

Ninth Annual JAT Contest for New and Aspiring Translators (Japanese to English)

Source Text

経済産業省ニュースリリース

(経済産業省を名乗った架空請求が発生していますのでご注意ください)

http://assets.jat.org/documents/contests/ninth_jat_contest_new_translators_ja-en_text.pdf

The translations of award winners and finalists

1st place: [E25](#) Lucy Takato

2nd place: [E38](#) Kuochoe Nikoi-Kotei

Finalists: [E2](#) Ria Ludemann [E10](#) Kaley Kriminger [E17](#) Kimberly Miller [E30](#) Chris McCabe

Commentaries from the Judges

[Ruth McCreery](#) [Ken Wagner](#) [James Davis](#)

[E25] Lucy Takato

January 25, 2012

Scam Warning: False Claims for Money Misrepresenting the
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) is warning the public of a recent increase in consumer inquiries related to requests for money and other belongings from individuals acting under the guise of belonging to a division of METI (see below for details) or having some connection to the Ministry.

These cases concern consumers who have previously suffered losses through transactions on unlisted stocks or other investments. Typically, an individual claiming to represent METI calls and says "METI is processing repayment for past losses, however, we would like you to transfer money to cover the related costs," requesting money for non-existent "costs" in a malicious false-claims scheme.

The public should be aware that METI does not initiate court cases for the return of losses on

behalf of victims in individual cases, nor does it conduct civil negotiation or mediation. In the event that you receive suspicious contact from an individual purported to belong to a division of METI, we request that you verify the facts with the METI Consumer Counseling Office. If you are a victim of this scheme, please also contact your local police station.

1. Modus Operandi

- ① Someone posing as a representative of a department at METI (using either fictitious or real names) makes telephone calls to people who have suffered losses in the purchase of unlisted stocks or other investments. They inform the individual that they are entitled to repayment of losses and request money to cover the processing costs (such as transaction fees and cash collateral).
- ② In some cases, another phone call under the guise of the police or some organization related to METI—coming prior to or following the main call—is made in an attempt to convince victims of the legitimacy of the repayment of previous losses.
- ③ In the majority of cases, victims are told to send cash by regular post to a designated location.

4. Consultation Examples (For reference)

[Case1]

A phone call came from an individual posing as A from the Metropolitan Police Department Crime Management Joint Investigation Headquarters, who said, “we found your contact details while conducting investigations in to overseas investment fraud. The METI Consumer Counseling Office is currently processing the repayment of past losses, so we have passed on your contact details to the METI Consumer Counseling Office.”

Following that, a phone call came from individual B purporting to belong to the METI Consumer Counseling Office. The victim was told “we will repay your past losses, but we require that you pay 15% of the value of the losses as a transaction fee. Repayment to you will be made via the Consumer Protection and Promotion Council.” The victim was requested to send 900,000 yen, an amount difficult for them to pay so they were told “if you have credit cards or mobile phones then we would like you to send them.” The victim sent two credit cards, 100,000 yen worth of precious metals, and 240,000 yen in cash to the Consumer Protection and Promotion Council. The victim was contacted once again to be told “we need you to send more money as the amount you sent is insufficient for the repayment of losses to be made,” following which they sent an additional 490,000 yen in cash.

When the repayment for losses was not credited in to the victim's bank account on the designated day, they contacted METI.

[E38] Kuochoe Nikoi-Kotei

January 25th, 2012

Beware of fraudulent requests for money purporting to be from the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

There has been a recent increase in the number of consumers contacting the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)'s Consumer Inquiry Counter regarding fraudulent requests for money they have received that claim to originate from a department of the Ministry (see below) or an affiliated organization.

These false requests come in the form of phone calls directed at consumers who have sustained financial losses through private equity deals and similar transactions. The calls purport to be from METI and contain malicious, fictitious requests for money. One frequent claim the scammers make is that the Ministry is processing refunds of monies lost in the past and that the target will need to send the processing fee to facilitate the process.

Please be informed that the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry has not filed a civil action lawsuit aimed at refunding monies lost to individuals who have lost money, neither does the Ministry act as an intermediary or mediator in civilian matters. If you receive any suspicious contact from a person claiming to work for a Ministry department, please contact the Ministry's Consumer Inquiry Counter to confirm the call's validity. Should you happen to fall victim to this scam, please contact your nearest police station immediately.

1. Chief modes of operation

- ① A person who has lost money through the purchase of private equity receives a phone call professing to come from a real or fictional METI department. The caller claims that the target will receive a refund of the amount they have lost, but that they will need to pay the "processing costs" (handling fees, guarantee, etc) involved.
- ② In some cases, the person also receives a call falsely claiming to be from either the police or from an agency affiliated with the Ministry. This purpose of this call is to convince the target that he or she will definitely get their money back.
- ③ In many cases, the target is asked to send the money requested by paying cash to a specific address through the Post Office.

4. Examples (for reference)

Case 1

The victim received a phone call from a person calling himself "A", an alleged member of the Joint Investigation Headquarters of the Crime Control Division of the Metropolitan Police Department. "A" told the victim that he found her contact details while investigating a foreign investment scam. He claimed that government agencies were currently carrying out proceedings to recover funds lost in the past, and that this process was being led by the Consumer Affairs Division of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. "A" added that he had passed the victim's contact details on to the Ministry.

This phone call was later followed by another from someone claiming to be "B" from METI's Consumer Inquiry Counter. According to "B," the Ministry was in the process of recovering funds the victim had lost. To that end she would need to pay a processing fee to the tune of 15% of the amount lost, after which the refund would be paid through a so-called "Council for Consumer Conservation and Cultivation." The victim was asked to send 900,000 yen. When she found that hard to do, the scammer informed her that she could send a credit card or mobile phone instead. The victim therefore sent two credit cards, approximately 100,000 yen worth of jewelry and 240,000 yen in cash to the Council for Consumer Conservation and Cultivation. After this, she received a further phone call claiming the money sent was insufficient and asking her to send more, which she responded to by sending an additional 490,000 yen.

When the victim did not receive the promised refund in her bank account on the date she was told it would be paid in, she called METI to let them know she had not received her money.

[E2] Ria Ludemann

January 25, 2012

Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry's Name Being Used for Billing Fraud

The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) has been receiving increasing numbers of reports to its Consumer Inquiries Center of a scam where consumers are contacted and fraudulently billed by scammers who claim to have connections to, or belong to, a METI department (see details below).

The scam targets consumers who have previously lost money, for example by trading

unlisted stocks. The scammers impersonate METI employees over the phone, and request non-existent "fees" from victims by claiming that METI is in the process of recovering lost funds for them, but a processing fee is required to do so.

METI does not file civil lawsuits, or act as a go-between or mediator in civil cases, on behalf of victims who are owed damages from specific cases. If you have any doubts after being contacted by someone claiming to be from a METI division, please contact the METI Consumer Inquiries Center to verify the request. If you have been victimized by this scam, please contact a nearby police station as well.

1. Primary scamming method

(1) The scammer phones someone who has lost money by, for example, buying unlisted stocks. The scammer will claim to be from a division of METI, which may or may not exist. The scammer will inform the victim that their lost money will be returned to them, and then request the necessary "fees," such as processing fees or collateral.

(2) In some cases, the scammers will call again before or after the main scam call, impersonating the police or an institution related to METI, in order to add validity to their claim.

(3) Often, the scammers will request that victims mail cash to a specified address via the postal service.

4. Sample consumer report (for reference)

[Case 1]

A phone call came from a Mr. A of the Police Department's Crime Control and Investigation Headquarters. He said, "We found your contact information while investigating overseas investment fraud. A Japanese institution is in the process of recovering funds for victims, with the Consumer Inquiries Center of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry in charge. We have given your contact information to the Ministry."

After that call, a Mr. B called, saying he was from the Consumer Inquiries Center of METI. He said, "We will retrieve the money you lost. To do so, we need you to pay 15% of the amount as a processing fee. You will be paid via the Consumer Protection and Development Council." Then he requested 900,000 yen. Since sending the requested amount was difficult,

he said, "If you have credit cards or a cell phone, send those." I then mailed two credit cards, valuables worth 100,000 yen, and 240,000 yen in cash to the Consumer Protection and Development Council. I received another phone call claiming, "The amount you sent was not enough to cover the fees. Please send more." So I transferred another 490,000 yen.

The refund money wasn't deposited to my bank account on the specified day, so I called METI.

[E10] Kaley Kriminger

Alert – Recent Reports of Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry Scam

01/25/12

Recently, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry's consumer consultation service has seen an increase in reports of fraudulent phone calls demanding payment, purportedly from the ministry.

The scam targets consumers who have previously suffered losses from the trade of unlisted stocks, and involves the demand of payment of bogus "fees". Posing as a representative of certain departments of the ministry (listed below), the perpetrator calls the consumer. The perpetrator claims to be processing the consumer's restitution, and demands the payment of "processing fees".

At present, the ministry is not taking any civil action or conducting mediation on the behalf of affected consumers. If you are contacted by any suspicious parties claiming to be from the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, please verify the facts at the ministry's consultation window. Should you suffer any losses, we request that you also contact your local law enforcement agency.

1. How the scam works:

- 1) Perpetrator calls the consumer, claiming to be from an (either real or bogus) department of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. States that said consumer is to receive restitution, and requests "funds" (service charges, cash collateral, etc...) necessary for processing.
- 2) In some cases, either before or after this, the consumer receives a call from someone claiming to be from law enforcement or an organization related to the ministry, granting credibility to the "restitutions".

3) In many cases, the consumer is directed to send the funds by post, as cash.

4. Sample Consultation (for reference)

(Case 1)

Consumer received a call from an individual identifying himself as "A" from the Metropolitan Police Department's Joint Criminal Investigation Headquarters. Consumer was told that, "We received your contact details in connection with an investigation into a foreign investment scam. At present, government agencies are processing restitutions for past losses, and the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry's consultation office is handling your case. We have given them your contact information."

After that, consumer received a call from an individual identifying himself as "B" from the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry's consumer consultation office, and was told that, "In order to return your lost money, we would like for you to pay a 15% service charge. Your restitution will be paid through the Council for Consumer Protection." The caller demanded a transfer of ¥900,000. The requested fees were steep, but after being instructed to send any credit cards or cellular phones in its place, the consumer mailed 2 credit cards, ¥100,000 in precious metals, and ¥240,000 in cash to the Council for Consumer Protection. After receiving another phone call stating that, "The funds we received were insufficient. In order to award you your restitution, we need for you to send the remaining fees," the consumer transferred an additional ¥490,000.

When the restitution money hadn't been deposited into the consumer's account after the designated date had passed, he called the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry.

[E17] Kimberly Miller

The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI)

News Release

January 25, 2012

Please Beware of an Outbreak of "Advance-Fee Fraud" From Those Assuming the Name of The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry.

Lately we are receiving increasing inquiries from Consumer Counseling about a party using the name of The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (see below) and operating under the guise of having a relationship with METI. This is a case of Advance-Fee Fraud, where con

artists using The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry name are making calls to those who have suffered losses through the trading of unlisted stocks in the past. These con artists are requesting that the victims pay fictitious fees, and are saying things such as, "We at The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry are taking measures to reimburse past losses. We would like to have you transfer the fee for doing this." The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry is not filing a civil suit claim to reimburse losses to individual aggrieved parties, and is not using civil intermediaries or conducting settlements. If you have been contacted in a suspicious manner by someone using the name of The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry, in the eventuality that you have suffered any losses we implore you to contact your nearest police station as soon as you have determined whether the person who contacted you is actually affiliated with METI or not via METI's Consumer Counseling reception desk.

(...)

Main Points of the Scheme

1. Con artists phone those who have suffered losses through the purchase of unlisted stocks under the pretense that they are from the division in charge (there are cases of the use of both fictitious and current division names) at The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry. Telling the victim that they will reimburse his losses, etc. the con artist demands the payment of necessary processing fees (broker fee, security deposit, etc.).
2. There are also situations where the perpetrator makes calls back and forth under the guise of having an affiliation with the police and groups related to METI in order to have victims believe that their losses will be reimbursed.
3. Furthermore, there are many cases where the victim is instructed to send cash remittances to a designated address through the mail.

Consumer Counseling Reference Case #1

The victim received a call from a person taking the name of "A" from the Metropolitan Police Department Crime Control Division at the Joint Investigation Headquarters and was told that their contact information was found on an investigation contact list when "A" was conducting a criminal investigation into international investment fraud. The victim was told that Japanese agencies are currently taking steps to reimburse past losses, and The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry's Consumer Counseling Office is the group carrying out these procedures. The victim was additionally told that their contact information had been passed on to METI. Afterward, the victim received a call from someone using the name of "B"

at The Consumer Counseling Office within The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry, and was told that their past losses will be reimbursed, but in order to do so, "B" wants to have the victim pay 15% as a fee. "B" then told the victim that the damages will be paid through the Consumer Protection Development Committee, and requested a 900,000 yen remittance. When the victim responded that it would be difficult to remit the requested amount, the victim was told that if he is a credit card holder and has a cell phone, "B" would like to have him send them. The victim then sent two credit cards, the sizable amount of 100,000 yen worth of precious metals, and 240,000 yen in cash to the "Consumer Protection Development Committee." On account of a second call stating that the victim needs to pay again because the amount remitted wasn't enough to pay the fee for collecting damages, the victim remitted an additional 490,000 yen. When it became the day the victim was told damages would be paid into his account and they hadn't been transferred, the victim called The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry.

[E30] Chris McCabe

January 25, 2012

Warning: False Claims from Individuals Posing as METI Employees

Recently the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) has received an increasing number of consumer consultations regarding demands for cash payments from individuals posing as employees of METI or related institutions.

These individuals make telephone calls to consumers, who have incurred damages in past private equity transactions. They claim that the consumer must pay procedural expenses for damage repayments planning to be made to them by METI. These spurious "expenses" are actually malicious false claims.

METI does not file civil lawsuits on behalf of individual citizens seeking repayment of damages incurred, nor does it provide civil mediation or counsel.

If you receive suspicious contact from an individual claiming to be from METI, please report to METI's Consumer Consultation Line to verify the contact's legitimacy. Please also report to your local police station if the false claim happens to result in damages.

1. Main Claim Patterns

- ① Individual claiming to belong to a METI department (both real and false department names used) makes telephone call to consumer who has incurred loss in private equity purchase. Individual claims that damage repayments will be made to consumer and demands payment of "expenses" (fees, guarantee money, etc.).
- ② In some cases prior to or after telephone call, another individual posing as police officer or METI employee convinces consumer that purported damage repayment is legitimate.
- ③ In many cases, individual orders cash payments sent by post to a designated address.

4. Example Consultations

Case 1

Individual calls consumer by telephone claiming to be "Mr. A" of the National Police Agency Crime Control Department's Joint Investigation Office. Individual claims he is investigating overseas investment fraud and obtained consumer's contact information during investigation. Individual states that a national government agency is currently undertaking repayment of past damages incurred by consumer and that "METI's Consumer Consultation Office" is managing procedures. Individual states he has given consumer's contact information to METI.

Later, another individual calls by telephone claiming to be "Mr. B" of "METI's Consumer Consultation Office." Individual claims his office will make repayments for consumer's past damages and demands 900,000 yen (15% of purported repayment) as procedural fee. Consumer instructed to make payment to "METI's Consumer Protection and Awareness Association." Consumer states difficulty of remitting amount demanded but informed that required payment would be accepted by credit card or mobile telephone remittance. Consumer remits payment using two credit cards and mailing precious metals valuing 100,000 yen and cash valuing 240,000 yen. Thereafter, consumer again contacted by telephone and told that money remitted insufficient to complete purported damage repayments. Consumer then remits additional 490,000 yen.

Consumer calls METI when purported damage repayment not transferred to bank account on promised date.

Commentaries from the Judges

[Ruth McCreery](#) [Ken Wagner](#) [James Davis](#)

Ruth McCreery

The translator's goal is to communicate the content of the original text to the intended reader accurately and in an appropriate manner. As one of the founders of JAT, Fred Uleman, has often said, achieving those goals requires reading a little, thinking a little, and writing a little--and, I would add, repeating that process until the result works.

The text the contest participants were asked to translate is a news release from a government ministry. It has two purposes: to warn of a growing type of fraud, in sufficient detail that potential victims can recognize the criminal intent and avoid being taken in, and to protect that ministry's reputation by stating that it has no connection with the perpetrators of the fraud. It also corrects any expectation that the ministry would act on behalf of individuals in recovering losses.

An obvious first step in understanding the text and how to translate it would be to explore fraud warnings on government websites in English-speaking nations. In fact, the website of the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) provides quite helpful information on fraud (<http://www.fbi.gov/scams-safety/fraud>), with descriptions of types of fraud and specific terminology (including the "advance fee scheme" addressed in the text to be translated). The clear, calm style employed there might also provide guidance. The translator should, however, bear in mind that the press release to be translated does have dual purposes.

The translator unfamiliar with the press release as a genre might also explore the extensive resources about writing effective press releases available on the Web. As many of those guides emphasize, the title is critical: it should be concise and highlight the key point in the press release, to attract the reader's attention.

While all the finalists' translations met the goal of communicating the content reasonably accurately and, in most cases, appropriately, most should have given more thought to the title. An overly long, confusing, or vague title will not grab the reader, whether a potential victim or a member of the press, and thus will reduce the press release's effectiveness.

This translation is reasonably readable and accurate. The title is, however, disappointing. "Scam" is too colloquial for a press release from a government ministry. On the other hand, the rule requiring that a name be stated in full before its abbreviation is used might be disregarded here in the interests of conciseness, given that METI is well known and is clearly identified in the letterhead and body of the press release. "False Claims for Money Misrepresenting the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry" is confusing at best. "Fraud Alert: Use of METI's Name in Advance Fee Fraud" might be a more effective title.

"Requests for money and other belongings," in the first paragraph, is weak; the perpetrators are demanding, not requesting, money. Moreover, "other valuables" might be a better choice than "other belongings" in rendering the "等" in "金錢等". (等 should, of course, often be worked around or ignored, but here, as the description of the fraud in Case 1 reveals, it does have substance.)

In the third paragraph, in METI's disclaimer of responsibility for helping individuals who have lost money, the translator has used "return" for "返還," a good choice. Other finalists used "repayment" or "refund," which could imply that METI owes the persons who have lost money, an inference that METI wants to discourage.

The choice of "Modus Operandi" for the description of the scheme is brilliant. Unfortunately, the description itself is muddled by referring to the target as both "the individual" and "they." "They inform the individual that they are entitled to repayment" would imply, as English, that "they," the perpetrators, are entitled to repayment."

A similar confusion arises in the description of Case 1; since it is describing one case, the victim should not be referred to as "they" or "them."

E38

The translator seems to have grasped the content, but the translation is awkwardly written. The title, while clear enough, is too wordy and, again, uses "requests" instead of "demands." "Consumer Inquiry Counter," in the first paragraph, is not a plausible title for a unit of METI. "Fraudulent request for money they have received that claim to originate from a department of the Ministry" is confusing; "fraudulent demands for money from persons claiming to represent METI" might be clearer. Moreover, in "malicious, fictitious requests for money," the demands are indeed malicious, but very real. It is the costs that are fictitious.

In the third paragraph, METI is not stating that it "has not filed a civil action lawsuit aimed at refunding monies" but that it does not do so; moreover, the use of "refunding" skews the translation in a direction that the original is avoiding.

The use of "processing costs" for "費用" in the description of the fraud scheme is a good

solution. "Paying cash to a specific address through the Post Office" is, however, an odd phrasing that could be confused with a postal transfer; "Send cash by post to a designated address" would be clearer (since we can no longer use "mail" and assume it will be understood as anything but e-mail).

The use of female pronouns for the victim, in Case 1, is a pleasing attempt at inclusiveness, and, with the caller referred to by male pronouns, makes the narrative clear. The female-victim, male-perpetrator scenario, however, raises other issues that rewriting with "victim" and "caller" would avoid. The intrusion of "scammer" later in the narrative is jarring.

Many of the translators had difficulty with "90万円の送金を要求された。要求額の送金は難しかった" in Case 1, apparently because of the question of voice. If the incident were recorded in the first person, as the victim described it to METI, we might expect, for example, "The caller demanded that I send 900,000 yen, but I said that would be hard for me to come up with." Here, staying with the third person narrative, "The caller demanded that the victim send 900,000 yen. When the victim said that would be hard to come up with . . ." would work.

E2

The translation is reasonably accurate, but has some accuracy and stylistic problems, beginning with the title: the scheme in question is not a billing fraud. Nor, in the first paragraph, are the victims being "billed" by the perpetrators of the fraud. The use of "scam" and "scammer" adds a certain zip to the translation, but seems out of place in a document of this sort.

One disturbing error occurs in the third paragraph: "被害を受けた者" has been rendered as "victims who are owed damages" instead of "persons who have suffered losses." METI is in no way implying that such a claim for damages exists.

In the description of the modus operandi, the second point states that "The scammers will call again before or after the main call; if before the main call, it will not be "again." "To add validity to their claim" is misleading since "the claim," referred to in the first point, is "to be from a division of METI." Here caller is trying to add plausibility to the assertion that METI will help recover the money, not that the caller is associated with METI.

In Case 1, the translator's use of the first person in describing what happened is largely effective, although it could have been taken further in handling the demand for 900,000 yen. The name of the law enforcement agency mentioned should, however, have begun with "the Metropolitan Police Department," which does exist. "国の機関" is not "a Japanese

institution" but a national government institution (from the context, understood to be a Japanese national government institution). Furthermore, "49万円を追加で送金した" has been translated as "So I transferred another 490,000 yen." While the choice of "transferred" could be correct in another context, here it is misleading, since a key feature of this fraud is its use of the post to send money. "Sent" should be used instead.

E10

The title, while succinct, is open to the interpretation that the Ministry is carrying out the scam (a term that is also too informal for this context). The first paragraph begins with an awkward and incomplete translation of the first sentence; use of the term "advance fee fraud" and rewriting to clarify that callers were demanding payment and claiming to be from METI or an affiliated institution would improve it. In the second paragraph, "bogus" is too informal. "At present" in the third paragraph is not in the original, and its introduction raises the possibility that METI might take such action in the future. "Your local law enforcement agency" seems an oddly wordy alternative to "your local police station."

The description of the modus operandi is inconsistent in style and includes some odd word choices, including the overly informal "bogus," "funds" for "費用," and the awkward "granting credibility to the 'restitutions'." The use of "etc." is always to be avoided; here "etc. . ." makes it even uglier. In the last sentence, "to a specified address" is omitted.

Consistently staying with a more colloquial, narrative approach in Case 1, instead of switching at times to a stiff, "Consumer was told" style, would make it more readable. (The "送金は難しかった" sentence was well handled, in the more colloquial mode, as "The requested fees were steep.") Unfortunately, the translator wrote, "The consumer transferred an additional ¥490,000," using "transferred" instead of "sent."

E30

This translation is fairly accurate but has stylistic and content problems, starting with the title: METI "を名乗った" does not imply "posing as METI employees." The translator has apparently tried to make the translation as crisp as possible, in the process perhaps shaving off too much, but does not always write clearly. "They claim that the consumer must pay procedural expenses for damage repayments planning to be made to them by METI" is awkward at best: are the repayments themselves planning to be made? Similarly, in the third paragraph, "Please report to your local police station if the false claim happens to result in

damages” is unnatural English. One reports to a police station if, for example, ordered to do so. “If the claim happens to result in damages” seems to imply that the claim itself somehow causes damages. “If you happen to have been victimized by this fraud, please contact your local police station” would be much clearer.

The translator seems to have attempted a terse, “police blotter” description of the modus operandi that, unfortunately, does not add clarity. In the second point, the vital point that the person posing as a police officer or someone affiliated with METI (not a “METI employee”) actually calls the victim has been cut, leaving it unclear how the victim was convinced to go along with the fraud.

The terse style of the description of Case 1, similarly, did not improve its clarity. Oddly, the translator wrote “calls by telephone,” a wordy choice. The translator also mistranslated “クレジットカードや携帯電話を所有しているようであれば、送ってほしい” as “required payment would be accepted by credit card or mobile telephone remittance,” which is succinct but very far from, to stay with the translator’s style, “Consumer was asked to send credit cards or mobile phone, if consumer owned them.” “相当” was also mistranslated as “valuing,” as in “precious metals valuing 100,000 yen,” a very unnatural usage.

E17

The title of this translation was the first instance of the use of “advance fee fraud,” the standard term for this fraud, in these translations. That title is, unfortunately, extremely long, if accurate. The first paragraph (which conflates the first three paragraphs of the original, to the detriment of clarity) is written in the first person plural, which seems out of place in a press release, and with an emotional intensity (“We implore you to contact . . .”) that the original lacks. Contrasting with that rather lofty, emotional style is the use of “con artist” for the perpetrator. The first sentence refers to “a party” who is both using METI’s name and pretending to have a relationship with it; the Japanese states that the fraud involves either using the METI name or pretending to have a relationship with it; moreover, as we learn, more than one “party” is involved. Similarly, the final sentence jumbles two statements: to check with METI if on the receiving end of a suspicious contact claiming to be from METI and, if taken in by the fraud, to report it to the police.

In the description of the modus operandi, the translator writes, in point two, “There are also situations where the perpetrator makes calls back and forth under the guise of having an affiliation with the police . . .” Probably because the translator has misunderstood 前後 as necessarily meaning “back and forth,” the meaning of the entire sense is mangled.

In Case 1, the translator has dropped into the passive voice, making the description harder understand. "The victim" is used, confusingly, with "their contact informaton" and "their losses," presumably to avoid a gender-specific pronoun. Here again, "国の機関" is not translated as "a national government agency" but a "Japanese agency." "相当" seems to have been interpreted as "sizable" as well as "worth."

The translator also repeatedly capitalizes "the" in the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry within sentences and uses the regrettable "etc." Phrases such as "When it became the day" or "On account of a second call" further suggest that more attention to the "a little writing" part of the process is needed.

Ken Wagner

Introduction

The text for the Japanese-to-English portion of the Ninth JAT Translation Contest was a news release from Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry with information directed at consumers about a telephone scam (架空請求詐欺). This scam appears to have gotten very little coverage in the Japanese-language press and no coverage in the English-language press. The contestants therefore had to research other kinds of fraud to find models for their translations. The contestants also had to cast the translation in an appropriate manner for this type of press release, find the official names of two government agencies, make up some names for some fictitious organizations, and even translate some dialogue. The contestants were asked to do this according to a specific set of translation instructions that recreate the circumstances of an "order" from a real-world translation agency or client. The instructions stated that the client was from the US, implying that US English should be used.

The object of the contest is to recognize new translators showing potential for further growth. All of this year's finalists demonstrated that they had either laid the foundations or made considerable progress in their development as commercial translators. The judges' commentaries concern the top six finalists in the contest. Even the sixth-place finisher turned in one of the best translations in the contest. I would like to thank the contestants for the carefully prepared translations that they submitted.

When judging the contest, I first read each translation after not having seen the Japanese-language text for a couple of months to get the feel of the English ("artistic impression"). Then I compare the translations to the source text, looking for good

translations and questionable choices or errors. The individual commentaries are in the order in which they placed in the contest. If a good or bad trait is mentioned about one translation, it might not be mentioned again later.

E25

E25 definitely received the highest “artistic impression” score when reading the English translation without seeing the Japanese text for a couple of months. E25’s translation struck me immediately as readable and natural sounding English. E25 also clearly received the highest cumulative score in rankings by the judges.

E25’s translation was highly accurate and clearly written in well organized, natural sounding sentences. The boxed warning was written particularly clearly. E25 understood that inquiries were coming in (1st sentence), not that an office was receiving them. E25 retained the use of the second person in conversations between the con artist and the victim, remaining true to the text without sounding literal or translated. E25 made sparing use of words like “scammer” or “con artist,” preferring terms like “someone” or “an individual” for missing sentence subjects, which seemed consistent with similar information on US law enforcement websites. E25 translated “手続き” as “processing,” which is very natural way to achieve the “official” sound that a con artist is looking for. E25 also understood that the principal loss was loss of money and spoke in terms of people losing money and having it returned. E25 also correctly translated the two agencies with official English-language names besides the Ministry itself (the Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department and METI’s Consumer Counseling Office) Victims had to “send” money, as people do in the US.

As some points to consider, E25 chose “false claims” for “架空請求,” which generally seems to refer to claims against the government or an insurance company, etc. E25 used the verb and noun “(to) post” when the translation instructions clearly said the translation was for US use, although this has very little effect on the information conveyed. “Consultation Examples (For Reference)” for “相談事例(参考)” sounded translated from Japanese. Overall E25’s translations of 名乗る weren’t as American-sounding those of some other finalists, especially “false claims misrepresenting [METI]” (changes the meaning) and “an individual purported to belong to [METI]” (wrong tense also changes the meaning).

In the first paragraph of Case 1, E25 thought 国の機関 and 消費者相談室 were the same agency in the sentence: “現在、国の機関が過去の被害金を取り戻す手続きを行っており、経済産業省の消費者相談室がその手続きを行っている。” But understanding this sentence admittedly requires quite a feel for Japanese or the application of logic to the situation, and this error would probably not have affected the reader very much. For “過去のあなたの被害

金を取り戻す,” E25 said METI’s Consumer Counseling Office “will repay your losses,” which the reader could perhaps interpret as the money was coming from the government, rather than through it.

Ultimately, though, E25 convinced the judges that he or she had excellent potential for further development as a translator. E25’s English prose was pleasant and natural. E25 added the mortar that holds the bricks together. In the boxed warning section of the news release, “METI is warning the public of a recent increase in...” and “The public should be aware that METI does not...” to give the text a smooth feel. Excessive additions can be risky, but this was the warning section of the news release, and these additions were evidence of an effort to make the translation pleasant for the reader. With all of the positive features of this translation taken together, the judges felt that E25 showed the greatest potential for growth as a commercial translator, based on the performance on the contest passage.

E38

E38’s translation was very pleasant to read and came in second in my purely subjective “artistic impression” score when reading the translation after not seeing the source text for a couple of months. E38 skillfully skirted the issue of an accepted published English name for this scam by just describing “架空請求書” as “fraudulent requests for money,” since this particular set of incidents does not seem to have been described in English anywhere. The translation featured many of clear, natural sounding statements. E38 did a good job with the paragraph-long sentence in paragraph 2 of the boxed warning, including dispensing with the “nado” as “one frequent claim that scammers make...”

In the second, “Modes of Operation” section, E38 called the perpetrator “a person” and “the caller” and called the victim “the target,” which is consistent with how US law enforcement websites describe the MO of a scam. E32 also used the active verb “the person receives a call” and the enticing and official sounding “processing” for “手続き.” Although Japan is the land of furikomi, speakers of US English generally send money, an expression E38 frequently used in the example of a case of this type of fraud.

Unfortunately, E38 did not transfer the sense of the original in a couple of ways that may have affected the reader. One was that METI “has not filed a civil action” for “民事訴訟の提起... を行うことはありません。” This suggests that METI may file lawsuits when, in fact, they are stating that they do not. E38 also mistranslated the “official” English name of METI’s Consumer Counseling Office, which might have led the reader in the wrong direction. Although E38 generally made good choices for translations of “名乗る” (purporting, claiming to be, calling [oneself]), E38 did use “a phone call professing to come from [METI]” and “an

alleged member of the [police]," terms that don't fit here. In the exercise in creativity making up a name for 消費者保全育成協議会, "Council for Consumer Conservation and Cultivation" sounded unnatural and like it was translated from an Asian language.

But overall, with pleasant English and only a couple of errors that would have affected the reader's understanding of the text, E38 also showed substantial potential for growth as a commercial translator in the translation of the contest passage.

E2

E2 did several things to make the translation pleasant to read so that it came in a close third in for "artistic impression" when reading the translation after not seeing the source text for a couple of months. For example, E2 took a non-literal approach to the second paragraph of the boxed warning, editing out "悪質な架空請求事案," while still conveying the sense that the scam was insidious. This phrase remained awkward in most other versions of the translation. E2 evocatively described the execution of the scam in Case 1 where he or she used the distinctly English-language turn of phrase "a Mr. A" and "a Mr. B" for "[A,B] と名乗る人物"名乗る." E2 used much of the good terminology used by E25 and E38 (e.g., processing (fees); lose, recover, send money; impersonate). There were very few errors that would have significantly misled the reader in E2's translation. The reader almost always knew who was doing what to whom.

Of the errors that were present, the one misleading error was not finding the official name of METI's Consumer Counseling Office. In the opening sentence, E2 said "reports to its Consumer Inquiries Center [are increasing] when the office receiving the reports isn't named in the text. This changes the sense of the Japanese, but has only moderate affect on the reader.

E2 flipped the hierarchy of "国の機関" and"消費者相談室," in a sentence that proved generally hard to understand, but this was not significantly misleading to the reader. Most of the problems affected readability. Although US law enforcement websites use "scammer" and "con artist," the almost constant use of "scammer" for subject-less verbs was annoying. A ministry of the Japanese government probably wouldn't call "国の機関" a "Japanese institution," and "institution" wasn't the best word choice here. Also, unfortunately, E2 told the story of Case 1 in the victim's voice, when it seemed to be in the voice of the reporting or summarizing officer. However, this wasn't overly misleading to the reader either.

E2's translation was extremely accurate and pleasant to read. Any of the negative features can be overcome with more reading of Japanese and practice at self-editing. I found something very likable about this translation when reading it for the first time. E25 certainly

has potential for continued growth as a commercial translator based on his or her performance on the contest passage.

E10

E10 was not far behind E2 for readability when the translation was read after not having seen the Japanese text for a couple of months. The translation was accurate overall; the reader knew who was doing what to whom. E2 liberally rearranged and paraphrased the boxed warning for readability, but taking elements from different paragraphs violated the translation instructions to retain the original paragraph structure. The translation instructions are essentially what the customer is asking you to do, and the customer is always right, with very few exceptions. In addition to many of the good translation choices made by the above candidates, good translations included “bogus ‘fees’” for “ありもしない「費用」,” dispensing with “仲介・あつせん” as simply “mediation”, and the English-sounding “Council for Consumer Protection” for the fictitious association “消費者保全育成協議会” (although this might not completely capture the hyperbolic feel of the original). A notable turn of phrase was the natural and appropriate translation of “How the Scam Works” for “主な手口.”

Some things to consider are that E2 translated the first sentence of the boxed warning as the “consumer consultation service” seeing an increase in inquiries rather than there being simply “an increase in inquiries.” “下記参照” was omitted. Neither of these items is that misleading to the reader, however. More misleading to the reader was the translation of “at present METI is not taking any civil action” versus the fact that METI does not take civil action on behalf of consumers. Also potentially misleading was the close but not exact translation of METI’s “Consumer Counseling Office” as “Consumer Consultation Office”. In the “How the Scam Works” section, “未公開株等の購入で損害を受けた” was omitted, perhaps as a conscious choice because that information is given in the boxed warning. But maybe that section should contain all of the information given and be able to stand alone. E10’s use of the word “restitution” (a making good of or giving an equivalent for some injury) did not sound as good as “recovering” or “returning” money” to me because in most cases, victims would simply be getting their money back (purportedly). E10 used an abbreviated semi-“police blotter” style in Case 1: “consumer received a call” and “consumer was told.” It’s curious that two finalists used this style, but the judges did not find any precedent for it in existing English-language consumer information and news releases and considered it inappropriate for a news release. I hope the judges did not miss something. Many things like following translation instructions, editing choices, and use of a specific style

can be changed easily, and with a low number of significantly misleading errors, E10 has good foundation for future growth as a commercial translator, based on the performance on the test passage.

E17

E17 used great care to produce a readable and appropriate translation and was the only finalist to use the term “advance-fee fraud,” perhaps the most accurate category for this fraud. E17 appeared to have done research and apply the logic of the subject matter discipline to help interpret the text. E17 also conveyed the relationship of 国の機関 and 消費者相談室 in Case 1 correctly. Generally speaking, the reader would have understood the main ideas of the news release.

Unfortunately the translation was a bit wordy for a news release. Rather than recasting the text into the form of a crisp English-language news release, E17 faithfully translated every Japanese structure in the original into some form of natural-sounding English. The use of the phrase “we implore you” in the last paragraph of the boxed warning underscored the fact that the English was in the wrong register. There were also a several minor instances in which the sense of the Japanese was not transferred. E17’s translation did not convey the following meanings: In the first sentence of the boxed warning, the number of inquiries is simply increasing. In the third paragraph, if contacted by someone suspicious, contact METI; if victimized, contact police. In the second paragraph of the MO, the perpetrator makes a call before or after the main call and claims to be the police or a group affiliated with METI. In an understandable attempt to spice up the translation, E17 ended up not following the translation instructions to retain the original paragraph structure in the boxed warning and in Case 1. In addition, the second person wasn’t retained in Case 1.

Unfortunately, commercial translation is usually not high art. Somebody usually has to proofread the translation. When elements from different paragraphs text are rearranged, it makes the proofreader’s job that much harder. Also, clients may have their own reasons for wanting things to remain in the same order, especially when a text is used as evidence in court. On the other hand, it may be appropriate to basically recreate the document for certain localization or PR jobs. But in this case, the translation instructions (i.e., the fictitious client) asked for the paragraph structure to be retained.

However, by correctly transferring of the meaning of the vast majority of the text, applying good translation techniques (e.g., research and proofreading), and taking care to produce readable English, E17 also demonstrated that he or she has laid the foundation for future growth as a commercial translator, based on the performance on the test passage.

E30

E30's translation of the boxed warning and MO was written in crisp English and was very readable. E30 used short, declarative statements for the most part. E30 translated “名乗る” into natural English (“posing as,” “claiming to be from”). Victims “incurred” loss. E30 also conveyed the relationship of 国の機関 and 消費者相談室 in Case 1 correctly. E30's “Consumer Protection and Awareness Association” was perhaps the most natural translation to capture all of the elements of the fictitious 消費者保全育成協議会.

However, some things that might be considered are, to begin with, the fact that there were a few omissions. “(記参照)” in the first paragraph and “部局” in last paragraph of the boxed warning were perhaps omitted for editing purposes. “Send more money,” at the end of Case 1 was omitted, and it is a crucial plot point in the narrative. Although Case 1 was written clearly enough, E30 chose to use the abbreviated “police blotter” style in this section. The judges could find no instances of law enforcement consumer information or news releases written in this style. Hopefully, the judges didn't overlook something. In addition, unfortunately, E30 didn't transfer the sense of the additional payment portion of Case 1. E30 said that the victims paid by credit card and cell phone, rather than sending the perpetrators credit cards and a cell phone. The fact that the criminals were willing to take unwieldy loot like credit cards and cell phones that require more committing more crimes to convert to cash could potentially be very important to the client.

E30 wrote in a clear manner and conveyed the meaning of the greater part of the text. Like E17, E30 also demonstrated that he or she has laid the foundation for future growth as a commercial translator, based on the performance on the test passage.

James Davis

General Comments:

The two primary goals for any translator are to convey the content of a document accurately and to express that content using the appropriate style, register and tone. This year's Japanese-into-English contest passage is a press release that was issued by a Japanese government ministry. The document was designed for two purposes: to inform the general public about a particular type of fraud and to protect the reputation of that particular government ministry. One important step when translating any document is to thoroughly understand the content of that document. An equally important step is to determine how such a document should read in the target language. Background reading and research are often essential when working in a new field.

In this case the most logical place to find background information and a document that could serve as a model for the translation would be the website of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In fact, the FBI website (<http://www.fbi.gov/scams-safety/fraud>) satisfies several needs. Not only does this website provide a quick summary of the type of fraud described in the source document, it also provides several key terms (such as “advance fee scheme”) that would be applicable to this translation, and it serves as a guide for the style, register and tone that should be employed in the translation. Searching the Internet for phrases such as “advance fee scheme” or “advance fee fraud” will yield other websites that provide further background and additional examples of terminology and phrases that are relevant to the translation.

All of the finalists produced translations that met the goals—in terms of understanding the content and appropriately expressing that content—in certain ways. Some people met the goals to a greater degree than did others. When evaluating individual translations I gave the highest priority to an accurate rendering of content, second priority to the use of appropriate language for expressing that content, and third priority to the overall integrity and readability of the translation. Comments for each of the six finalists follow.

E2

The translator did a reasonably good job of conveying the intended meaning. However, several omissions and misrepresentations reduce the value of this translation. Generally speaking, in a document of this type it would be better to refer to “fraud” and “perpetrators,” rather than “scam” and “scammers.” (The latter terms are too colloquial.) The term “billing fraud” is not completely accurate. That term actually refers to fraudulent billing for services that were never rendered. “Medicare billing fraud,” “hospital billing fraud,” “insurance billing fraud” or “attorney billing fraud” are serious problems, but the problem described here does not fit into the category of “billing fraud.” It would be better to refer to “advance fee fraud” or “demands for money.” Also, including some reference to a “warning” or an “alert” in the title would allow the translation to better suit the original purpose of the document.

In the description of Case 1 the source document indicates that there are three distinct portions (警視庁 + 犯罪取締課 + 合同捜査本部) in the name of the fictitious law enforcement agency. For the first portion the translation simply refers to “the Police Department.” The 警視庁 is a real organization. According to its own website the 警視庁 is actually “the Metropolitan Police Department” in Tokyo. In the translation the second and third portions have been combined, and the 合同 aspect of the third portion has been omitted. One possible translation for the complete name would be “the Investigative Joint

Task Force in the Criminal Investigation Section of the Metropolitan Police Department.” (Such an imposing name would probably convince most ordinary citizens of the authenticity of the organization.)

In the description of Case 1 it is convenient to render “A と名乗る人物” as “a Mr. A,” but we cannot be sure that A is male. A gender-neutral alternative would be “a person posing as ‘A’” or “a person claiming to be ‘A.’” (The same comment applies to “B と名乗る人物.”) The reference to “a Japanese institution” is far too vague for “国の機関.” In this instance 国 refers specifically to the national government. It would be better to refer to “a national government agency.” The translation refers to “valuables” that were sent by the victim, but this is also too vague. The source document refers to 貴金属, which are “precious metals.” Recounting the details of Case 1 from the standpoint of the victim was a good idea. Describing the events in the first person eliminates any temptation to use gender-specific pronouns when referring to the victim.

E10

This translation contains most of the intended meaning. However, there are significant lapses. In the opening sentence one portion of the source text describes two alternatives: “経済産業省の部署名 (下記参照) を名乗り、または関連を装い.” The translation refers to “an increase in reports of fraudulent phone calls demanding payment, purportedly from the ministry.” The structure of this phrase is both awkward and misleading. The translator intended to indicate that the callers demanded payment and that the callers pretended to represent METI. However, that is not what the translation says, and the second option (i.e., “affiliated with METI”) does not appear at all. This sentence contains the first of several references to “the ministry.” In each instance “Ministry” should be capitalized, to indicate that the reference is to the “Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry.” The source text includes within parentheses a reference to details that will be provided later in the document. In the translation this reference appears in the second paragraph, rather than in the opening sentence. This portion of the opening sentence could read, “an increase in counseling requests from consumers who report that individuals claiming to represent the Ministry (see examples below), or claiming to be affiliated with the Ministry, have demanded money.”

Words such as “scam” or “bogus” and phrases such as “we would like for you to pay” are not appropriate for this type of document. In addition, the writing style that is used in the description of the mode of operation is not consistent. Point #1 is written in a rather clipped “police blotter” style, but the second and third portions are written in complete sentences.

Similar shifts in style appear in the description of Case 1 (e.g., “Consumer received ...,” “Consumer was told that ...,” “the consumer mailed ...,” “the consumer transferred ...”) It is true that in the source text the sentences contained in point #1 end with “電話” and “を請求,” respectively. However, such abrupt changes in style in the English document distract the reader from the message and lower the credibility of the document itself. In the third item under the description of the mode of operation the text includes the phrase 指定先に送る, but the translation contains no reference to a “designated location” or “specific address.”

Both “A” and “B” are identified as male, and in the final sentence the consumer is also identified as male. Although the translator was careful to use well-chosen terms such as “perpetrator” in contrast to “victim” or “consumer” throughout most of the translation, these passing references to “himself” or “he” suggest insufficient editing.

E17

This is the only translation (among the six) that contains the term “advance fee fraud,” which is the best way to describe the fraud in question. In the source document the portion that appears within the box consists of three paragraphs, but the translation contains only one paragraph. This violates the concept of a “mirror image.” The translation should—to the greatest degree possible—have the same number of headings, paragraphs, lists, and items within a particular list as the original. In addition, this long paragraph contains significant deviations from the source text. In the first sentence the source text presents two options: the perpetrators may use the name of a METI unit or they may claim to be somehow connected with METI. The translation refers to “a party,” although the document indicates that multiple people may be involved, and merges the two alternatives into one. In the last sentence of the third paragraph (in the source text) those readers who have been contacted by the perpetrators are urged to contact METI, and those readers who have become victims are urged to contact the police. In the translation the use of “implore” is excessive, and the scope of the recommendations has been distorted.

The subheadings “主な手口” and “相談事例(参考)” are numbered in the source text, but are not numbered in the translation. The subheading “【ケース 1】” should have appeared on a separate line. (These points are also related to the concept of a “mirror image.”) The description of Case 1 consists of three paragraphs in the source text. In the translation the entire description appears in one paragraph. Attention to such details is a significant part of the translator’s responsibility in any translation project—large or small.

In the description of the mode of operation the second point begins “その電話と前後して.” The translation states, “the perpetrator makes calls back and forth.” In fact, the word 前後

has several meanings: “back and forth” (with regard to motion), “before and after” (with regard to a sequence of events over time), “in front and in back” (with regard to locations in space) and “approximately” (with regard to numerical values). In this instance another call may be received “before or after” the call that was mentioned in the first point. This is a significant difference.

In the description of Case 1 the translation refers to “Japanese agencies,” but such agencies could be affiliated with the national government, the prefectural government or the local government. The source text indicates clearly (国の機関) that these are “national government agencies.” As part of the description of what the victim actually sent, the translation reads “the sizable amount of 100,000 yen worth of precious metals.” The word 相当 has been translated twice (“sizable” and “worth”). A concise translation for “10 万円相当の貴金属” would be “precious metals worth 100,000 yen.” Several phrases (e.g., “Lately we are receiving,” “On account of a second call” and “When it became the day”) seem excessively literal. These phrases could be reworked through careful editing to improve readability.

E25

This translation accurately conveys the intended information and is very readable. However, in some places awkward phrases and inappropriate wording interfere with the message that is being presented.

In the title the word “scam” is too colloquial for this type of document. “Fraud” would be a better choice. The phrase “False Claims for Money Misrepresenting the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry” is awkward and could be easily misunderstood. A better alternative would be “Fraud Warning: Callers Obtain Money by Misrepresenting the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry” or perhaps “Fraud Alert: Callers Use the Name of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry to Obtain Money.”

In the description of Case 1 most of the finalists translated 本部 as “Headquarters.” Although the word “Headquarters” does appear in the English translations for the names of many Japanese organizations, the combination of 合同 with 捜査 and 本部 suggests that either “Investigative Joint Task Force” or “Joint Investigative Task Force” would be better than “Joint Investigation Headquarters” in the name of this fictitious unit. (There are precedents for both translations in law enforcement circles.)

In the description of Case 1 the translation contains numerous references to “the victim.” This usage is fine. However, referring to the victim of the fraud as “they” or “them” (e.g., “The victim was requested to send 900,000 yen, an amount difficult for them to pay so they were told ...”) is too colloquial for this type of document. Replacing “they” or “them” with “the

victim” would be a simple change, but it would improve the integrity of the translation.

E30

This translation contains a number of errors in content and weaknesses in style, although most of the meaning is conveyed accurately. The expression “false claims” in the title does not really describe the problem at hand, which is a type of fraud. One important concept in the translation of any document is the concept of a “mirror image.” In other words, the translation should—to the greatest degree possible—have the same number of headings, paragraphs, lists, and items within a particular list as the original. In the source document the portion that appears within the box consists of three paragraphs, but the translation contains four paragraphs. The translator divided the third paragraph (in the source text) into two paragraphs—perhaps because the first sentence in this paragraph contains a general statement of fact, while the second sentence contains specific instructions. Even though this change may have been well intentioned, the original paragraph structure should have been retained. In contrast, dividing a very long sentence from the source document into several sentences in the translation, as the translator did with the second sentence of the third paragraph (in the source text), is often desirable in order to maintain readability.

Portions of this translation are written in the same “police blotter” style that was mentioned with regard to E10. The same comments apply here. In addition, the second item under the description of the mode of operation refers to “another individual posing as police officer or METI employee.” However, the source text reads 警察や当省の関係団体等. The translation is too narrow; a better option could read “an individual who claims to represent the police or an organization affiliated with METI.” In the description of Case 1 the translation refers to “the National Police Agency.” Unfortunately, the source text reads 警視庁, which is “the Metropolitan Police Department” in Tokyo. (The “National Policy Agency” certainly exists, but that would have been 警察庁, rather than 警視庁.)

Regarding the method of payment, the translation states that “required payment would be accepted by credit card or mobile telephone remittance” and that the victim in Case 1 “remits payment using two credit cards and mailing precious metals valuing 100,000 yen and cash valuing 240,000 yen.” In this instance the translation differed significantly from the meaning of the source text. It may be difficult to imagine that someone would actually send a credit card or a cell phone to a complete stranger, but that is what the caller requested the victim to do. Also, the use of “valuing” in the translation is not correct. The action of the victim could be described in this way: “The consumer mailed two credit cards, precious metals valued at 100,000 yen and 240,000 yen in cash to the Consumer Protection Council.”

(The name of the fictitious recipient organization was also missing from the translation.)

E38

This translation accurately conveys most of the intended meaning. However, there are a number of instances of awkward or inappropriate wording. The translator struggled to translate the verbs 名乗る and 装う. The first sentence contains a reference to “fraudulent requests for money they have received that claim to originate from a department of the Ministry (see below) or an affiliated organization.” This phrase is awkward and could easily be misunderstood. A better alternative would be “fraudulent requests for money from persons who claim to represent a department of the Ministry (see below) or an affiliated organization.” In the description of the “Chief modes of operation” the translator uses the phrases “a phone call professing to come from a real or fictional METI department” and “a call falsely claiming to be from either the police or from an agency affiliated with the Ministry.” Better options for these two phrases would be “a phone call from someone claiming to represent a real or fictional METI department” and “a call from someone impersonating the police or an agency affiliated with the Ministry.”

Referring to the perpetrators as “scammers” is too colloquial. Referring to them as “perpetrators” or “callers” would be a significant improvement. In the third paragraph of the translation a reference is made to “civilian matters.” Generally speaking, the word “civilian” is used in contrast to “military,” but the intended meaning here is clearly “civil matters” (in contrast to “criminal matters”). The phrase “to the tune of 15%” (in the description of Case 1) is also too colloquial.

In several places the translator struggled with the use of pronouns when referring to the victim and the caller. In point #1 under “Chief modes of operation” the translator refers to the victim as “they,” but in point #2 the translator uses “he or she.” In the description of Case 1 the translator consistently refers to the victim as female (“her” and “she”) and the callers as male (“himself” and “he”). Although it is convenient to use personal pronouns, it would be better to use gender-neutral descriptors, such as “the victim/consumer” and “the caller/perpetrator” throughout the translation. If the translator is concerned about overusing these nouns, sentences could be rewritten to avoid naming the individuals quite as frequently. For example, the final sentence could read, “When the promised funds did not appear in the victim’s bank account on the appointed date, the victim called METI.” In this alternative the number of references to the victim has been reduced from six to two.