

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS OF PAPERS 11 AND 18

BOTH papers were concerned with an elaboration of procedures developed to deal with inadequacies which have been disclosed by further application of the predictive analysis method to Russian. Since the two papers had a common theme, the chairman of the session proposed that there be joint discussion after the second. The discussion was useful in bringing about better understanding between proponents of predictive analysis and workers using different approaches. It may also have led to a clearer understanding of predictive analysis by prompting terminology other than that applied in the first flush of its presentation.

PRESENTATION OF PAPER 11 BY DR. MEYERS, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

DR. MEYERS of the National Bureau of Standards presented the first paper, in the absence of Franz L. Alt and Ida Rhodes. Using a series of slides Dr. Meyers illustrated with a sentence of seventeen entitles the process of determining predicates, and through them clauses, by assigning numbers to potential predicates, with the highest number given for entitles most likely to be used in predicates. In spite of the plan to permit discussion only after the papers, two brief questions were raised.

DR. EDMUNDSON inquired about the origin of the pseudo-product; about the procedure used to build a particular function if a word has several uses.

DR. MEYERS replied that a table was constructed after a description had been made. He also answered briefly a question by Prof. Zarechnak on the assignment of specific values to words.

PRESENTATION OF PAPER 18 BY DR. SHERRY

DR. SHERRY presented the second paper, with a preamble crediting Ida Rhodes with some of the ideas underlying the procedures for automatic syntactic analysis aimed at by work at Harvard University on predictive analysis. The procedure discussed was a sentinel, dubbed the end wipe, tailored to remove predictions from the prediction pool. Again, well-designed slides illustrated the essence of the procedure.

DISCUSSION

SERIOUS attempts were made to challenge the procedure of predictive analysis.

PROF. YNGVE provided the following as problems for predictive analysis:

1. Something that glistens could be there.

2. Something could have been there that glistens.
3. Could something have been there that glistens?
4. There could have been something there that glistens.
5. Could there have been something there that glistens?

DR. SHERRY admitted, in reply, that he uses sentinels merely because prediction of itself is inadequate. If, as in Prof. Yngve's example, sentinels too would be inadequate, a further means to assure analysis would have to be devised. No sentence unamenable to predictive analysis plus the sentinel technique had, however, been found as yet in Russian.

DR. HAYS proceeded to furnish such a sentence:

Во всех ты душенька парадах хороша.

DR. SHERRY agreed that literary Russian texts may contain such problematic sentences though they were absent in scientific materials.

DR. DOSTERT then discussed both the terminology of predictive analysis and the procedure itself. In dealing with a text he suggested that, after items were identified in given contexts, inventorial lists were produced, which had little to do with prediction. Using a French sentence beginning with le, Dostert further inquired whether the procedure was economical in carrying on textual analysis. By predictive analysis various possible functions would be suggested for le, yet if one went on to examine further sections of the text one could introduce economy by dispensing with provision of the various possible predictions for le.

DR. SHERRY held no brief for the terminology employed in the procedure, permitting the name "inventory list" or even others rather than "predictive pool". On operational economy he stated that since neither system operates at one hundred percent efficiency, only a final demonstration could test their respective powers. In dealing with Russian, problems like that Dostert raised for French le were handled as Dostert suggested. Though recognizing the possible need of further refining of predictive analysis, Sherry still considered it a useful technique.

PROF. IRINA LYNCH, in an impassioned statement, returned to Dr. Hays' Russian sentence, pointing out that in Russian ДУШЕНЫКА would be set off by commas, which would make possible its analysis by the predictive method. Referring to an analytical procedure of Lecerf, Lynch stated that even more complicated Latin sentences might be analyzed by an extension of the method.

To a final question by PROF. VAUQUOIS, DR. SHERRY replied that ambiguous sentences would be given a complete set of possible solutions.

The well-handled set of questions and answers had clarified the current status of predictive analysis, illustrating the adaptability of its proponents and its increasing modification towards techniques of syntactic analysis with more sober nomenclature.

*W. P. LEHMANN.*