1. Aims and Methods, Survey and Critique

1.1 Introduction

Machine translation (MT) has become a multimillion dollar affair. It has been estimated[1] that in the United States alone something like one and one-half million dollars were spent in 1958 upon research more or less closely connected with MT, with approximately one hundred and fifty people, among them eighty with M.A., M.Sc. or higher degrees, working in the field, full or part time. No comparable figures are available for Russia,[2] but it is generally assumed that the number of people engaged there in research on MT is higher than in the States. At a conference on MT that took place in Moscow in May 1958, 347 people from 79 institutions were reported to have participated. Not all participants need necessarily be actively involved in MT research. There exist two centers of research in MT in England, with a third in the process of formation, and one center in Italy. Outside these four countries, MT has been taken up only occasionally, and no additional permanent research groups seem to have been created. Altogether, I would estimate that the equivalent of between 200 and 250 people were working full-time on MT at the end of 1958, and that the equivalent of three million dollars were spent during this year on MT research. In comparison, let us notice that in June 1952, when the First Conference on Machine Translation convened at MIT, there was probably only one person in the world engaged more than half-time in work on MT, namely myself. Reduced to full-time workers, the number of people doing research on MT could not at that time have been much more than three, and the amount of money spent that year not much more than ten thousand dollars.

For the 1952 MT Conference I had prepared in mimeograph a survey of the state of the art [1]. That report was based upon a personal visit to the two or three places where research on MT was being conducted at the time, and seems to have been quite successful, so I was told, in presenting a clear picture of the state of MT research as well as an outline of the major problems and possibilities. Time has come to critically evaluate the progress made during the seven years that have since passed

[1] This estimate is not official. In addition, it is still rather difficult to evaluate available machine time. Some basis for the estimate is provided in Appendix I.

[2] Reitwiesner and Weik, in their report cited in reference [3], say on p. 34 that "Dr. Panov's group consists of approximately 500 mathematicians, linguists and clerical personnel, all working on machine translation of foreign languages into Russian and translations between foreign languages with Russian as an interlanguage." No source for this figure is given, and it is likely that some mistake was made here.

in order to arrive at a better view of these problems and possibilities. To my knowledge, no evaluation of this kind exists, at least not in English. True enough, there did appear during the last year two reviews of the state of MT, one prepared by the group working at the RAND Corporation [2], the other by Weik and Reitwiesner at the Ballistic Research Laboratories, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland [3]. The first of these reviews was indeed well prepared and is excellent as far as it goes. However, it is too short to go into a detailed discussion of all existing problems and, in addition, is not always critical to a sufficient degree. The second review seems to have been prepared in a hurry, relies far too heavily on information given by the research workers themselves, who by the nature of things will often be favorably biased towards their own approaches and tend to overestimate their own actual achievements, and does not even attempt to be critical. As a result, the picture presented in this review is somewhat unbalanced though it is still quite useful as a synopsis of certain factual bits of information. Some such factual information, based exclusively upon written communication from the research groups involved, is also contained in a recent booklet published by the National Science Foundation [4]. Brief histories of MT research are presented in the Introductory Comments by Professor Dostert to the Report of the Eighth Annual Round Table Conference on Linguistics and Language Study [5] as well as in the Historical Introduction to the recent book by Dr. Booth and associates [6].

The present survey is based upon personal visits during October and November 1958 to almost all major research centers on MT in the United States, the only serious exception being the center at the University of Washington, Seattle, upon talks with members of the two research groups in England, and upon replies to a circular letter sent to all research groups in the United States asking for as detailed information as possible concerning the number and names of people engaged in research within these groups, their background and qualifications, the budget, and a short statement of the plans for the near future, as well as, of course, upon a study of all available major publications including also, as much as possible, progress reports and memoranda; with regard to the USSR I had, unfortunately, to rely exclusively on available English translations of their publications and on reports which Professor Anthony G. Oettinger, of the Harvard Computation Laboratory, who had visited the major Russian research centers in MT in August 1958, was so kind to put at my disposal. Some of the purely technical information with regard to the composition of the various MT research groups, their addresses and budgets is presented in Appendix I in tabular form.

Therefore, the innumerable specific advances of the various groups with regard to coding, transliterating, keypunching, displaying of output, etc., will be mentioned only rarely. But the list of references should contain sufficient indications for the direction of the reader interested in these aspects.

The order in which these groups will be discussed is: USA, Great Britain, USSR, others, following, with one exception, the order of degree of my personal acquaintance. Within each subdivision, the order will in general be that of seniority.

2.1 The USA Groups

2.1.1 THE SEATTLE GROUP

Professor Erwin Reifler of the University of Washington, Seattle, started his investigations into MT in 1949, under the impact of the famous memorandum by Weaver [17], and has since been working almost continuously on MT problems. The group he created has been constantly increasing in size and is at present one of the largest in the States. In February 1959, it published a 600-page report describing in detail its total research effort. This report has not reached me at the time of writing this survey (April 1959) which is the more unfortunate as the latest publication stemming from this group is a talk presented by Reifler in August 1957 [18], and I was, due to a personal mishap, unable to visit Seattle during my stay in the States. It is not impossible that my present discussion is considerably behind the actual developments.

The efforts of this group seem to have concentrated during the last years on the preparation of a very large Russian–English automatic dictionary containing approximately 200,000 so-called "operational entries" whose Russian part is probably composed of what was termed above (Section 1.3) "inflected forms" (as against the million or so inflected forms corresponding to the total Russian vocabulary of one hundred thousand canonical forms). This dictionary was to be put on a photoscopic memory device, developed by Telemeter-Magnetics Inc. for the USA Air Force, which combines a very large storage capacity with very low access time and apparently is to be used in combination with one of the large electronic computers of the IBM 709 or UNIVAC 1105 types. The output of this system would then be one version of what is known as *word-by-word translation,* whose exact form would depend on the specific content of the operational entries and the translation program. Both are unknown to me though probably given in the above mentioned report. Word-by-word Russian-to-English translation of scientific texts, if pushed to its limits, is known to enable an English reader who knows the respective field to understand, in general, at least the gist of the original text, though of course with an effort that is considerably larger than that required for reading a regular high quality translation, or else to enable an expert English post-editor to produce on its basis, with some very restricted use of the original text (in transliteration, if he does not know how to read Cyrillic characters), a translation which is of the same order of quality as that produced by a qualified human translator. However, no comparisons as to quality and cost between the Seattle MT system and human translation is given in the publications known to me. In any case, in view of the rather low quality of the machine output (word-by-word translation is theoretically a triviality, of course, though a lot of ingenuity is required to get the last drop out of it) the claim that the Seattle-Air Force system is "the most advanced translation system under construction" [19] is very misleading; even more misleading is the name given the photoscopic disc, "The USAF Automatic Language Translator Mark I" [20], which creates the impression of a special purpose device, which it is not.

The Seattle group started work towards getting better-than-word-by-word machine outputs in the customary direction of automatically changing the word order and reducing syntactical and lexical ambiguities (the Seattle group prefers to use the terms "grammatical" and "non-grammatical") but again little is known of actual achievements. One noticeable exception is Reifler's treatment of German compound words, which is an especially grave problem for MT with German as the source-language since this way of forming new German nouns is highly creative so that the machine will almost by necessity have to identify and analyze such compounds [21]. In the above mentioned 1957 talk, Reifler claimed to have "found moreover that only three matching procedures and four matching steps are necessary (sufficient?) to deal effectively with—that is, to machine translate correctly—any of these ten types of compounds of any[!] language in which they occur," [22]—a claim which sounds hardly believable, whose attempted substantiation is probably contained in the mentioned report. It is worthwhile to stress that this group does not adopt the "empirical approach" mentioned above, and is not going to be satisfied with so-called "representative samples," but is trying to keep in view the ascertainable totality of possible constructions of the source-language though representative samples are of course utilized during this process [23].

For reasons given above, I must strongly disagree with Reifler's "belief that it will not be very long before the remaining linguistic problems in machine translation will be solved for a number of important languages" [24]. How dangerous such prophecies are is illustrated by another proph-

ccy of Reifler's, to the effect that "in about two years (from August 1957) we shall have a device which will at one glance read a whole page and feed what it has read into a tape recorder and thus remove all human cooperation on the input side of the translation machines" [25]. The best estimates I am aware of at present mention five years as the time after which we are likely to have a reliable and versatile print reader (Section 1.3) at the present rate of research and development.

2.1.2 THE MIT GROUP

I started work on MT at the Research Laboratory of Electronics of MIT in May 1951. In July 1953, when I returned to Israel, Victor H. Yngve took over, steadily recruiting new assistants for his research. During the last years, the MIT group has laid great stress on its adherence to the ideal of FAHQT. For this purpose they regard the complete syntactical and semantical analysis of both source- and target-language to be a necessary prerequisite. It is, therefore, to these processes that their research effort has been mostly directed. It seems that this group is aware of the formidableness of its self-imposed task, and is rather uncertain in its belief that this prerequisite will be attained in the near future. In one of his latest publications, Yngve says: "It is the belief of some in the field of MT that it will eventually be possible to design routines for translating mechanically from one language into another without human intervention" [26]. It is rather obvious from the context that Yngve includes himself among the "some." How remote "eventually" and "ultimately" —another qualifying adverb occurring in a similar context—are estimated to be is not indicated. On the other hand, the MIT group believes, and I think rightfully, that the insights into the workings of language obtained by its research are valuable as such, and could at least partly be utilized in practical lower aimed machine translation by whomever is interested in this latter aim. However, it will probably be admitted by this group that some of the research undertaken by it might not be of any direct use for practical MT at all. The group employs to a high degree the methods of structural linguistics, and is strongly influenced by the recent achievements of Professor Noam Chomsky in this field [27].

The impact upon MT of Chomsky's recently attained insights into the structure of language is not quite clear. Since I presented my own views on this issue in a talk at the Colloque de Logique, Louvain, September 1958 [28], as well as in a talk given before the Second International Congress of Cybernetics, Namur, September 1958, a greatly revised version of which is reproduced in Appendix II, I shall mention here only one point. The MIT group believes, I think rightly, that Chomsky has succeeded in showing that the *phrase structure model* (certain variants of

which are also known as *immediate constituent models*) which so far has served as the basic model with which structural linguists were working, in general as well as for MT purposes, and which, if adequate, would have allowed for a completely mechanical procedure for determining the syntactical structure of any sentence in any language for which a complete description in terms of this model could be provided—as I have shown for a weak variant of this model, already 6 years ago [29] by a method that was later improved by Lambek [30] (cf. Appendix II)—is not fully adequate and has to be supplemented by a so-called *transformational model.* This insight of Chomsky explains also, among other things, why most prior efforts at the mechanization of syntactical analysis could not possibly have been entirely successful. The MIT group now seems to believe that this insight can be given a positive twist and made to yield a more complex but still completely mechanical procedure for syntactical analysis. I myself am doubtful about this possibility, especially since the exact nature of the transformations required for an adequate description of the structure of English (or any other language) is at the moment still far from being satisfactorily determined. A great number of highly interesting but apparently also very difficult theoretical problems, connected with such highly sophisticated and rather recent theories as the theory of recursive functions, especially of primitive recursive functions, the theory of Post canonical systems, and the theory of automata (finite and Turing), are still waiting for their solution, and I doubt whether much can be said as to the exact impact of this new model on MT before at least some of these problems have been solved. I think that Chomsky himself cherishes similar doubts, and as a matter of fact my present evaluation derives directly from talks I had with him during my recent visit to the States.

The MIT group has, among other things, also developed a new program language called COMIT which, though specially adapted for MT purposes, is probably also of some more general importance [31], and whose use is envisaged also by other groups.[3] The fact that it was felt by this group that a program language is another more or less necessary prerequisite for MT is again the result of their realization of the enormous difficulties standing in the way of FAHQT. It is doubtful whether the development of a program language beyond some elementary limits is indeed necessary, or even helpful for more restricted goals. I would, however, agree that a program language is indeed necessary for the high aims of the MIT group, though I personally am convinced that even this is not sufficient, and that this group, if it continues to adhere to FAHQT, will by necessity be led in the direction of studying learning machines.

[3] This information was given to me in a letter from Yngve.

I do not believe that machines whose programs do not enable them to learn, in a sophisticated sense of this word, will ever be able to consistently produce high-quality translations.

About the actual achievements of the MIT group with regard to MT proper little is known, apparently due to its reluctance to publish incomplete results. It is often felt that because of this reluctance other MT workers are wasting some of their time in treading over ground that might have already been adequately covered, though perhaps with negative results.

2.1.3 THE GU GROUP

The largest group working on MT in the States is that at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., led by Professor Dostert. The GU Group comprises four subgroups. One of these is headed by Professor Garvin and has been engaged during the last two years exclusively in programming the mechanization of the syntactical analysis of Russian. Their method seems to work rather satisfactorily for the syntactical analysis of a large class of Russian sentences, though its exact reach has not yet been fully determined nor all the details of their program debugged. They have produced a very large number of publications, in addition to a multitude of Seminar Work Papers of the Machine Translation Project of Georgetown University, of which I shall mention only two of the more recent ones [32, 33].

The other three subgroups at GU are working on MT as a whole, two of them from Russian into English, the third from French into English. It is claimed that during the last few months the research done at GU has broadened and MT from additional languages into English has begun to be investigated. However, I am not aware of any publications reporting on these new activities and shall therefore not deal with them here. They seem to be at present in their preliminary stages only.

I already mentioned above (Section 1.2) that far-reaching claims were made by one of the GU subgroups. This is the group headed by Miss Ariadne W. Lukjanow and using the so-called *Code Matching Technique* for the translation of Russian chemical texts. I expressed then my conviction that this group could not possibly have developed a method that is as fully automatic and of high quality as claimed. There are in principle only two procedures by which such claims can be tested. The one consists in having a rather large body of varied material, chosen by some external agency from the field for which these claims are made, processed by the machine and carefully comparing its output with that of a qualified human translator. The other consists in having the whole program presented to the public. None of these procedures has been followed so far.

During a recent demonstration mostly material which had been previously lexically abstracted and structurally programmed was translated. When a text, lexically abstracted but not structurally programmed, was given the machine for translation, the output was far from being of high quality and occasionally not even grammatical. True enough, this did not prevent the reader from understanding most of the time what was going on, but this would have been the case also for word-by-word translation, since the sample, perhaps due to its smallness, did not contain any of those constructions which would cause word-by-word translation to be very unsatisfactory. In contrast, however, with word-by-word translation which, if properly done, is hardly ever wrong, though mainly only because it is not real translation and leaves most of the responsibility to the post-editor, this translation contained one or two rather serious errors, as I was reliably told by someone who carefully went through the machine output and compared it with the Russian original. (I myself did not attend the demonstration, and my knowledge of Russian is rather restricted.)

The task of evaluating the claims and actual achievements of the Lukjanow subgroup is not made easier by the fact that there seems to exist only one semipublicly available document prepared by herself [34]. This document contains 13 pages and is not very revealing. The only peculiarity I could discover lies in the analysis of the source-text in a straight left-to-right fashion, in a single pass, exploiting each word as it comes, including the demands it makes on subsequent words or word blocks, whereas most other techniques of syntactical analysis I know go through the source-language sentences in many passes, usually trying to isolate certain units first. I shall return to Miss Lukjanow's approach below (Section 2.1.9).

The claim for uniqueness (and adequacy) of the translation of a chemical text is based upon an elaborate classification of all Russian words that occurred in the analyzed corpus into some 300 so-called *semantical classes*. Though such a detailed classification should indeed be capable of reducing semantic ambiguity, I am convinced that no classification will reduce it to zero, as I show in Appendix III, and that therefore the claim of the Lukjanow group is definitely false. There should be no difficulty for anyone who wishes to take the trouble to exhibit a Russian sentence, occurring in a chemical text, which will be either not uniquely translated or else wrongly translated by the Lukjanow procedure, within a week after all the details of this procedure are in public possession.

On the other hand, I am quite ready to believe that this subgroup has been able to develop valid techniques for a *partial* mechanization of Russian-to-English high quality translation of chemical literature (or

be of great help to everybody in the field. I understand that work on MT at Ramo-Wooldridge has been discontinued at the end of 1958, though perhaps only temporarily so.[6a]

2.1.6 THE HARVARD GROUP

The Harvard University group, headed by Professor Anthony G. Oettinger, stands in many respects quite apart from the others. First, it has busied itself for years almost exclusively with an exploration of the word-by-word translation method. Secondly, this preoccupation was accompanied by, and originated partly out of, a strong distrust of the achievements of other groups. Though it must be admitted that the possibilities of word-by-word translation from Russian into English have never before been so thoroughly explored as they were by this group, with many new insights gained, and that very valuable results were obtained as to the structure and construction of MT dictionaries, one may still wonder whether this group really struck the golden middle between utilizing other people's work in the field and distrusting their work, though there certainly were good reasons for the distrust on quite a few occasions.

The progress made by this group can be easily evaluated by comparing two doctoral theses submitted at Harvard University, the one—to my knowledge the first dissertation on MT—by Oettinger [40] in 1954, the other by Giuliano in January 1959 [41]. This second thesis seems to close an era and indicate the opening of a new one. The first five chapters describe the operation of the Harvard Automatic Dictionary, the methods for its compiling and updating, as well as a great variety of applications, in such thoroughness and detail that the impression is created that not much more is to be said on this subject. The last chapter, on the other hand, contains some interesting but tentative and almost untested remarks on what Giuliano calls a *Trial Translator* [42], i.e., an automatic programming system for the experimental production of better than word-by-word translations.

Out of the enormous amount of material contained in this thesis, let me dwell on those passages that are of immediate relevance to the question of the commercial feasibility of MT. The existing program at the Harvard Computation Laboratory can produce word-by-word Russian-to-English translations at a sustained rate of about 17 words per minute on a UNIVAC I, and about 25 words per minute on a UNIVAC II. This is 4–6 times more than an expert human translator can produce, but since UNIVAC II time is 100 times more expensive than a human translator's

[6a] *Note added in proof:* In the meantime, continuation of this project has been decided upon.

time, commercial MT is out of the question at present. Giuliano estimates that a combination of an IBM 709 (or UNIVAC 1105) with the photoscopic disc mentioned above (Section 2.1.1) would, after complete reprogramming —requiring some three programmer years—and a good amount of other development work, be able to produce translations at 20–40 times the present rate which, taking into account the increase in the cost of computer time, would still leave the cost of a word-by-word machine translation slightly above that of a high-quality human translation. The difference will, however, now be so slight that one may expect that any further improvement, in hardware and/or in programming, would reverse the cost relationship. This does not yet mean that true word-by-word MT will be in business. The cost of post-editing the word-by-word output in order to turn it into a passable translation of the ordinary type would probably be not much less than producing a translation of this quality without machine aid. As a matter of fact, senior research scientists having excellent command of scientific Russian and English, and extensive experience in technical writing, would be hampered rather than assisted by the automatic dictionary outputs in their present form.[7] The number of these individuals is, on the other hand, rather small and few of them can take the time from their scientific work to do a significant amount of translating and would have to be remunerated several times the ordinary professional translator's fee to be induced to spend more time on translating.

Altogether, it does not seem very likely that a nonsubsidized, commercial translation service will, in the next five years or so, find use for an automatic dictionary as its only mechanical device. However, as the Harvard group is quick to point out, an automatic dictionary is an extremely valuable research tool with a large number of possible applications, some of which have already proved their value. Let me add that in situations where speed is at a premium, high quality is not a necessary requisite,. and human translators at a shortage for any price—such situations might arise, for instance, in military operations—automatic dictionaries would be useful as such for straight translation purposes.

The whole issue is, however, somewhat academic. There is no need to speculate what the commercial value of an automatic dictionary would be since the same computer-store combination that would put out a word-by-word translation can be programmed to put out better than word-by-word translations. This is, of course, the subject on which most MT groups, including the Harvard group itself as of this year, are working on right now. At what stage a winning machine–post-editor combina-

[7] This evaluation is taken from a paper by Giuliano and Oettinger, "Research on automatic translation at the Harvard Computation Laboratory," to be published.

Appendix I

MT STATISTICS AS OF APRIL 1, 1959

(No responsibility as to the accuracy of the figures is undertaken. They were obtained by personal communication, the author's impressions or *bona fide* guesses. In cases of pure guesses, a question-mark is appended.)

Institution	Year of start of research	Number of workers	Full-time equivalents	Current yearly budget ($)	Project leader(s)
University of Washington Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages and Literature Seattle, Washington	1949	10 ?	6 ?	?	Erwin Reifler
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Research Laboratory of Electronics and Department of Modern Languages Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1951	10 ?	6 ?	?	Victor H. Yngve
Georgetown University The Institute of Languages and Linguistics Machine Translation Project 1715 Massachusetts Avenue Washington, D.C.	1952	30 ?	15 ?	?	Leon E. Dostert Paul L. Garvin Ariadne W. Lukjanow Michael Zarechnak A. F. R. Brown
The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	(1950) 1957	15	9	?	David G. Hays Kenneth E. Harper

Harvard University The Computation Laboratory Machine Translation Project Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1953	11	7 ?	?	Anthony G. Oettinger
University of Michigan Willow Run Laboratories Ann Arbor, Michigan	1955	11	7	?	Andreas Koutsoudas
University of Pennsylvania Department of Linguistics Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1956 ?	10 ?	3 ?	?	Zellig S. Harris
National Bureau of Standards Washington, D.C.	1958	3	2	25,000	Ida Rhodes
Wayne State University Department of Slavic Languages and Computation Laboratory Detroit, Michigan	1958	10	6	40,000	Harry H. Josselson Arvid W. Jacobson
University of California Computer Center Berkeley, California	1958	8	5	40,500	Louis G. Henyey Sydney M. Lamb
University of Texas Department of Germanic Languages Austin 12, Texas	1958	?	?	?	Winfred P. Lehmann