

BERKELEY PRESENTATION

After he offered a definition of a lexeme as "the basic unit of the dictionary or lexicon", Professor Lamb made some observations on lexemes in general, and then, turning back to the handout, shifted the discussion to nonce forms (forms coined as combinations of items), and related material on segmentation.

Professor Lamb talked about the productivity of Russian suffixes, as he presented his handout on Derivational Suffixes. He introduced the second Berkeley conferee, C. Douglas Johnson, who presented material along with the handout A List of Derivational Suffixes Considered for Segmentation. Immediately thereafter, Professor Lamb submitted comments on productivity in the source language as the main criterion for determining the proper degree of segmentation. He added that combinations which are complicated are not segmented.

The remaining time was spent in active open discussion.

CAMBRIDGE LANGUAGE RESEARCH UNIT PRESENTATION Tuesday, 19 July, 3:45-5:00 p.m.

MASTERMAN

Margaret Masterman (Mrs. Braithwaite) presented four CLRU items to the Meeting:

- 1) A flexible procedure for punched-card distribution (from a forthcoming CLRU Report), by M. Kay and T.R. McKinnon Wood.
- 2) Mechanical Pidgin Translation, a handout, of some 175 pages, reporting on a CLRU inquiry on the "language" produced by word-for-word M.T., of the kind at present being carried out by I.B.M. Research.

CAMBRIDGE LANGUAGE RESEARCH UNIT PRESENTATION

- 3) The resolution of Semantic Translation problems with the aid of a thesaurus, On this she asked the Meeting's leave to speak informally, and at some later time.
- 4) Dr. Parkers-Rhodes' Syntax-Finding Program. She introduced Mr. R.M. Needham to speak on this.

In passing, however, she stressed the value of cooperative exchange among the different research projects. She expressed her belief that some groups had assumed patterns of general research, while others had concentrated on particular aspects only. She anticipated genuine contributions from exchange between the particular - and generally - oriented groups.

NEEDHAM

Mr. Needham first presented the CLRU Bracketing Program. He explained that they had found it was possible to discover dependency and government relationships in text material, using unexpectedly simple syntactic coding. He added that with the blocking routine, titivation (homograph resolution) is carried on alternatively with bracketing, rather than doing everything in two separate stages.

Mr. Needham also described Parker-Rhodes' Rule for Bracketing, and thereafter, proceeded to offer a graphic example of how a dictionary entry is made. He also presented some CLRU handout material in conjunction with his demonstration.

In summation, he added that the system could be adapted to another language, the only changes made being in the dictionary and titivation routines. Mr. Needham offered to answer any questions from the floor.

CAMBRIDGE LANGUAGE RESEARCH UNIT PRESENTATION

Two questions receiving primary attention in the following open discussion period were concerned with scanning technique and the order of precedence to be taken regarding volume of data and awkward cases. It was generally agreed that scanning should be done back and forth, and there remained some mixed feeling about whether or not volumes of data should be taken first, as opposed to the immediate analysis of awkward examples.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY PRESENTATION

Wednesday, 20 July, 9:00-10:15 a.m.

JOSSELSON

Dr. Josselson's presentation consisted of a detailed description of the grammar coding scheme which the Wayne group is presently using. He discussed the 'part of speech' categories and the differences between the present and traditional grammar classes.

The coding sheet contains information to be used in the process of making translation decisions on both syntactic and semantic levels. In many instances a bit of information in the grammar code applies to a set of words, and a list of words in this set was included in the instructions. Dr. Josselson noted that the lists were in many cases merely a beginning, and that they could and would be expanded. He pointed out that one task for MT investigators is to seek and record examples of linguistic phenomena. He added that the questions asked in the coding format will change on the basis of further syntactic investigation; new categories will appear, and others may turn out to be unnecessary.