. 牌手在轮抽过程中窥视其他牌手抽到的牌。</b></p>

<b>draft.</b>	
<b>F. A player adds cards to his Sealed Deck pool.</b>	<b>F. 参加现开赛的牌手加额外的牌到他的牌池中。</b>
<b>G. A player realizes he has accidentally drawn an extra card, then fails to call a judge in order to avoid a penalty.</b>	<b>G. 牌手发现自己不慎额外抓了一张牌，但为了逃避惩罚，并未叫裁判。</b>
All of these are examples of a player intentionally violating game rules, tournament rules, or lying. While this is not an exhaustive list, it covers many of the most common cases. One thing that is noticeably absent: not pointing out your opponents Missed Trigger. This is NEVER cheating, even if you point out the Missed Trigger at a point in time that is beneficial to you.	这些例子都是牌手在故意违反游戏规则、比赛规则或者撒谎。尽管这些例子无法涵盖所有的作弊情况，它涵盖了很多常见的情况。注意，有一种情况不属于作弊：没有指出对手的遗漏触发。这 <b>永远</b> 不是作弊，即使你在更有利于你的时间才指出对手的遗漏触发，也是一样。