

TIGERS AND POLAR BEARS ON TRANSLATING AND THE COMPUTER

Veronica Lawson BA FIL *

"The polar bear and the tiger cannot fight" (Sigmund Freud)

Things are happening after all. Machine aids for translators are beginning to look inviting and actual machine translation (MT), thrown ignominiously out of fashion by the ALPAC report in 1966¹⁾, is now in use. Only our scepticism is unchanged. We remain wary, especially of MT. Yet although machine translation – or rather, in most cases, machine *pre-translation* – certainly has far-reaching implications, it is not, it seems, a threat to translators, unless of course they cannot translate better than the machine. Firstly, there will be no less work for translators. Secondly, *MT and human translation are different*: they will attract different texts, translators and users. In particular, MT will create a whole new market of users who would not otherwise obtain translations at all.

What follows is part report, part speculation and part an account of how one freelance translator, after many years of distrust, became first intrigued and then, to her astonishment, involved.

I

Aslib's multidisciplinary seminar

Perhaps it is best to start with "Translating & the Computer", the seminar which Aslib organized in Sudbury House, London, on 14 November 1978, and in which Translators' Guild members also played a part.

As an Institute of Linguists' delegate to the *Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs'* 1977 congress in Montreal, I had dutifully attended the workshops on the machine, expecting to put the subject away again as I had done at 5-yearly intervals since 1960. What I saw in Montreal and at the Federal Translation Bureau in Ottawa convinced me that computers were now relevant at last, and I reported that our members should be informed. Since the Translators' Guild Committee could not arrange a seminar, Barbara Snell took the idea to Aslib, and what might have been a low-key lecture session for (with luck) 30 British translators snowballed out of all recognition, with 180 people from 12 countries having a packed, at

times hilarious day with a deliberately wide-ranging programme: Artificial Intelligence: two machine translation systems (SYSTRAN, CULT); two machine-aided translation systems with term banks (EURODICAUTOM, TEAM); word processors; the contrasting approaches of two big corporations (Siemens, Xerox).

The first thing I noted was that the boundary between machine translation and machine-aided translation is now blurred, since even MT proper works only with an artificially simple original or much correction at a later stage. Introducing the seminar, Professor Juan Sager (UMIST; chairman of CETIL, the committee of experts advising the European Commission on language problems) emphasized that translators need not be Luddites. The machine depends heavily on people and actually needs a new type of translator, one who understands the way the machine works.

Cost, as always, is decisive. Even what Martin Kay of Xerox has called HTLGI (human translation like God intended) is not cheap, and all too frequently, as we well know, it is poor. It is also slow: human translation of the *Acta Mathematica Sinica* took 18 months, whereas libraries can, and do, buy Professor Loh's MT printout within 4 months of this journal's publication. MT may soon be economic in such cases or for large volumes of translation, as in the multinationals or the European Communities. "Money speaks sense in a language all nations understand."²⁾ Machine aids, too, are becoming so cheap that quite a small English translation agency represented at the seminar already has a term bank (machine dictionary) on floppy disks, combined with word processing equipment.

Early MT is said to have failed because the machine, not having our knowledge of the world, could not sort out the relationships within sentences and so resolve ambiguities. Now, as Professor Yorick Wilks (Essex) told us, Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques can model human association patterns and make the machine "intelligent". AI promises well³⁾.

The European Communities' approach to their immense translation problems are described later in this

article. At the seminar their machine dictionary EURODICAUTOM (founded 1973) and the American SYSTRAN MT system (bought 1976) were described by Jacques Goetschalckx (EC Terminology Bureau, Luxembourg; treasurer of FIT) and Peter Arthern (head of the EC Council's English translation department in Brussels). A machine dictionary can be constantly updated and give plenty of context. EURODICAUTOM includes definitions and sometimes notes. Frank Knowles (Professor of Language, Aston) suggested where Russian-English SYSTRAN might be improved to eliminate such felicities as "It handles it" for "He is courting her" or "We require world" for "We demand peace". Margaret Masterman (Cambridge Language Research Unit) set out the essential mechanism of MT and the choices available: fast batch-programmed bilingual MT like Russian-English SYSTRAN, or pre-edited on-line assisted MT like CULT, which is slower, dearer and of higher quality. Most important, she highlighted MT's need for the human translator's high-grade intuitive skills, not only in pre-editing but in picking out words for special treatment and then programming special dictionary entries for them.

Professor Shiu-Chang Loh (Chinese University of Hong Kong) spoke on CULT, with which he translates the Chinese mathematics and physics journals (on-line since last summer). It was earlier CULT printout which had finally convinced me that MT could compete seriously for what a translator calls "information texts": material written for the interested and informed reader.

E. Tanke (Siemens) outlined the machine aids (term bank, word processors, very flexible programming) used for translating this company's highly specialized texts. Translators' work can be displayed on a cathode-ray tube, printed out or fed via OCR (optical character recognition) equipment for immediate typesetting. It is interesting that Siemens, with probably the largest company translation department in the world, use freelance typists to reduce overheads.

Finally, John Elliston, a Rank Xerox manager, related how Xerox technical writers restrict their vocabulary, producing simpler, more concrete language which SYSTRAN and also more foreigners can understand and which some of us found more elegant than their standard jargon, good though this was of its kind. Many users, eg in Scandinavia, read Xerox manuals in English rather than in translation; for these readers the

* Member, Translators' Guild Committee. freelance translator, particularly of patents; now studying feasibility of patent translation by computer for the Commission of the European Communities.

freedom enjoyed by Xerox writers in the past had cost time and effort, even confusion, whereas the limpid style created by the new vocabulary easily and fast. There may be a lesson, here not merely for those who write for foreigners, but for many non-literary writers. It seems that writers (and presumably other people will accept fundamental changes like these *if properly consulted*. The Xerox writers are brought from different parts of the world to help determine their restricted vocabulary, since the suspicion of a regional preference, eg within English or French, could jeopardize the scheme.

Aslib's "Translating & the computer" (an intentionally broad title), then, gave as general a view as a one-day seminar could. Some 60% of the audience were translators (including, significantly 15 freelancers), 13% library staff, 13% academics and the remainder from computer science, management and publishing. The Translators' Guild was represented by Peter Arthern on the platform and by chairman Ewald Osers and numerous members in the audience, and (more remarkably) the Translators Association of the Society of Authors sent their chairman George Unwin and secretary George Astley. Discussions were extremely lively and down to earth, and a sequel on a larger scale is planned for 1980. The proceedings ("*Translating & the Computer*", ed. Barbara M Snell) are available now from the North-Holland Publishing Company.

II

The EC's attack on the language barrier

The immense translation problem of the European Communities (EC) derives from the ideal of multilingualism. Learn a man's language, and you are likely to respect his culture, not to invade him: but impose your language on him, and you will invade without even noticing. *In a community of equals there can be no dominant language.*⁴⁾

However, the high-minded principle of complete multilingualism in the Communities is neither easy nor cheap to apply. The paragraphs that follow are based on an article by Professor Sager in UNESCO'S ALSSED newsletter.

Important documents appear in all seven Community languages, and all these six versions carry equal weight. Over half the budget of the European Parliament goes to multilingualism. A third of the European Commission's graduate staff work full-time on the language barrier, and in 1977 they translated over half a million pages. This volume has been rising at the

rate of some 10% a year and when Greece, Spain and Portugal join, the number of language combinations will leap from 30 to a horrific 72. Further details can be found in "*The Economist*" for 12 August 1978, in an article which begins: "The EEC Commission's recent study on the consequences of enlarging the community devoted precisely one sentence to languages: 'Questions arising in this connection require further study'".⁵⁾

A solution had to be found to the steadily rising volume and cost of translation and interpreting in the EC institutions, and in 1976 the European Parliament approved a 3-year plan of action for the "Improvement of information transfer between European languages". The plan was officially presented to the public at large at a conference of which many staff translators will have heard: *Overcoming the language barrier*,⁶⁾ the Third European Congress on Information Systems and Networks, organized in Luxembourg on 3/6 May 1977 by the European Commission's Directorate General XIII (the directorate for scientific and technical information and information management). The multilingual dimension of information transfer was stressed in an impressive display of applied linguistics research and development, with some 700 participants and numerous papers on teaching and the use of languages in the Communities, multilingual terminology, human and machine-aided translation, multilingual thesauri (which are access tools used to search through literature for relevant references) and, of course, automatic translation. Another reason for the conference was EURONET, the European Information Network which is to be opened later this year. Through EURONET (for example if we use our Post Office's impressive PRESTEL viewdata system on our television sets) we can consult data banks all over Europe, including, ultimately, EUROCAUTOM. The conference provided a meeting point for future users of EURONET and those responsible for implementing it, and showed users the methods and tools which will soon be available. The main objective of the conference, however, was to give those responsible for the 3-year plan of action a good view of existing and developing systems and methods, so that the plan could be based on the best knowledge available.

The plan of action is intended to produce solutions which will reduce cost while maintaining or even improving the quality of the linguistic services. It is administered by the Commission's Directorate General

XIII, with the assistance since September 1977 of an advisory committee of experts from the 9 member states (CETIL). The British members are Chris Leamy of the British Library, and the chairman, Professor Sager. CETIL also acts as a forum for the exchange of information on the situation in the member states and at the Community level, covering all the interests represented in our Institute of Linguists: language knowledge and qualifications in various occupations, language teaching policies, translation, language policies concerning scientific and technical publications, and current or planned research.

Much of the plan of action concerns the application of computerized methods to the transfer of information between the Community languages. It is divided into the following sections:

- automatic pre-translation of unprocessed texts drafted in natural language,
- automatic translation of texts drafted in limited syntax,
- terminology banks,
- multilingual thesauri,
- technical infra-structure (word processing),
- assessment of applied research, encouragement of multilingualism.

The Commission's work under the first three of these headings can be summarized as follows.

Automatic pre-translation of "natural" texts

The Commission bought the SYSTRAN automatic translation system for development for the language pair English-French in 1976, and has since added French-English and English-Italian versions. Both SYSTRAN, which is the subject of another article in this issue of *The Incorporated Linguist*, and the other existing systems have been designed mainly to supply information quickly to small groups of specialists in limited subject areas. Given the complexity of the documents used by the European institutions in respect of subject matter and text types and the high degree of accuracy and idiomaticity required by the extremely heterogeneous user groups, both in these institutions and at the numerous levels of national government, the EC demands far more of SYSTRAN than any previous customer. A fair amount of post-editing is required, therefore, and since extensive dictionaries have to be compiled, the system may be used initially for only a limited range of subjects and types of text. This then is definitely machine pre-translation, rather than pure MT. It seems possible that a new generation of post-editors may have to be trained, for at present translators

and revisors tend to find the work both difficult and irksome. (However, see my comments in section V. Meanwhile the Commission, again unlike all other customers, is carrying out development work on SYSTRAN and acquiring a large quantity of MT expertise; and SYSTRAN, if not of high quality, is now surprisingly good and clearly improving.)

A system built upon 30 (let alone 72) *language pairs* is cumbersome, and it was felt that the considerable European expertise in automatic translation might yield a more convenient system. CETIL therefore began immediately to investigate the possibility of developing a joint European MT system EUROTRA, which should be *multilingual* and modular, so that the various stages in the translation process could be developed separately and used for a variety of functions related to information transfer. This would be a major project, supported by both national governments and the Commission.

Automatic translation of texts in limited syntax

TITUS, the multilingual MT system of the *Institut Textile de France*, translates textile abstracts drafted in limited syntax. It works into several languages simultaneously and is used by various countries. Once we accept that certain forms of communication can be standardized to some extent, the development of limited-syntax systems for the translation of restricted text types like abstracts becomes very attractive. The exclusion of post-editing would enable multilingual versions of texts to be produced much faster and more cheaply, especially as not only translation but the print-out and storage of documentation could be fully automated.

Terminology banks

The Commission was one of the pioneers in the computer storage of terminology. The importance of *terminology centres* is enshrined in the UNESCO *Recommendation on the legal protection of translators*⁷⁾ (the "Nairobi Recommendation"). Britain, despite approving the Recommendation in 1976, has yet to set up even a terminology centre. In fact, however, every major country should have a computerized *term bank* (machine dictionary): an up-to-date, reliable and quick way to find or check accepted terminology and its foreign equivalents. In the Commission too, with its very large number of translators who may work as a team on a single document and have to produce five equally valid and acceptable translations, a term bank

is indispensable. EURODICAUTOM is fully operational, but for technical reasons it is not yet widely used. There are still far too few terminals. Also, I suspect that the average translator has a slow reading speed (rapid-reading specialists certainly expect this of people with literary modern-language degrees), and that before the scanning of dictionary pages on a television screen feels natural one needs to use EURODICAUTOM a few times under normal working conditions. Fortunately the Commission is expanding EURODICAUTOM and making it more accessible, ultimately even to EURONET users.

Benefits to member states

The benefits of the plan of action will not be confined to the Community institutions. EURONET and the governments of the EC's member states will have access to the new expertise and to the plan's tangible results (studies; systems ready for implementation). (For example, I understand that government bodies can even now approach the Commission for SYSTRAN translations in the subject areas already covered in the system. If they want a better translation than SYSTRAN can yet offer, the Commission will teach them to update the system's dictionaries, an operation which, if properly done, eliminates many more errors than one would expect.)

III

A translator facing up to the machine

As part of the Commission's SYSTRAN development work, the language philosopher Margaret Masterman and her Cambridge Language Research Unit (CLRU) have been advising on what improvements to make. The SYSTRAN program consists of 100 000 instructions with very little annotation. One of her proposals was that the linguistic part of the program be made "transparent", so that the translator could understand it. Instead of feeling cut off from the machine, he could read the annotated SYSTRAN program and see both where and why an error had occurred. Then, "translated thus from a poor creature to a creator"⁸⁾, he could apply his skills and experience to the devising of new translation rules and to the correction of the errors at source. In doing this he would work with, and on a level with, the systems analyst.

But would she in fact find an ordinary translator – intuitive, totally ignorant of computers – who was willing or able to decipher and then "translate" some SYSTRAN program? I at least had some curiosity, and I was well enough established not to care about looking a fool. She faced

me with the SUBSENU sub-routine from the first of SYSTRAN's five syntactic passes. This demanded pluck and patience from her, too, since she knew that the arts person "won't play while in a fog", but keeps asking fundamental questions. The report on "The SUBSENU experiment" by her and the systems analyst Bob Smith is like a comic novel; if and when it is published, it will be a fascinating document of a multi-disciplinary approach to the machine⁹⁾

Perhaps I should stress that I was no more machine-oriented than other translators. Quite the reverse: all my early training tended to promote intuition, not reason, and my typical Englishwoman's arts-biased education had led me to give up science at the age of 13 and mathematics at 14, when it stopped being mere computation. In some ways, then, I was remarkably ill-fitted for the experiment. However, as Ewald Osers says, "a translator should always try new things", and we persevered. I compiled a glossary of the orders in the sub-routine, so that they could be turned into English. That was really a simple translation problem, but it and the comments I made seemed to confirm that *translators can come in on an equal footing* with systems analysts. The work will not be easy, but that first time will probably be by far the worst, particularly as the sub-routine chosen was very tricky.

What took the time on that first occasion, sure enough, was the arts person's constant interruptions as she strove to acquire and maintain an overall vision of the machine – no mean feat when you are staring at a computer language which you do not understand.¹⁰⁾ SYSTRAN, unfortunately, was written in a compact macro language, having been conceived when computer storage was very costly¹¹⁾. (EUROTRA, if or when it happens, will be in an approachable, "high-level" computer language, probably PASCAL.)

Translators clearly need a popularizer. John Hutchins writes very readably on MT and machine-aided translation,¹²⁾¹³⁾ for which I am most grateful. We would benefit also from something written specially for translators, even (dare one say it) philosophical.

Linguistics go commercial

The reason why I, a strictly practical translator, now find philosophy intriguing is very simple: Computers force us to ask "What is translation?" Translation theory and linguistics have ceased to be merely academic, simply because the machine cannot

help but be a testbed for a theory: an MT system just will not work if the concepts underlying its program do not conform to the reality of language.

I shall be criticized for confusing translation theory with linguistics, but in this context some merging of the two disciplines seems overdue. The linguistics specialists of the past two decades have paid too little attention to foreign languages. As Margaret Masterman says, a translator retains both languages in his subconscious at the same time, whereas some structural linguists tend to revert to being unilingual,¹⁴⁾ with the result that their ideas may fall down when applied, say, to a language like Chinese which does not have a subject-and-predicate structure, but conveys meaning by stress and intonation. ("What should they know of England who only England know?"¹⁵⁾)

IV

Stress and reiteration

Her own idea of language is based on reiteration (explicit or implicit) and stress¹⁶⁾ 17). It makes a lot of sense to me. In my experience much more meaning is conveyed by rhythm and stress than we recognise, even in the written word. This is borne out by various things that are revealed in difficult or abnormal situations. For example, a dyslexic cannot read without reading aloud. A dyslexic actress like Susan Hampshire, for example, cannot read from a script, but must learn her lines in advance by slowly, softly reading to herself¹⁸⁾. Similarly, when I myself am faced with a problem in a text, whether English or foreign, I hear myself reading the words, at a volume which increases (privacy permitting) with the difficulty. If, for example, a prepositional phrase has more than one possible antecedent, I "test intonations"¹⁹⁾, trying out each possible intonation for size, and selecting the one that imparts the right shape, or rhythm, to the sentence. This also helps to clarify the typically English noun strings which are the bugbear of foreign translators, as in the following (real) news-paper headline "BIRTH CONTROL SCANDAL PRIEST SENSATION", with its pyramid of layered adjectival nouns. A classic example²⁰⁾ of the importance of stress arose on the Archbishop of Canterbury's arrival in the United States, when the news-men at the airport asked if he was going to any nightclubs in New York. Archbishop: "Are there any nightclubs in New York?" Morning headline: "ARCHBISHOP'S FIRST QUESTION; ARE THERE ANY

NIGHTCLUBS IN NEW YORK?" (Alas for Lord Chesterfield's "Everything suffers by translation except a bishop".)

Margaret Masterman suggests that the basic unit of language may be the "breath group". A typical breath group ("at the corner of the street"; will contain about 7 words and include two stress points and what hangs on them. There are exceptions, for example, at the beginning of a sentence, where there tends to be only one stress point. The breath group corresponds to the brain's short-term memory and probably to the unit used by interpreters. Most important in this context, she believes it is also the "translation unit", the conceptual unit into which we unconsciously divide the texts which we translate.

V

What will MT mean?

As already implied, I do not expect the tiger and the polar bear to clash. What then *will* acceptable machine translation imply for us? I believe it is essentially a question of standards.

How many standards, and whose? Should the standard applied to MT be that of the user, or the (often much higher) standard of the translator? CETIL have been discussing the setting up of different translation quality criteria so as to differentiate according to the importance of the text translated. A human translator, whether staff or freelance, has very little option but to produce his best. If he allows the user to persuade him into doing substandard work, it is fairly certain to end up in other hands sooner or later, probably with a disgruntled user who will assume it to be of the translator's normal quality. So a translator can afford to have only one standard. However I, for one, do not enjoy doing my best for someone who does not want it. It makes for an uneasy, and short, relationship with the client.

Instinctively, translators judge a translation by its quality. A poor translation is felt as an affront, particularly since the low average standard of translation is a threat to the profession's status. Yet many users tolerate that low standard. It cannot always be ignorance; there must be other criteria than quality, such as speed and cost. Are our standards appropriate for all users, even for committed information-seekers who bring their own expertise and need no persuading? Professor Loh *sells* his machine translations of the Chinese mathematics journals; they appear in fact to be *what the user needs* – not pretty, but comprehensible, and available in a fraction

of the time that the humans took.

The public, or publics, need many different levels of translation, but I think they all fall into one of two basic categories:

- 1) *Routine "information" texts* for the interested, expert reader. Style, even nuances, are of secondary importance. Many of these are likely soon to be machine-translatable. The translations will normally be post-edited, but even without this they will have uses: the user can scan them to see whether the document is important enough to warrant a high-quality translation; or, for example if time is short, he can read them normally but expecting errors, which his knowledge of the field will help him to spot (machines are worse than people at camouflaging their mistakes).
- 2) *Texts with a message* for the less-than-committed reader: legal, political, school-level educational, publicity. These will not be machine-translatable in the foreseeable future. This is tiger fodder: with MT taking care of some of the routine, the bad translators might lose, but the good ones might be much happier; they could concentrate on the more rewarding work, and the *average standard of human translation would rise*.

What of the translators who miss having, say, one gentle day a week on that routine translation? Many, though not all, may find post-editing a good substitute, so good in fact that they will become interested despite themselves in improving the system, both by inserting fresh terminology and by recognizing new linguistic rules. The challenge here is that the machine is logical, whereas the human and his language are illogical: you have to make the illogical seem logical if the machine is to cope with it. It can be rather fun. EC translators, moreover, are particularly fortunate in that the Commission, alone of the bodies which have bought the right to use SYSTRAN, is allowed to undertake actual development work on the system.

There are more serious fears, however. If we accept a lower standard of language for MT, will it infect the language of the human translator? If so, will we lose precision, then intellectual capacity? After all, it is very hard to think about a thing if you cannot name it properly. And could there be still worse to follow? As Confucius said:

"If language is not correct, then what is said is not what is meant, if what is said is not what is meant.

then what ought to be done remains undone, if this remains undone, morals and arts will deteriorate, justice will go astray; if justice goes astray, the people will stand about in helpless confusion. Hence there must be no arbitrariness in what is said.

This matters above everything.²¹⁾ I believe him. But I cannot share the pessimism of those who see the machine dragging down the standards of the human translator. As A.R. Clarke, head of the Commission's English translators in Brussels, has written, translators "see themselves — and rightly so — as the guardians of the purity of the language".²²⁾ I think that the translator's awareness of words and their meanings will survive, as usual. That awareness, after all, is probably what made him a translator in the first place. Meanings matter to us. Indeed, I have been known to suggest that translators selecting a word almost, as it were, take a moral stand: "This is what he means / a true translation / the right thing." Professional pride is a prickly plant, but strong.

There are two tendencies in language. One tendency is to *restrict* expression, paring down the language and, if unchecked, ultimately impoverishing it. MT might possibly reinforce this by encouraging the adoption of restricted syntax or vocabulary or of *pro formas* or set patterns for certain information texts (CETIL is interested in these approaches). Anna Meuss has suggested that descriptions of clinical trials for drugs could be fitted on to a standard form and machine translated; space would remain for notes on anything which did not fit the form — notes which would be translated manually. We already have fairly set patterns in most patents, Barbara Kostrewski has found them in medical records²³⁾, and according to Eugene Winter they also exist hidden in engineers' reports.

However, this restrictive, truncating tendency in language is counterbalanced by its opposite, the tendency to *lift restrictions* and luxuriate. Puns and children's flowery writing are obvious examples: we sharpen our wits, almost our teeth, on words. Words stimulate us. Translators, of all people, will not easily lose their sensitivity to them. So if my English changes over the next few months (when I shall see a lot of MT), take note — and please warn me.

© VERONICA LAWSON, 1979

Postscript: translation agency buys MT
A Boston translation agency has now bought the Weidner Multilingual

Word Processing System. This is marketed as a translation aid by Weidner Communications Systems, Inc. of La Jolla, California, and was well received at the American Translators Association's convention last autumn in New York. It consists of a mini-computer, terminal and CRT screen, costs only \$125,000 and appears exceptionally convenient to operate. Spanish-English, English-Spanish and English-French versions are already available. Post-editing is done on-line, with both the source and the target versions shown together on the screen. The vocabulary can reach 3 million words, although I have seen surprisingly useful Weidner output produced with a dictionary of only 9000 terms. There is also a dictionary of synonyms. All in all, it would be surprising if the system were not brought to Europe before long.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the many people through whom I have begun to make the acquaintance of the machine. For particular help and many, if not most, of the ideas in this paper I am indebted to Margaret Masterman above all, but also to: Professor Juan Sager, Professor Frank Knowles of the British MT Group, Bob Smith and Barbara Kostrewski; Loll Rolling, Albert Bachrach, Jacques Goetschalckx, Ian Pigott and Peter Wheeler in the Commission of the European Communities, Luxembourg; Willem Dijkhuis of the North-Holland Publishing Company; and my translator colleagues, particularly Françoise Moore and various members of the Translators' Guild.

References

- 1) ALPAC: *Languages and machines: computers in translation and linguistics*. A report by the Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee, Division of Behavioral Sciences, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council. Washington, D.C. (1966).
- 2) Aphra Behn, *The Rover*, Part II, III.i.
- 3) For an idea of AI's potential, and for fun (unless you are a psychiatrist) try Parkison et al. on PARRY, a program which simulates a paranoid patient and can be interviewed by a real psychiatrist (*Artificial Intelligence*, 9, 2 (October 1977) 111/134, esp. 130/133). For example:
"HUMAN: WHEN DID YOU FIRST LEARN YOU WERE CRAZY?
PARRY: I DON'T WANT TO TALK TO YOU ANYMORE, BUZZ OFF.
(The model responds to the emotionally-charged embedded presupposition instead of the innocuous main clause.)
HUMAN: BUT, I LIKE YOU A LOT.
PARRY: SOMEBODY SHOULD TEACH YOU A LESSON ABOUT INTERVIEWING PATIENTS.
(The model cannot accept this claim from such an erratic interviewer.)"
- 4) After J. Albert Bachrach, head of the

European Commission's Medium- and Long-Term Translation Service, Luxembourg.

- 5) The gift of too many tongues, *The Economist* (12 August 1978) 38-41.
- 6) *Third European Congress on Information Systems and Networks: Overcoming the language barrier*. (Luxembourg 3/6 May 1977. Verlag Dokumentation, Munich (1977). 2 vols.
- 7) The UNESCO *Recommendation on the legal protection of translators and translations and the practical means to improve the status of translators*, paragraph 12. See in particular Crampton, Patricia: Assimilated to authors, *The Incorporated Linguist* 16, 2 (1977) 34-39.
- 8) Ben Jonson, *Every man in his humour*.
- 9) Masterman, M. and Smith, Robert J.: The SUBSENU experiment (1979).
- 10) The opacity of some of what I saw reminded me of the story Leo Rosten heard at a Bar Mitzva, about two Martians who met in America:
"What's your name?" asked the first.
"4286. And yours?"
"3359."
"That's funny; you don't look Jewish."
The Joys of Yiddish, W. H. Allen (1970).
- 11) The cost of computer storage is a thousandth of what it was twenty years ago.
- 12) Hutchins, W.J.: Machine translation and machine-aided translation, *Journal of Documentation* 34 (1978) 119-159 (Progress in Documentation).
- 13) Hutchins, W.J.: Linguistic models in machine translation, *UEA Papers in Linguistics* 9 Norwich (January 1979) 29-52.
- 14) I believe that this very ability to retain both languages in one's subconscious at once, *intact*, may be what distinguishes the good translator from the bad. Often indeed, when the source language persistently shows through a colleague's translations, translators will say "He's a superb linguist, but he just isn't a translator."
- 15) Comment by D.G. Lawson, quoting Kipling.
- 16) Masterman, M.: The basic reiterative semantic patterns of language, in proceedings of *Informatics* 3, Aslib, London (1978).
- 17) Masterman, M.: Rhetorical punctuation by machine, in proceedings of 1978 conference *Computers in literary and linguistic research*, Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing, Birmingham (1979).
- 18) Communication from Frank Dale, producer and director of the documentary on dyslexia "If you knew Susie" shown on BBC TV, 23 August 1976.
- 19) Comment by Stephen Walker at Aslib conference *Informatics* 5, 27 March 1979.
- 20) Those two examples I owe to Brian Ledwith.
- 21) Translated by Arthur Waley. Quoted in *Translators' Guild Newsletter* 1, 4, by Barbara Snell.
- 22) Clarke, A.R. and Andre, C.: A time of rapid growth . . . a visit to the Commission's English Translation Division, *Staff Courier* of the Commission of the European Communities, 34-43.
- 23) Kostrewski, B.: Structural considerations for the derivation of application-linked reference languages for medical information systems, to be published in proceedings of Aslib conference *Informatics* 5 (26-28 March 1979).