

# 版本说明

---

IPG正文翻译版本：2024年9月23日

当前版本更新者：王人可、李思扬

历史贡献者：杨一宁、许兆本、张天启

IPG精解（Annotated IPG）是对IPG逐字逐句的分析及注释。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，但它最主要的是教育。如果你发现问题、或想要提供建议，请发邮件给MagicJudges.aipg@gmail.com。

在本文件中，精解部分在对应的正文下方用方框包裹。形如：

这是一段注解

IPG精解翻译版本：2024年9月23日

IPG精解初版翻译团队：常雨桐、杜昊、吕家恺、陈锐鸣

贡献者：张翼

火花之战版本更新：杜昊

2024\_9\_23版本更新：鼠鼠

克隆仓库：[https://github.com/EmoShuShu/AIPG\\_2025](https://github.com/EmoShuShu/AIPG_2025)

克隆仓库提供PDF文件、更新列表以及创作者工具

如精解部分有错漏，请直接在 GitHub Issues 提交反馈。亦可发邮件 Zjjshushu@outlook.com。

## 目录

---

- 版本说明
- 目录
- Introduction 引言
- Framework of this document 本文件架构
- 1.0 General 一般原则
  - 1.1 Definition of Penalties 各式处罚之定义
  - 1.2 Applying Penalties 应用处罚
  - 1.3 Randomizing a Library 随机化牌库
  - 1.4 Backing Up 倒回
  - 1.5 Sets 牌叠
- 2.0 Game Play Errors 游戏行动失误
  - 2.1 Missed Trigger 遗漏触发
  - 2.2 Looking at Extra Cards 额外看牌
  - 2.3 Hidden Card Error 非公开牌张失误

- 2.4 Game Play Error — Mulligan Procedure Error 再调度失误
- 2.5 Game Rule Violation 违反游戏规则
- 2.6 Failure to Maintain Game State 未维护游戏状态
- 3.0 Tournament Errors 比赛失误
  - 3.1 Tardiness 迟到
  - 3.2 Outside Assistance 外来协助
  - 3.3 Slow Play 游戏进行过慢
  - 3.4 Decklist Problem 套牌登记表问题
  - 3.5 Deck Problem 套牌问题
  - 3.6 Limited Procedure Violation 违反限制赛流程
  - 3.7 Communication Policy Violation 违反交流原则
  - 3.8 Marked Cards 有记号的牌
  - 3.9 Insufficient Shuffling 未充分洗牌
- 4.0 Unsporting Conduct 举止违背运动道德
  - 4.1 Minor 轻微
  - 4.2 Major 严重
  - 4.3 Improperly Determining a Winner 不当决定胜方
  - 4.4 Bribery and Wagering 贿赂与赌博
  - 4.5 Aggressive Behavior 攻击性举止
  - 4.6 Theft of Tournament Materials 窃取比赛用品
  - 4.7 Stalling 拖延
  - 4.8 Cheating 作弊
- 附录 A ~ 处罚快速查询
- 附录 B ~ 与之前版本的更动

## Introduction 引言

---

The Magic™ Infraction Procedure Guide provides judges the appropriate penalties and procedures to handle rules violations that occur during a tournament held at Competitive or Professional Rules Enforcement Level (REL), as well as the underlying philosophy that guides their implementation. It exists to protect players from potential misconduct and to protect the integrity of the tournament itself. Rules violations usually require a penalty or they are unenforceable. Tournaments run at Regular REL use the Judging at Regular REL document.

《万智牌违规处理方针》此份文档，是用来在执法严格度（REL）为“竞争”或“专业”级别的比赛中发生违反规则事件时，为提供裁判适当的罚则与处理程序，并阐述其背后的原则。这是用来保护牌手免于犯下潜在的失误，也保护比赛本身的公正性。违反规则的行为通常应受处罚，否则规则将无法执行。执法严格度为一般等级的比赛使用《一般严格度下执法指南》。

## Framework of this document 本文件架构

---

This document is divided into two major parts: General Definitions and Philosophy (section 1), and Infractions (sections 2-4). Infractions are broken down into general classes (Game Play Errors, Tournament Errors, and Unsporting Conduct), and further into subclasses for specific infractions.

此文件分为两个主要部份：一般定义和原则（第1节），以及违规（第2-4节）。违规分为一些主分类（游戏行动失误、比赛失误及举止违背运动道德），以及为特定违规进一步区分副分类。

See the Magic Tournament Rules for further definitions of terms in this document.

欲知本文件中一些特别用语的定义, 请参见。最新版本的《万智牌比赛规则》可于此处获得:

<http://wpn.wizards.com/zh-hans/document/magic-gathering-tournament-rules>。

This document is published in multiple languages. If a discrepancy exists between the English version and a non-English version of this document, tournament participants must refer to the English version to settle disputes concerning interpretations of the Infraction Procedure Guide.

本文件以各种不同语言版本发行。若英语版本与非英文版本之间有相异之处, 参与比赛者必须依据英文版本来诠释违规处理方针。

This document is updated periodically. Please obtain the most current version at <https://wpn.wizards.com/en/rules-documents>.

此文件系定期更新。欲知最新版本, 请参见这个网页:<http://wpn.wizards.com/en/document/magic-infraction-procedure-guide>。

## 1.0 General 一般原则

---

Judges are neutral arbiters and enforcers of policy and rules.

裁判是中立的裁决者, 也是政策与规则的执法者。

This is probably the single most important concept in the document. Whenever there is an issue, judges should evaluate the situation without bias and in accordance to the rules and policy documents. 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. It should also be unimaginable that a judge creates rules or rulings without policy guidance.

这可能是这份文件中最重要的概念。每当问题发生时, 裁判应当毫无偏袒地评估情况, 并依照规则和方针文件进行处理。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。裁判在没有方针指导下自行创造规则或做出判决也是无法想象的。

A judge shouldn't intervene in a game unless they believe a rules violation has occurred, a player with a concern or question requests assistance, or the judge wishes to prevent a situation from escalating.

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。

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.

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，不打断牌手的思考。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。

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.

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。

Like in many other sports, judges don't prevent mistakes. However, when 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 a judge is watching a match at the end of round or during a Top 8.

It's also important that judges set a good example of behavior. At an event, your attitude is an advertisement for the behaviors you want to see at events. Your attitude and actions have a pronounced impact on the tone of the event. Your role is largely a customer service role, and that requires a high degree of diplomacy.

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。裁判在每轮结束时或者八强的盯桌时同样需要遵守这一条。

裁判做出良好的行为举止的表率也是很重要的。在比赛中，你的态度会为你希望在比赛中看到的举止广而告之。你的行为和态度对赛事的氛围有着非常显著的影响。你的角色在很大程度上是客户服务的角色，而这需要较高水平的交际手腕。

Judges may intervene to prevent or preempt errors occurring outside of a game.

为避免或预防游戏之外的失误发生，裁判可以介入。

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:

- A judge sees that a player is shuffling their 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 their deck; the judge steps in and tell the player that they're forgetting to shuffle a card.

- 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 they're playing.
- 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.
- Before the event, a judge sees a questionable card alter. The Judge reminds the player that the head judge needs to approve all card alters prior to the event.

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：

- 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。
- 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。
- 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。
- 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牌。

Knowledge of a player's history or skill does not alter an infraction, but it may be taken into account during an investigation.

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 GRV is a warning regardless of whether the player is new or a grizzled Pro. Once you determine what the infraction was, you apply the penalties without any preconceived biases. You don't make penalties harsher because the player should 'know better'. A player who has a reputation for being shady has their GRVs fixed the same way as an L3 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。不应该因为牌手本应“了解地更多”而进行更严厉的处罚。一位声名狼藉的牌手和一位参加比赛的3级裁判犯下违反游戏规则后进行的修正应当遵循相同的方式。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。

The purpose of a penalty is to educate the player not to make similar mistakes in the future.

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。

This is done through both an explanation of where the rules or policies were violated and a penalty to reinforce the education.

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。

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.

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。

We should also note that you don't have to receive a penalty to recognize that you don't want to receive one. Hearing about a friend getting a penalty for an action helps reinforce that you don't want one either. We learn from our friend's mistakes as well as from our own.

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 – They revealed their opponent's cards while shuffling their opponent's deck before the beginning of the match" for twenty times in twenty consecutive tournaments, well, wouldn't you believe that they are doing it on purpose and they are doing it only once just because they know that "the first time is just a warning."

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。

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）保存着所有的处罚记录。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个连续的比赛中受到了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？

If a minor violation is quickly handled by the players to their mutual satisfaction, a judge does not need to intervene.

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。

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. If you see an error, you can wait a second to see if the players fix it themselves, and if they do, you can continue watching Magic.

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。如果你发现了一个失误，你可以稍等一下，看牌手会不会自行修正。如果牌手这样做了，你便可以继续观战而无需干预。

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.

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。

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 are clear to anyone who is watching their game.

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对手表达清楚，也要对旁观他们游戏的其他人表达清楚。

In both these situations, the judge should ensure that the game progresses normally.

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. We don't want a player

taking advantage of the confusion, or the error compounding on 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。我们不希望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。

More significant violations are addressed by first identifying what infraction applies, then proceeding with the corresponding instructions.

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 give infractions 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，我们的确需要对任何比“轻微”违规严重的情况给出判罚；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。

Only the Head Judge is authorized to issue penalties that deviate from these guidelines.

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。

The Head Judge may not deviate from this guide's procedures except in significant and exceptional circumstances or a situation that has no applicable philosophy for guidance.

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。

Significant and exceptional circumstances are rare—a table collapses, a booster contains cards from a different set, etc.

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。

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. If you find yourself considering a deviation, give it a serious second thought.

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。如果你想要考虑偏离方针，请认真地再次考虑一遍。

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.

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。

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 receive the appropriate penalty 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.

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，他仍然会获得相应的判罚，不管你认为这是否“公平”。另外，成为一个L3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。

If another judge feels deviation is appropriate, they must consult with the Head Judge.

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。

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.

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。

Judges are human and make mistakes. When a judge makes a mistake, they should acknowledge the mistake, apologize to the players, and fix it if it is not too late.

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。

Despite all efforts to train Golden Retrievers, we judges are still only human.

For now.

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 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.

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。

至少现在为止还是这样。

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你错误判罚的人。

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.

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。

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 HJ. 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.

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。

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.

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套牌登记表，但由于是裁判的失误直接导致了此违规行为的发生，他可以将罚则降级为“警告”。

Other examples might include:

- Downgrading a Game Rule Violation Warning to no penalty if a judge tells a player that they can untap two untapped lands with Teferi, Hero of Dominaria.
- Downgrading a Decklist Problem Game Loss to a Warning if a judge has previously told the player that registering "Jace" on their Decklist is fine.

其他的例子包括：

- 将违反游戏规则的“警告”降级为无判罚，因为裁判告诉一位牌手他可以用多明纳里亚英雄泰菲力重置两个未横置的地。

- 将套牌登记表问题的“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。

If a player clearly acts on erroneous information provided by a judge during the game, the Head Judge may consider a backup to the point of the action taken, even if that action did not lead to a violation.

如果牌手明显是根据裁判提供的错误信息而在游戏中行动，在主审可以考虑倒回至实际行动前之时点，即便相关行动并未违规也可如此操作。

We expect players to trust the information provided by their tournament officials, as detailed already. Normally a backup could only be considered if an infraction had been committed, but in the same way that it is unfair to penalize a player for trusting the information provided, it is also unfair for a player to have made a decision based upon that information even if it doesn't result in an infraction.

正如上文所述，我们期望牌手信任比赛工作人员提供的信息。通常而言，只有在发生违规时才能考虑是否进行倒回。但是正如牌手信任这些信息而导致受到判罚对他们是不公平的，即使没有造成违规，牌手根据这些信息导致作出游戏决定也同样是不公平的。

## 1.1 Definition of Penalties 各式处罚之定义

### **WARNING 警告**

Warnings are used in situations of incorrect play when a small amount of time is needed to implement the corrective procedure.

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。

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.

“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。

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.

其目的是用来针对已产生的问题，警示相关裁判和牌手，并将此违规永久记录。

A Warning needs to be tracked and judges should write it down on the back of the result slips (if you are using them). The Scorekeeper will input the warning penalty into the tournament software to track the infraction. Scorekeepers can notify you when a player is close to an upgrade, and players need to be aware of how many penalties they have.

“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）。记分员将会将这个警告处罚记录在比赛软件内以追踪违规。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。

A time extension should be issued if the ruling has taken more than a minute.

如果解释规则花费超过一分钟的时间，则要给予延长时间。

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?

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？

## GAME LOSS 一盘负

A Game Loss ends the current game immediately 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.

一盘负处罚会立刻结束目前这一盘游戏，犯下此违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）。

If a player gets a Game Loss, that game is over. Board position or “but they were 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 they play or draw 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.

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。

Game Losses are applied immediately if the game is still ongoing, or to the player’s next game if it is not, unless otherwise specified.

一盘负处罚在游戏仍在继续的情况下立刻生效，否则对该牌手的下一盘游戏生效，除非特别说明。

The default time to apply a Game Losses is immediately. If there is no game going on, you apply the penalty to the next game that you can, even if its in a different match. However, there are a few infractions where the penalty specifically tells you to apply the penalty at a specific time. Mostly this is for a Decklist Problem discovered through decklist counting.

默认情况下，一盘负在适用时会立即发生。如果当前没有进行对局，则该违规会适用到下一盘中，即使这一盘发生在另一局中。然而，有一些违规明确说明了判罚应在何时发生。这种情况最常见的就是在清点牌表上的张数时发现的套牌登记表问题。

If a player would receive multiple Game Losses at the same time, they only receive one.

如果牌手会在同一时间受到多个“一盘负”判罚，则其只会受到一个一盘负。

The infractions don’t have to happen at the same time; if you’re going to write two or more Game Losses on the match slip in one go you will only issue one. While relatively rare it is most likely to come up during a deck check, where multiple infractions could occur as part of the one check. Another scenario is handing a decklist in late, then before the round starts needing to fix the list because of mis-registering lands. A Game Loss is always a significant penalty, receiving 2 or more for infractions

discovered at the same time essentially converts the penalty into a match loss which doesn't fit the infractions. Although it may feel like the player is getting away with no penalty for the other infraction or infractions, they are still receiving the same penalty they would have for that infraction and they are all being recorded.

这些违规不一定非要在同时发生；只要你将在成绩条上一次写下两个一盘负，你就只会给出一个实际的一盘负处罚。虽然这种情况相对而言比较罕见，最可能的情况之一是在一次套牌检查时发生了多种不同的违规。另一种情形是牌表提交晚了，然后在一轮开始前因为填写的地数量不对又需要修改登记表。一盘负是较重的处罚，因同时发现的不同违规而一次获得2个或更多一盘负会导致判罚实际变成一局负，这与违规并不相称。虽然这可能让你感觉牌手的某些违规没有得到惩罚，牌手实际还是会得到与其违规相称的处罚，且都会被记录在案。

If simultaneous Game Loss penalties are issued to each player, they are recorded, but do not affect the match score.

如果游戏中所有牌手同时受到一盘负之处罚，则此些“一盘负”处罚会记录在案，但不会影响当前对局的成绩。

This covers situations where both players have an illegal deck, or other similar circumstances. If we issue both players with a Game Loss penalty, only one game in the match will determine the winner and it's always better for both players to play a complete match. 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.

这适用于两位牌手套牌都不合法等其他的情况。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，但对于两位牌手而言打完一个完整的对局总是更好的。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，刚才那一盘视同不存在。

## MATCH LOSS 一局负

A Match Loss is a severe penalty that is usually issued when the match itself has been compromised.

一局负是严厉的处罚，通常用于对局本身被干扰的情况。

The infractions associated with this penalty, are all things that cannot be "undone" even with a Game Loss. For example, if you offer a bribe to your opponent, a Game Loss cannot unmake that offer.

Note that it is possible for a match to become compromised but still continue such as if a spectator commits Outside Assistance.

导致这种处罚的犯规，都有一个共同点：它们是不可逆的，就算判决一局负也无法补救。举个例子，如果你试图贿赂对手，那么判你一局负并不能消除你提出过贿赂这个事实。

注意，对局可能会受到干扰但仍然继续，例如一位旁观者犯下外来协助的情形。

Match Losses are applied to the match during which the offense occurred unless the offender's match has already ended, in which case the penalty will be applied to that player's next match.

一局负的处罚应该适用于发生违规的该对局，倘若违规牌手已经结束该对局，则应将一局负适用于相应牌手的下次对局。

If the match has already ended, apply the penalty to the next match.

如果这一局已经结束了，那么这个处罚将应用于下一局。

## DISQUALIFICATION 取消资格

A Disqualification is issued for activity that damages the integrity of a tournament as a whole or for severe unsporting conduct.

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。

The recipient of a Disqualification does not need to be a player in the tournament. They may be a spectator or other bystander.

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。

Entering the spectator or bystander into the event ensures that there is a record of the DQ and the information can be used by the Investigations Committee. Get the person's name and Wizards Account email address, even if you have to ask around. Remember to collect statements and enter an investigation report.

将旁观者或路人录入赛事，能确保对取消资格的判罚有档可查，并且相关信息可供调查委员会使用。即便需要多方打听，也务必获取到此人的姓名和威世智账户的电子邮箱地址。切记要收集陈述并提交调查报告。

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.

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。建议主审在报告中反应这个事实。

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 their decision is right, they just need 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 they 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要求主审解释为何认为该牌手应该被取消资格。

When this penalty is applied, the player loses their current match and is dropped from the tournament. If a player has already received prizes at the time they are disqualified, that player may keep those prizes but does not receive any additional prizes or awards they may be due.

此处罚生效时，牌手输掉目前正在举行的该局，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。

When a player is disqualified from the tournament, their event is over. The results of the matches or games they have finished won't be changed, and if the player has already received prizes prior to the Disqualification, they get to keep what has already been received. However, they are not given anything they are yet to receive. This is mainly to avoid the legal complications of "taking back" something that has already been given.

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。

When a player is disqualified during a tournament, they are removed from the tournament and do 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 Magic Tabletop Mythic Qualifier, the former 9th place finisher does not advance into the single elimination top 8, but they do move into 8th place in the standings.

当比赛中有关手被取消资格时，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，有位牌手在万智牌实体传奇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。

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.

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。

Disqualifications should be reported here. Please include the Wizards Account email address of the disqualified player and that player's opponent.

取消资格需要在[这里](#)上报，需包含被取消资格的牌手及其对手的威世智账号邮箱地址。

The link to the disqualification process has all the information on what needs to happen when a player is disqualified. This link requires a Wizards login.

这个取消资格流程的链接中包含了牌手被取消资格时所有需要做的事情的信息。这个链接需要用威世智店家网络（译注：即WPN）登录。

## 1.2 Applying Penalties 应用处罚

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 Decklist Problems (3.4)).

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）和套牌登记表问题（3.4）此两项违规除外）。

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 be consulted prior to giving any Game Loss or Match Loss. As for Disqualifications, only the Head Judge can give those. The reason Tardiness and Decklist Problems 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 Decklist Problems. 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 large competitive REL events is that a Level 3 judge can issue Game Losses instead of having to consult the Head Judge. At some events like StarCityGames Opens it is not uncommon for Team Leaders to have the authority to issue Game Losses.

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。迟到和套牌登记表问题是两个例外，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大型竞争级别赛事中，L3裁判可以代替主审给出一盘负的判罚。在一些例如星城公开赛 (SCG Opens) 的比赛中，组长可以给一盘负的情况也并不少见。

Being enrolled in the tournament is not a requirement to receive a penalty. Although these guidelines refer to players, other people in the venue, such as spectators, staff, or judges may be enrolled into (and dropped from) the tournament in order to receive a penalty. Penalties are still issued even if a player drops from the tournament before it would take effect.

并非只有参赛牌手才可能会得到处罚。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、工作人员或是裁判皆可能被加入比赛（并立即退赛）以得到处罚。即使牌手在罚则生效之前选择退出比赛，该牌手依然会受到相应的处罚。

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 any kind of penalties. If you commit an 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 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. If a spectator is giving outside assistance for example, we need to keep track of it.

这句话的主要目的是告诉大家：“如果有人并不是我这场比赛中的参赛者，却犯下了这些违规，我该怎么办？”当谈及判罚时，我们并不区别对待任何比赛的参与者。如果你在没有参赛的情况下犯下了违规，你将被通过比赛报告软件加入比赛、并给予相应的判罚。如果有一个人旁观者言行冒犯他人，这便属于一件需要被记录在案的事情。你甚至可以在没有参赛的情况下犯下值得被禁赛的事情。例如，一个旁观者给予他人外来协助，我们就应该将其记录在案。

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.

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。

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 speak to you after the match.

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，以及修正什么是。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。

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.

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。

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.

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 the judge is following the document, a player can't (reasonably) claim that the judge is out to get them, 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。

These procedures do not, and should not, take into 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.

这些流程不会也不该考虑游戏进行过的部份、游戏目前的状况，或是谁会因此流程与所连带的处罚而得到策略上的好处。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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”。

If an error leads to multiple related infractions, only issue one with the most severe penalty.

如果一个错误导致了多个相关联的违规，仅作出其中最严重的处罚。

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 this three times, treat it as a single infraction for the purposes of fixing it and upgrades.

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 not two infractions.

这条适用于当裁判被叫到桌前时发现了许多问题的情况。有时这些问题时相互无关的。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，于是反复启动武具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。

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。

## 1.3 Randomizing a Library 随机化牌库

The remedy for some infractions in this document includes shuffling the randomized portion of the library.

本文档中某些违规的修正方式包含将牌库已随机化的部分洗牌。

Some infractions in the IPG instruct to shuffle or randomize a library as part of the fix. If they do, use these instructions.

IPG中的一些违规指示说，作为修正的一部分，要将牌库洗牌或随机化。如果需要如此做，请参照以下的指示。

This requires first determining whether any portion of the library 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 library manipulation cards, such as Brainstorm and cards with the scry mechanic.

利用此种方式进行修正时，首先需要确定牌库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/Brainstorm和拥有占卜机制的牌。

When instructed to randomize the library, we don't want to lose parts of the library that have been seen and intentionally ordered. Be sure to ask the players if any cards are known, but given player memory is not always perfect, check all the zones for cards and effects that might have ordered or unordered (like fetch lands) parts of the library.

当随机化牌库时，我们并不想让牌库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。

Once the library has been shuffled, any manipulated cards are returned to their correct locations.

在完成牌库的洗牌之后，将已调整过顺序的牌张放回原本的位置。

Separate the cards that are known, keeping the cards face down and hidden and have the players shuffle the part that is unknown, then add the known cards back to where they are supposed to be.

将已知的牌分开并保持牌面朝下不要泄露，然后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。

Shuffles performed by a judge as part of a remedy are not considered shuffles for game purposes.

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。

Sorry Cosi's Trickster. Note that even though this sentence says "performed by a judge" it's not recommended for a judge to shuffle the library if an infraction calls for the library to be shuffled. Let the player shuffle and present.

抱歉，寇希诈术师。注意即使这句话说道「由裁判执行」，我们也不推荐在发生需要洗牌的违规时，由裁判来执行洗牌。让牌手洗牌，然后呈现牌库。

## 1.4 Backing Up 倒回

Some infractions in this document permit the judge to consider the possibility of a backup.

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。

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.

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。

A whole article could be written on this topic, and fortunately, one has been. 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[写过了一篇](#)。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。

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.

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 let's add to the scenario. Let's say the active player cast the Terror to remove a blocker and then attacked with their 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 of the turn. The fewer decisions, the more likely a rewind is acceptable.

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。

Only the Head Judge may authorize a backup. At large tournaments, they may choose to delegate this responsibility to Team Leaders.

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。

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 Regional Championships or StarCityGames 10K, 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.

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，比如区域冠军赛或星城10K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。但是如果觉得倒回是个好主意的话，你当然也可以向主审提出要求。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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 after returning a random card from a player's hand as part of a rewind, you are probably doing more harm than good at this point with the 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.

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对游戏非常有破坏性；下面会介绍如何倒回洗牌。

Actions that caused a player to learn the identity of cards at a specific location in the library are reversed by shuffling those cards into the random portion of the library unless they were subsequently drawn; cards being returned to the library as part of the backup should not be shuffled at that stage if their identity was known to only one player.

让牌手得知某一张牌在牌库中具体位置的动作，除非是在之后抓起导致的，否则以将这些牌洗进牌库中随机部分的方式进行倒回；由于倒回而回到牌库的牌如果之前只有一位牌手知道内容，则在此步骤中不将它们洗牌。

If we are rewinding through an action that resulted in information about card location in the library becoming known (like scrying), we randomize the portion of the library that information was contained in (in plain language, we shuffle the previously random portion of the library, including the card(s) that became known). If we are rewinding through a drawn card, however, we don't want to enable that card or another to be shuffled away, and so... it's not. We simply return a random card from the hand to the top of the library.

当倒回一个能够得知牌库中某些牌张的位置的动作时（例如占卜），我们将包含该信息的牌库部分进行随机化（用更直接的方式来说，就是将原本牌库的随机部分，包括被得知的这些牌，进行洗牌。）但是，如果要倒回一张抓起的牌，我们并不想让这张牌或另一张牌被洗走，所以.....它不会被洗走。我们只是将一张随机的牌从手牌放到牌库顶。

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.

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。

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.

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。

Some remedies state a simple backup may be performed. A simple backup is backing up the last action completed (or one currently in progress) and is sometimes used to make another portion of the prescribed remedy smoother. A simple backup should not involve any random elements.

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，有时用于保证列明之修正方式的其他部分能够顺利执行。

Game Rule Violation, Missed Trigger, and Hidden Card Error mention that a simple backup may sometimes be applicable. This describes what a small backup is. Small backups are limited to one action, and exist just to make other fixes have intuitive results.

违反游戏规则，遗漏触发和非公开牌张失误中提到，有时可以适用简易倒回。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。

A simple backup should not involve any random elements.

简易倒回不应涉及任何随机元素。

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.

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。

## 1.5 Sets 牌叠

Some infractions in this document refer to "sets" of cards.

本文档中的某些违规会提及“牌叠”之概念。

These infractions are IPG 2.2 Looking at Extra Cards, IPG 2.3 Hidden Card Error, and IPG 3.5 Deck Problem.

这些违规包括2.2额外看牌、2.3非公开牌张失误、以及3.5套牌问题。

A Set is a physically distinct group of cards defined by a game rule or effect. It may correspond to a specific zone, or may represent part of a zone. A Set may consist of a single card.

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。一张牌也可构成牌叠。

A card or rule may create sets briefly during their resolution (such as Fact or Fiction, Collected Company, or even your draw for turn). If you are holding one or more cards, that's a set. If you flipped over the top 3 cards of your library to reveal them, that's a set. Other sets simply exist naturally in the game, such as your Library, Graveyard, Exile, and Hand. Just to be as clear as possible, it is also directly spelled out that a single card may be a set.

有些牌可能在其结算过程中临时创造牌叠（例如真伪莫辨，征召军伍，甚至是你这回合抓的牌）。如果你拿着一张或几张牌，这些牌就构成一个牌叠。如果你翻开你牌库顶的三张牌来展示它们，这些牌就构成一个牌叠。另一些牌叠自然地存在于游戏中，例如你的牌库、坟墓场、放逐区、或手牌。为了特地澄清，这里还直接说明了即使只有一张牌也可能构成一个牌叠。

Cards are considered to be part of a set until they join another set. There is no in-between state and any card that has not yet been seen is part of the previous set (unless the new set is hidden).

牌张在移入新的牌叠之前，视为在原来的牌叠之中。牌张不存在“移动中”之状态，任何还没有被看到的牌都属于之前的牌叠（除非新的牌叠也为非公开）。

This is just explicitly clear language to ensure that, no matter how hard you try, there will not exist a card without it being part of a set. Consider any unseen card as a part of the previous non-hidden set.

这句话是为了清楚地确保不会有一张不属于任何牌叠的牌出现。将没有被看到的牌视为之前非公开牌叠的一部分。

## 2.0 Game Play Errors 游戏行动失误

Game Play Errors are caused by incorrect or inaccurate play of the game such that it results in violations of the Magic Comprehensive Rules. Many offenses fit into this category and it would be impossible to list them all. The guide below is designed to give judges a framework for assessing how to handle a Game Play Error.

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。

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.

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.

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。

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，这就是为什么游戏行动失误这类失误十分常见。

Many offenses fit into this category and it would be impossible to list them all.

许多违规都属于此类情况，但不可能全数详列。

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 the 5 Game Play Errors defined by the IPG.

鉴于万智牌游戏的复杂性，将所有可能发生的错误之类型——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，这份文件就可能有几百页长，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5种游戏行动失误。

The guide below is designed to give judges a framework for assessing how to handle a Game Play Error.

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。

Most Game Play Error infractions are assumed to have been committed unintentionally.

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.

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.

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。

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。

If the judge believes that the error was intentional, they should first consider whether an Unsporting Conduct — Cheating infraction has occurred.

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。来自经验更加丰富裁判的经验和建议有助于正确分析情形，并推断出牌手的违规是否明知故犯。

With the exception of Failure to Maintain Game State, which is never upgraded, the third or subsequent Warning for a Game Play Error offense in the same category is upgraded to a Game Loss.

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而得到的警告，均应升级为一盘负。

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 Error to a player, be sure to ask if they have received the infraction before. Note that this is the third warning in a category, not the third infraction. If a player has received 2 Hidden Card Errors that have been upgraded to Game Losses, and they commit a third Hidden Card Error that does not meet the upgrade criteria, that warning is not upgraded to a Game Loss.

Regarding the 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 they are getting the Warning, and if they 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 doesn’t make sense. And, if this is the third time that my opponent has made a play mistake that I didn’t catch right away, 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. 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 their favor, this gives judges the ability to track these infractions — and when added to the larger infraction database, we can track across events too.

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。注意这是同一个问题的第三次警告，而不是第三次判罚。如果一个牌手已经两次因非公开牌张失误的升级判罚而获得过一盘负，之后犯下了第三次非公开牌张失误但并没有达到升级的标准，那么该警告不会被升级为一盘负。

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们会得到这个判罚，如果牌手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不合理的。假如未维护游戏状态要升级的话，我可能会在第三次对手犯错而我没能立刻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。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未维护游戏状态，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。

For multi-day tournaments, the penalty count for these infractions resets between days.

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次日清零。

Multi-day tournaments reset between days because it was determined to be unreasonable that the upgrade path was held at three regardless of the number of rounds in an event — it's much easier to accumulate three GPEs over a fifteen round Regional Championship than a five round RCQ.

历时多日的比赛会在次日重置判罚累计次数是因为无论几轮的比赛都是三次累积升级是不公平的——在15轮的区域冠军赛上累积三次游戏行动失误远比在5轮的区域冠军赛预选赛上容易。

## 2.1 Missed Trigger 遗漏触发

*Penalty None 处罚无*

### DEFINITION 定义

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.

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。

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.

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." The finer details of when things "first matter" will be covered throughout this definition.

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。

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。关于何为“第一次产生作用”，我们将在这一部分中进行详解。

The point by which the player needs to demonstrate this awareness depends on the impact that the trigger would have on the game:

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：

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.

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。

- 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.
- 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。

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.

Examples: Anointed Deacon, Academy Journeymage, Rhonas's Monument

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 — they 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 it's "obvious" that you want to target the opponent.

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。

例如：祝圣助祭、学院老练法师、罗纳斯纪念碑。

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。

- 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.
- 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。

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.

Examples: Banewhip Punisher, Anointer Priest, Sparring Construct

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 a player to take damage or gain life first matter at the point that a score pad should be updated.

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。

例如：驱邪鞭手、圣洗僧侣、战训组构体。

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。

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.

请注意，让过优先权、施放瞬间咒语或起动异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。

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.

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。

- A triggered ability that changes the rules of the game: The controller must acknowledge the trigger or stop an opponent who tries to take any resulting illegal action.
- 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，或在对手尝试执行因此变为不合法的动作时阻止之。

These are triggered abilities that first matter at the point at which an opponent tries to take an illegal action due to the trigger. 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.

Examples: Brine Elemental, Lavinia of the Tenth, Wall of Frost, Cunning Survivor

If an opponent hasn't acknowledged the trigger then players are welcome to behave as if it was forgotten, but they must expect to be stopped by that opponent.

For example, suppose after cycling a card Alex attacks Nat with a Cunning Survivor and doesn't immediately mention their trigger. Nat is allowed to animate a Mutavault and try to declare it alone as a blocker. If Alex does not speak up about this blocking assignment being illegal before taking a later action or continuing with combat, Alex has missed their trigger. If a player chooses to perform this "Missed Trigger gambit," so to speak, they risk giving away information like the identity of cards in their hand or intended plays. Worse yet, a player banking on a forgotten trigger of this type may lock themselves into a play they would otherwise not want to take. In the above example, if Alex prevents Nat from blocking with Mutavault alone, Nat wouldn't get to undo the activation of Mutavault.

这些触发式异能第一次产生作用的时点是对手尝试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。

例如：盐湖元素、第十区的拉温妮、霜墙、狡黠遗民。

如果对手没有声明触发，牌手可以假设这个触发被遗忘了，但他们必须意识到自己的动作可能会被对手阻止。

例如，循环了一张牌后，Alex使用狡黠遗民攻击Nat，但没有立即提到其触发式异能。我们允许Nat将他的易形地窖变成生物，并试图宣告单独阻挡。如果Alex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，Alex就遗忘了这个触发。如果牌手想要“赌”对手忘了异能，他们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，他们可能需要做出一些原本不想做的游戏操作。例如上面的例子中，如果Alex阻止了Nat用易形地窖单独阻挡，Nat将无法撤销将异形地窖变生物的操作。

- 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.
- 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。

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 or giving a creature a power and toughness bonus (but not a counter or targeted). The result of these effects may cause some later visible change to the game state. For example, suppose Nat controls an Aether Flash at the time that Alex casts a 3/3 Hill Giant, and neither player mentions the trigger. If, later that turn, Nat deals 1 additional damage to Alex's creature, Nat will have not missed the Aether Flash trigger if they prompt Alex to put their creature into the graveyard at that time. In this case, Aether Flash's trigger first matters at the point when Alex's creature receives lethal damage.

Examples: Boros Elite, Steppe Lynx, Zhur-Taa Ancient, Emrakul, the Aeons Torn.

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.

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（而非被放上指示物或被目标）。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，Nat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。）Alex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Nat对Alex的生物又造成的1点伤害，若Nat提示Alex将该生物放进坟场，Nat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Alex的生物获得致命伤害之时。

例如：波洛斯精兵、草原山猫、筑塔族祖兽、万世创伤伊莫库。

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。

Once any of the above obligations has been fulfilled, further problems are treated as a Game Play Error — Game Rule Violation.

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。

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.

For example, suppose Alex attacks Nat with an unblocked Arbor Elf equipped with Sword of Feast and Famine. During the combat damage step, Alex untaps their lands but both players forget about Nat 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 Nat whether to place the trigger 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.

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）。

例如，Alex使用佩带了丰谨剑的乔木妖精攻击Nat，且没有被阻挡。在战斗伤害步骤，Alex重置了自己的地，但两位牌手都忘了Nat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Nat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。

If the turn-based action of putting a lore counter on a Saga is missed, it should be handled as though it was a missed trigger.

如果在传纪上放置学问指示物的回合动作被遗忘了，将这个问题视作遗漏触发来处理。

While putting a lore counter on a Saga isn't a trigger, it feels an awful lot like one, especially when the immediate result of putting the lore counter on is the creation of a trigger. Now, instead of handling this with our standard Game Rule Violation fixes of "back up" or "leave the game alone," we handle this like we'd handle any missed trigger.

Note that this does not apply in the rare case where a player plays a Saga and doesn't put the first lore counter on it. That's still a Game Rule Violation.

尽管为传纪放置学问指示物并非一个触发式异能，但它给人的感觉与触发式异能极为相似，尤其是当放置指示物的直接结果就是产生一个触发式异能时。因此现在，我们不再采用倒回或维持现状这类标准的

处理违反游戏规则的修正方式，而是将其视同遗漏触发来处理。

请注意：这不适用于牌手在结算一个传纪咒语进场时，忘记放置第一个学问指示物的罕见情况。那种情况依然属于违反游戏规则。

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.

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。

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 Nat's creature dies while Alex controls a Grave Betrayal, the trigger happens. However Alex 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 trigger's creation isn't "relevant," but its resolution is.

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Alex操控坟场叛行的时候，Nat的生物死去，该触发式异能自动结算。但Alex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。

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 their turn, the storm trigger would be considered missed. Again, this is a concession to the way players actually play Magic.

对于只会产生咒语或异能之一个或数个复制品，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）。

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 their turn, the storm trigger would be considered missed. Again, this is a concession to the way players actually play Magic.

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，我们也不认为牌手遗漏了这个触发。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。

Abilities consisting of an action followed by "when you do" in the same ability are considered communicated by the announcement of the action. This is most commonly the case for exert and similar abilities.

一些异能包括一个动作以及紧跟其后的“当你如此作”异能。此类异能视为在宣告该动作之后就已声明。这种情形通常包括耗竭和其他一些类似的异能。

Announcing the action that makes the trigger ability to trigger is sufficient to demonstrate the awareness of the Reflexive triggers.

牌手宣告使触发式异能触发的动作足以表示其对该自身触发异能的认识。

If a triggered ability would have no impact on the game, it's not an infraction to fail to demonstrate awareness of it.

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。

There has to be no impact to the game, not that it's obvious a choice wouldn't be made. You shouldn't 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.

此处指的是不会对游戏造成影响的触发，并不是指没有做出一个显而易见的选择。你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。

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.

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。

Another example of a triggered ability that would have no impact on the game may occur in a scenario in which a player controls no other creatures and attacks with 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.

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谷兽（每当深峡谷兽攻击时，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。深峡谷兽本身是其异能的唯一合法目标，但再次赋予深峡谷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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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 their triggered abilities.

除非认为应给予警告，或有理由怀疑异能的操控者系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。

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 they 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.

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.

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。

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。

A player controlling another player is responsible for that player's triggers in addition to their own.

若某牌手正在操控其他牌手之回合，则他除了需留意自己的触发外，还有责任准确处理其所操控之牌手的触发。

If one player is controlling another player then the controlling player is responsible for remembering that player's triggers. There aren't any differences to this infraction other than the controlling player cannot forget any triggers, theirs or the player's they are controlling. For the purposes of any fixes below, the controlled player is the opponent.

如果牌手正在操控其他牌手，那么前者应当对后者的触发负责。除了该牌手不能忘记任何触发——无论是他们自己的还是正在操控的牌手的——以外，对于违规本身而言并没有任何区别。下文所提及的修正中，对手指的是被操控的牌手。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. Knight of Infamy (a 2/1 creature with exalted) attacks alone. Its controller says "Take two."

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。”

(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 their trigger, even if they are stating the knight is attacking for 2 prior to the combat damage step.

(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，意味着其遗漏了触发，即使该牌手在战斗伤害步骤之前如此声明也是如此。

- B. A player forgets to remove the final time counter from a suspended spell and then draws a card during their draw step.

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。

(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, they have advanced the game past the point where the visible game state would first be altered had the trigger resolved.

(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。

- C. A player casts Manic Vandal, then forgets its triggered ability by not choosing a target for it. They realize this only after casting another spell.

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，他们才发现遗忘了此触发。

(When Manic Vandal enters the battlefield, destroy target artifact.) In this scenario, this ability first matters before the player passes priority. This is a triggered ability that requires its controller to choose targets.

(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用。这是一个需要其操控者选择目标的触发式异能。

- D. A player forgets to exile the Angel token created by Geist of Saint Draft at end of combat. They realize the error when declaring blockers during the next turn.

D. 在战斗结束的时候，牌手忘记放逐圣沙弗的游魂/Geist of Saint Draft产生的天使衍生物。等到下一个回合宣告阻挡者的时候，他们才发现这个失误。

In this scenario, this ability first matters before the player indicates that they have moved past the combat phase. This is a delayed triggered ability that causes a change in the visible game state.

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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Triggered abilities are common and invisible, so players should not be harshly penalized when forgetting about one.

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。

It's pretty easy to forget triggers, there are a lot of them and there are often no visual components 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.

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，就当做它们没发生过即可。

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).

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）。

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. It was pointed out that now, with the Pacts, a player can "forget" their trigger and then say "oops I forgot" when the opponent notices; this is a case where an investigation for Cheating can be a good idea.

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”。需要指出的是，现在牌手可以“忘记”他们的条约触发式异能，然后在对手发现时才说“哎呀，我忘了”；这种情况下调查牌手是否作弊可能会是一个好主意。

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 to point out triggered abilities that they do not control, though they may do so if they wish.

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。

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.

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.

Why might a player want to remind an opponent of their triggered ability? It's possible that the trigger might benefit themselves more than their opponent or it might inconvenience their opponent so reminding them makes sense.

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、渎圣恶魔和琉璃研究。

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。

为什么牌手会想要提醒对手操控的触发式异能呢？可能是因为这个异能对自己比对对手更有利，或者只是为了干扰对手。

Triggered abilities are assumed to be remembered until otherwise indicated, and the impact on the game state may not be immediately apparent.

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。

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 their 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 they forgot the trigger. Attacking 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.

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”说明这个触发已经被遗漏了。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

Suppose Alex controls Cathedral of War and attacks with a single 2/2 Bear Cub, proceeding through to the declare blockers step without mentioning the triggered ability. After declaring blockers, Nat considers casting Shock targeting the unblocked Bear Cub.

Nat has two options — they could simply cast Shock, targeting the Bear Cub, hoping that Alex forgot about the trigger. However, by doing so, Nat risks Alex acknowledging the trigger by not putting the Bear Cub into the graveyard. In other words, just because Alex didn't explicitly announce the trigger doesn't mean they missed it — the point at which the trigger would first matter in this case would be after Shock resolves. So, if Nat were to attempt this ploy, they risk wasting the Shock.

Alternatively, Nat could ask Alex what Bear Cub's current power/toughness is. This is derived information, so Alex isn't required to answer, but if they do, Nat knows if the trigger is missed or not.

This may seem somewhat unsatisfactory to Nat, since asking questions about the toughness of the Bear Cub will probably remind Alex about the trigger and give them 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 Nat trap Alex, it's designed to reflect the way players actually play the game.

假设Alex操控战事圣堂（颂威）并使用一个2/2幼熊进行攻击。他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Nat考虑对这个未被阻挡的幼熊施放电震。

Nat有两个选择。要么他以幼熊为目标施放电震，希望Alex忘记触发。如果他这么做，他便冒着Alex记住这个触发，不将幼熊置入坟墓场的风险。换句话说，Alex即使没有声明这个触发，也不说明他就遗忘了——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Nat想要这样冒险的话，他可能会浪费他的电震。

要么Nat可以先问Alex幼熊现在的攻击力和防御力是多少。这是推断信息，Alex并不必回答这个问题。但如果他回答了，Nat便会知道触发是否被遗忘。

这对于Nat可能不怎么有利，因为询问幼熊的防御力可能就会提醒Alex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Nat给Alex下套，而是为了反映牌手实际打牌的方式。

A player who makes a play that may or may not be legal depending on whether an uncommunicated opponent's trigger has been remembered has not committed an infraction; their play either succeeds, confirming that the trigger has been missed, or is rewound.

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对手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。

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 Alex is attacking with Pyreheart Wolf, it is not illegal for Nat to block the wolf with one creature. When that block is proposed, it is up to Alex to indicate the illegality of the block or not, and this will determine if the play needs to be rewound.

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Alex使用葬火心狼攻击，Nat使用一个生物进行阻挡它并非不合法。当Nat提出阻挡时，Alex有责任表示阻挡是不合法的。如果Alex如此表示了，那么这个动作会被倒回。

Players may not cause triggered abilities controlled by an opponent to be missed by taking game actions or otherwise prematurely advancing the game.

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。

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 they move through that turn's steps and phases. Magic players rarely explicitly pass priority, most of the time just shortcircuiting through nearly all of the technical rigmarole.

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 will often proceed straight from their main phase to declaring attackers without asking the opponent if they want to first do anything — such as announcing any beginning of combat triggers.

The missed trigger policy was written to address the way that players already play the game and not the other way around.

A player that says nothing about their 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.

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。

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。

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。

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。

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.

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。

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 their trigger.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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 they can respond at the appropriate time (at which point players will not be held to any still-pending actions).

An out-of-order sequence must not result in a player prematurely gaining information which could reasonably affect decisions made later in that sequence.

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.

For example, a player may, in quick succession, sacrifice Pitchburn Devils to pay the cost of their 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.

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, they would still have gained the knowledge of the card drawn for the turn before choosing their Rift Bolt target. This should usually be ruled a Missed Trigger.

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。

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）。

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。

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。

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。

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。

A triggered ability is considered to have triggered even if it was subsequently missed. Effects that count or restrict the number of times a triggered ability can trigger will count the missed one.

即使一个触发式异能在触发后被遗忘，它仍被视作已触发。计算或限制异能触发次数的效应，会将被遗漏的触发计算在内。

This applies to cards like Welcoming Vampire and others that "trigger only once each turn" or similar. It stands to reason that if a trigger is missed, it must have happened – otherwise, how could it have been missed? If a player has one 2/2 enter and forgets the trigger, they won't get a subsequent one this turn if they play another 2/2.

Be cautious, though, and read triggered abilities carefully, as this would not apply to something like Omnath, Locus of Creation that cares about how many times the trigger has resolved. That is, if a player missed the first landfall trigger to gain 4 life, the next one won't "skip" to the second time and add mana.

此规则适用于像迎宾吸血鬼这类具有“每回合只会触发一次”或类似措辞的牌。按照常理，如果一个触发被遗漏了，那它必然已经发生过——否则，它又怎么能被称为遗漏了呢？因此，如果一位牌手有一个2/2生物进场并忘记了迎宾吸血鬼的触发，那么在本回合中，即使他再出一个符合条件的2/2生物，也不会得到再次的触发机会。

然而，务必谨慎并仔细阅读触发式异能的文本，因为此规则不适用于像生机核欧那斯这类异能——它的效应取决于该触发在本回合中已经结算了多少次。也就是说，如果一位牌手错过了第一次地落触发来获得4点生命，那么下一次的地落触发也不会“跳过”第一次的效应，直接进入第二次的效应产生法术力。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

If the triggered ability is an enters-the-battlefield trigger of an Aura that affects only the enchanted permanent and causes a visible change to that permanent, resolve the ability immediately.

若该触发式异能系由进战场之灵气触发，仅影响其所结附的永久物并对其产生可见变化，则立即结算之。

Mostly these will be Auras that tap the permanent such as Malfunction, once the missed trigger has been noticed the trigger will be resolved tapping the permanent immediately.

这类异能绝大多数是横置其结附之永久物的异能。一旦注意到了遗漏触发，该异能将结算，立即横置该永久物。

If the triggered ability is a delayed triggered ability that undoes a zone change (including token creation) caused by the effect that created the delayed triggered ability, 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. The new zone does not need to be the same as the one the card was originally moved from.

若该触发式异能系由改变某物件区域（包括派出衍生物）之效应产生、用于复原前述区域改变的延迟式触发异能，则由对手选择是令其在下一次将有牌手获得优先权时结算，还是在下一个阶段开始、有牌手将获得优先权时结算。新的区域不需要与牌原本来自的区域相同。

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 Draft, etc.), it also includes many abilities that are utterly vital to the continued use of the associated object or objects. For example, the delayed triggered abilities that return AEtherling 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. The opponent chooses whether the trigger occurs “now” (when a player would get priority) or “in a moment” (when a player would get priority at the start of the next phase).

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 their trigger, and this allows the opponent to minimize the impact of the player “suddenly” remembering the trigger. It does also allow the opponent to notice and wait to point it out even if this is to their advantage.

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 their own missed trigger during their 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 step if they really want to.

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. 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.

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 their opponent’s Obzedat, Ghost Council never returned from exile. The final sentence is to make it clear that even though the concept of undoing a zone change implies returning it to the zone it came from it covers delayed triggered abilities that put the card in a completely different zone, Sneak Attack being a good example.

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的一个或多个物件能够持续使用而至关重要的异能。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。对手选择它们“现在”（当牌手将获得优先权时）结算，或者“一会儿”（当牌手在下一个阶段开始将获得优先权时）结算。

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。这个选项也允许对手在注意到遗漏触发之后，等到对他最有利的时机再指出。

结算一个在下个阶段开始时将生物返回战场的延迟触发意味着，如果牌手在对手的结束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结束步骤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。

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。注意，对手能选择的是“何时”而非“是否”结算。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。

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。最后一句旨在明确：尽管撤销区域变更这一概念通常意味着将牌张移回其原本区域，但该规则同样涵盖了那些会将牌张置入一个完全不同区域的延迟触发式异能。偷袭便是一个很好的例子。

For all other triggered abilities, if the ability was missed prior to the current phase in the previous turn, instruct the players to continue playing.

对所有其他触发式异能而言，以前一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。

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, they should still receive a penalty no matter how long it's been.

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。

If the triggered ability created an effect whose duration has already expired, instruct the players to continue playing.

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。

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.

Examples: Battlegrace Angel, Colossal Whale, Nivix Cyclops

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。

例如：战华天使、超巨鲸、尼米斯独眼巨人。

If the triggered ability isn't covered by the previous paragraphs, the opponent chooses whether the triggered ability is added to the stack.

如果该触发式异能不属于前面段落所述之情况，则由对手选择是否要将该触发式异能加入堆叠。

So, run through the checks above. If none of them fit, this is our default.

The opponent should be explicitly asked if they 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.

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。

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。

If it is, it's inserted at the appropriate place on the stack if possible or on the bottom of the stack.

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。

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.

有一种不能将异能插入原本应处的位置的情况是，另一些与被遗漏的触发同时触发的异能已经结算并不在堆叠里。

No player may make choices for the triggered ability involving objects that would not have been legal choices when the ability should have triggered.

牌手在为该触发式异能作选择时，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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

If a player unintentionally misses their own Smokestack trigger (At the beginning of each player's upkeep, that player sacrifices a permanent for each soot counter on Smokestack), but this is not noticed until after the player has moved into their first main phase and played a land, the player should receive a Warning and the opponent should be asked if they 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 they just played for the turn as one of the permanents to sacrifice.

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。

If the player is in the process of, or has just completed, an action that indicates the trigger has been missed, and completing that action would change the effect of the trigger, a simple backup may be performed on that action.

如果牌手正在进行或刚刚完成一个动作表明其遗漏了触发，并且完成该动作会改变该触发式异能的效应，则可以对该动作进行简易倒回。

Simple backups are now allowed for specific missed trigger situations. For a 38 word single sentence, there's a lot to talk about in the blue box. There are three questions to ask before using this new tool.

- Will you be giving a warning? (This is more of a guideline than an absolute and discussed below )
- Does the missed trigger affect the action you are considering reversing?

- Does your simple backup stick to a single action and avoid pitfalls like reversing draw steps with a shuffle effect on board?

As long as you answer "Yes" to each of these questions, performing a backup may be sensible. Not doing the backup is still an option which is why you should let the player know if you're offering a simple backup when giving them the choice to put the trigger on the stack.

Let's take an example of Artemis missing their Chalice of the Void trigger when casting Green Sun's Zenith for X=0 tutoring up a Dryad Arbor immediately after fetching for a green source to cast it.

Before Austin takes their next action, Nevil says, "Hey, X=0 means the spell should have been countered by your Chalice on 1." then calls a judge.

Does this fit the situation above?

Will you be giving a warning? Yes, this upgrades since Artemis missed a triggered ability usually considered detrimental for Artemis, the controlling player. Will backing up help the missed trigger fix...? Again, yes. Prior to this change a judge could ask Nevil if they wanted the trigger put on the stack; however, since the spell was already fully resolved this would do nothing. With this change, we can back up the search and shuffle to counter the spell.

Does the backup change just the last action and leave the game in a better state? While some judges may be nervous about backing up through a shuffle and search, there is no reason to avoid this backup. After all, the Dryad Arbor will be returned to the deck and the Green Sun's Zenith will be removed from it and put in the graveyard prior to the deck's randomization.

Note: We are using "Will you give a warning?" as a stand-in for several complex items. The policy here is indicating that a player takes an action that indicates their own trigger was missed. In the case above, if Nevil cast the spell and Artemis didn't point out the trigger, we would either rule that Artemis missed their trigger and Nevil gets to put it on the stack -or- investigation would reveal that Nevil tried to advance the game improperly past Artemis' trigger. However, in neither case would Artemis get a warning. Additionally if we are in a case where a player misses their own trigger and completes an action, and the trigger was good for the player, the opponent is not going to choose to put the trigger on the stack. So, in general, the opponent will only wish to put the trigger on the stack when the trigger is detrimental. And missing a detrimental trigger comes with a warning. There are exceptions, but we are basically in a corner case of a corner case of a corner case and this annotation is already long enough.

Likewise, most triggered abilities do not require this backup because they fail on question #2. A missed Dictate of Kruphix trigger ends up with the same outcome as a recognized trigger even if you are giving a warning—the player who didn't get to draw a card at the correct time draws one now.

Regarding question #3, this reminds us to look at potential random elements such as drawing cards, shuffling, coinflips, etc. If the spell that should have been countered by the caster's Chalice is a resolved Brainstorm followed by a fetch land activation, you will still give the warning; however, you won't backup.

Finally, the simple backup as the authorized fix means we cannot backup multiple steps such as backing up through Abe's missed Desecration Demon trigger after attacks have been declared, blockers chosen, damage assigned, and Abe played a land in the second main phase before either player notices. You will still give the warning and offer to put the trigger on the stack.

针对特定的遗漏触发情况，现在允许进行简易倒回了。对于这一句只有38个单词的规则，注解里有很多值得探讨的内容。

在使用这个新工具之前，需要问三个问题：

- 你会给出警告吗？（这更多是一个指导方针而非绝对标准，将在下文讨论）
- 遗漏的触发是否影响了你正在考虑撤销的那个动作？
- 你的简易倒回是否仅限于单一动作，并避免了诸如在场上有洗牌效应时倒回抓牌等隐患？

只要你对所有这些问题的回答都是“是”，那么执行倒回就是合理的。当然，不进行倒回仍然是一个选项，这就是为什么当你让牌手选择是否将触发放入堆叠时，如果你同时也提供简易倒回作为方案，你应该告知他们。让我们看一个例子：Artemis在施放 X=0 的绿阳当空时遗漏了他操控的虚空圣杯的触发。为了施放它，他先掰找地地找了一个绿色法术力源，然后结算绿阳当空找出了树灵乔木。在Artemis采取下一个行动之前，Nevil说：“嘿，X=0 意味着这咒语应该被你的一豆圣杯反击才对。”然后叫了裁判。

这符合上述情况吗？

- 你会给出警告吗？是的，判罚会升级，因为 Artemis 遗漏了一个通常被认为对操控者不利的触发式异能。
- 倒回是否有助于修正遗漏的触发？同样，是的。在这项改动推出之前，裁判会询问Nevil是否希望将触发放入堆叠；然而，由于咒语已经完全结算，这样做毫无意义。有了这项改动，我们可以倒回搜寻和洗牌的动作，从而让圣杯反击该咒语。
- 倒回是否只改变了最后一个动作并让游戏处于更好的状态？虽然有些裁判可能对倒回洗牌和搜寻动作感到紧张，但没有理由避免这种倒回。毕竟，树灵乔木会被放回牌库，绿阳当空会从牌库中移除并放入坟墓场，这一切都发生在牌库随机化之前。

注意：我们使用“你会发出警告吗？”来代表几个复杂的事项。这里的方针是指牌手采取了一个动作，表明他们遗漏了自己的触发。在上述案例中，如果是Nevil施放咒语而Artemis没有指出触发，我们要么判Artemis遗漏了触发且Nevil可以选择将其放入堆叠，要么调查显示Nevil试图不正当地跳过Artemis的触发来推进游戏。然而，无论哪种情况，Artemis都不会收到警告。此外，如果牌手遗漏了自己的触发并完成了一个动作，而该触发对该牌手是有利的，对手是不会选择将触发放入堆叠的。所以，通常情况下，对手只有在触发对操控牌手不利的时候才希望将其放入堆叠。而遗漏不利的触发会伴随着一个警告。虽然有例外，但我们基本上是在讨论极端情况中的极端情况，而这条注解已经够长了。

同样，大多数触发式异能不需要这种回溯，因为它们不符合问题 #2。遗漏克罗芬斯的旨意触发的结果与被未被遗漏的触发结果相同，即使你发出了警告——原本没能在正确时间抓牌的牌手现在抓一张即可。

关于问题 #3，这提醒我们要关注潜在的随机因素，如抓牌、洗牌、掷硬币等。如果一个已结算的脑力激荡本该被其施放者的圣杯反击，他紧接着使用了找地地，你仍然要发出警告；但是，你不能进行倒回。

最后，简易回溯作为一种经授权的修正手段，意味着我们不能回溯多个步骤。例如：在Abe遗漏了渎圣恶魔的触发，且已经宣告攻击、选择阻挡者、分配伤害，并且Abe在第二行动阶段下了一块地之后，双方才发现。这种情况下不能进行倒回。你仍然要发出警告，并提供将触发放入堆叠的选项。

Upgrade: If the triggered ability is usually considered detrimental for the controlling player and they own the card responsible for the existence of the trigger, the penalty is a Warning.

升级：如果该触发式异能属于“通常认为对其操控牌手不利”，且由操控牌手拥有的牌张产生，则罚则为警告。

“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.

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 (on his blog) 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.

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 Missed Trigger Guides project.

The last sentence is added for cards like The Tabernacle at Pendrell Vale or Kataki, War’s Wage. They have a mostly-defunct template which creates triggers on other objects, notably opponents’ objects.

We cleaned up the default action. What about the Warning? How do we make these triggers not detrimental? It turns out there’s an intuitive solution – a trigger is only detrimental for you if you caused its existence. Always take responsibility for your creations!

“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。

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（在其博客上）说明了如何进行这种判断：“如果这个触发不存在，这张牌会变更好还是变更差？”问问自己这个问题，如果答案是“变更差”，那这个异能一般不是不利的异能。

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：[http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Missed\\_Trigger\\_Guides](http://wiki.magicjudges.org/en/w/Missed_Trigger_Guides)|遗漏触发指南

最后一句话是为诸如潘卓欧谷大礼拜堂或是战仇祸太奇这类牌增加的。这些牌的异能写法现在几乎已经不再用，它们会为其他物件（尤其是对手的物件）赋予触发式异能。

我们现在去掉了预设动作。那警告怎么办？我们如何不把这类触发式异能看成是不利的？有一种很直观的解决方法——只有你造成了触发式异能的存在，它对你才是不利的。永远都要为你自己创造的东西负起责任！

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.

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。

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.

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: 1. are likely to trigger multiple times per game, triggering for different players 2. have the same effect on both players.

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 their hand.) is not symmetrical.

If a player misses a symmetrical trigger that would be either bad for them or good for an opponent, they should receive a Warning.

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。

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。

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。

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。

## 2.2 Looking at Extra Cards 额外看牌

### *Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player takes an action that may have enabled them to see the faces of cards that they were not entitled to see.

牌手采取之行动让他们看到了本不应能检视的牌。

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 a card, two cards may get stuck or picked up together. Additionally mistakes aren't limited to cards seen from the deck. Sideboard cards and facedown cards can count as well.

Generally, when we are talking about Looking at Extra Cards (L@EC), 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.

Be careful not to confuse this infraction with the Hidden Card Error infraction. In particular, the Hidden Card Error infraction also 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 specific case, you are looking at extra cards, but you aren't Looking At Extra Cards. Does your brain hurt? Mine does.

As mentioned in the section above, HCE touches similar space to the Looking at Extra Cards infraction. When you are manipulating a set of cards from the top of the library, and you manipulate too many of them, that's considered HCE. For the purpose of HCE, once the drawn cards have significantly left the library as part of a draw, they can no longer be considered Looking at Extra Cards.

From the explanation released with a recent change to this infraction, it is stated that "the key [to determining the LEC/HCE border] is to look at whether the opponent intended (mistakenly or not) to pick up that many cards, or if they were trying to pick up the correct number and failed to do so thanks to bad dexterity (as opposed to bad counting)!"

Sets are defined in section 1.5, so head there if you need a refresher. Basically, 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 L@EC but rather HCE. But if you are supposed to Scry 1, and you instead pick up two cards, you didn't add that second card to the Scry set until you actually start to Scry. Get it? It's ok if this is a little confusing because this distinction is probably the least clear of anything in this entire guide. Basically, there is a point when picking up those two cards where we transition from "oops, I grabbed a second card" to "I have a second card that I can perform actions on". Its that point that marks the line between L@EC and HCE in this case.

Looking at Extra Cards also covers when you knock over a card, drop a card while shuffling an opponent's deck, start to draw a card when you shouldn't, and milling or dredging too many cards. Milling and Dredging are covered by Looking at Extra Cards because the cards are being placed into a public zone we can all see. However, this only applies if we catch the error right away. If we start to take other actions, we have moved past the point where we can claim we accidentally saw an extra card, and we have instead accepted that card is supposed to be in the graveyard.

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 HCE infraction.

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.

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 3.13 allows players to reveal hidden information to their opponent that they are entitled to know.

It's important to note that this infraction doesn't just apply to cards in a library (or sideboard). If you accidentally look at cards exiled by a Bomat Courier, that's also Looking at Extra Cards.

这种违规是相当容易犯的。当你接触牌库时，你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一张或两张并看到了下一张的牌面。此外，这类错误并不仅限于看到牌库里的牌。备牌和面朝下的牌也算在内。

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，你也有可能在洗对手套牌时看到其中的某些牌。

请小心，不要将这个违规与非公开牌张失误混淆。具体来说，非公开牌张失误也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。

正如上面所提到的，非公开牌张失误（HCE）与额外看牌这两个违规涉及的范围有相似之处。当你操纵牌库顶的一些牌却操纵多了时，这属于非公开牌张失误。在考虑HCE时，一旦所抓的牌在抓的过程中显著离开了牌库，违规便不再是额外看牌。

在对这项违规近期一次更动的同时发布的解释中如此说：「[确定LEC和HCE边界线]的关键是看对手是本意（无论这种本意是否出于错误）就是拿起这么多牌，还是在本想拿起正确数量的牌时因为手脚笨拙（而不是因为数错了数！）而没能做到。」

牌叠的定义在1.5节，如果你不记得的话可以去看一下。简单地说，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。但是，如果你应当占卜1，却拿起了两张牌，直到你实际开始占卜之前，你都不算是把第二张牌加入了占卜的牌叠。明白了吗？即使还没明白也没关系，因为这里面的区别可能是这整个AIPG里面最为模糊的部分了。简而言之，在拿起这两张牌时，从「哎呀，我多拿起了一张牌」到「我有第二张牌可以用来执行动作」之间有一个分界点。在这个情形下就是这个分界点区分了LEC和HCE。

额外看牌也适用于你不小心碰掉了一张牌、洗对手的牌时掉了一张牌、当你不应抓牌时却开始抓牌、磨掉了或者发掘了太多牌。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。但是，这只会在立即发现错误时才算做额外看牌。如果我们开始执行其他动作，我们就越过了可以称为「不小心看到一张额外的牌」的时间点，而变成已经接受了这张牌就应该在坟墓场。

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。

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。

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) MTR3.13允许牌手展示自己知悉的隐藏信息给对手知道。

请记住，这个违规并不只对牌库中（或备牌中）的牌适用。如果你不小心看到了被博默区讯使放逐的牌，那也是额外看牌。

This penalty is applied only once if one or more cards are seen in the same action or sequence of actions.

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。

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.

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。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player accidentally reveals (drops, flips over) a card while shuffling their opponent's library.
- A. 牌手在洗对手牌库时意外地翻开（掉落，翻转）一张牌。
- B. A player pulls up an extra card while drawing from their library.
- B. 牌手抓牌时多带起了一张牌。
- C. A player sees the bottom card of their deck when presenting it to their opponent for cutting/shuffling.
- C. 牌手在将套牌给对手洗或切时看到了牌库底的牌。

In Example B, please consider 'pulls' up, as 'lifts up, but not so much that it could reasonably 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 their deck, and this is noticed immediately.

在例子B中，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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

A player can accidentally look at extra cards easily and this infraction handles situations where a dexterity or rules error had led to a player seeing cards that they shouldn't have.

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牌张的情况。

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.

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。

Cards in a library are considered to be there until they touch cards in another hidden set. Once those cards have joined another hidden set, the infraction is Hidden Card Error or Game Rule Violation.

只要牌库中的牌张尚未触碰到其他非公开牌叠中之牌张，均视为在牌库之中。一旦相关牌张已加入其他非公开牌叠中，便应按照“非公开牌张失误”或“违反游戏规则”来处理此违规。

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.

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”。

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.

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”。

This point involves judge ability to understand if a 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.

判断这一点需要裁判具有阅读牌手是否在说谎的能力。有些牌手知道额外看牌的额外修正正是洗牌，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。

Players also are not allowed to use this penalty as a stalling mechanism.

牌手也不应该将此处罚当做拖延的手段。

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.

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。

The library is already randomized, so shuffling in the revealed cards should not involve excessive effort.

由于牌库都已经充分随机化，所以将展示的牌洗回去并不会造成太大的影响。

This means that the player doesn't have to waste time by shuffling as they 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.

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”。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

If the cards were in the library, shuffle any previously unknown cards from a deck back into the random portion of the library, then put any previously known cards back in their correct locations.

如果额外看的牌在牌库中，则将此前套牌中未知的牌张洗入牌库的随机部分，然后将此前已知牌张置于正确位置。

See IPG 1.3 on the details on how to randomize a deck. A summary is: figure out what cards are legally known 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. If the cards accidentally seen don't belong in the library (a player accidentally

looks at an opponent's sideboard, or a player accidentally looks at a stack of cards exiled by their own Bomat Courier), then there is no fix.

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。如果额外看到的牌原本就是合法知道的（例如因脑力激荡所致），则无需做此修正。如果意外看到的牌不属于牌库（例如牌手意外看到了对手的备牌，或牌手意外看到了被自己的博默区讯使放逐的一叠牌），则没有修正方案。

## 2.3 Hidden Card Error 非公开牌张失误

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player commits an error in the game that cannot be corrected by only publicly available information.

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。

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.

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。

It is not a Hidden Card Error if the opponent acknowledges the action or controls the continuous effect modifying the game rule that made the action illegal.

如果牌手的行动得到对手许可或由对手操控改变游戏规则的持续性效应使牌手的行动不合法，则这不是一个非公开牌张失误。

This sentence has two parts that involve the opponent. If the opponent acknowledges the draw, the player has given warning that something is about to go wrong. In a very real sense, this error was correctable with publicly available information. 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 their opponent a harsher penalty. The second part involves continuous effects the opponent controls. This is essentially a clause for Narset, Parter of Veils. Here we want to put a bit more of a burden on the owner of the effect to be proactive in preventing problems. Keeping your mouth shut and then getting a free Thoughtseize is too good, and makes these effects a bit strong by allowing the player to play the IPG instead of Magic: The Gathering.

In both cases, consider a Game Rule Violation instead, and for the second case, double GRV is probably appropriate.

Note that if the action would be illegal without the opponent's continuous effect then it should still be treated as a Hidden Card Error. For example if instructed to scry a player draws a card instead, it is still

a Hidden Card Error even if an opponent controls a Narset.

这句话包含两个涉及对手的部分。如果对手许可了这次抓牌，说明该牌手已经对即将发生的错误给出了预警。从非常现实的角度来看，这个错误本可以通过公开信息来纠正。在这种情况下，我们不想过度惩罚该牌手，因为该错误对双方都是“可见的”；我们也不希望鼓励对手为了让对方受到更严厉的惩罚而“同意”某个会导致对方受罚的动作。第二部分涉及对手操控的持续性效应。这本质上是针对揭帷娜尔施的一项条款。在这里，我们希望让该效应的拥有者承担更多责任，主动去预防问题的发生。保持沉默然后获得一次免费的思绪实在太赚了；如果允许牌手玩弄IPG而不是好好玩万智牌，会使得这些效应变得过于强力。

在这两种情况下，都应考虑违反游戏规则；对于第二种情况，双方都判违反游戏规则可能是恰当的。

注意，如果该动作在没有对手持续性效应的情况下本身就是非法的，那么它仍应被视为非公开牌张失误。例如，如果牌手被指示占卜却抓了一张牌，即使对手操控揭帷娜尔施，这依然是一个非公开牌张失误。

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.

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。

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.

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。

If an additional card is seen but not added to the set, the infraction is Game Play Error —Looking at Extra Cards.

如果牌手看到了额外的牌，但并未将其加入任何牌叠，这属于游戏行动失误～额外看牌。

This line is here to give a distinction between when a player action should be considered Hidden Card Error versus GPE – Looking at Extra Cards.

If we use 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 HCE, 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 GPE – Looking at Extra Cards infraction.

Additionally, if a player goes to scry one card, and accidentally picks up two, This could still be Looking at Extra Cards. The difference does require a bit of common sense, as defining an exact technical line between HCE and Looking at Extra Cards is would require a lot of text and examples and still not cover everything. Take a moment to consider whether Looking at Extra Cards is a more appropriate

infraction, whether the player made a mistake in the number of cards or the number of cards was an accident, and whether the player has already started to make decisions about the set of cards.

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。

进一步说，如果一位牌手应该占卜一张牌，却不小心拿起了两张牌，这也可能属于额外看牌。区分这两种违规需要具有一定的常识判断力，给非公开牌张失误和额外看牌从定义上划分一个非常明确的界限，需要使用大量的文字和案例，即便这样也无法涵盖所有可能发生的情况。因此在下结论之前要多想，额外看牌是不是更适用的判罚，牌手是拿取了错误的牌张数，还是因为某种意外不小心导致张数错误，以及牌手是不是已经开始对这个发生错误的牌叠采取思考或行动。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player draws four cards after casting Ancestral Recall.
  - A. 牌手施放Ancestral Recall之后抓了四张牌。
- B. A player scries two cards when they should only have scried one.
  - B. 牌手在只该占卜一张牌的情况下占卜了两张牌。
- C. A player resolves a Dark Confidant trigger, but forgets to reveal the card before putting it into their hand.
  - 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。
- D. A player has more cards in their hand than can be accounted for.
  - D. 牌手的手牌数量比其应有的数量多。
- E. A player casts Anticipate and picks up the top four cards of their library.
  - E. 牌手施放预先考虑/Anticipate，并拿起了其牌库顶的四张牌。
- F. A player, going first, draws for their turn.
  - F. 先手的牌手在第一回合开始时抓了牌。

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 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.

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.

Example F looks a lot like it might fall under Mulligan Procedure Error, but it doesn't 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.

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、或因为手脚笨拙导致看到了一张或多张牌，按照额外看牌处理违规。

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。

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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

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.

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。

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.

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。

If cards are placed into a public zone, then their order is known and the infraction can be handled as a Game Rule Violation.

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。

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 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.

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更多的信息。在此情况下，使用违反游戏规则这项违规。

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.)

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。

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.

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。

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.

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/Brainstorm），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。

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.

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。

Information about cards previously known by the opponent, such as cards previously revealed while on the top of the library or by a previous look at the hand, may be taken into account while determining the set of cards to which the remedy applies.

若存在对手先前已知晓的牌张，例如之前展示过的牌库顶牌或检视手牌时看到的牌，则可考虑在此信息的基础上来确定要对哪部分牌叠适用修正。

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 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.

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。

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 Collected Company, picks up three cards with one hand and then four cards with the other, the last drawn set of four cards should be used for the remedy, instead of the full set of seven cards.

修正失误时，应尽量从相关牌叠中牌张数量最少者入手。这可能意味着仅对叙述规定之牌叠中的某一部分适用修正。举例来说，如果某牌手在结算征召军伍/Collected Company时用一只手拿起了三张牌，再用另一只手拿起了四张牌，则应对后抓起的这四张牌进行修正，而不是对全部七张。

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).

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）。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

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.

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。

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 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.

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.

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。

举个例子，某牌手脑力激荡抓了4张牌，然后在牌库顶放了2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。

If the set of cards that contained the problem no longer exists, there is no remedy to be applied.

如果存在问题之牌叠已不存在，则无需应用修正。

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.

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。

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 their 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.

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。

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.

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。

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 their opponent chooses that many previously-unknown cards. Treat those as the cards that were 'revealed' and return them to the set that was being selected from; the player then reperforms the action. If recreating the original selection set and reperforming the action would be too disruptive, leave the selected cards in hand.

如果错误涉及本应展示但实际未展示之牌张，则该牌手展示包含此类牌张之牌叠，其对手从中选出等量之先前未知的牌张。将选出的这些牌视作需“展示”的部分，并将它们移回其原本所在之牌叠，然后该牌手重新执行有关动作。如果复原待选牌叠并重新执行动作会对游戏产生过量干扰，则将所选牌张留在手上。

This involve 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 first 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 set with the unrevealed card (this case, the hand) and allowing the opponent to choose which card should be treated as the "revealed card(s)". Then, the player reperforms the action (the Domri Rade's 1 ability in our example). If, for instance, the opponent chooses a non-creature card in the Domri Rade example, that card no longer fits legally in the set (the hand) and should be returned to the top of the library.

这一条主要涵盖一些使牌在进入隐藏区域之前，先验证牌的某些特征的异能。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，我们可以展示包含未展示牌张的牌叠（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。然后牌手重新执行动作（如上例中多密雷德的第一个异能）。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）并且应当移回牌库顶。

If a set affected by the error contains more cards than it is supposed to contain, the player reveals the set of cards that contain the excess and their opponent chooses a number of previously unknown-cards sufficient to reduce the set to the correct size. These excess cards are returned to the correct location. If that location is the library, they should be shuffled into the random portion unless the owner previously knew the identity of the card/cards illegally moved; that many cards, chosen by the opponent, are returned to the original location instead. For example, if a player playing with Sphinx of Jwar Isle illegally draws a card, that card should be returned to the top of the library.

如果受失误影响之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。将过量牌张移回其原本所处位置。如果将移回的位置为牌库，则应将其洗回随机的部分；但如果其拥有者先前知道错误移动之牌张的内容，则改为由对手选择同等数量之牌张，并将其移至原本的位置。举例来说，如果某牌手场上有爪尔岛史芬斯，但他错误地抓了一张牌，则应将该牌移回牌库顶。

This is the commonly termed "Thoughtseize" fix. The player with too many cards in the set reveals that set 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. Return the excess cards to the location they came from. If that location is the library, we typically do this by shuffling them into the random portion. If the cards were previously known from the top of the library before adding to a set, we return them to the top of the library instead. This exists to remove a minor cheating angle where a player would attempt to use HCE to get a free shuffle if their hand and top of library were bad.

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。处理这些多余的牌的方式就是将它们移回其原本所在的位置。如果该位置是牌库，我们通常会将其洗入牌库的随机部分。如果牌库顶的牌在加入牌叠之前就是已知的，我们应改为将其移回牌库顶。这样做是为了消除牌手可能会在手牌和牌库顶都不好的时候试图利用HCE来获取免费洗牌这种作弊的可能性。

Upgrade: If a face-down card cast using a morph or disguise ability is on the battlefield during the game and does not have the relevant ability printed on the card, the penalty is a Game Loss. If the player has one or more cards with the same ability in hand, has not added previously unknown cards to their hand since casting the card found in violation, and has self-reported the error before an effect that would reveal it is played, the upgrade does not apply and they may swap the card for a card with the appropriate ability in hand.

升级：如果曾以变身或伪装异能施放之牌面朝下的牌张在游戏中发现实际上不具相关异能，则处罚为一盘负。如果牌手手上有一张或数张相应具变身或伪装异能的牌，自施放引致违规之牌张后未曾将其他之前未知的牌张加入手牌，且又是在某个效应会将其展示之前自行上报该失误，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。

In all but a very few cases, Magic play allows both players be fully aware and notice errors. This is why it's reasonable for both players to be responsible for correct game states. Opponents can notice if a player casts a spell while paying the wrong mana. Likewise, if a players puts too many counters on a creature, the opponent (even a spectator) can see that. However, accidentally casting a card as though it had the morph or disguise ability cannot be confirmed by the opponent who only is authorized to see the back side of the card (something non-morphs and non-disguised cards also have). Playing Highland Game thinking it is Temur Charger fits this upgrade path.

Before issuing the upgrade, see if either exception applies: First, ignore this upgrade if the player discovers it themselves and hasn't added cards to their hand since casting it. Second, ignore the upgrade if when the face-down creature is bounced to the hand or the spell being casted is returned to the hand by an effect like casting Unsubstantiate. Of course, when you're investigating this call to apply the exception you will want to see a card with the relevant ability in hand.

除了极少数情况外，万智牌游戏允许双方牌手充分了解游戏状况并发现错误。这就是为什么要求双方牌手都有责任维护正确游戏状态是合理的。如果牌手在施放咒语时支付了错误的法术力，对手是可以注意到的。同样，如果牌手在一个生物上放置了过多的指示物，对手（甚至是旁观者）也是看得到的。然而，如果牌手意外地将一张牌当作拥有变身或伪装异能来施放，这是对手无法确认的，因为对手有权看到的只有牌背（而非变身或非伪装的牌也有牌背）。误以为是铁木尔战马而面朝下施放了高地猎物，就符合这种升级判罚的情形。

在执行判罚升级之前，请检查是否适用以下两种例外情况之一：第一，如果牌手自己发现了错误，且自施放该牌后尚未有牌加入其手牌，则忽略此升级。第二，如果面朝下的生物被移回手中，或者正在施放的咒语被像消解这样的效应移回手中，则忽略此升级。当然，当你在调查是否适用这一例外时，你需要确认该牌手的手牌中确实有一张具有相关异能的牌。

## 2.4 Game Play Error — Mulligan Procedure Error 再调度失误

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player makes an error in one of the steps of the mulligan process. Once the mulligan process is complete and the game begins, excess cards arising from an improper mulligan is a Game Play Error — Hidden Card Error and too few cards is a Game Play Error — Game Rule Violation.

牌手再调度流程中的一步出现失误。一旦再调度流程完成并且游戏开始后，由于错误的再调度而产生额外牌张属于游戏行动失误～非公开牌张失误，而牌张过少则属于游戏行动失误～违反游戏规则。

Mulligan Procedure Error covers actions before the game begins, but once the game has started, those same errors become Hidden Card Error or Game Rule Violation and are fixed by those respective infractions.

再调度失误涵盖的是游戏开始前的动作；但一旦游戏开始，同样的失误将转变为非公开牌张失误或违反游戏规则，并按照这些相应违规的修正方案进行处理。

Unintentional process errors that provide no advantage, such as declaring an intent to mulligan early or exiling too many cards to Serum Powder, are not an infraction.

流程上无意的失误如不会带来优势，例如提前表明再调度之意图，或使用浆液粉末放逐了太多牌，不属于违规。

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. 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

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.

尽量不要对这种违规过度解读。如果牌手犯了未在示例中列出的错误，请衡量该错误的影响，并判定其是否属于无关紧要的小错。示例：

- 后手牌手在先手牌手之前宣布保留手牌。
- 一名牌手在对手完成调度之前就将地脉放进了战场。

严格来说这些属于程序失误，但在对局的这一阶段，其影响微乎其微，因此不应被视为违规。

## EXAMPLE 范例

A. A player draws eight cards at the start of the game (instead of seven).

A. 牌手在游戏开始的时候抓了八张牌（应为七张）。

B. A player chooses to not take a mulligan then takes a mulligan after seeing their opponent choose to take a mulligan.

B. 牌手先选择不进行再调度，后在看见对手再调度后也进行再调度。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

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.

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。

Even with the new London Mulligan it can still be easy to make an error in the pre-game procedure, drawing too many cards the most common one, so we have the player take an additional mulligan.

Note that counting cards face down onto the table does not count as drawing, encourage this practice to count the cards before drawing, so any extra cards counted onto the table can be returned to the top of the library.

即使已采用新的伦敦调度，在游戏前程序中犯错依然很容易，其中多抓牌是最常见的情况，因此我们让该牌手再多调度一次。

请注意，将牌面朝下数到桌面上并不算作抓牌，应鼓励牌手养成在抓入手中之前先这样数牌的习惯，这样任何多数到桌面上的牌都可以直接放回牌库顶。

## **ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正**

The player takes an additional mulligan.

牌手再额外进行一次再调度。

This is self explanatory, the player shuffles their hand and redraws, which means they will be returning an additional card to the bottom of the library.

这不言自明，牌手将手牌洗回牌库并重新抓牌，这意味着他们将额外放一张牌回牌库底。

## **2.5 Game Rule Violation 违反游戏规则**

### ***Penalty Warning 处罚警告***

### **DEFINITION 定义**

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.

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。

“Game Rule Violation” does not refer to any particular type of error. Rather, Game Rule Violations are 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。

### **EXAMPLES 范例**

A. A player casts Wrath of God for 3W (actual cost 2WW).

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. A player does not attack with a creature that must attack each turn.

- B. 牌手没有让每回合都必须攻击的生物来进行攻击。
- C. A player fails to put a creature with lethal damage into a graveyard and it is not noticed until several turns later.
- 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。
- D. A Phyrexian Revoker is on the battlefield that should have had a card named for it.
- D. 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。
- E. A player casts Brainstorm and forgets to put two cards back on top of their library.
- E. 牌手施放脑力激荡/Brainstorm，却忘记将两张牌放回牌库顶。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

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.

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 principle 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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

First, consider a simple backup (see section 1.4).

首先，考虑是否简易倒回（参见1.4章节）。

If a simple backup is not sufficient and the infraction falls into one or more of the following categories, and only into those categories, perform the appropriate partial fix:

如果简易倒回不足以完全修正，且违规属于下列某种情形或同属多种情形（但不得超出各情形规定之内容），则进行部分修正：

So right here we are going to have a list of partial fixes. Try to do a simple backup (see Backing Up 1.4 for more information about back ups) then, if you can't, you can try to do a partial fix. If you cannot apply a simple backup or a partial fix you evaluate if you need to do a back up or leave alone. If the error fits more than one of these categories, it's ok to partial fix, but be careful that the error only fits

into those categories. If there are multiple fixes within the same bullet point, you're still fine to use that partial fix.

以下是部分修正的列表。首先试着进行简易倒回（关于倒回，详见一节）；如果简易倒回不够，你可以试着执行部分修正。如果你既不能进行简易倒回、也不能执行部分修正，那么你可以考虑倒回或者保留当前状态不修正。如果失误属于一种类别以上，可以使用部分修正，但必须小心注意该失误只属于这些类别。如果在同一条目中满足了多个修正条件，你仍然可以使用这种部分修正。

- If a player forgot to untap one or more permanents at the start of their turn and it is still the same turn, untap them.
- 如果牌手在自己回合开始时忘记重置一个或数个永久物，并且当前依然是同一个回合，则重置它们。

Out-of-Order-Sequencing has always been a viable option when this type of situation arises, and it does so with some regularity. Players get excited, or simply lose focus and forget to untap everything before advancing into the turn. If that happens, we simply issue the warning and fix the mistake, by untapping those permanents now.

发生这种情况时，判定为“次序不当的行事顺序”也是一个合适的选项，过去我们也一直这样做。在进入回合之前，牌手容易因为激动或者注意力不集中而忘记对场面进行重置。发生这种情况时，我们只需给予警告并通过重置本该重置的永久物来修正错误。

- 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.
- 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。

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. So, if Nick casts Doom Blade on Albert's Voice of All, we can have Albert choose 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.

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。所以，如果Nick对Albert的万物使者施放送终刀锋，我们可以让Albert现在选择一种颜色。如果Albert选择了黑色，送终刀锋的目标就会变得不合法。接着，我们可以进行一次简易倒回，回到送终刀锋被施放之前的状态。

- If a player failed to draw cards, discard cards, or return cards from their hand to another zone, that player does so.
- 如果某牌手未能抓牌、弃牌或忘记将牌从手上移至其他区域，则该牌手如此作。

Players will generally be able to determine with high accuracy if they failed to draw or discard cards. Note that this partial fix does not expire, even if the error was many turns ago.

牌手如果未能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。

- If an object is not in the correct zone, the exact object is still known to all players, and it can be moved with only minor disruption to the current state of the game, put the object in the correct zone. This only applies if the object being in the wrong zone is the Game Rule Violation, and not if it is the consequence of a different error.
- 如果一个物件处于错误的区域中，且该物件依然为所有牌手所知悉、移动此物件仅会对游戏当前状态造成轻微影响，则将该物件放入正确区域。此修正仅适用于，当“违反游戏规则”的问题本身，是由于有物件处于错误的区域中而产生的，而非因其他错误导致此类结果的情况。

There is a fair amount to consider here. There are four tests to determine if this partial fix is relevant. 1) Is the object not in the correct zone. This covers when a creature died but shouldn't have, or when a creature shouldn't have died but did. It also covers if a card was supposed to be bounced as wasn't or a card was put in the GY when it should have been exiled. Basically, if the game was played correctly, that card should be somewhere else. 2) The identity of the object was known to all players. This means that all players know what the object is. This could be because the card was revealed or it could be because the card is in a location known by both players such as the top of a library. 3) The movement of the card (or lack of movement) is the error, not the result of some other error. For example, if a Path to Exile was cast for {C}, and the card was put in exile; that is not eligible for this partial fix because the error was in casting Path for {C}.

— “and it can be moved with only minor disruption to the current game state”: Things disappearing from the battlefield mid-combat tends to be disruptive. Same with things disappearing from the GY while certain spells are on the stack. Be sure to look at what decisions and actions are currently being made based on that card being where it is.

这里有不少需要考量的因素。要确定此项部分修正是否适用，需要进行四项测试：该物件是否不在正确的区域？这涵盖了生物本不该死却死了，或者生物本该死却没死的情况。这也包括牌本该被回手却没移回，或者牌本该被放逐却进了坟墓场的情况。简而言之，如果游戏进行正确，该牌应当处于其他位置。是否所有牌手都知晓该物件的身份？这意味着所有牌手都知道那个物件具体是什么。这可能是因为该牌曾被展示过，或者因为它处于双方都知道的位置，例如已知的牌库顶。失误是否是牌的移动（或未移动）本身，而非其他失误导致的后果？例如，如果某人用方片施放了流放之径并将目标牌放逐了；这种情况就不适用此项部分修正，因为错误的根源在于用方片施放了流放之径。

——“移动此物件仅会对游戏当前状态造成轻微影响”：在战斗阶段中让东西从战场消失往往会造成严重的干扰。当堆叠上有特定咒语时，让东西从坟墓场消失也是如此。务必审视当前正在做出的决定和动作是否基于该牌当前所处的位置。

- If damage assignment order has not been declared, the appropriate player chooses that order.
- 如果未宣告伤害分配次序，对应牌手决定此顺序。

This is a dead partial fix. Damage assignment order has been removed from the CR. The IPG just hasn't had an update since then.

这是一个已经失效的部分修正。伤害分配顺序已经从CR中移除了。只是IPG自那以后还没有进行更新。

For each of these fixes, a simple backup may be performed beforehand if it makes applying the fix smoother. Triggered abilities are generated from these partial fixes only if they would have occurred had the action been taken at the correct time.

对于以上各修正而言，如果能让修正更平滑，可以在此之前进行一次简易倒回。对于在部分修正中产生的触发式异能，只有在这些动作在正确的时间进行也会触发的情况下，才会在这些部分修正中产生。

A simple backup is backing up the last action completed (or one currently in progress) and is sometimes used to make another portion of the prescribed remedy smoother. A simple backup should not involve any random elements. Also while applying a partial fix consider the triggered abilities if they would have occurred while taking the action at the correct time.

简易倒回意指倒回上一个已完成的（或正在进行的）游戏动作，有时可用来使前述之修正的某一部分更加平滑。简易倒回不应涉及任何随机元素。另外，在执行部分修正时，应将在正确的时点作该动作时本应发生的触发式异能考虑在内。

Otherwise, a full backup may be considered or the game state may be left as is.

若属于其他情况，则可以考虑进行完整倒回，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 don't. Please see 1.4 Backing Up for information on if it's appropriate to back up. For example, if players missed a Day/Night change in the game, it may make sense to back up to the point of day/night transformation. However, if a full backup is ill advised, the day/night state will remain as it is.

所以，我们先试图执行简易倒回；如果简易倒回不能适用，再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。例如，如果牌手遗漏了游戏中的白昼/黑夜转换，那么倒回到转换发生的时间点可能是合理的。然而，如果不建议进行完全倒回，那么白昼/黑夜状态将保持现状。

If the game has proceeded past a point where an opponent could reasonably be expected to notice the error, the opponent has also committed an infraction. In most cases, the infraction is Game Play Error — Failure to Maintain Game State. However, if the judge believes that both players were responsible for the Game Rule Violation, such as due to the opponent controlling the continuous effect modifying the rules of the game that led to the Game Rule Violation or a player taking action based on another player's instruction, they have instead committed 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, once the game has continued both players will have committed a Game Rule Violation.

如果对手没能在预期其能注意到失误的合理时间点前指出游戏行动失误，则对手也犯下违规。大多数情况下是“游戏行动失误～未维护游戏状态”。然而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，例如是由于对手操控的改变游戏规则的持续性效应导致的，或是某位牌手根据另一位牌手的指示执行行动，则对手也犯下了“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，一旦游戏继续进行则双方牌手均犯下“游戏行动失误～违反游戏规则”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。

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, whose 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. Fundamentally if the judge thinks that both players share the responsibility for the error, because of continuous effects or both participating in the action, then both players receive this penalty. Another example of a situation that both players are responsible for, is the transition from day/night or night/day, provided there are permanents on the battlefield that care about night/day

Note that this double GRV only applies *after* the game has moved on from the point of the error. If, in the example above, one player puts the creature into the graveyard, it's not a double GRV until the game continues on. Instead, if one player points out the error, play can continue on with the error corrected and no infraction assessed.

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。基本上，如果裁判认为两位牌手对失误都有责任，无论是因为持续性效应还是因为两人均参与了动作，两位牌手都会受到此判罚。另一个双方牌手都要负责的例子是白昼/黑夜的转换，前提是战场上有关于白昼/黑夜的永久物。

请注意，这种双方都判GRV仅在游戏从错误发生点继续进行之后才适用。在上述例子中，如果一名牌手将生物放入坟墓场，在游戏继续进行之前，这还不算双方都判GRV。相反，如果当时有一名牌手指出了错误，游戏可以在纠正错误后继续，而不判处违规。

## 2.6 Failure to Maintain Game State 未维护游戏状态

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player allows another player in the game to commit a Game Play Error and does not point it out immediately.

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 they do not catch an error made by the opponent. Also note that if a player points out the opponent's error right away, they do 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。

If a judge believes a player is intentionally not pointing out other players' illegal actions, either for their own advantage, or in the hope of bringing it up at a more strategically advantageous time, they should consider an Unsporting Conduct — Cheating infraction.

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动，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 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收益。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。

Not reminding an opponent about their triggered abilities is never Failure to Maintain Game State nor Cheating.

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 opponent's errors” rule. Missed triggers are handled differently. A player is allowed to not point out their opponent's 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。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player's opponent forgets to reveal the card searched for by Worldly Tutor. It is not noticed until the end of turn.

A. 牌手的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. A player does not notice that their opponent has Armadillo Cloak on a creature with protection from green.

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。

In both of these cases, the player's opponent committed a Game Rule Violation, and the player didn't notice it right away.

在这两个例子中，该牌手的对手违反了游戏规则而该牌手没有立刻发现。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

If an error is caught before a player could gain advantage, then the dangers of the ongoing game state becoming corrupted are much lower.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

The key point here is that both players are responsible for the game state. If the opponent is being observant, they 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.

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。

## 3.0 Tournament Errors 比赛失误

Tournament errors are violations of the Magic Tournament Rules.

比赛失误指的是违反《万智牌比赛规则》之违规行为。

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.

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。

If the judge believes that the error was intentional, they should consider Unsporting Conduct — Cheating.

假如裁判认为牌手系蓄意造成该失误，则应该首先考虑适用“举止违背运动道德～作弊”此违规。

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.

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。

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.

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。

Only the more serious Magic Tournament Rules warrant a penalty. These violations 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 Rules 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.

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。这类违规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。

Continued or willful disregard of these rules may require further investigation.

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。

Although not all violations of the 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.

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。

A second or subsequent Warning for a Tournament Error offense in the same category is upgraded to a Game Loss. For multi-day tournaments, the penalty count for these infractions resets between days.

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。

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 we get to a Disqualification. Also, there are a few Tournament Errors where the first time a player receives it, it can be a warning OR a Game loss (Tardiness and Deck Problem are examples). If the second instance of one of those penalties is supposed to be a Warning, it’s still a warning, despite receiving an earlier Game Loss.

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。此外，有少数比赛失误在牌手初犯时，可能被判为警告，也可能被判为一盘负（例如迟到和套牌问题）。如果这类违规的第二次按规定本应是警告，那么即便该牌手在第一次被判过一盘负，这次判罚依然是警告。

For multi-day tournaments, the penalty count for these infractions resets between days.

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次日清零。

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 PPTQ, 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PPTQ上更高。清零处罚计数会更加公平。

## 3.1 Tardiness 迟到

*Penalty Game Loss 处罚一盘负*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player is not in their seat at the beginning of a round, or has not completed tasks assigned within the time allocated.

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.

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。

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.

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。

If, before or during a match, a player requests and receives permission from a judge for a delay for a legitimate task, such as a bathroom break or finding replacements for missing cards, that player has up to 10 minutes to perform that task before they are considered tardy. If the player takes more than 10 minutes, a Match Loss will be applied. Otherwise, no penalty will be applied and a time extension given for the time taken.

如果，在对局开始或进行过程当中，牌手请求并得到裁判准许延时且行为合理（例如上洗手间、寻找遗失牌张的代用品），则该牌手有至多10分钟时间来执行相关请求，倘若超时便会视作迟到。如果该牌手花费超过10分钟的时间，则其会受到一局负。如果少于10分钟，则没有处罚，且会依照所用的时间给予相应补时。

This part here should be pretty self explanatory. If the player needs to perform a legitimate task, let them. Smoking, or buying snacks, or finishing a trade aren't legitimate reasons. This also doesn't mean that they have unlimited time. In fact, they should perform the task without delay. Impress upon them that they need to hurry back. They have up to 10 minutes to accomplish the task, at which point, if they haven't completed it, they receive a Match Loss and are dropped from the event, the same as the standard Tardiness upgrade. This is to mitigate the impact to the event as long extensions impact everyone else. It is also to establish an absolute upper bound on how much time a player to perform the task. Now, that doesn't mean the player can wander off and do other things as well. If they were given time to go to the bathroom, that doesn't include stopping at the counter to buy a snack.

When the player returns, give the match the appropriate extension.

这一段自身就解释的相当清楚了。如果牌手有合理的理由去做一些事，请让他们去做。去抽烟、买零食、或完成交易并不算合理的理由。这也并不意味着他们有无限制的时间去做。事实上，他们需要毫无迟延地去做这些事。请让他们留意他们必须赶紧回来。他们有至多10分钟时间来完成这些事，如果超出这个时间，他们将会得到一局负并从比赛中退赛，这与标注的迟到升级判罚一致。这是为了减少对整场比赛的影响，因为过长的加时会影响比赛中的每一个人。这一条也制定了一个绝对的上限，限制牌手要在多少时间之内做完这些事。即使如此，这也不意味着牌手可以到处闲逛去做其他事情。如果给了牌手时间去洗手间，这并不包括允许他们在小卖部停下来买个零食吃。

当牌手回来时，给予该对局适当的加时。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player arrives to their seat 5 minutes after the round begins.

A. 牌手在一局开始5分钟后才到他的座位。

If a player isn't in their seat when the round starts, they are 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.

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。

- B. A player hands in their decklist after the time designated by the judge or organizer.

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。

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.

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。

- C. A player loses their deck and cannot find replacement cards within the first 10 minutes of the round.

C. 牌手遗失了他的套牌，且无法在本局比赛开始10分钟之内找到替换的牌。

In addition to being on-time for a match, a player is expected to be on-time with their stuff. However, if they arrive on time and discover that they have lost their deck or some cards, we do allow them time to go find replacements. This is not a Game Loss at this time. However, the player has a maximum of 10

minutes into the round to find replacements. If they exceed this time limit, give the player Tardiness with the upgraded penalty.

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。但是，如果牌手准时到场，却发现丢了套牌或者其中的某些牌，我们应当给他一些时间让他找到替代品。在此时还不是一盘负。但是，牌手最多有10分钟的时间（从本轮开始起计算）来找到替代品。若超过此时限，他将受到升级的迟到判罚（一局负）。

D. A player sits at an incorrect table and plays the wrong opponent.

D. 一位牌手坐错桌，并且跟错误的对手进行对局。

While you can try to make an argument that the player was on time, they still weren'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？

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Players are responsible for being on time and in the correct seat for their matches, and for completing registrations in a timely manner.

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。

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 always 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.

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.

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。如果迟到总是仅仅警告的话，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。

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。

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.

比赛主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。

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 Organizers have options. However, it is not recommended you go over 3 minutes. If there was no "grace period", the penalty is earned at the beginning of the round.

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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

The players are given a time extension corresponding to the length of the tardiness.

根据迟到耽误时间的长短，给予牌手相应的补时。

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。

Upgrade: A player not in their seat 10 minutes into the round will receive a Match Loss and will be dropped from the tournament unless they report to the Head Judge or Scorekeeper before the end of the round.

升级：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。

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 judge's name on the line for the player's signature who didn't show up.

For more information: <http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/>

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。

更多信息请参见：<http://blogs.magicjudges.org/articles/2012/06/11/tardiness-kevin-desprez/>

Downgrade: A player who arrives at their seat before 1 minute has elapsed in the round receives a Warning.

降级：如果牌手在一局比赛开始后1分钟内到达座位则得到警告。

Players have a one minute period of time from the start of round to get to their seats. Before we get into the philosophy of this downgrade, we want to explicitly call out that if you get two warnings for

the same Tournament Error, that Warning is Upgraded. It is not explicitly called out here because it is in the Tournament Errors section. But in essence this downgrade allows a one time "oopsie" by the player. Philosophically Judges had been executing a policy of "0 with a heart". What that meant was, if the player was genuinely trying to get to their seat, we allowed a little bit of leniency if a player was ~20 seconds late, as this penalty is meant to punish those not paying attention, as opposed to those really trying. However, this had two problems. The first is that it introduced some subjectivity into a ruling. The judge basically had to determine if the player had a genuine reason for being late. The second is that players caught on to this, and would argue for the subjective leniency, and try to make the judge out as being a jerk for not granting it. This downgrade removes both problems. Be sure to ask if a player has received this penalty prior in the day before assessing the penalty.

从一轮开始算起，牌手有一分钟的时间就座。在深入探讨此项降级的法理之前，我们要明确指出：如果你因同类别的比赛失误收到了两次警告，该警告将会升级。这一点并未在此处明确列出，因为它属于“比赛失误”通则章节的内容。但本质上，这项降级允许牌手犯一次“无心之过”。在法理上，裁判过去一直执行着一种“带有人情味的0分钟”方针。这意味着，如果牌手确实是在努力赶往座位，即便迟到了约20秒，我们也会给予一点宽容；因为设立此项判罚的初衷是惩罚那些不注意时间的牌手，而非那些真正尽力了的牌手。然而，这带来了两个问题。首先，它在判罚中引入了一些主观性。裁判基本上不得不去判断牌手迟到是否有正当理由。其次，牌手们察觉到了这一点，便会争取这种主观上的宽大处理；如果裁判不予批准，他们就会试图把裁判描述成一个不近人情的混蛋。此项降级解决了这两个问题。在进行判罚之前，务必询问该牌手当天此前是否已经收到过此项判罚。

## 3.2 Outside Assistance 外来协助

### *Penalty Match Loss 处罚一局负*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player, spectator, or other tournament participant does any of the following:

牌手、旁观者或是其他参与比赛的人出现下述行为：

- Seeks play advice or private information about their match from others once they have sat for their 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私人信息。

As soon as a player has sat for a match, they are 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 include asking for advice at the pairings board or dealer booth, or outside while smoking. 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.

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。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。

- Gives play advice or reveals private information to players who have sat for their match.
- 在牌手已经入座准备开始对局之后，给予牌手游戏建议或私人信息。

This scenario often happens to a spectator or a player who is watching a friend playing after just finishing their 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.

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。

- During a game, refers to notes (other than Oracle™ pages) made before the official beginning of the current match.
- 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）。

The form notes take can be varied, but are 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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. During a game, a player references play notes that were created before the tournament.

A. 牌手在游戏中参阅他在比赛之前作好的游戏笔记。

B. A spectator points out the correct play to a player who had not solicited the information.

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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Tournaments test the skill of a player, not their ability to follow external advice or directions. Any strategy advice, play advice, or construction advice from an external source is considered outside assistance.

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。

A game is between two players. Not a player vs. another player and their friend, or Google, or the Twitterverse. 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 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.

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，即使这个信息会使得这盘游戏直接结束。

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.

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。

Some players write notes on cards, which may contain some strategic information. Several words, a mark, or 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.

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，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。

Spectators who commit this infraction may be asked to leave the venue if they are not enrolled in the tournament.

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。

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.

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.

对于比赛中的牌手来说，“外来协助”这项就像悬在头顶的达摩克利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。

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。

Downgrade: If the information acquired is information that the player would have access to between games, the penalty is a Game Loss.

降级：如果牌手取得的信息是该牌手在两盘之间本来可以得到的，处罚为一盘负。

This downgrade reflects that the advantage that you might gain for accessing information that you are allowed to access between games is likely to be less than if you access information that you wouldn't normally have access to between games. Looking at your notes on sideboarding is still likely to give you an advantage but not as much as asking a friend what your opponent sideboarded in and out this game.

这个降级反映了取得原本可在两盘之间合法取得之信息可能产生的获利，相较于取得原本不能在两盘之间合法取得之信息可能产生的获利是比较低的。查看换备笔记仍然很可能给你带来一定的获利，但比起问你的朋友对手这盘换出去什么牌、换进来什么牌比起来，程度要轻微许多。

### 3.3 Slow Play 游戏进行过慢

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player takes longer than is reasonably required to complete game actions.

牌手在完成游戏中动作所需时间超过了合理的时长。

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 use their best judgment when making them. Two methods judges have reported using are:

- If you have had time to assess the board, figure out what to do, and then get bored, it's slow play
- If you start wondering if you should give Slow Play, you should have already given it.

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：

- 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；
- 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。

If a judge believes a player is intentionally playing slowly to take advantage of a time limit, the infraction is Unsporting Conduct — Stalling.

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”。

Players can be playing slowly unintentionally without realizing it. 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, and typically revolves around how much the player was aware of the remaining time on the clock.

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，其判断通常取决于该牌手对比赛剩余时间的关注程度。

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.

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。

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 loop 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. Also, if the opponent wants to respond when you have milled both Emrakuls and both shuffle triggers are on the stack, how do you determine which state happens first?

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小，只要有，你就不能进行这样的循环。而且，如果对手想要在你将两个伊莫库都磨进坟墓场、两个洗牌触发都在堆叠上时进行响应，你要怎么确定哪个游戏状态会先发生？

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player repeatedly reviews their opponent's graveyard without any significant change in game state.
  - 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. A player spends time writing down the contents of an opponent's library while resolving Thought Hemorrhage.
  - B. 牌手在思想溢血/Thought Hemorrhage结算时，花时间将对手牌库的内容全部写下来。
- C. A player takes an excessive amount of time to shuffle their deck between games.
  - C. 在两盘游戏之间，牌手花费了过多的时间来洗牌。
- D. A player gets up from their seat to look at standings or goes to the bathroom without permission of an official.
  - 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。

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, they 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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

All players have the responsibility to play quickly enough so that their opponents are not at a significant disadvantage because of the time limit.

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。

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 their 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内结束。

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.

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。

A player who is deep in thought may not be aware that they have 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 and 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 their 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. This is also OK.

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”，而是一个“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。

Further slow play should be penalized.

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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

In the event that the match exceeds the time limit, two additional turns are added to the number of additional turns played.

若对局超出时间限制，则游戏将进行的延长回合数增加两个。

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 two additional turns if the match goes to time. These turns may be taken by the same player if 'take an extra turn after this one' effects are used.

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额外延长两个回合。如果有牌手使用了“进行额外回合”效应的话，这些回合可能会由同一位牌手进行。

This turn extension occurs before any end-of-match procedure can begin and after any time extensions that may have been issued.

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。

No additional turns are awarded if the match is already in additional turns, though the Warning still applies.

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.

For further reference on Slow Play, see this article.

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了。

更多关于游戏进行过慢的信息，参见这篇文章。

## 3.4 Decklist Problem 套牌登记表问题

*Penalty Game Loss 处罚一盘负*

### DEFINITION 定义

The decklist is illegal, doesn't match what the player intended to play, needs to be modified due to card loss over the course of the tournament, or is presented to the opponent with errors in it

套牌登记表发生以下问题之一：（1）套牌登记表不合法；（2）套牌登记表与牌手意图使用之套牌内容不符；（3）因在比赛过程中丢失牌张需要对套牌登记表进行修改。（4）呈现给对手的套牌登记表有误。

These are the major cases where the decklist has to be modified. An illegal deck, is a deck with not enough cards; too many cards in the sideboard, ambiguous cards names, or cards that are illegal for the format.

While we use decklists to confirm that players do not change their decks over the course of the tournament, we do consider the physical deck to be the true representation of what the player intended to play, and we expect the decklist to represent the physical deck.

While a penalty for lost cards may seem harsh, players have the option to replace those lost cards with another copy; if they can find it. Additionally this discourages a potential cheating angle, where the player determines their land count is incorrect and would like to "lose" a card and replace with a land.

这是套牌登记表必须被修正的几个主要原因。套牌张数不足、备牌张数过多、牌名模棱两可、包含非法牌张都会导致套牌非法。

虽然套牌登记表的用途是用来确认牌手在比赛过程当中不改变套牌的内容，我们仍应将实际的套牌内容视为牌手想要使用的套牌，并且期望套牌登记表的内容能够反映实际的套牌内容。

虽然丢了牌还要吃判罚听起来过于严厉，但如果牌手能够找到其他同名牌的话，仍然能用其替代丢失的牌张。此外这也阻止牌手利用这一条，在认为自己套牌地的数量不够时故意“丢”一张牌来换进一张地的作弊方法。

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.

此违规不包含现开牌池交换之前由其他牌手犯下的登记错误。此类错误应在征得裁判同意后修正。

In the case of a sealed pool, the registration was done by another player, and those errors were not made by the player playing the deck. We don't want to penalize a player for a mistake made by another participant. Use your judgement to determine if the error can be corrected and do so.

对于现开牌池而言，登记是由另一位牌手作的，所以登记错误并不是使用套牌的牌手的责任。我们不应因为他人犯下的失误惩罚牌手。使用你的判断力来决定错误能否修正，如能修正则如此做。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player in a Legacy tournament lists Mana Drain (a banned card) on their decklist.

A. 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. A player has a 56-card decklist. Their actual deck contains 60 cards, with four Dispels not listed.

B. 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。

C. A player lists 'Sarkhan' in a format with both Sarkhan, the Dragonspeaker and Sarkhan Unbroken.

C. 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。

D. A player loses some cards and is unable to find replacement copies, making them unable to play a deck that matches their decklist.

D. 牌手丢失牌张且无法找到同样牌张替换，令其无法用符合套牌登记表的套牌比赛。

E. A player registers Ajani, Valiant Protector, but they are playing Ajani Unyielding.

E. 牌手登记的英勇卫士阿耶尼/Ajani, Valiant Protector，但实际使用刚毅阿耶尼/Ajani Unyielding。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Decklists are used to ensure that decks are not altered over the course of a tournament.

套牌登记表是用来确定套牌内容没有在比赛过程中变动。

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.

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。

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.

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。

Making announcements at the start of a tournament can prevent a lot of the errors that could occur in a tournament; 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". Decklists are often a rushed last-minute job, so by providing an extra minute or two during a players meeting to check for last-minute issues many of these errors can be prevented.

在比赛开始时进行诸如“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”的公告，能够避免比赛中可能出现的很多错误。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一两分钟时间来提醒牌手检查一下牌表能够避免出现很多牌表问题。

A player normally receives a Game Loss if their decklist is altered after tournament play has begun.

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。

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 sentence says "normally" because there is a corner case where the player is unable to replace a lost card, receives the penalty, yet later is able to replace it. In that case, we can change the list back to its original configuration without issuing a penalty.

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。说“通常”的原因是在一种极端情况下牌手无法找到替代用的牌，得到了判罚，稍后又找到了替换用的牌。在这种情况下，我们可以将登记表改回其原本的状态，并不再给予判罚。

Penalties for decklist errors discovered outside the context of the match and its procedures (such as those discovered through decklist counting) are issued at the start of the next match unless the judge believes there is strong evidence the deck itself is illegal.

在对局及其过程之外发现的套牌登记表错误（例如在清点套牌登记表时发现的），应等到下一局开始才执行，除非裁判相信有强烈的证据证明该套牌当前非法。

If an error is discovered during a deck check, the penalty is issued immediately. The players aren't playing. Issue the penalty. Apply the fix, and if the match isn't over, get the players playing as quickly as possible.

At events, judges will occasionally 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 match. 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 Mental Misstep. You can inspect the library of the player. If the deck is in fact illegal, go ahead and issue the infraction. Otherwise, issue the penalty and resolve the fix between rounds, with the infraction taking effect at the beginning of the next match.

如果在套牌检查时发现了错误，判罚应立即给出。牌手并没有正在进行对局。给出判罚，然后应用修正，如果对局还没有结束，请牌手尽快继续比赛。

在比赛中，裁判在套牌检查之外也会偶尔检查牌表。如果在套牌检查之外的牌表中发现了问题，那么判罚将在下一局开始时给出。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，一张近代赛的牌表中出现了心灵失足。你可以检查该牌手的牌库。如果套牌确实是非法的，接下来请给出判罚。反之，如果套牌是合法的，在两轮之间给出判罚并执行修正，此判罚将在下一局开始时生效。

Ambiguous or unclear names on a decklist may allow a player to manipulate the contents of their deck up until the point at which they are discovered.

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。

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.

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以应对环境，同时声称自己只是图方便写的简称。

Truncated names of storyline characters on decklists (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.

对于套牌登记表上故事角色的名字（鹏洛客及其他传奇永久物），只要在此赛制中含有该名称的合法卡片只有一张，便可允许使用该角色名字之缩写。这类简写被视为指代前述之合法卡片，而非其他具有相同开头名称的牌张。

In the case of storyline figures, it is often easy to see which card a player means. If a player lists "4 Ulrich", that player is unlikely to be talking about Ulrich's Kindred, 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. Listing "4 Jace" on a Legacy decklist, however, is 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.

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 乌力奇”，那么他基本不可能指的是乌力奇同族，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。再比如，在薪传比赛的套牌登记表上写“4 杰斯”就并不满足要求，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。

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 tournaments, 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 given the actual contents of the deck; needing to check the deck for confirmation is a sign that the entry is not obvious.

主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。

Checking and confirming the cards in the deck against the decklist in this situation causes unnecessary work for the deck check team. If the error is extremely obvious and the correct card name can only be one thing, then there is no ambiguity. If the error is obvious, there is truly no question of what the card is. There is not even a reason to check. In those cases, the HJ is allowed to choose not to issue a penalty. It's not even a warning. 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 an 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' for Dark Confidant.

Now what about a situation where the player writes down the wrong card name, such as Temple of Malady in the B/R 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 they meant Temple of Malice? Not by looking solely at the decklist. So this scenario would not be eligible for a downgrade.

Toby Elliott wrote a wonderful blog entry detailing what is and is not to be considered 'obvious'.

检查并确认这些套牌中的牌是否符合牌表会给套牌检查组带来不必要的工作。如果错误非常明显、且正确的牌名只有一种可能，那么就没有歧义。如果错误太明显，那么它所指的牌应该不存在疑问，甚至连套牌都不用去检查。在遇到这种情况时，主审可以选择不给判罚，甚至警告都不用。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。用“Bob”（黑暗亲信的昵称）表示黑暗亲信也是一样。

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。

Toby Elliot就“哪种算明显，哪种算不明显”写了一篇非常好的博文。

Companions affect what the player intended to play, and may produce a situation in which the deck and decklist match, but violate the restriction on the intended companion. In these situations, it is acceptable to alter the deck and sideboard configuration to meet the restriction.

行侣牌会影响牌手的游戏计划，并且会出现一种情况，即套牌与套牌登记表相匹配，但违反了所使用行侣牌对套牌的限制。这种情况下，可以让牌手更改套牌构成以满足行侣牌的使用限制。

Players can make mistakes and when the situation arises where a player has a correct deck and matching decklist, but the companion is not legal due to an unsatisfied restriction in the deck, we will allow the player to be able to continue with the companion as planned. However, the only way to legally do this is to modify the deck and the sideboard in order to no longer violate the restriction. In this case we exchange cards between the main deck and the sideboard until the companion restriction is satisfied for game 1. The Game Loss Penalty is still utilized as we are still modifying the decklist.

牌手难免会犯错。当出现以下情况时：牌手的套牌与牌表是相符的，但由于套牌内未满足构筑限制条件导致行侣不合法，我们将允许牌手按原计划继续使用该行侣。然而，要合法地做到这一点，唯一的办法是修改主牌和备牌，使其不再违反该限制条件。在这种情况下，我们在主牌和备牌之间交换牌张，直到满足第一局游戏的行侣限制条件。由于我们实际上是在修改牌表，因此仍然适用一盘负的判罚。

In tournaments with open decklists, if the wrong decklist is provided to an opponent and it is discovered during the game, the opponent may have made strategic decisions throughout the game based on the error, and that cannot be fully assessed or offset.

在使用公开牌表的比赛中，如果牌手为对手提供了错误的套牌登记表，并在比赛过程中发现，对手可能会在整个比赛中都基于该错误做出决策，而这一错误是无法完全估量和弥补的。

It is possible for the opponent to have made decisions during the mulligan procedure based on an incorrect decklist. Since it's nearly impossible to determine how much impact the erroneous information may have had on the game, we err on the side of a game loss.

对手有可能基于错误的牌表在再调度程序中做出了决定。由于几乎无法确定该错误信息对游戏造成了多大程度的影响，我们倾向于从严判罚一盘负。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

If the decklist contains illegal cards, remove them.

如果套牌登记表包含不合法的牌，则移除这些牌。

The steps for the remedy are performed in order. The first thing you want to do is remove any illegal cards from the list. If the illegal cards are also in the deck, remove them too.

修正的步骤应当按顺序进行。你应当作的第一件事就是移除牌表上所有非法的牌张。如果套牌中也有非法的牌，将其一并移除。

If the decklist is being adjusted to allow for an intended companion, the player exchanges cards between the deck and sideboard until the restriction is met.

如果需要调整套牌登记表以符合指定行侣牌的使用限制，则牌手需在主牌与备牌间调整直至符合行侣牌的使用限制。

This is simply being done to allow the companion to still be used in a legal configuration. The cards that violate the restriction have to be removed, and we need to replace them from somewhere, so the sideboard is that somewhere.

这样做仅仅是为了让行侣依然能在合法的构筑下被使用。那些违反限制条件的牌必须被移出，而我们需要从某处找牌来替换它们，那个地方就是备牌。

Alter the decklist to match the deck the player is actually playing.

将登记表按照实际使用的套牌组成进行更改。

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 they intended to play.

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。

If the deck/sideboard and decklist both violate a maximum cards restriction (usually too many cards in a sideboard, more than four of a card, or the same card in two decks in a Unified Constructed format), remove cards as directed by the player to make the decklist legal.

如果套牌 / 备牌和套牌登记表同时违反最大张数限制（一般为备牌数量过多，同一张牌超过四张，或在使用“套牌联合构组规则”的赛制中于多于一副套牌内使用了同一张牌），则根据牌手的指示移除牌张，确保套牌登记表合法。

In this case you need to remove cards from the players deck. The player decides what they remove in order to make the quantity of cards legal. In the case of Unified Constructed Team formats, the team can decide who is the player that needs to change their list. The result is, the player whose decklist changes gets the Game Loss. The players may discuss this, but they may not take too long. This may result in a “strategic decision”, but that’s an acceptable consequence.

在这种情形下，你需要从牌手的套牌中移除牌张。牌手可以决定移除哪些牌，使得套牌的张数合法。在联合构组团队赛制中，团队可以决定哪位牌手需要修改其牌表，结果就是修改牌表的那位牌手获得一盘负。牌手可以进行讨论，但不能花费过多的时间。虽然这会导致「战术讨论」，但也算是可接受的结果。

If the deck contains too few cards, the player chooses to add any combination of cards named Plains, Island, Swamp, Mountain or Forest to reach the minimum number. Alter the decklist to reflect this. These changes may be reverted without penalty if the player is subsequently able to locate identical replacements to legal original cards.

如果套牌张数过少，该牌手选择加入任意组成且牌名为平原、海岛、沼泽、山脉、或树林的牌，直到满足张数下限为止。然后照此更改套牌登记表。

While some decks might start out with too few cards, some decks will drop below a legal amount after illegal cards have been removed. In addition, cards may be lost and the player unable to find replacements. To fix these problems, judges can add Plains, Islands, Swamps, Mountains, or Forests of

the player's choice to their deck, so that it becomes playable. Because some formats have special restrictions on Snow-Covered basics or Wastes, and their availability is not guaranteed, they are not allowed.

除了有些套牌本就缺少牌张以外，在移除非法牌张之后一些套牌也会减少至不足合法张数下限。此外，牌手一旦丢牌，也可能会找不到替代品。要修正这类问题，裁判让该牌手选择平原、海岛、沼泽、山脉或树林加入他的套牌中，使套牌合法。因为一些赛制对雪境基本地和荒野有特殊限制，并且也无法保证能提供这些地牌，因此不允许在此使用它们。

This change may be reverted without penalty if the player is subsequently able to locate identical replacements to the legal original cards.

如果牌手之后能够找到与原本合法牌张相同的卡牌加以替代，则可以复原此更动，不会再度处罚。

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.

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。

## 3.5 Deck Problem 套牌问题

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

### DEFINITION 定义

The contents of a deck or sideboard do not match the decklist registered and the decklist represents what the player intended to play.

套牌或备牌的内容与登记的套牌登记表不符，且牌手意图使用的套牌内容与套牌登记表登记的内容一致。

If the deck and decklist are not the same, the player could potentially modify their 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. A common way this error can occur is when a player fails to desideboard after a match, then presents a deck in a sideboarded configuration for game 1 of their next match. Also possible here is the case of a player scooping up cards at the end of a game and now having one or more of an opponents cards in their deck when presenting (or, alternatively, missing one or more cards from their deck).

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。出现这类失误的通常情形之一是牌手在一局比赛后没有还原备牌，然后在下一局的第一盘游戏中呈视了含有备牌的套牌。另一种情形是牌手在游戏结束后收牌时夹带了对手的牌，然后呈视了含有对手牌张的套牌（或缺少牌张的套牌）。

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:

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：

- Promotional cards that have been handed out as part of the tournament.
- 在比赛过程中分发的特制纪念牌。
- Double-faced cards represented by substitute cards in the deck.
- 在套牌中已用辅助牌来表示的双面牌。
- Damaged cards that have been officially proxied for the tournament.
- 已被赛事官方制作代牌的受损牌张。
- Double-faced cards being used to represent the back side of cards in the deck. These cards must not be sleeved in the same way as cards in the main deck and/or sideboard.
- 用于表示套牌中某些牌之背面的双面牌。这些牌张不可与属于主牌和 / 或备牌的牌使用相同的牌套。

It is important that the sideboard is kept physically far 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 called out as an exception. It can be a good idea for a supplementary announcement involving cards in deckboxes to be issued so that we can curb this behavior.

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.

Promotional cards that were given out at an event have an exception because otherwise, we would be giving players a Game Loss during every deck check at a Regional Championship. This exception also applies to other tournaments at that same Regional Championship such as if the RC promo is in the deckbox during a RC \$10K. Double Faced cards have an exception because...where else are you supposed to keep them if you are using substitute cards? Those DFCs need to be in different sleeves to lower the risk that they be accidentally or intentionally shuffled into the deck itself, causing more than 4 of the card to be present.

将备牌与主牌显著区分开是非常重要的。同时，在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，所以除非明确声明为例外情况，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。

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不符合以上例外的牌也不应受到判罚。应该鼓励牌手养成这样的习惯。

比赛中发放的纪念牌属于例外之一，否则我们将会在区域冠军赛中每一次查套牌都判罚一个一盘负。这一例外同样适用于同一区域冠军赛期间的其他比赛，例如在参加RC 10K赛时，牌盒中放有RC的赠卡。双面牌属于例外之一是因为.....如果你用了辅助牌的话，那么双面牌本身还能放在什么地方呢？这些双面牌应当套上不同的牌套，这样可以降低将其不小心或故意洗进套牌的风险，导致套牌中有某张牌超过4张。

Cards in different sleeves, tokens, and double-faced cards for which substitute cards are being used are ignored when determining deck (not sideboard) legality.

在确定套牌（不含备牌）的合法性时，忽略装在不同牌套中的牌张、衍生物以及使用辅助牌所代表的双面牌。

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. Additionally meld cards count as double-faced cards here.

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。此外，融合牌在此处也算作双面牌。

If a player is unable to locate cards (or identical equivalents) from their main deck, treat it as a Decklist Problem instead. If sideboard cards are missing, make a note of this, but issue no penalty.

如果牌手无法找到其主牌当中的某些牌（或可用于替代的其他版次牌张），则应视作“套牌登记表问题”进行处理。如果备牌中出现牌张短少，则记录此事，但不予处罚。

If a player has lost one or more cards in their deck, and has no quick way to replace them (if it's a mythic that the venue is sold out of, for instance, or they don't wish to buy replacements), then the infraction is Decklist Problem, rather than Deck Problem since they can no longer play a deck that matches the list as intended. In fact, this particular case is example D. in Decklist problem – "A player loses some cards and is unable to find replacement copies, making her unable to play a deck that matches her decklist."

If sideboard cards are wrong or inaccurate, a penalty may be merited due to the potential for advantage. 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.

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.

如果牌手丢失了套牌中的一张或几张牌，并且没有迅速的方法来替代这些牌（例如这是赛场中脱销的一张秘稀牌，或者牌手不愿意购买替代品），那么违规就是套牌登记表问题而不是套牌问题，因为牌手无法使用符合其原本登记表的套牌进行比赛。事实上这就是套牌登记表问题中所述的范例D：“牌手丢失了一些牌并无法找到替代品，导致其无法用符合套牌登记表的套牌继续比赛。”

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，但是在如上处理之后找回自己的备牌时是可以考虑让他把这些牌加回去的。

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。

The discovery of a card that violates a companion restriction is a Deck Problem if the player does not wish to modify their decklist to accommodate the companion restriction.

如果牌手不希望修改其牌表以满足行侶的限制条件，那么发现一张违反行侶限制条件的牌属于套牌问题。

This is really simply just defining what infraction the action of finding a card that violates your companion's restriction belongs in.

这其实很简单，只是在界定“发现一张违反行侶限制条件的牌”这一行为应归为哪类违规。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player has 59 cards in their deck, but 60 listed on their decklist.

A. 牌手的套牌中有59张牌，但登记表上登记了60张牌。

B. A player has a Pacifism in their deck from a previous opponent.

B. 牌手把上一局对手的和平主义/Pacifism放入自己套牌中。

C. In game one of a match, A player has Pithing Needle in their deck, but only has one registered in their sideboard.

C. 在对局的第一盘游戏中，牌手套牌中出现了穿髓金针/Pithing Needle，但她只登记了在备牌中有一张该牌。

For the first example, we have a deck that is not legal, though the decklist itself IS legal. Therefore, the error is with the deck, not the decklist, and we deal with it here. Example B is a case where the card just got scooped up during the previous round, but still has resulted in the deck being different than that which is intended. Example C is a failure to de-sideboard error, which results in the deck not matching that configuration which is intended for game 1.

One thing to call out in the first example. While counterfeit cards are not cards for the purpose of allowing them in the tournament, they are considered cards for the purpose of a Deck Problem infraction. If counterfeit cards are discovered during play or a deck check, perform the necessary investigation for cheating. If it determined to be unintentional, the player needs to replace the cards with real copies or replace them with basic lands. Replacing with basic lands will result in changing the decklist – which would earn the player a Decklist Error penalty. Philosophically the Deck Problem error is about mathematical or strategic advantages in differences from card composition.

第一个例子中，虽然套牌登记表是合法的，但套牌不合法。因此，问题来自于套牌，应该在此违规下进行处理。例子B中，牌手上一轮收牌时拿走了不属于他的牌，这导致了他的套牌与其应有的内容不符。例子C则是没有还原备牌的错误，导致套牌不符合它在第一盘游戏中应有的内容。

关于第一个例子，有一点值得特别指出。虽然在“允许在比赛中使用”这一层面上，伪造牌并不被认可为牌，但在判定套牌问题违规时，它们被视为牌张。如果在对局或套牌检查中发现了伪造牌，必须进行必要的作弊调查。如果判定为非故意，牌手需要用真牌替换这些牌，或者将它们替换为基本地。如果替换为基本地，将导致牌表发生变更——这会让牌手受到套牌登记表问题的判罚。从法理上讲，套牌问题这一错误的核心在于卡牌构成的差异所带来的数学或策略上的优势。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Players are expected to call attention to deck errors immediately, and not gain any potential advantage from having the cards in their deck.

牌手在发现套牌错误时必须马上叫裁判，不得因套牌中有此类牌张而获得任何优势。

If a player does not call attention to a deck error they notice right away, they may reasonably be considered to be trying to gain an advantage from it. A player that waits to call a judge until the point that the error would become public (from a “reveal your hand” type of effect or something similar) has not called attention to it when they first noticed the issue.

如果牌手在发现套牌错误时不马上叫裁判，我们可以有理由认为他试图从中获得优势。如果牌手等到错误即将被公开（因某些“展示你的手牌”或类似的效果）时再叫裁判来，说明牌手没有在意识到问题时第一时间呼叫裁判。

The most common forms of deck error are failure to desideboard and having a card in the wrong deck. Both of these are difficult to gain advantage from without obvious cheating. Allowing the opponent to choose which card they would have otherwise be working with is sufficient to compensate for the easily discovered situations.

最常见的套牌问题包括未能还原备牌，以及套牌中出现不属于该套牌的牌张。除非刻意作弊，否则牌手很难从这两种情况当中获利。由对手来选择他们本应对局的牌张，就足以修正这种较易注意到的情况。

Since these two errors are both common (ish) and, as stated, difficult to take advantage of without being very obviously cheating, the penalty of a warning should be enough to educate the players to not repeat the infraction. Alongside the fix of removing the errant cards, this should combine to be enough of a deterrent.

正因为这两类失误非常常见，并且如上所述，难以从中获利，除非牌手在刻意作弊。警告对于牌手应当足够起到教育作用，使其不要再犯。此外再加之以移除错误牌张的修正手段，应该对牌手构成足够的威慑。

Duplicates of cards that begin in the main deck are more problematic, as they are not as easy to realize and catch, and thus mandate an upgraded penalty.

但对于本来就在主牌中放入数张的牌而言，如果这类牌发生前述失误，会较难发现并指出该牌在套牌中的数量是否增多，因此在此情况下便须升级处罚。

It's much simpler to abuse a case where the library has additional copies of a card from the sideboard in game 1 of a match. It's also much harder to catch, and, as a result, needs to have a harsher penalty associated with it to dissuade the potential for abuse.

如果这张牌在备牌和主牌中都有，那么在对局的第一盘中滥用这种违规就会更加简单。这种情况也更加难以发现，为了对这种滥用的可能起到威慑作用，应当对其适用更严厉的判罚。

A window in which the error is a Game Loss is necessary to discourage intentional abuse of the minimum number of cards in the deck. Once that point has passed, the opponent agrees that the deck is valid. Judges should always be mindful of the abuse possibilities when investigating these infractions.

此类失误在一定的时间范围内判罚为一盘负。设立这段特殊的时间范围，意在防止牌手滥用此失误的罚则规定，通过使用少于最小张数限制的套牌来获利。一旦超出这一时点，便视为对手亦认同此套牌合法。裁判在调查这一违规时，应时刻留意牌手是否有可能滥用这一规定。

This section refers to the window in the first upgrade path discussed below. The window for the upgrade needs to exist as a harsher discouragement against cheating. If the error is discovered by your opponent, during the presentation of your deck, you're still getting that Game Loss penalty.

这一段提及的是下面说到的第一种升级情形中的时间范围。为了更有效地吓阻作弊，必须存在升级的时间范围。如果是对手在你呈现套牌时发现了套牌错误，你仍然会得到一盘负判罚。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

Locate any cards missing from the deck and any incorrect cards in any game zone. Reveal those cards to the opponent.

找到套牌中缺失的相应牌张，以及在各个游戏区域中的所有错误牌张。向对手展示这些牌。

Once the deck has been determined to be in an incorrect configuration, we want to return it to the intended configuration as simply as possible. To start fixing things, find all the cards that are present in the game that shouldn't be there, and all the cards that are missing from the game, and reveal these to the opponent.

For example, assume that a player registered a deck with two Snapcaster Mage, one Crucible of Worlds, and with four Rest in Peace in the sideboard. In their last match, they took out the two Snapcaster Mages and the Crucible, while bringing in the four Rest in Peace. They played 61/14 for that game, which was legal. Now, however, they forgot to desideboard before their next match started. They Scryed a Rest in Peace to the bottom at one point, later drew a Rest in Peace. Then, they realized the error. The judge should determine that there is one Rest in Peace erroneously in the hand, three erroneously in the library, two missing Snapcaster Mages, and one missing Crucible.

一旦确定套牌的状态有误，我们要尽可能简单地将其恢复到预期的状态（译注：即牌表所登记的合法状态）。作为修正的开始，找出所有处于游戏中但不该存在的牌，以及所有本该在游戏中却缺失的牌，并将这些牌向对手展示。

例如，假设某牌手登记的套牌包含两张迅咒法师和一张世间锤炼，备牌中有四张得享安息。在上一场对局中，他换出了两张迅咒法师和那张世间锤炼，同时换入了四张得享安息。他在那局游戏中主牌为61张，备牌为14张，这是合法的。然而现在，在下一场对局开始前，他忘记将套牌还原。在游戏过程中，他曾占卜将一张得享安息放到了牌库底，随后又抓到了另一张得享安息。这时，他意识到了错误。裁判应当判定：有一张得享安息错误地位于手牌中，三张错误地位于牌库中；同时缺失了两张迅咒法师和一张世间锤炼。

If the game has started, the opponent chooses whether to fix the problem now or when a player would next get priority. Then, at the appropriate time, they specify which of the missing cards replaces each incorrect card; any extras are shuffled into the random portion of the library.

如果当前游戏已经开始，由对手选择当前立刻修复该问题，或是等到下一次有牌手将获得优先权时再进行修复。接下来，在其所选择的时点，由对手选择用缺失的牌张与错误牌张一一对应进行替换；多余的牌张将被洗入牌库中的随机部分。

This rule is to minimize the potential advantage of discovering a problem during the resolution of a spell or ability where fixing it at the point of discovery could severely impact the result. For example, if resolving a Indomitable Creativity a player gets down to the last two cards of their deck before realizing their three combo pieces are missing, the opponent might be upset if we add those 3 cards

mid resolution. However, they do get the choice. This also means that if a player cracks a fetch, and while searching their library they realize their only basic swamp is missing, the opponent will get to choose to fix the deck problem mid search, or after the search has completed.

The opponent chooses whether to fix the problem now or when the player would get next priority. Once they have made that determination, we apply the fix at the chosen time. This means the opponent does not get to know what the fix will be and what the cards involved are before making the decision on when the fix is applied. As with all choices by the opponent, this decision needs to be made quickly as with Deck Problems, we are already giving a non-trivial time extension.

Now, reveal all of these incorrect cards to the opponent. For each card that is there incorrectly, the opponent chooses which missing card will replace it, starting with cards not in the library. Make sure any parts of the library that are in a known order stay that way.

For instance, continuing the example from above, reveal the 7 incorrect cards to the opponent. First, replace the Rest in Peace in hand with either a Snapcaster Mage or a Crucible- whichever the opponent decides. Then, replace the three Rest in Peace copies in the library with the remaining two cards. Note that they can choose to replace either the copies in the random portion of the library, or the known card on the bottom of the library.

这条规则旨在最大限度地减少在咒语或异能结算过程中发现问题所可能带来的潜在优势，因为在发现问题的时间点立即进行修正可能会严重影响结果。例如，如果在结算无畏创新时，牌手翻到了牌库最后两张牌才意识到他们的三个组合技组件缺失了，如果我们在这时候半路把那3张牌加进去，对手可能会感到不满。然而，对手拥有选择权。这也意味着，如果一名牌手起动找地地，并在搜寻牌库时意识到他唯一的基本地沼泽不见了，对手可以选择是在搜寻中途修正这个套牌问题，还是在搜寻完成之后再修正。

对手选择是现在修正问题，还是在下一次有牌手即将获得优先权时修正。一旦他们做出了决定，我们就在选定的时间点执行修正。这意味着对手在决定何时修正之前，无法知晓具体的修正方案以及具体涉及哪些牌。与所有由对手做出的选择一样，这个决定需要迅速做出，因为对于套牌问题，我们已经给予了非同小可的时间延长。

现在，向对手展示所有这些不正确的牌。从不在牌库中的牌开始，对于每一张错误存在的牌，由对手选择用哪张缺失的牌来替换它。确保牌库中已知顺序的部分保持原样。

例如，延续上文的例子，向对手展示那7张不正确的牌。首先，将手中的那张得享安息替换为迅咒法师或世间锤炼——具体换成哪个由对手决定。然后，将牌库中的三张得享安息替换为剩余的两张缺失牌。注意，对手可以选择是替换牌库随机部分中的牌，还是替换牌库底已知的那张牌。

If more cards are being removed than added, prioritize ones not in the library first. If there are still additional cards not in the library that need replacing, they are replaced by cards from the random portion of the library.

若需被移除的牌张多于需被加回的牌张，则优先替换不在牌库中的牌张。如果在此之后，仍有不在牌库中的牌张需被替换，则用牌库的随机部分中的牌张进行替换。

If the player was playing a 61st card from the sideboard but hadn't taken anything out, that will be replaced by a random card from the library. Most commonly, this will be accomplished by simply drawing a card now.

如果牌手在未换备出任何牌的情况下使用了来自备牌的第61张牌，该牌将被替换为牌库中的一张随机牌。通常，这可以通过现在直接抓一张牌来完成。

If the missing card(s) are with the sideboard and it isn't the first game, choose the ones to be returned to the deck at random from main deck cards in the sideboard.

若缺失的牌与备牌放在一起，且当前并非第一盘游戏，则从备牌中原本属于主牌的牌张中随机选择相应数量的牌张加回套牌。

This case can occur when a player is looking through their deckbox (say to grab a token or something) and notices a card present with the sideboard that should be in the deck. If the deck is determined to be incorrect (specifically if there is 59 or fewer cards, or the deck is otherwise somehow illegal, not that a player intended to sideboard a card in and missed their opportunity to do so), we can restore the deck to a legal configuration by randomly adding a card back in from the sideboard. Note- this fix should only return main deck cards into the deck.

这种情况可能发生在牌手翻看牌盒（比如为了拿衍生物之类的东西）时，发现一张本该在套牌中的牌混在了备牌里。如果套牌被判定为不正确（具体是指只有59张或更少，或者套牌在其他方面不合法；注意，这不包括牌手原本打算换入备牌却错过了时机的情况），我们可以从备牌中随机加入一张牌，将套牌恢复至合法的构筑状态。注意——此修正只应将原本属于主牌的牌张放回套牌中。

If the error caused a violation of a companion restriction and it is a post-sideboard game (or a pre-sideboard game and the player has elected to continue with the deck they registered that does not match the revealed companion condition), locate all cards violating the restriction. Then, reveal all cards in the sideboard that meet the companion restriction. The opponent decides which of those cards replaces each illegal card. If making the deck match the companion condition is impossible, upgrade the penalty to a Game Loss.

如果失误是因违反了行侣牌使用限制所导致的，且当前游戏为换备后对局（或者当前游戏为换备前对局，牌手已展示使用行侣，且选择继续用当前违反了该行侣牌使用限制的套牌进行游戏的情况），先找出套牌中所有违反该行侣牌使用限制的牌张。然后，展示备牌中所有符合该行侣牌使用限制的牌张。由对手在这些已展示的牌张中选择用哪些来对应替换不符合限制的牌张。如果无法将套牌调整至能满足该行侣牌的使用限制，则将处罚升级为一盘负。

Note: the process for this as originally described in Toby's blog post is no longer current and the text below has been changed below to reflect current policy.

(<https://blogs.magicjudges.org/telliott/2020/04/20/policy-update-for-ikoria-lair-of-behemoths/>).

"Here's what happens when someone discovers that they've violated the restriction announced by their companion at the start of the game:

1. The judge goes through the rest of the cards you're currently playing and finds any that violate the restriction.
2. The judge goes through the sideboard and finds the cards that do not violate the restriction. All cards that could fix the deck problems are set aside. If the judge can't find sufficient cards in the sideboard to fix the problem, it upgrades to a Game Loss.
3. The opponent looks at the set aside cards and decides which replaces each illegal card. Swaps are made, the library is shuffled, unchosen cards are returned to the sideboard and the game carries on."

注意：Toby的[博客文章](#)中最初描述的此流程已不再适用，下文内容已根据现行方针进行了修改。

"当发现某人违反了其在游戏开始时宣布的行侣限制条件时，处理流程如下：

1. 裁判检查你当前对局正在使用的其余牌张，找出所有违反该限制条件的牌。
2. 裁判检查备牌，找出所有不违反该限制条件的牌。将所有能够修正此套牌问题的牌挑出来放在一旁。如果裁判无法在备牌中找到足量的牌来修正此问题，则判罚升级为一盘负。
3. 对手检视这些被挑出来的牌，并决定用哪一张去替换每一张不合法的牌。执行替换，洗牌库，未被选中的牌放回备牌，然后游戏继续进行。”

If the missing card(s) were in a previous or current opponent's deck, issue penalties to both players.

如果所遗失的牌是在之前或现在的对手套牌当中，则对双方牌手都予以处罚。

If the missing or extra card was from another player's deck, both of the players have decks that don't match what they intended to play, and so both of them get a warning.

如果遗失的或额外的牌是来自于另一位牌手的套牌，这两位牌手的套牌便不符合他们应当使用的套牌内容，因此他们都应获得一个警告。

**Upgrade:** In games before sideboarding, while the deck is presented to the opponent for pregame shuffling or during a deckcheck, if the deck contains fewer cards than registered (and any missing cards are not in the opponent's deck) or the sideboard contains more cards than registered, the penalty is a Game Loss.

**升级：**在换备前的对局中，如果是在将套牌呈视给对手做游戏开始前洗牌时，或是在进行套牌检查的过程中，发现组成套牌的牌张总数少于登记的数量（且缺失的牌张不在当前对手的套牌中），或备牌的牌张总数多于登记的数量，则处罚为一盘负。

This upgrade path exists to discourage cheating. The process of presenting your deck to an opponent is a statement that "this deck is legal and ready for you to shuffle." If the opponent discovers the deck has less cards than is registered on the deck list, while shuffling or counting, the penalty is upgraded to a Game Loss. Similarly, if this is discovered by a judge during a deck check, the penalty is upgraded. This does not apply if there are the correct number of cards. That's why the wording here is "fewer cards than registered", the judge will have the decklist, however the opponent will probably only be able to count the cards and see that its less than 60 (or 40, or 100).

设立此项判罚升级是为了遏制作弊。向对手呈现套牌的这一过程，相当于声明“本套牌合法且已准备好供你洗牌”。如果对手在洗牌或数牌时发现套牌张数少于牌表上登记的数量，判罚将升级为一盘负。同样地，如果是裁判在套牌检查中发现了这一点，判罚也会升级。如果牌张数量是正确的，则不适用此升级。这就是为什么这里的措辞是“少于登记数量”；裁判手头会有牌表，而对手通常只能通过数牌发现套牌少于60张（或40张、100张）。

In games after sideboarding, while the deck is presented to the opponent for pre-game shuffling or during a deckcheck, if the deck contains fewer cards than the format minimum (and any missing cards are not in the opponent's deck) or the sideboard contains more cards than the format maximum, the penalty is a Game Loss.

在换备后的对局中，如果是在将套牌呈视给对手做游戏开始前洗牌时，或是在进行套牌检查的过程中，发现组成套牌的牌张总数少于当前赛制限定的数量（且缺失的牌张不在当前对手的套牌中），或备牌的牌张总数多于当前赛制限定的数量，则处罚为一盘负。

This sentence is previous to the other, only this is for post sideboard games. It requires slightly different wording as players do not have to sideboard in cards one for one.

这句话排在另一句之前，但这是针对备牌局的游戏的。它需要稍微不同的措辞，因为牌手在换备时并不强制要求一换一。

Upgrade: If an opponent may have made strategic decisions based on the presence of a sideboard card (such as having seen it in the hand or library during a search effect), the penalty is a Game Loss.

升级：如果对手可能因备牌的存在而作出相应的游戏决策（比如从手牌中看到，或通过搜寻效应在牌库中看到），则处罚为一盘负。

This upgrade path, again, is to discourage cheating. Calling attention to the error only after an opponent has made decisions based on the incorrect card is very suspicious and abusable, so the penalty is a Game Loss to ensure the practice is heavily disincentivized. Of course, investigation needs to occur in these cases to ensure there isn't actually cheating, but the route for abuse here still warrants a Game Loss penalty.

同样地，设立此项判罚升级是为了遏制作弊。只有在对手基于那张错误的牌做出了决定之后才指出错误，这种行为非常可疑且容易被滥用，因此判罚被定为一盘负，以确保能严厉遏制这种做法。当然，在这些案例中需要进行调查，以确保实际上没有作弊，但鉴于此处存在被滥用的途径，判处一盘负依然是正当的。

Upgrade: If an error resulted in more copies of a main deck card being played than were registered or allowed by companion restriction, the penalty is a Game Loss unless all copies of the card are still in the random portion of the library. For example if the decklist has two copies of Shock in the main deck and two in the sideboard, but a search finds two copies of Shock in the library with another already in the graveyard, the penalty is upgraded.

升级：如果失误导致原本即在主牌中使用之某牌数量，较原有登记或行侣牌的使用限制为多，且是在游戏开始之后才发现此失误，则除非所有这些牌依然处于牌库中的随机部分，否则处罚为一盘负。举例来说，如果套牌登记表上登记的是电震/Shock，此牌在主牌和备牌中各有两张，但搜寻牌库时发现牌库里有两张电震，且坟墓场中还有另一张，则需升级处罚。

The upgrade applies here because there is no way to know if an advantage has already been gained. Typically, you aren't going to realize you have three copies of Shock until you have already seen/drawn/cast the previous two. This policy is currently lacking wording that prevents situations where all copies (between main and sideboard) are in the player's opening hand. It is the opinion of the AIPG authors that this is an oversight, as 'all copies in the opening hand' is just as fixable as 'all copies still in the random portion of the library.'

这种情况需要升级，是因为无法得知牌手是否已经获利。通常来说，你不会意识到你牌库中有三张电震，除非你已经看见（或抓到、施放过）之前的两张。目前的方针缺乏相关措辞来豁免所有那种牌（包含主牌和备牌中的）都出现在牌手起手中的情况。AIPG的作者们认为这是一个疏忽，因为“所有同种牌都在起手中”的情况，与“所有同种牌仍位于牌库随机部分中”的情况一样，都是可以修正的。

## 3.6 Limited Procedure Violation 违反限制赛流程

### *Penalty Warning 处罚警告*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player commits a technical error during a draft.

牌手在轮抽过程当中犯下了技术性失误。

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 something like a Pro Tour draft, will cause the entire room to be held up.

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，或者类似的情形在专业赛的第二天，这将让整个比赛中的所有人的时间被耽误。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player passes a booster to their left when it is supposed to go to their right.

A. 牌手在该往右手边传时，将补充包传向左手边。

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.

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。

B. A player exceeds the amount of time allotted for a draft pick.

B. 牌手没有在指定时间内抽选牌。

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 unnoticed.

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。

C. A player puts a card on top of their draft pile, then pulls it back.

C. 牌手将牌放到自己的轮抽牌堆，之后又将该牌拿回来。

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.

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。

D. A player moves their head to the side at inappropriate times.

D. 牌手在不适当的时间转动脑袋。

This example gives judges some leeway to use LPV when they see a player making movements with their head. Use common sense here and be sure to consider Cheating if you believe the player is doing this to obtain hidden information.

这个例子给了裁判一些余地，使得裁判可以在看到牌手的脑袋有所动作时适用这条违规。使用常识进行判断，如果你相信牌手如此做是为了获取隐藏信息，请务必考虑是否属于作弊。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Errors in draft are disruptive and may become more so if they are not caught quickly.

轮抽流程中的失误会造成比赛中断，且不及早发现会影响更剧。

During a draft there are many 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. 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.

在轮抽中，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。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。

Announcements prior to the draft or the specific tournament rules for the format may specify additional penalties for Limited Procedure Violations.

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 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。

## 3.7 Communication Policy Violation 违反交流原则

*Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player violates the Communication policies detailed in section 4 of the Magic Tournament Rules and the judge believes their opponent has taken an in-game action or clearly chosen not to act based on the

erroneous information. This infraction only applies to violations of that policy and not to general communication confusion.

牌手违反了于《万智牌比赛规则》之第4章详述的交流原则，同时裁判相信对手针对此错误信息进行了任何游戏中动作或明显的基于此错误信息而选择不做动作。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。

It is important to remember that this infraction only covers violations of the Communication Policy in the Magic Tournament Rules (section 4) and only if the judge believes that the opponent has made decisions based upon the incorrect information.

很重要的是，记住这个违规只涵盖对于《万智牌比赛规则》中的交流方针（MTR第四章）的违反，且仅当裁判认为对手基于错误信息做出了决定的情况下才能适用。

## EXAMPLE 范例

A. A player is asked how many cards they have in their hand and answers "Three." A few moments later, their opponent casts a discard spell and they realize that they have four.

A. 牌手被问及手牌有几张，回答“三”。片刻之后，对手施放了一个弃牌咒语，此时他们发现应该是四张。

B. A player keeps their Llanowar Elf in with their land, and their opponent attacks thinking they have no blockers.

B. 牌手将罗堰妖精放在地中间，对手以为没有阻挡者并进行攻击。

C. A player casts Path to Exile, forgets to remind their opponent that they have the opportunity to search for a basic land and, as a result, they don't.

C. 牌手施放流放之径，并且忘记提醒对手有机会可以搜寻一张基本地，并且对手确实没有搜寻基本地。

In each of these examples, a player takes an action or fails to take an action in a way that is impacted by illegal communication. In the first example, the opponent makes a choice regarding the discard spell assuming that the player has three cards in their hand, while they actually have four. In the second, the player has violated section 4.7 of the MTR by keeping a creature with their lands, and the opponent assumes that the player has no blockers. In the third case, the player violates MTR 4.2 by assuming that the opponent chose not to search. In each case, it isn't the illegal information that causes the infraction, but rather the opponent acting on the illegal information. If a player keeps their Llanowar Elf with their lands, but the opponent doesn't make an attack assuming that the player has no blockers, then no infraction has occurred. However, judges should step in to clarify the board state before an infraction occurs.

在这些例子中，由于不合法的交流产生的影响，牌手因此要么做出了一些游戏动作，要么是未能做出一些游戏动作。在第一个例子中，对手认为牌手手中有三张牌而做出了施放弃牌咒语的动作，但他手中实际有四张牌，在第二个例子中，牌手违反了MTR4.7节，将生物与地牌放在一起，使得对手以为他没有生物可用来阻挡。在第三个例子中，牌手默认对手选择不找地，这违反了MTR4.2节。在每个例子中，并非是不合法的信息导致了违规，而是因为对手根据不合法的信息而做出了动作。如果牌手将罗堰妖精和地放在一起，但对手并没有因为他没有阻挡者而攻击，那么就没有违规发生。但是，裁判应当介入，在违规发生之前就厘清场面状态。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Clear communication is essential when playing Magic. Though many offenses will be intentional, it is possible for a player to make a genuine mistake that causes confusion and these should not be penalized harshly.

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并使对手产生了迷惑；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. 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 these violations, 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.

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。对于此类违反，应该给予警告的处罚。我们不想给出更严厉的处罚，因为我们不想牌手因为怕吃到判罚而惧于跟对手交流。

A player may commit this infraction in situations where they have not spoken.

牌手可能在没有讲话的情况下犯下此违规。

This can occur in many different ways. As another example, a player might control Dusk Charger, but not have represented that they have the city's blessing. If the opponent acts on the belief that the player does not have the city's blessing and assumes that the Dusk Charger is only a 3/3, a CPV has occurred.

这种情形会以很多方式发生。举另外一个例子，一个牌手操控暮影战马，但却没有表示其拥有黄金城祝福。如果对手因为相信他没有黄金城祝福、暮影战马仍然是3/3而采取行动，此时就发生了CPV。

A physically ambiguous board state is not automatically a penalty, but judges are encouraged to tell players to fix ambiguous placements before they might become problematic.

桌面上出现迷惑的局面并不会自动导致判罚，但是应鼓励裁判在可能出现问题之前，让牌手改正迷惑的局面。

As above, in the example where Llanowar Elves was with the player's lands, no CPV occurs until the opponent acts on the bad information. Judges should encourage clear board states even before an infraction occurs.

在上面罗堰妖精和地混在一起的示例中，在对手因为错误信息做出动作前，没有CPV发生。即使还没有违规发生，裁判也应当鼓励牌手保持清晰的游戏状态。

Misapplication of a shortcut is usually not a Player Communication Violation, as the default interpretation applies in ambiguous situations and the opponent is able to act on that shortcut. Any deviation from a tournament shortcut requires a clear explanation.

错误的使用简化一般不是违反交流原则，因为默认的解释只适用于不明确的情况，而此时对手可以针对该简化做出动作。任何偏离比赛规定的简化都必须有清晰的解释。

Just misunderstanding a shortcut isn't a CPV. Since the default shortcuts described in MTR 4.2 are well-defined, those definitions can be applied in ambiguous situations.

仅仅是错误理解某种简化本身并不是CPV。由于MTR4.2中描述的默认简化定义的很好，这些定义也可以在不明确的情况下适用。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

A backup may be considered to the point of the action, not the erroneous communication.

可考虑倒回至执行动作的时点，而非产生错误交流的时点。

Sometimes a violation of the communication policy doesn't matter. Sometimes it does. Typically a judge, will only get calls "when it matters," and will need to consider if a backup is appropriate. If when asked what the power/toughness of a creature is, the player responds "2/3," the opponent might feel safe attacking with a 3/3. If during declare blockers it's discovered to be a 3/4 then different choices could have been made. This wasn't a play mistake or a strategic error, and if a judge is being called, it is clear that a player took actions based upon that incorrect information. In this instance a backup to before attackers have been declared, as outlined in section IPG 1.4 Backing Up, should be considered.

Any backup should only go to when the opponent acted on the incorrect information, and not before then. Any backup should only go to when the opponent acted on the incorrect information, and not before then. If a Llanowar Elves were with a player's lands since turn 1, but the opponent only attacked into them on turn 10, the backup isn't to turn 1.

有些违反交流方针的行为并不会有影响，但是也有另一些会有影响。通常来说，裁判只会在交流问题会影响局面的时候才会被叫过去。这时裁判需要考虑倒回是否合适。如果问一位牌手某个生物是几几的，回答说“2/3”，对手可能就放心的拿3/3人宣攻了。但是如果在宣告阻挡者时才发现这个生物其实是3/4的，那么对手可能原本就会做出不同的选择。这不属于犯包或者策略失误，如果此时叫来裁判，很清楚就能知道一位牌手根据错误的信息做出了动作。在这种情况下可以考虑根据IPG的1.4的内容，将游戏倒回到宣告攻击者之前。

任何倒回都只能倒回到对手根据错误信息做出动作的时间点，且不能比此时间点更早。如果一个罗堰妖精在第一回合开始就跟牌手的地混在一起，但对手在第十回合才宣告攻击，倒回不能直接倒到第一回合。

## 3.8 Marked Cards 有记号的牌

### *Penalty Warning 处罚 警告*

#### DEFINITION 定义

Cards or sleeves in a player's deck have inconsistencies on them that might allow them to be differentiated from each other while in the library. This includes scuff marks, nail marks, discoloration, bent corners and curving from foils.

牌手套牌中的牌张或牌套有所差异，使得牌手有机会在牌库中即将之辨别出来。这包括划伤、指甲印、色差、牌角弯折及闪卡弯曲。

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 their 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 Cheating.

We only issue this infraction if the marked cards are in a player's deck, not the sideboard. If the cards in the sideboard have different markings or the sleeves appear newer we should only issue this infraction after sideboarding the marked cards into the deck. If the sideboard cards are noticed during a deck check the player should be made aware of this and suggested to use the main deck sleeves when sideboarding.

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，那么我们应当考虑作弊。

只有当有记号的牌在牌手套牌，而非备牌中时，才判处这个违规。如果备牌中的牌有记号、或牌套看起来更新，我们应当在这些有标记的牌被换进套牌之后才能判处这个违规。如果在套牌检查时发现这种问题，我们应当提醒牌手，建议他在换备时使用主牌的牌套。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player has small marks on a few of their sleeves. The markings are on a Mountain, a Loxodon Hierarch, and a Lightning Helix.

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。

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 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.

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。

B. A player has several foil cards that stand out significantly from the rest of their deck.

B. 在一副套牌中，可以明显地辨别出部分闪卡。

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 their 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).

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。

C. The basic lands in a player's unsleeved deck are from a set with notably lighter backs.

C. 在一副没有用牌套的套牌中，使用了牌背颜色略淡的基本地。

Having noticeably lighter backs makes these cards marked. Because it is all the basic lands this fits the upgrade path outlined in the additional remedy, since substantial advantage can be gained knowing if the top card of the library is a land just by seeing the different back.

一些牌的牌背颜色显著地较淡会使这些牌成为有标记的。由于它们都是基本地，这就符合了进一步的修正一节中所说的升级条件，因为从牌背就能看出来牌库顶的牌是不是地，该牌手便会因此可观地获利。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

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.

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。

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.

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个小时经常会造成员套的损坏，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。

In cases of marked cards, educating players to shuffle their cards and sleeves before sleeving the cards is very important.

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。

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 occurrences. Typically the players won't know anything is wrong until you tell them.

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).

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。一般来说你不说的话牌手是不知道问题所在的。

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）。

This infraction applies only to cards in a player's deck. Differently-marked sleeves in the sideboard are not illegal unless they are put into the deck without being changed.

此违规只适用于牌手套牌中的牌。牌手备牌中的牌，就算牌套上有相异的记号也不会算作不合法，但倘若牌手在此种情况下不更换牌套即将之换入套牌则不然。

Let's say a player's whole deck is sleeved, but their sideboard is unsleeved. Are those sideboard cards marked? Of course not! These two sentences here delineate the boundary between Marked Cards and cards that are marked, and that boundary is the deck. Cards in the sideboard can be in any condition until they are put in the deck. This means during a deck check, you may run across marked sleeves that make sideboard cards stand out, but if they aren't in a deck, its legal.

比如说，一个牌手的整个套牌都套了牌套，而备牌却没有套牌套。这些备牌是有记号的吗？当然不是！这两句话是用来划清“有记号的牌”和“牌上有记号”之间的界限，而这个界限便是套牌。在备牌中的牌可以是任何状况，直到这些牌被换入了套牌。这意味着在套牌检查中你可能会看到备牌上有标记的牌套，但只要这些牌不是套牌的一部分，便是合法的。

Unless investigating, judges are encouraged to alert players about concerns with marked sideboard cards.

除了需进行调查的情况外，在此鼓励裁判提醒牌手注意自己备牌是否上存在记号。

During a deck check, if you find some sideboard cards that are marked, please notify the player they will need to swap sleeves with their main deck cards. Do not silently wait to see if they put those cards into the deck and then jump in with a penalty. Tell them beforehand. The exception to this is: Investigating. If you are investigating cheats, you may opt to not tell them so that you can gather more information for your investigation.

在套牌检查时，如果你看到一些备牌上有记号，请提醒牌手他应当在换备牌时，也将主牌中的牌套一并换上。不要默不作声地等待直到牌手把有记号的牌换进套牌，然后跳出来给他判罚。请事先告诉他们。有一个例外是：调查。如果你在调查作弊，可能不告诉他们更好，这样你可以为调查收集更多的信息。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

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.

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。

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 a Regional Championships, an smaller RCQs 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.

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。在诸如区域冠军赛这样的大型比赛赛场里通常有售牌的摊位，而较小的RCQ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、便宜地买到牌套。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。

If the cards themselves have become marked through play in the tournament, the Head Judge may decide to issue a proxy.

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。

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 they can't play with their 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 MTR 3.4.

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）

Upgrade: If the player is unable to find replacement cards, they may replace those cards with any combination of cards named Plains, Island, Swamp, Mountain or Forest. As the decklist is being changed to match the new contents of the deck, the penalty is a Game Loss. This change may be reverted at a later point without further penalty if replacements for marked cards are found.

升级：假如牌手无法得到符合规定的牌，他可用任意组合且名称为平原、海岛、沼泽、山脉、或树林的牌来取代这些牌。由于套牌登记表将根据套牌新的内容进行修改，处罚为一盘负。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且不会再有更多的处罚。

If a player can no longer play with certain cards due to them being illegal (for example, the player's four foil Huntmaster of the Fells were bowed, and 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 any combination of cards named Plains, Island, Swamp, Mountain or Forest. If the player opts to find replacement cards, please ask them to hurry, and give them 10 minutes before assessing a Tardiness Penalty. If the player adds any of the named basic land cards instead, the decklist should be changed to reflect what the player is actually now playing. We issue the player with a Game Loss because of the changed decklist which means they also won't receive a Decklist Problem penalty if they receive a deck check later. If the player ends up finding replacements for any reason, we can reverse this change, this time without any penalty.

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，或者拿任意组合且名称为平原、海岛、沼泽、山脉、或树林的牌来替代。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以上名字的基本地，那么他的套牌登记表也应该被相应的修改。由于修改了牌表，我们判罚牌手一盘负，这也意味着他们如果稍后在比赛中遇到套牌抽查的话不会受到套牌登记表问题的处罚。不论什么原因，牌手最终找到了替代品，我们可以将变更复原，并且这一次不再给予任何判罚。

Upgrade: If the Head Judge believes that a deck's owner noticing the pattern of markings would be able to gain substantial advantage from this knowledge, the penalty is a Game Loss.

升级：如果主审相信套牌的拥有者已经注意到记号的模式，且有可能利用此信息得到实质性优势，则处罚为一盘负。

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.

Now lets talk a bit about "substantial advantage" vs "advantage". If there is a pattern of markings, and the pattern is noticed, there is the potential for advantage. If I know that one Island, one Counterspell, and one Ragavan, Nimble Pilferer, you could argue that its an advantage to know if one of those three cards are on top of your deck as opposed to the other 49 other cards in your deck, but its not a substantial advantage. We can extend this logic to the "pattern of one". You can argue "one is a pattern", and "one isn't a pattern", but that distinction is mostly irrelevant. The important distinction is if being able to identify that one card over all other cards in the deck is a substantial advantage or just an advantage. For example, it is difficult to argue that having a single marked Forest in a deck is a significant advantage. However if the marked card is the lone Maze's End in a deck based on gates, then that would be a substantial advantage, and the upgrade applies. Policy is written so that the Head Judge is able to use a lot of judgement in this upgrade. However, we caution you from overthinking the issue. Much like you can stare at a deck long enough and start to see marked cards, you can stare at a single card and start to concoct scenarios where it is *substantial* to know where that single copy of forest is in your library.

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。

现在我们来谈谈“实质性优势”与“优势”的区别。如果存在标记规律，且该规律被察觉，就存在获利的可能。如果我知道有一张海岛、一张反击咒语和一张巧手窃猴勒格文有记号，你可以认为：相比于套牌中其他49张牌，能知道这三张牌中的某一张位于牌库顶确实是一种优势，但这并不构成实质性优势。我们可以将这一逻辑延伸至“单张牌构成的规律”。你可以争辩“一张也算规律”或者“一张不算规律”，但这种区分大体上是无关紧要的。重要的区别在于：能够从套牌的所有其他牌中识别出这一张牌，到底会带来实质性优势，还仅仅只是某种优势。例如，你很难主张套牌中有一张有记号的树林会带来重大优势。然而，如果这张被标记的牌是套牌中唯一的那张迷宫终点，那么这就构成了实质性优势，判罚升级适用。违规处理方针之所以这样撰写，是为了让主审在处理此类升级时拥有较大的裁量权。不过，我们也要提醒你不要对这个问题过度解读。就像你盯着一套牌看久了总能看出些记号来一样，你也完全可能盯着单一一张牌，然后脑补出各种极端场景，让你觉得知晓那张树林在牌库中的位置也是一种实质性优势。

## 3.9 Insufficient Shuffling 未充分洗牌

*Penalty Warning 处罚警告*

## DEFINITION 定义

A player unintentionally fails to sufficiently shuffle their deck or a portion of their deck before presenting it to their opponent, or fails to present it to their 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 their deck.

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。

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 their 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.

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 Cheating.

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。

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”。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player forgets to shuffle their library after searching for a card.  
A. 牌手在搜寻一张牌之后忘了洗他的牌库。
- B. A player searches for a card, then gives the library a single riffle-shuffle before presenting the library to their opponent.  
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。
- C. A player fails to shuffle the portion of their library revealed during the resolution of a cascade ability.  
C. 牌手没有将因结算倾曳而展示的部分牌库洗牌。

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 common one seen

among inexperienced players, or players in a hurry — those who just give the library 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.

第一个例子很简单，“唉？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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

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.

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。

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.

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。

However, as the opponent has the opportunity to shuffle after the player does, the potential for advantage is lowered if tournament policy is followed.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

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 shuffled anymore, and you have to start again. In Team games, shuffling away from yourself but towards your teammate is also bad.

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。

A player should shuffle their deck using multiple methods. Patterned pile-shuffling is only allowed at the start of a game.

牌手应使用多种方式洗牌；有规律的分堆洗牌只能在一盘游戏一开始时使用。

When shuffling, multiple types of shuffles should be used together to ensure randomization. Six to eight riffle or "mash" shuffles is sufficient to randomize a deck. A pile shuffle is not shuffling. It is not part of shuffling. It doesn't count. You can do it once per game in order to count your cards prior to presenting. If a player pile shuffles more than once, don't give a penalty, and instead instruct the player on correct shuffling techniques.

当洗牌时，应该使用多种方式洗你的牌库以保证随机化。六到八次的插洗或鸽尾式洗牌就足够使套牌随机化。分堆洗牌不是洗牌，它甚至不是洗牌的一部分，并不算数。你可以在游戏开始前、呈现套牌之前为了清点牌张数量，每盘游戏进行一次分堆洗牌。如果牌手分堆洗牌多于一次，不要给判罚，但应指导牌手使用正确的洗牌方式。

Any manipulation, weaving, or stacking prior to randomization is acceptable, as long as the deck is thoroughly shuffled afterwards.

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。

When a player sits down, their 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.

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”。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

Shuffle the appropriate portion of the deck thoroughly.

对套牌的对应部分充分洗牌。

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 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.

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。同样这也可防止牌手指责裁判“你帮我洗完之后我掏的就好烂。”。

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。

## 4.0 Unsporting Conduct 举止违背运动道德

Unsporting conduct is disruptive behavior that may affect the safety, competitiveness, enjoyment, or integrity of a tournament in a significantly negative fashion.

举止违背运动道德是具干扰性的行为，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。

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 tournament experience. As judges we need to be watchful for things that can create negative experiences for players, and deal with them as appropriate.

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情况，并恰当的处理它们。

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."

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”。

It's important to make this clarification. If a player is not being nice to you, that doesn't necessarily mean they are 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 their "game face" on.

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。

The Head Judge is the final arbiter on what constitutes unsporting conduct.

主审是判定举止是否举止违背运动道德的最终仲裁者。

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.

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。

Judges should inform the player how their 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 their actions is important, judges should focus first on calming a situation, and deal with infractions and penalties afterwards.

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。

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 their 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 them a penalty at that moment will probably make things worse. Get control of the situation, and then worry about infractions.

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。

## 4.1 Minor 轻微

### *Penalty Warning 处罚警告*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player takes action that is disruptive to the tournament or its participants.

牌手的个人行为对比赛或是参与者产生干扰。

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 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.

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.

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. However, you also need to be cautious to not over-apply what is disruptive by taking the most extreme definition.

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 because we can. 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."

Finally, if the disruptive behavior is neither Unsporting Conduct — Major nor Aggressive Behavior, then it is Unsporting Conduct — Minor.

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。

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。

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人们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。然而，也要注意不要过度解读牌手的行动，而采取最极端的定义。

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单纯炫耀权力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。

最后，如果干扰行为既不能归类为举止违背运动道德～严重，也不能归类为攻击性举止，那么它就是举止违背运动道德～轻微。

It may affect the comfort level of those around the individual, but determining whether this is the case is not required.

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。

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 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. Additionally, you can always construct a fictitious person that would be discomfited by any action. Avoid using this method when determining if an action should be infractions, and instead rely on what is reasonable.

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。对于上面这句话而言，反过来的情形也是如此。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一个警告，或者必须更换这张牌。此外，你总能构想出一个会因任何举动而感到不适的虚构人物。在判定某项行为是否违规时，请避免使用这种方式，而应依据常理来判断。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player uses excessively vulgar and profane language.  
A. 牌手使用过度粗俗不雅的言语。
- B. A player inappropriately demands to a judge that their opponent receive a penalty.  
B. 牌手无理地要求裁判去处罚其对手。
- C. A player appeals to the Head Judge before waiting for the floor judge to issue a ruling.  
C. 牌手在巡场裁判作出判罚之前就上诉至主审。
- D. A player throws their deck on the ground after losing a game.  
D. 牌手在输掉游戏后将套牌摔向地面。
- E. A player leaves excessive trash in the play area after leaving the table.  
E. 牌手离开座位时将过多的垃圾留在游戏区域。
- F. A player fails to follow the request of a tournament official to leave the play area.  
F. 牌手未遵从比赛工作人员的要求，例如请离比赛区域。

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?

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？

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

All participants should expect a safe and enjoyable environment at a tournament, and a player needs to be made aware if their behavior is unacceptable so that this environment may be maintained.

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。

Unfortunately, not everyone you meet at a 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.

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.

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.

不幸的是，并非每一个你在比赛中遇到的人都能够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。

穿着冒犯性的服装通常不属于自己违规的范畴。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。

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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

The player must correct the problem immediately.

该牌手必须立即更正问题。

A player who commits unsporting conduct must be educated that their behavior is not acceptable. Regardless of whether or not the player understands how the behavior is unacceptable, they are expected to stop.

举止违背运动道德牌手必须接受教育——他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。

Subsequent Unsporting Conduct — Minor infractions, even for different offenses, will result in a Game Loss.

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。

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 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.

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。

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.

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 their actions were unacceptable.

If you want a deeper knowledge about USC you can read this great Unsporting Conduct Article.

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助益。

如果你需要更深入地了解举止违背运动道德，你可以阅读[这篇文章](#)。

## 4.2 Major 严重

*Penalty Match Loss 处罚一局负*

As explained below, the penalty for this infraction is sometimes upgraded to Disqualification.

如下所述，此违规的处罚有时会升级为取消资格。

## DEFINITION 定义

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.

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, Unsporting Conduct — 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 Unsporting Conduct — Major, this is no longer the case. This infraction has been expanded to include a wider category of unacceptable behavior.

For the purposes of identifying this infraction, it is important to consider whether or not a player's 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 blog article.

Note that it is possible for a player to commit this infraction by potentially causing these feelings in individuals other than their 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 their actions is not their current round opponent.

Finally, it should be pointed out that actual incidents of Unsporting Conduct — 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.

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。

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犯者产生上述感受。是否有人确实产生上述感受并非是必要的。为了进一步说明这一点，请看Sean Catanese博客中这篇[优秀文章](#)。

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。

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。因为万智牌牌手首先是人，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。

This may include insults based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, gender, disability, or sexual orientation.

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。

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, they should consider only how others might be expected to react to it.

Furthermore, the infraction doesn't depend on whether or not anybody was actually made to feel any of these ways. The IPG 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.

Similarly, a generic comment that merely annoys or offends another person is not necessarily sufficient for Unsporting Conduct — 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.

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。

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。

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。

Threats of physical violence should be treated as Unsporting Conduct – Aggressive Behavior.

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。

Threats of violence, be they explicit or implied, represent an even more serious category of problems that should be dealt with even more severely. Unsporting Conduct — Major does not cover these.

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。

It is possible for an offender to commit this infraction without intending malice or harm to the subject of the harassment.

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。

Realistically, most incidents of Unsporting Conduct — 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.

In fact, if a player committing Unsporting Conduct — Major does so with malicious intent, meaning they have 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.

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。

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。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player uses a racial slur against their opponent.  
A. 牌手诋毁对手的人种。
- B. A player intentionally misgenders their opponent.  
B. 牌手故意错判对手的性别。
- C. A player takes inappropriate photos of another player without express permission.  
C. 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。
- D. A player asks a spectator for a date, is denied, and continues to press the issue.  
D. 牌手意图约会某位旁观者，但在遭拒后依然不依不饶。
- E. A player purposefully obstructs another player with the intent of inducing physical contact.  
E. 牌手故意阻挡其他牌手，意图寻衅滋事。
- F. A spectator uses social media to bully another player.  
F. 牌手利用社交媒体欺侮其他牌手。

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 Unsporting Conduct — Major. It may be helpful to refer back to these after reading through some other sections of this annotation.

## ANTI-EXAMPLES

Z. After losing a game, a player physically threatens their opponent using a racial slur and saying they'll see them in the parking lot.

While it is true that this certainly could be expected to cause feelings of harassment and threat, this is not Unsporting Conduct — Major because it more appropriately meets the definition of Aggressive

Behavior. Threatening violence is a more serious concern and so takes precedence.

Y. After losing their match, a player throws their chair in anger at a group of spectators, but doesn't actually hit any of them.

Again, this is not Unsporting Conduct — Major. Violence directed toward someone is more properly categorized as Aggressive behavior.

X. A player refuses to shake their opponent's hand after losing a close game. The opponent, with no reason to believe otherwise, assumes that the refusal is due to their gender.

This is not Unsporting Conduct — Major or any other infraction, really. As said in the introduction to Unsporting Conduct, 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.

W. A player opens their sealed pool and exclaims to themselves in disgust, "These cards are gay!"

Once again, this is not Unsporting Conduct — Major, but does sound like it may be Unsporting Conduct — Minor. While statements like this are sure to offend some people, they are a lot less 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 Unsporting Conduct — Major, it must reasonably potentially cause one or more of these feelings. Note that in issuing the Unsporting Conduct — Minor infraction, the player should still be talked to about this behavior and told to knock it off.

V. A player in a losing position repeatedly shouts expletives to themselves during their match and is issued a Warning for Unsporting Conduct — Minor. During the next round, that player continues to use the same expletives.

Similarly, this is not Unsporting Conduct — Major. Repeated infractions of Unsporting Conduct — Minor do not automatically upgrade the infraction to Unsporting Conduct — Major. Please refer to the Unsporting Conduct — Minor infraction in the IPG for guidance on dealing with recurrences of that error.

U. A player, Nevin has Xe/Xem/Xyr pronouns is in a match against Sky (She/Her). Sky calls a judge and during the call misgenders Nevin using he/him pronouns. Nevin moves uncomfortably and Sky says, "Oh, um, Xe. Xe tapped out for..." and proceeds with the judge question.

This is not Unsporting Conduct — Major. The concept of intentionality is often found by either remorse from the player who misgendered or by rapid self-correction. The investigation for intention is usually fairly easy as those intentionally misgendering are oft eager to tell you.

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。

反例:

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。

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，因为这更符合攻击性举止。暴力威胁是更严重的问题，所以优先考虑。

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。

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攻击性举止。

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。

事实上，这不是举止违背运动道德 ~ 严重或者任何其他违规。如举止违背运动道德的介绍中所说，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. 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”

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、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. 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。

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。

U. 牌手Nevin对自己使用Xe/Xem/Xyr代词，正在与Sky (她) 进行对局。Sky 呼叫裁判，并在陈述过程中使用he/him (他) 指代 Nevin，错称了其性别。Nevin表现出不适，Sky随即说道：“噢，嗯，是 Xe. Xe 横置了……”然后继续向裁判提问。

这不属于举止违背运动道德 ~ 严重。判断是否存在「蓄意」，通常取决于错称性别的牌手是否表现出懊悔，或者是否进行了快速的自我纠正。对蓄意与否的调查通常很容易，因为那些故意错称性别人往往恨不得直接告诉你。（译注：Xe/Xem/Xyr: 这是一组英语中的中性代词，用于非二元性别者。在中文语境下很难完美对应。）

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

A safe environment is a basic expectation of any tournament attendee. Harassment undermines the safety and integrity of a tournament.

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。

Players who purposefully create harmful or unwelcoming situations in a tournament are expected to immediately correct the behavior and demonstrate remorse or be removed.

在比赛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 their words or actions, the penalty for the infraction should be upgraded to Disqualification as explained later.

Determining whether or not a player has demonstrated remorse requires at least a basic level of attentiveness and empathy. Statements such as “I’m sorry,” and “I shouldn’t have done that,” are good indications that a player regrets their 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 their 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.

A player not demonstrating sincere remorse should be informed that continuing to not do so will result in their 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 tournament. Note that, “I don’t agree with you, but I’ll stop,” should be an acceptable response.

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。

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有机会对自己的违规行为表示懊悔。

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。

Because of the confrontational nature of this infraction, judges need to end any match in progress and separate the players.

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，

Some judicious teamwork may be a useful approach, here. For example, the attending judge might ask to speak to the offending player privately. After they have been escorted from the playing area, another assisting judge might then inform the opponent that they will be receiving a win for the current match, assist them with gathering their belongings, and then ask them 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 them back to the playing area to retrieve their belongings without risk of further confrontation.

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。

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.

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。

Handling aggressive behavior with more aggressive behavior is a poor way to approach a situation, as it 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 them 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 them, let them vent, and do whatever else is needed to calm the offending player down.

It is important for judges to remember to themselves remain calm. When dealing with Unsporting Conduct — 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.

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。

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。

They may need a few moments to cool down afterwards.

此后牌手可能需要一段时间冷静。

Judges should take their time dealing with all players involved in Unsporting Conduct — 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.

Because the penalty for this infraction is a Match Loss, it is unlikely that issuing it will result in much delay to the entire tournament, 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.

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。

因此此违规的判罚是一局负，给出此判罚一般不会对整场比赛造成太多的拖延，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。

Apologizing is encouraged, but the desire of the other individuals to not interact with their harasser must be respected.

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。

One of the main reasons why the penalty for Unsporting Conduct — Major is a Match Loss is that assessing it immediately disengages the offending player from their 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.

However, a player eager to apologize is a good indication that they are demonstrating enough remorse to be allowed to continue playing after receiving their penalty. This is true even if they are not given the chance to deliver it.

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。

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。

Officials must investigate these matters as soon as they are brought to their attention.

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。

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 Unsporting Conduct — 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.

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。

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.

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。

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, Unsporting Conduct — Minor. Judges should refer to that infraction to make sure that the player's behavior matches up to what's described therein.

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. Pro-activity 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.

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。

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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

The player must correct the behavior immediately.

牌手必须立刻改正其行为。

The outward display of remorse and a tacit agreement to not repeat the unacceptable behavior is generally all that's necessary for correction, here. As described above, apologies should be encouraged, but they are not usually required.

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，道歉是值得鼓励的，但是一般不要求牌手致歉。

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.

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。

As a rule of thumb, if a player committing Unsporting Conduct — 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.

Note that this represents a very different philosophy from that of most other infractions found in the IPG. 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 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 Unsporting Conduct — Major.

The reason for this difference in philosophy is simple. Unlike most other infractions, it's possible for a player to commit Unsporting Conduct — 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 their 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.

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，并且有必要的话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。

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，或马上要输了。然而这并不适用于举止违背运动道德 ~ 严重。

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被接受的。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。

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.

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。

This is an admittedly tricky section of the policy, as the term “malicious intent” isn’t especially well-defined. However, what this is getting at is that judges need to use some careful discernment to investigate the intent behind Unsporting Conduct — 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.

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 (Aggressive Behavior), is still actively choosing to harm someone. That player does not belong in a Magic tournament.” Players fitting this profile should be disqualified and removed from the venue.

A player taking inappropriate photos of another player because they think 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 they think that they can convince them to change their mind is probably not acting with malicious intent. A player continuing to ask because they know it makes them feel uncomfortable probably is. A player using a racial slur because they are 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.

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 Unsporting Conduct — Major maliciously; there may be deeper issues with them than simple ignorance. Sometimes Disqualification is the only suitable option.

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.

For more information, read these articles from Toby Elliott on the M15 Policy changes and from Sean Catanese on the updates to Unsporting Conduct — Major.

必须承认方针的这一部分有些复杂，因为“恶意企图”不好被定义。然而，裁判需要敏锐的洞察力来调查牌手违规的意图，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。

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（即攻击性举止），仍然是主动伤害他人。这样的牌手不能留在万智牌比赛中”。符合这项定义的牌手应当被取消资格并逐出赛场。

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。

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，一局负的目的在于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。

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。

更多信息参见Toby Elliott的[M15方针更新](#)或者Sean Catanese的[举止违背运动道德～严重更新](#)。

## 4.3 Improperly Determining a Winner 不当决定胜方

*Penalty Match Loss 处罚一局负*

### **DEFINITION 定义**

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, or uses language designed to trick someone who may not know it's against the rules to make such an offer.

牌手利用或提议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，或用言语诱使不知悉此行为属于违规的某人做出提议。

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.

As a result, even just offering to use an outside-the-game-method (or an illegal action within the game) falls into this infraction.

The opponent no longer is expected to call a judge, if they receive an offer.

You are also prohibited from trying to trick your opponent into making an offer to improperly determine a winner. Saying something like "Oh no. If we draw it is bad for both of us, if only there was something we could do" is prohibited.

Note: While the association with gambling factors into the reason the penalty is a Match Loss (or DQ), please keep in mind that when explaining the penalty to players, they aren't going to care about that part of the justification. You should focus on how rolling undermines the game and the fairness to other players

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。

因此，仅仅只是提议一个比赛外方法（或非法的游戏行动）来决定胜方也是触犯此违规的。

现在，如果对手收到了提议，他无需叫裁判。

试图引诱对手做出不当决定胜方的提议也是禁止的。说出诸如「糟了。如果打平对我们都不好，不如我们……？」此类的话是不允许的。

注意：虽然与赌博的关联是该判罚被定为一局负（或取消资格）的考量因素之一，但请记住，在向牌手解释判罚时，他们并不会关心这部分的理由。你应该着重解释掷骰子（决定胜负）是如何破坏游戏本质以及损害对其他牌手的公平性的。

If the player was aware that what they were doing was against the rules, the infraction is Unsporting Conduct — Cheating.

若牌手知悉其所作所为乃违规行为，则属于举止违背运动道德～作弊。

We still want to treat this infraction seriously, but we do not want to DQ players who genuinely did not know this was illegal. At local stores where rules are a bit more relaxed, players might not know. We still want to educate and correct, but a DQ is too extreme. However, if players know that they are not allowed to do this, then a DQ is appropriate. Additionally, knowing that offering to roll a dice is illegal, and deliberately trying to trick your opponent into making an offer so that you can win shows a level awareness of what you are doing is wrong.

What are actions that are "not part of the current game"? The IPG provides some helpful examples:

我们仍然想要严肃对待此类违规，但我们不想DQ真的不知道这样做是不允许的牌手。在规则相对较松的本地牌店，牌手可能会不知道。我们仍然想要教育并纠正牌手，但是DQ有些太极端了。然而，如果牌手知道他们不被允许如此做，那么DQ就是合适的。更有甚者，知道扔骰子是不允许的、所以故意试图引诱对手做出此类提议、并借此获得胜利的手段更能显示出你有多么清楚你这么做是错误的。

什么行为是「不属于当前游戏的方法」？IPG提供了很多有用的例子：

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. As time is called, two players about to draw roll a die to determine the winner.
- A. 比赛时间结束时，本该平手的两位牌手以掷骰来决定胜负。
- B. A player offers to flip a coin to determine the winner of a match.
- B. 牌手提议以掷铜板来决定对局的胜方。
- C. Two players arm wrestle to determine the winner of the match.
- C. 两位牌手比腕力来决定对局的胜方。
- D. Two players play rock-paper-scissors to decide if they should play the match or draw.
- D. 两位牌手猜拳决定是否要进行对局或者约和。
- 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.
- 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。
- F. Two players reveal cards from the top of their libraries to see "who would win" after extra turns.
- F. 两位牌手展示各自牌库顶牌，决定延长回合之后“谁会赢”。
- G. A player says "Oh no, we're going to draw, that's terrible for us. If only there were something we could do about it."
- G. 牌手说“平了大家都遭殃，要是咱们能用‘某种办法’来分出胜负就好了。”

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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Using an outside-the-game method to determine a winner compromises the integrity of the tournament.

使用游戏之外的方式来决定胜方，会危害比赛的公平性。

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 match and the tournament as a whole. It affects other matches and other players’ standings in the event. Rolling a die to determine the winner is playing the system, not playing the game.

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。

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.

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。

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.

That said, if a player asks their opponent to concede because they have 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.

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。

虽然如此，若一位牌手在对局时间结束时因为他的游戏局势占绝对优势更高而请他的对手投降，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。

## 4.4 Bribery and Wagering 贿赂与赌博

*Penalty Match Loss 处罚一局负*

### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player offers an incentive to entice an opponent into conceding, drawing, or changing the results of a match, encourages such an offer, or accepts such an offer. Refer to section 5.2 of the Magic Tournament Rules for a more detailed description of what constitutes bribery.

牌手提供奖励来诱使对手认输、约和，或改变对局结果，牌手鼓动此类行为，或是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》第 5.2 节的详细叙述。

Where the IPG says “refer to the Magic Tournament Rules,” it means “everything on the subject of Bribery 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.

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 intentionally draw so we can go get some food before the next round" is not an offer or an incentive, and as such is acceptable.

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.

Players can use information regarding the results of another match to determine if they want to offer to intentionally draw. However, they cannot consult those other matches, or reach an agreement with them.

In some events, during the single elimination, the players may decide to split all the prizes evenly. This requires the Tournament Organizer's agreement, and must be unanimous amongst the players.

IPG提到“请参照《万智牌比赛规则》中的叙述”，表示“除判罚外，任何关于贿赂的内容都在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。

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。

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。

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。

在某些比赛中，单淘赛阶段牌手可以决定将所有奖品平分。这必须得到比赛主办人的同意，并且必须得到所有牌手的同意。

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 their own match.

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自己的对局。

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 they run the risk of damaging the image of Magic as a whole, beyond that single event. There have been cases where events like FNM were shut down by local law enforcement because they felt it was breaking gambling laws. This is the kind of thing Wizards of the Coast doesn't want people to think of when they think of their game.

Wagering requires two or more people to be risking something. Offering a bounty on a player is not wagering. "I'll give you a booster if you beat my friend" is only one person risking something, and even then they're hoping they do have to give the booster away.

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，若裁判不对此采取行动，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。

赌博需要两位或更多牌手在某事上冒险。为牌手提供赏金不属于赌博。“如果你打败我的朋友，我就给你一包”只有一位牌手在冒险，而且即使如此他们也希望他们能够真的把这一包给出去。

If the player was aware that what they were doing was against the rules, the infraction is Unsporting Conduct — Cheating.

若牌手知悉其所作所为乃违规行为，则属于举止违背运动道德～作弊。

This infraction assumes that the player or players have no knowledge that bribery or wagering are not against the rules. Knowing it is against the rules changes the infraction to Unsporting Conduct – Cheating.

这项违规假定涉事的牌手不知道赌博或贿赂是规则所不允许的。如果牌手知道，违规就变成举止违背运动道德～作弊。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player in a Swiss round offers their opponent \$100 to concede the match.

A. 牌手在瑞士轮的对局之中，提供100美金来让对手认输。

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.

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。

B. A player offers their opponent a card in exchange for a draw.

B. 牌手愿意给对手一张牌，用以交换平手。

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.

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。

C. A player asks for a concession in exchange for a prize split.

C. 牌手要求平分奖品来交换认输。

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.

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。

- 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.
- 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。

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.

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。

- E. Two spectators place a bet on the number of games that will be needed to decide a match.
- E. 两位观众下注，赌某对局要打几盘才会结束。

This is a great example of wagering that you might not have immediately thought of.

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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Bribery and wagering disrupt the integrity of the tournament and are strictly forbidden.

贿赂和赌博会干扰比赛的公平性，必须严格禁止。

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 potentially no longer decided by games of Magic. Because this can be so damaging and difficult to catch, it's penalized.

Earlier versions of the IPG had this penalty as Disqualification because of the severity of the disruption to the integrity of the tournament, that is still the case, using Unsporting Conduct – Cheating, if the player knew bribery or wagering were against the rules. It's a lot harder to provide education to a player unaware that a small bet or what they thought was a valid prize split is against the rules when filling out disqualification paperwork than explaining why they are receiving a match loss.

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——比赛结果可能不再是根据万智牌对局本身来决定的。因为这种行为伤害极大并且难以被发现，必须对其进行判罚。

这项违规的判罚在先前版本的IPG中是取消资格，其原因是这种违规对比赛公正性的影响十分严重。现在如果牌手知道贿赂或赌博是违反规则的，判罚仍然是取消资格，但使用的是举止违背运动道德~作

弊。对于没有意识到赌点小钱或是自认为合法的分奖品是规则所不允许的牌手而言，向其解释为什么他们会吃到一个局负比起直接让他们写DQ陈述更容易起到教育效果。

## 4.5 Aggressive Behavior 攻击性举止

### *Penalty Disqualification 处罚 取消资格*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player acts in a threatening way towards others or their property.

牌手对他人或是他人的拥有物进行威胁性的行动。

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), 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，攻击性举止是基于肢体动作或有意伤害他人身体的言论。

#### **EXAMPLES 范例**

A. A player threatens to hit another player who won't concede to him.

A. 牌手威胁要殴打不愿认输的对手。

B. A player pulls a chair out from under another player, causing them to fall to the ground.

B. 牌手将别的牌手所坐的椅子拉开，使该牌手摔在地上。

C. A player makes threats against a judge after receiving a ruling.

C. 牌手在得到规则解释之后威胁裁判。

D. A player tears up a card belonging to another player.

D. 牌手撕毁他人拥有的牌张。

E. A player intentionally turns over a table.

E. 牌手故意翻到桌子。

These examples make it pretty clear what 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 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。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

The safety of all people at a tournament is of paramount importance. There will be no tolerance of physical abuse or intimidation.

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。

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。

## ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正

The offender should be asked to leave the venue by the organizer.

比赛主办人必须要求该牌手离开赛场。

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. They will be disqualified. Be sure to collect a statement from the player if they are 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 Organizer to make this decision, 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.

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。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。

## 4.6 Theft of Tournament Materials 窃取比赛用品

*Penalty Disqualification 处罚 取消资格*

### DEFINITION 定义

A player steals materials from the tournament, including but not limited to cards or tournament equipment.

牌手偷拿比赛物品，例如牌或是比赛的配备。

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 tournament. Theft of an EDH deck of a player enrolled in a Standard event is not Theft of Tournament Material. It is still unacceptable though, and the TO should still be notified. Stealing is wrong.

偷窃是不可接受的行为。此类行径在万智牌比赛中正如在一般社会中一样，均是无法容忍的。这里有一条明确的界线：要适用此项判罚，被盗物品必须属于比赛物品。偷窃一位报名参加标准赛的牌手的指挥官套牌，并不属于偷窃比赛物品。但这依然是不可接受的，且仍应通知比赛主办人。偷窃是错误的行为。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player steals cards from the sideboard of their opponent.  
A. 牌手偷拿对手备牌里的牌。
- B. A player steals the table number from a table.  
B. 牌手偷拿桌号牌。
- C. A player realizes they have a previous opponent's card, but they hide it instead of telling a tournament official.  
C. 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。

Example C 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 they notice the issue. However, a player noticing that they still accidentally have their last round opponent's Thragtusk in their 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."

例子C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”。

## PHILOSOPHY 原则

Players enter a tournament expecting that their materials will be protected.

牌手加入比赛之后，他们的物品就应该受到保护。

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.

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。

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.

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。

Theivery is an ever-present concern, and keeping an eye on one's own stuff is important. Despite constant reminders from judges, Tournament Organizers, and here even the IPG itself, it's rare to get through a large tournament 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.

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。

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.

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 Material, although the outcome (the removal of the player from your tournament) 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.

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。

## **ADDITIONAL REMEDY 进一步的修正**

The offender should be asked to leave the venue by the organizer.

比赛主办人必须要求该牌手离开赛场。

With or without the police, depending on the circumstance.

是否需要警方介入，视具体情况而定。

## **4.7 Stalling 拖延**

### *Penalty Disqualification 处罚 取消资格*

#### **DEFINITION 定义**

A player intentionally plays slowly in order to take advantage of the time limit.

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 they attempt 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 their sideboard or graveyard for no strategic reason.

Alternatively, the player may act as if they are 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。

If the slow play is not intentional, please refer to Tournament Error — Slow Play instead.

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, pieces of power, 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 Stalling.

The key thing to look for when issuing a penalty for Stalling is intent. If there wasn't intent on the part of the player, then the appropriate infraction is Slow Play.

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、珍贵卡牌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，那么违规就不是拖延。

判断拖延的关键点在于牌手的意图。如果牌手不是有意的，适用的违规是游戏进行过慢。

## EXAMPLES 范例

A. A player has two lands in their 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.

A. 牌手上只有两张地牌，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。

A player encounters a situation where they realize that there's no significant play available, but knows the opponent has no way of verifying this. The player intentionally acts as though they have 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.

牌手意识到他并无法做出有意义的游戏行动，但他知道对手没有办法觉察这一点。该牌手假装他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。

B. A player is ahead in games and significantly slows down their pace of play so the opponent has little chance to catch up.

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。

A player wins the first game and realizes that instead of winning a second game, they could waste the time that the opponent would need to catch up by intentionally playing slowly.

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。

C. A player playing slowly appeals a warning in an attempt to gain advantage by having more time to make a decision.

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。

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. 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 they then appeal, 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.

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/她认为它可以滥用上诉程序作为获得时间的手段。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。

D. A player intentionally mulligans slowly before the third game in an attempt to make it harder for their opponent to win in time.

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。

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 their time sideboarding, shuffling, and mulliganing to eat up time in an effort to force the match to a draw.

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。

E. A player losing a game starts slowing down the pace of play in an attempt to run out the clock.

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。

A player knows that they are about to lose the current game, but realizes it is possible to draw the match if the opponent is unable to "finish them off" in time. Knowing that a draw is better than a loss, that player begins to slow their rate of play to below a reasonable pace to deny the opponent the time needed.

一位牌手知道他即将输掉当前这一盘，但意识到，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。

## 4.8 Cheating 作弊

*Penalty Disqualification 处罚 取消资格*

### DEFINITION 定义

A person breaks a rule defined by the tournament documents, lies to a tournament official, or notices an offense committed in their (or a teammate's) match and does not call attention to it.

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。

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.

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.

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.

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。

"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。

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。

Additionally, the offense must meet the following criteria for it to be considered Cheating:

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”：

- The player must be attempting to gain advantage from their action.
- 该牌手确实意图利用自身的行动来获取优势。
- The player must be aware that they are doing something illegal.
- 该牌手确实知道自己之作为属违规行为，但仍决定如此作。

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.

Additionally, if a player is not attempting to gain advantage from their 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: Alex, who is at 6 life, attacks with a creature the turn it was summoned. Nat notices, but just takes the damage because they are holding 2 Lightning Bolts in their hand, and want to let Alex get in a hit so Alex doesn't feel as crushed when Nat wins next turn. In this case, Nat is not committing a cheating infraction (although it would be ruled Failure to Maintain Game State if there is a judge call from a spectator). 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 'nice'. It is your responsibility to determine as much of the truth as possible.

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.

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.

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。

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，Alex的生命值为6，用一个召唤失调的生物进攻。Nat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。他想让Alex多打一点时间，这样当他下回合击败Abe时，对方不会感到特别难受。这种情况下，Nat并没有犯下作弊此违规（但如果旁观者呼叫裁判，这可能被判为未维护游戏状态）。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。

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。

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。

If all criteria are not met, the offense is not Cheating and is handled by a different infraction.

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。

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.

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。

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.

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。

The ability to conduct investigations is highly prized by the judge community; it is one of the qualities of higher level 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 vigilant and ask questions. This particular skill is a hard one to develop as each potential situation is unique.

裁判社群对调查能力高度重视。这是高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。

## EXAMPLES 范例

- A. A player alters the results on a match slip without their opponent's knowledge.
  - A. 牌手在对手不知情的状况下更改对局的结果。
  - B. A player lies to a tournament official about what happened in a game to make their case stronger.
    - 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。
  - C. A player allows their opponent to put a creature into the graveyard even though the creature has not been dealt lethal damage.
    - 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。
  - D. A player notices that their opponent resolved only half of the triggered ability of Sword of Feast and Famine and decides not to call attention to the error.
    - D. 牌手注意到其对手仅部分结算了丰饗剑/Sword of Feast and Famine的触发式异能，但却决定不去寻求解决此失误。
  - E. A player peeks at another player's picks during the draft.
    - E. 牌手在轮抽过程中窥视其他牌手抽到的牌。
  - F. A player adds cards to their Sealed Deck pool.
    - F. 参加现开赛的牌手加额外的牌到他的牌池中。

G. A player realizes they have accidentally drawn an extra card, then fails to call a judge in order to avoid a penalty.

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。

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。这永远不是作弊，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。

## 附录 A ~ 处罚快速查询

违规	<b>Infraction</b>	处罚
<b>游戏行动失误</b> <i>Game Play Errors</i>		
遗漏触发	Missed Trigger	无
额外看牌	Looking at Extra Cards	警告
非公开牌张失误	Hidden Card Error	警告
再调度失误	Mulligan Procedure Error	警告
违反游戏规则	Game Rule Violation	警告
未维护游戏状态	Failure to Maintain Game State	警告
<b>比赛失误</b> <i>Tournament Errors</i>		
迟到	Tardiness	一盘负
外来协助	Outside Assistance	一局负
游戏进行过慢	Slow Play	警告
套牌登记表问题	Decklist Problem	一盘负
套牌问题	Deck Problem	警告
违反限制赛流程	Limited Procedure Violation	警告
违反交流原则	Communication Policy Violation	警告
有记号的牌	Marked Cards	警告
未充分洗牌	Insufficient Shuffling	警告
<b>举止违背运动道德</b> <i>Unsporting Conduct</i>		
举止违背运动道德 ~ 轻微	Unsporting Conduct – Minor	警告

违规	Infraction	处罚
举止违背运动道德 ~ 严重	Unsporting Conduct – Major	一局负
不当决定胜方	Improperly Determining a Winner	一局负
贿赂与赌博	Bribery and Wagering	一局负
攻击性举止	Aggressive Behavior	取消资格
窃取比赛用品	Theft of Tournament Material	取消资格
拖延	Stalling	取消资格
作弊	Cheating	取消资格

## 附录 B ~ 与之前版本的更动

---

2024年9月23日

- 1.2: 由于记录和收集方式因软件而异，故取消此方面的特别说明。
- 2.1: 遗忘传纪的回合动作，视为遗漏触发来处理。
- 2.1: 被遗漏的触发式异能仍认为已触发过。
- 2.5: 物件处于错误区域中的情况始终适用于部分修正，但仅当该GRV是由处于错误区域本身导致的。
- 3.5: 牌张数量错误的升级被分为两段内容，以厘清换备前与换备后对局两种不同情况之判断标准的区别。

2024年4月15日

- 2.3: Made it clearer that a morph returned to hand without reveal is not part of the upgrade path.
- 2.3: Added a clarification that the player needs to identify a morph problem before it is about to be discovered by the opponent.
- 3.4: Added wording to make presenting the wrong decklist to an opponent a Decklist Problem. \*3.5: Clarity on the order of when things happen once a problem has been discovered.
- 3.5: Companion restriction fix now parallels the normal error fix.
- 3.5: Removed the requirement that multiple copies of the card have to be discovered after the game has begun (can now happen during pregame procedures).

2024年2月2日

- 2.3: Upgrade language changed to account for disguise ability.