

provide intermediate devices for
sidered.

ize that this is a delicate question,
all the more important to avoid
uld seem to be the effort to evolve
vices. I would even label this a
e is a great deal of evidence that
; second, if a device such as the
at people can and do use it, then
development costs just to produce
ilities.

assign a rather low priority is the
acter recognizers or large random
rtant problems, but they will be
s by the time we need the devices

with a brief reminiscence and a
forties the Committee on Sensory
ading machines for the blind. It
listened attentively to suggestions
its active life the Committee con-
a device to recognize typewritten
ing letter sounds. This idea, even
ientist high in one of our largest
o visionary to warrant exploration.

will have, within five years or so,
h a reading machine is being used
ers; further, that the machine will
e acceptable speech at normal-to-
that the cost per tape will be quite
e me of merely betting on a sure

SECTION III

INDIRECT ACCESS

TO THE PRINTED PAGE

CHAIRMAN: EDWARD L. GLASER
Burroughs Corporation, Paoli, Pennsylvania

AUTOMATIC MACHINE TRANSLATION: POTENTIALITIES FOR BRAILLE ENCODING

VICTOR H. YNGVE
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

The automatic transcription of contracted braille from uncontracted material shares many of the problems of the translation by machine of such languages as German and Russian. To the extent that the braille spelling rules refer to the conventional spelling of the original the problems are minor. But to the extent that the braille spelling rules refer to pronunciation, grammatical function, or meaning the problems are severe and can be attacked only with very sophisticated methods. In other words, going from a code (ordinary inkprint spelling) into braille is really a problem in translation.

There are available source documents in the form of punched paper tape that are by-products of the printing industry. It has occurred to many of us that these could perhaps be used to produce braille copies automatically. There is also the possibility of providing, from a typewriter keyboard, pulses corresponding to ordinary spelling, and then translating these into the correct contractions in braille. There are various other possible ways of tying the two systems of representation together.

The problem is made difficult by the nature of braille. Braille is in a

sense based on spelling, but many of its rules refer not to the spelled form but to the underlying language. In other words, in a very real sense braille is a direct representation of the spoken language rather than a direct representation of the spelled form that we find in books.

In order to make the rules of braille easier many of the rules of ordinary spelling have been adopted, so that many words in braille are spelled exactly the same way as they are in a book. Since the purpose of braille is still to transmit information, however, I think it proper that the rules have been stated in terms of the underlying language. This is true as long as a human being transcribes the braille, because he can understand the language that is being encoded into braille and can very easily use rules couched in terms of the underlying language. However, given the problem of translating into braille from a representation equivalent to inkprint, or from the output of a typewriter keyboard, one faces a different problem. First of all, the spelling system of English is notoriously poor.

I think I can illustrate the sort of problems one faces by stating a couple of rules from the braille standard of some years ago. Rule 34 for Grade 2 braille has to do with contractions; it says, "Contractions forming parts of words should not be used when they are likely to lead to obscurity in recognition or pronunciation, and therefore they should not overlap well-defined syllable divisions." This rule is stated in terms of syllable divisions, something that is not explicitly represented in inkprint. "Word signs should be used sparingly in the middle of words unless they form distinct syllables. . . . Special care should be taken to avoid undue contractions of words of relatively infrequent occurrence." It goes on, ". . . when words occur at the end of a line, they must be at the end of a syllable." Here we have a rule for contracted braille stated not in terms of the inkprint spelling, but in terms of syllables, which are a feature of the underlying language. The question arises: Can one syllabify a word automatically? I think most of you know that this is very difficult. I have to look words up in the dictionary in order to separate them correctly at the end of a line. The difficulty is partly due to the traditional spelling of English, a heritage from past eras, and does not in many cases conform exactly to the pronunciation.

The next example is contained in Rule 23. According to this rule the contractions "to," "into," and "by" are always to be written close up to the word or that word which follows. It goes on, ". . . in such phrases as 'it was referred to yesterday,' and 'he was passed by when others were noticed,' the 'to' and the 'by' should be written in full and not contracted, as they refer to the preceding verb and not to the word that follows them."

In other words, if "to" or "by" are prepositions, as in "to the house," or "by the table," then one would contract the "to" or the "by" according to this rule, and write the contracted form without a space immediately preceding the next word. However, if "to" and "by" are adverbs, as in the case ". . . it was referred to yesterday . . ." and ". . . he was passed by when others were noticed," they are not contracted. There is no clue in the inkprint that these words are in one case prepositions and in the other case adverbs; they are not marked explicitly. One needs to have an understanding of the sentence in order to make that distinction, or else one has to have a method of grammatically parsing the sentence so that he can determine whether these words are prepositions or adverbs. This is a problem that has been faced in the mechanical translation of languages, and I shall say a little bit about it below.

The following sentence is actually syntactically ambiguous: "It was referred to the other day" (or, "It was referred, to the other day"). The first inkprint makes no distinction; one can *say* it either way, however, using a different tone of voice. The "to" in this sentence (as I read the rules of braille) would in one case be contracted and written next to the word; in the other case it would not be contracted. The resolution of such ambiguities is relatively easy for the person who reads the material, if he understands it. The resolution of such ambiguities would be very difficult, however, for a machine. It is also the sort of ambiguity resolution that the people working in mechanical translation of languages have been facing.

I shall give a brief summary of this work. The first hope was that one could put a dictionary into a computer. The computer would simply look up the words one at a time in the dictionary, finding equivalent words in the other language, and print them out. Such a dictionary would be easy to mechanize; the problems were involved primarily in the large size of the dictionary as compared with the relatively small size of memories. The most promising method of implementing such a thing would be to put the dictionary on magnetic tape available to the computer and arrange to look up the words in batches. I say this was a hope; there were many problems with it. First of all, especially in languages such as Russian which was given a lot of attention by people working in mechanical translation, it was realized very quickly that the size of the dictionary could be greatly reduced by not storing a whole word complete with its ending, but storing instead its stem separate from the ending. Then a program in the machine would take each Russian word, examine it letter by letter, split off any inflectional endings there might have been (e.g., case endings, verb

endings), and look up the remainder in the dictionary. Then, having found the stem of the word in the dictionary, the machine could go ahead and interpret the remainder of the word as an inflectional ending and give it its appropriate meaning. Programs of this type have been written at a number of universities and at a number of industrial firms that have been working on this type of translation. I can report that the problem is effectively solved.

However, our hopes were really too high. The result of writing out just the words from such a dictionary look-up process was completely inadequate as a translation (and I mean *completely* inadequate). There are two main reasons for this. One was that if one looks up almost any word in a dictionary, one finds that it has several renditions in the other language. The other reason was that even if one could select the correct meaning of each of the input words and string these meanings together the word order would be wrong and in general a grammatically correct sentence is not obtained. In some cases the "translation" is so badly garbled that one cannot make any sense out of it even if the correct word is there. The problem was, what next to do?

The next step was to look at the output and see whether something more could be done. Certain rules were set up, ad hoc rules, which worked perhaps 80 percent of the time. Let me illustrate such a rule. The letter sequence d-e-r in German can be an article in front of a noun; it can be a relative pronoun; if it is an article it can be nominative, genitive, or dative. The translation of this three letter word would depend on its grammatical function. Thus, a very simple rule of thumb is: "If d-e-r follows a noun without a comma translate it 'of the.'" This rule will give the correct answer about 90 percent of the time; perhaps even 95 percent of the time. It is wrong when "der" is dative (and it could very easily be dative), but it is dative perhaps only 5 percent of the time. Thus the translation is wrong about 5 percent of the time. It sounds impressive, however, to have a rule that works 95 percent of the time. This is the type of rule that I call an "ad hoc rule." The rule is not really based on the structure of the language. In other words the case is not determined and the part of speech is not determined.

Many of the mechanical translation groups looked for and discovered a large number of such rules of thumb; they were able to make a fairly reasonable improvement in readability. Another example they found was this: "If there are three meanings for a word, and one is very frequent while the other two are not as frequent, then print the frequent meaning

remainder in the dictionary. Then, having found a dictionary, the machine could go ahead and use the word as an inflectional ending and give it programs of this type have been written at a number of industrial firms that have been established. I can report that the problem is effective-

is really too high. The result of writing out a dictionary look-up process was completely (and I mean *completely* inadequate). There is one. One was that if one looks up almost any words that it has several renditions in the other was that even if one could select the correct words and string these meanings together wrong and in general a grammatically correct some cases the "translation" is so badly garbled sense out of it even if the correct word is there. to do?

look at the output and see whether something 1 rules were set up, ad hoc rules, which worked time. Let me illustrate such a rule. The letter can be an article in front of a noun; it can be an article it can be nominative, genitive, or his three letter word would depend on its gram- very simple rule of thumb is: "If d-e-r follows translate it 'of the.'" This rule will give the percent of the time; perhaps even 95 percent of 1 "der" is dative (and it could very easily be 1aps only 5 percent of the time. Thus the trans- cent of the time. It sounds impressive, however, 95 percent of the time. This is the type of rule ." The rule is not really based on the structure words the case is not determined and the part

al translation groups looked for and discovered files of thumb; they were able to make a fairly 1 readability. Another example they found was meanings for a word, and one is very frequent ot as frequent, then print the frequent meaning

and forget about the others." Again the quality is improved because it is very difficult for the reader to be faced with three alternatives; he can read much more easily if he has only single words to consider. Choosing the most frequent meaning is more often right than not. This is also the kind of rule that is not really a "correct rule." On the average, however, it will work.

Mechanical translation people were quite optimistic about this procedure; they thought, ". . . it's just a matter of finding more and more of these rules; fixing up the order; eliminating more and more of the problems." Unfortunately, one can't go all the way with this approach. It becomes much too complicated, rules conflict with rules, and one never really knows what one has when it is done. I want to emphasize, however, that such rules will take care of perhaps 80 percent of the problems involved. This first 80 percent of the problem is easy to solve. It is the remaining 20 percent that is extremely difficult and that cannot be solved by such rules of thumb.

The next approach was to try and do it right: to find out what are the actual parts of speech of each word in the sentence. Let us try to find out whether it *is* a preposition or an adverb. Let us find out what *is* the subject of the sentence; what *is* the verb; what *is* the object; and so on. In other words, do a complete parsing of the sentence. Programs of this sort have been written and they are fairly successful, but a new batch of problems has shown up.

In general it is not possible to parse a sentence without knowing its meaning. This we found through experience. I suppose if we had thought about it we would have known, but we hoped that a simple parsing of the sentence would give us enough improvement in the output of the translating program to be useful. Take the sentence we used above: "it was referred to the other day," or, as it may be read, "it was referred, to the other day." It would appear that parsing would help. However, this sentence is ambiguous; it has two different parsings. In any given text this sentence would be unambiguous because of its context, because the person who reads it would understand what was meant very readily, and it would never enter his mind that the sentence was ambiguous. Unless he can understand the text too, he cannot do this. So the limitations on automatic parsing of sentences is just at that point where we need to understand the meaning of the sentence in order to resolve ambiguities. I can report to you that such ambiguities are a very frequent occurrence. A very large number of sentences are really ambiguous from this grammatical point of view. We

are not bothered by such ambiguity when we read because we understand the meaning and it is this understanding of the meaning of the sentence that carries us through the ambiguities.

Our hopes have been dashed again. The essential limit of a program for parsing a sentence is just in this area which I like to call "semantics." A number of the groups working on mechanical translation are now facing up to the problem of semantics. This problem appears to be orders of magnitude more difficult than the syntactic problem. We have a few hunches, but I don't think we have the foggiest idea, really, of how to solve this problem. Nevertheless, most of the groups are working at it. They are trying ad hoc rules, and they are trying various other schemes. They have also tried schemes such as the following.

You all know that you can *row* a boat. Now, it turns out that there aren't very many other things that you *row*, other than boats. The word r-o-w is ambiguous: it could be a row (a brawl) or a row (of objects). In other words the meaning of this word or the solution of this ambiguity can be found partially but not completely. In the general case one must also take care of the meaning of the sentence. One way of doing this is to list in the dictionary that it is *boats* that you row and not other things. Much information of this kind in the dictionary might be quite useful in resolving ambiguities. There are other methods that have been proposed. One is to order the words in the dictionary in much the same way as they are in a thesaurus, by meaning categories with indexes and connections between words, and putting them into fields of knowledge and fields of interest much the same way Roget did in his Thesaurus. There are several other such schemes. In other words, we are taking the first faltering steps into the area of semantics.

Now, as to braille, I think that the complete and correct transcription of contracted braille, according to the currently accepted official rules of standard English braille, is not currently feasible. I want to be very clear about this; it is exactly what I mean. I say, "It's not feasible," but on the other hand it is. Attend very carefully to the qualification: it is more than "not feasible" vs. "feasible."

Automatic transcription is feasible if certain of the rules are compromised. The real question is, what is the degree of compromise that is necessary? I suggest that we work out the best compromises and standardize them into a new type of braille specifically for machine transcription. All the rules should be phrased in terms of the conventional spelling of the original text with no reference to pronunciation, grammatical function, or meaning. This "machine transcription braille" should conform *as closely as possible to the current practice* so that it could be read interchangeably with hand

we read because we understand of the meaning of the sentence

The essential limit of a program which I like to call "semantics." Mechanical translation are now facing a problem appears to be orders of magnitude. We have a few hunches, an idea, really, of how to solve this problem are working at it. They are trying other schemes. They have also

Now, it turns out that there aren't more than boats. The word row (or a row (of objects)). In other words, resolution of this ambiguity can be done in the general case one must also take into account the way of doing this is to list in the program not other things. Much information has been quite useful in resolving ambiguities. One has been proposed. One is to order the words the way as they are in a thesaurus, and to list connections between words, and to list fields of interest much the same as there are several other such schemes. In the next steps into the area of semantics. A complete and correct transcription of the currently accepted official rules of transcription is feasible. I want to be very clear in saying, "It's not feasible," but on the other hand the qualification: it is more than

certain of the rules are compromised. A degree of compromise that is necessary to compromise and standardize them for machine transcription. All the rules of traditional spelling of the original text must have grammatical function, or meaning. They should conform as closely as possible to be read interchangeably with hand

transcribed braille. Now this is precisely what is being done, except that we have not standardized our usage. The braille programs that we have now *do* operate with rules stated in terms of the traditional spelling. In other words, a pronunciation rule would be restated: "you will do such-and-such," instead of saying, "you do such-and-such except when you would pronounce it some other way" (you do such-and-such and list the exceptions). This is tantamount to restating the rule in terms of the inkprint spelling.

If we devise machine programs that actually are used for transcribing braille, a little thought should be given to stating these rules the way we really want to use them, while realizing that machine programs can be very easily changed to conform with any set of braille rules one might wish to use. I think it would behoove the people who are interested in what the machine produced braille is going to look like to look at the rules *as they are stated now*, and to the problem of restating these rules in some way so that machine programs can be written that will give the kind of braille they want. They must realize that it is impossible to program a machine to transcribe braille according to the rules as they now stand, because the criteria now put down have to do with the pronunciation, with the grammatical structure, or with the meaning of a sentence. These are problems that have not been solved even in the mechanical translation of languages. They are in fact extremely difficult problems.

I have one other comment. It would be a good idea to capitalize upon the rather wide availability of punched tape from the printing industry. I imagine that this has been suggested before. I feel that this material should be placed in a central repository so that people who want to make braille editions would have it available. There are other groups that are also interested in a centralized repository for this material. I would think it would be very wise to contact these groups and work with them. The other groups are primarily concerned with mechanical translation (who would like to have the material for translation) and the groups associated with information retrieval (or the automatic library). I don't know where the best place would be for such a center; possibly the Library of Congress. Publishers send copies there anyway for copyright purposes. Perhaps they wouldn't mind sending their punched paper tapes to the Library of Congress. I don't know; I presume that the Library of Congress is not set up for this kind of thing, that there would have to be something added. Perhaps it is unsatisfactory as a repository for other reasons; but I certainly feel that this should be explored, and it should be explored concurrently with other groups that are also interested, particularly the information retrieval people.

In concluding, I should like to consider a number of specific questions

having to do with problems in applying the caveats I have discussed.* Among these I would include those dealing with (1) paper tapes, (2) contractions vs. syllable boundaries, (3) the anticipated or possible contraction in a revised and "computer-oriented" braille, and (4) the argument for complex translation programs versus the generation of a modified braille.

THE PROBLEM OF OBTAINING PUNCHED PAPER TAPES

This is an extremely difficult problem. I personally feel that the best solution, which perhaps is not feasible, would be to update the procedures in the printing industry. After all, the printing industry was mechanized about 50 years ago, when Monotype was really the last word in automation. It uses a player piano-like roll which is not quite as wide as that for the player piano. It is read the same way, with compressed air; it huffs and puffs and chugs along, and is not really in line with modern automation techniques. Monotype has served the printing industry admirably; I could imagine they would be loathe to change unless a very real advancement were achieved. There are people who are thinking in terms of computer programs to help correct errors. In fact there are some at MIT who are doing this sort of thing. If one can get the material that is to be published on tape and into a computer, then it is possible to write a program that will correct this tape to order. This has a very great advantage, namely that one does not have to proofread the material carefully once more. Once it is set, once it has been proofread, once it is correct—it is there, it is done. I feel that there is a great deal of room for advancement in this area.

CONTRACTIONS, SYLLABLE BOUNDARIES, AND THE COMPRESSION OF COMPUTER- ORIENTED BRAILLE

I think that there is no doubt that contractions across a syllable boundary could tend to slow a person up. I think the problem here is to state the rules in such a way that a machine can follow them; in other words, to state mechanical rules that will give braille that is readable. Probably a statistical approach here would do. If there is only one word out of ten pages that is going to slow up a reader, then it is not going to slow him very much overall. If one can state the rules in such a way that they do the right things

* The material in this section was prepared from the question and answer period following Dr. Yngve's paper—Ed.

the caveats I have discussed.*
 g with (1) paper tapes, (2) con-
 ntingated or possible contraction
 aille, and (4) the argument for
 generation of a modified braille.

ING

personally feel that the best solu-
 e to update the procedures in the
 dustry was mechanized about 50
 last word in automation. It uses
 e as wide as that for the player
 pressed air; it huffs and puffs and
 1 modern automation techniques.
 / admirably; I could imagine they
 real advancement were achieved.
 ns of computer programs to help
 T who are doing this sort of thing.
 ublished on tape and into a com-
 ram that will correct this tape to
 amely that one does not have to
 e. Once it is set, once it has been
 is done. I feel that there is a great

LE BOUNDARIES,
 OF COMPUTER-

ctions across a syllable boundary
 e problem here is to state the rules
 w them; in other words, to state
 t is readable. Probably a statistical
 one word out of ten pages that is
 oing to slow him very much over-
 way that they do the right things

l from the question and answer period

effectively most of the time, then if a mistake is made once in ten pages, or
 a contraction is made across a syllable boundary, the risk is worth taking.
 Let us make a standard to do the contracting so that different people who
 have different programs can still produce the same braille. I think that once
 the reader is used to the results they might not slow him up very much.

My guess is that the degree of compression in braille would not be
 changed appreciably. This is only an impression, for I have not made a
 study of this. The size of a braille book is not likely to be increased by very
 much; perhaps by one page out of 100, or something like that.

There are two problems here. One is the physical problem of storing
 all the words. One would have for example the word "hothouse," in which
 the "th" should not be contracted, presumably. There are several ways of
 approaching this problem in a machine. One is to list all these words. This
 means merely looking up the word in the dictionary, seeing what list it is in,
 perhaps storing only one list, the smaller one. If the word is not in that list,
 then do the job the longer way. There is one problem here in that the list
 might require a fairly large storage. One way out is to store only the words
 one expects to run into frequently and not the others. Then the rule would
 be correctly followed most of the time. Another approach would be to look
 at the spelling and to make such rules as " 'th' after 's' should be contracted"
 (assuming that we find that this is generally the case), and for "hothouse,"
 the "th" after a vowel perhaps would not be separated. In other words, it
 might be possible to state the rules in terms of spelling and yet have a
 fairly satisfactory result. Whichever way it is done, there is not too much
 difference from a machine point of view, except it is out of the question to
 list all of the words involved in some of these rules.

The other problem is that there are many of these words; with vocabu-
 lary one is dealing essentially with an open class. People can invent new
 words, for example, and when they have invented new words one wants the
 program to deal with them correctly. It is not feasible, however, to list
 words that haven't been invented or used.

LARGE COMPUTERS VS. MODIFIED BRAILLE

First of all, I agree 100 percent with the statement made here that the ma-
 chine should serve man and not vice versa; this is in part my own motivation
 in working towards mechanical translation. Communication between differ-
 ent linguistic communities now goes entirely through people who are to
 some extent bilingual. If we had some machine aid in this area we could,
 I think, do something by machine which is quite a burden to people. I don't

want to be misunderstood on this point: from one point of view, one must change the rules of braille if the job is going to be done by machine. From another point of view, the rules need not be changed. It depends on just what one means by the phrase "changing the rules of braille." If one lists all the words, and indicates how they are to be contracted, this is a rule. This is a different rule from the kind of rule that tells us, "You must not cross syllable boundaries." The result may be precisely the same, which is to the good if it is judged that the braille as currently written is the best.

In other words I am not proposing to alter the braille codes as they are currently written unless there are good reasons to do so from the point of view of the reader. But I am proposing that the rules be restated in a machine-usable form, as they are in fact now being applied by working programs. The other comment I would have is that such rules as the use of "to" contraction, and "by" contraction (in the case of preposition and not in the case of adverb) is something that is rather difficult to mechanize; it is not out of the question, but it would take a rather sophisticated computer program. We don't know quite how to do this completely adequately. If this rule were restated in some other way that would give the result intended (or very close to it), then I think we should do so, and we should say to ourselves, "This is machine braille that we are using."

AUTOMATIC BRAILLE REPRODUCTION

VIRGIL E. ZICKEL

American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Kentucky

During the past ten years some effort has been expended to produce braille by the application of the principles and techniques of automation. This effort was initiated, at least in the United States, by the Library of Congress; in 1954 the American Printing House for the Blind (APH) was selected to conduct an exploratory survey to determine the need and the areas for which research might result in an improvement in the quality of braille and the lowering of its cost. As a result of this survey, several definite projects were selected and approved by the Library for further research and development over the next three years.

Several studies were made in cooperation with the University of Kentucky to determine the optimum physical dimensions of braille. These studies were concerned primarily with interdot, intercell, and interline spacing.

Some effort was made to fabricate a braille book paper that would be attractive, have maximum classroom life, and optimum readability. Under this program an effort also was made to improve the braille plate embossing machines to increase operating speed and raise the level of accuracy of embossing. Special emphasis was laid on the need to lessen the variation in dot height.

Through a cost analysis of braille book production from editing through binding, it was learned that the braille plate making operation which includes embossing, proofreading, and correcting is the largest single item of cost in this operation. This is due primarily to the fact that most runs of braille are very small. The Library of Congress, for illustration, normally orders 28 to 30 copies of a book; for this number the plates alone account for over two-thirds of the total cost. The fact that plate making represents such a large part of book cost suggests that research in this area could be rewarding, and that the use of the recent developments in technology might result in lower cost for the plates.

A braille plate consists of a sheet of zinc, iron, or aluminum approximately .010 inch thick, 9½ inches wide and 25 inches long. This plate is

folded to form a double sheet of metal $9\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $12\frac{1}{2}$ inches. It is then placed in a stereograph machine where it is embossed through both thicknesses, forming in effect a male and female die. After embossing, proof sheets are made from the plates and are checked for errors. The plates and the error sheets are returned to the operator for correcting. These three operations—embossing, proofreading, and correcting—each require about the same amount of time. The actual translation is done by the operator at the same time as the embossing.

A systems engineering approach to the braille plate making operation suggests that a three unit system consisting of an input unit for originating and verifying punched cards or tape, an intermediate unit (probably a computer) in which the actual translation would be accomplished, and a third unit from which the output of the computer would be used to control a braille plate embossing machine, could logically replace the present manual operation.

The input unit presents no problem since punched tape and card machines are in everyday use. The intermediate unit probably presents the greatest problem, since it involves the selection of the computer that is most practical for the purpose, and many factors affect this decision, two of the most important of which are the size of memory and the actual per word cost of operation. Although the output unit presents several problems too, there appeared to be advantages in early construction of this unit as it would prove the feasibility of automatic control of the embossing machine, the practicability of verifying, and could result in some immediate saving in plate cost.

In 1955 the construction of the first tape controlled braille plate embossing system was started in IBM's laboratory. This machine consists of a braillewriter/tape punch unit to originate the tape, a tape reader/braillewriter/tape punch unit for verifying and a tape reader/stereograph machine combination for the output. Tape control was selected for this first unit since both tape punch and read units are small and flexible, which resulted in the entire unit being a small efficient machine.

Through several years of use in production, this pilot project proved the feasibility of tape control of the embossing machine; further, that verifying could be used in lieu of proofreading. Actually the level of accuracy obtained through verifying proved to be higher than that obtained with conventional proofreading. The shape and height of the braille dots are also much better with the tape controlled unit, since corrections are not made on the plates as they are with the conventional system. Braille plate cost

2 inches by 12½ inches. It is then embossed through both thick-nale die. After embossing, proof checked for errors. The plates and rator for correcting. These three d correcting—each require about islation is done by the operator at

he braille plate making operation ng of an input unit for originating ntermediate unit (probably a com- ould be accomplished, and a third puter would be used to control a gically replace the present manual

since punched tape and card ma- ediate unit probably presents the selection of the computer that is factors affect this decision, two of of memory and the actual per word nit presents several problems too, construction of this unit as it would ol of the embossing machine, the sult in some immediate saving in

t tape controlled braille plate em- oratory. This machine consists of a te the tape, a tape reader/braille- a tape reader/stereograph machine rol was selected for this first unit are small and flexible, which re- ent machine.

oduction, this pilot project proved ossing machine; further, that veri- ing. Actually the level of accuracy e higher than that obtained with d height of the braille dots are also nit, since corrections are not made entional system. Braille plate cost

with this unit is slightly lower than with the manual operation, but probably not enough to justify the increased cost of the equipment.

The positive results obtained with the tape control embossing project encouraged further research on the translation unit, and in October 1958, IBM agreed to write a program for the IBM 704 computer to translate fully spelled input into Grade 2 braille. IBM also agreed to translate 12 books to determine if machine translation could afford the necessary degree of accuracy. It was also important to learn whether or not the machine could produce acceptable braille format. ('Format' means page number, correct number of cells per page, correct number of lines per page, etc.)

It was agreed that APH should select the titles to be translated so that they would present as nearly as possible the unusual situations encountered in applying the braille literary code in day-to-day production. Special consideration was to be given to unusual format, the author's unique style, and word usage. Among the books chosen were *How Big Is Big*, Kipling's *Jungle* books, *The Fanny Farmer Cookbook*, *Psychology for Living*, and *New Ways In Sex Education*.

The translation program was developed in the IBM Department of Mathematics and Applications in New York City. The actual work was done by Mrs. Ann Shack, working closely with the brailist at the APH. As we might expect, some of the situations that we felt would cause trouble failed to do so, while some of the simpler situations (simple at least from the standpoint of the manual transcriber) presented the biggest problems. For instance, one of these books, an elementary reader, *Up And Away*, has only a few lines on the page of the original inkprint edition, the type is large, and the lines are widely spaced. Normally the braille version of a book of this kind is written with twice the normal line spacing, and the lines on the reverse side of the sheet fall between the lines on the first side. This situation coupled with the fact that running headings are placed only on the numbered pages presented one of the toughest format problems the program had to solve.

The choice of the IBM 704 computer was based on the flexibility the machine affords and the fact that it provided the memory or storage capacity that the project seemed to require. Since the 704 used punched cards for both input and output, it was decided that the embossing machine at APH should be fitted up for card control as well as tape control, so that a conversion from cards to tape would not be necessary. This was accomplished by adapting an IBM 056 Verifier as the card reader input to the embossing machine.

A program was completed and machine translation of braille became a reality in April 1959. Several revisions were necessary, of course, before the program attained its present form, but in the Spring of 1962 the last of the 12 books was completed.

It should be emphasized that the program as written takes no liberties with the braille code, the only compromise being that words normally hyphenated at the end of a line with the manual system are not hyphenated with the automated system; instead the entire word is carried over to the next line.

When the first few books had been completed and it appeared that translation was feasible, APH decided with the help of IBM to adapt two more stereograph machines for card control. This was done because it had been found that to emboss a plate takes approximately five minutes, the equivalent of 12 plates an hour. This capacity was far too small and did not utilize the operator's time efficiently. With three output machines 250 plates can be produced each eight-hour day. This is roughly equivalent to one-half the total production of the Printing House.

The experience gained from these 12 books suggests that machine translation is not only possible, but it will prove to be faster and more efficient than the manual method; it promises to be entirely satisfactory. With a table look-up type of program, some up-dating will have to be done continuously. It is felt, however, that some procedure such as translating the first chapter, then reading the proof listing and making the indicated changes, will enable us to cope with any unusual style or word usage that is encountered in a particular book without making a complete retranslation necessary.

The accuracy of the complete system seems to be ensured by the fact that input cards are verified, that a proof listing will be read at least in part, and that the embossing machine incorporates the fail-safe principle, thereby practically eliminating machine errors. The only remaining factor that might make the system impractical is economic and APH has given this a great deal of serious thought. Whenever possible accurate records have been kept of each operation and we know within reason the cost of punching and verifying the input cards; we know, too, the cost of embossing the metal plates.

Some estimates of computer cost have been made; however, there are many factors affecting this cost other than the actual per word cost of the machine. Since a computer sophisticated enough to handle the braille program is not available in the Louisville area, it is necessary that the cards

ne translation of braille became a were necessary, of course, before ut in the Spring of 1962 the last gram as written takes no liberties mise being that words normally anual system are not hyphenated ntire word is carried over to the completed and it appeared that ith the help of IBM to adapt two rol. This was done because it had s approximately five minutes, the acity was far too small and did not three output machines 250 plates his is roughly equivalent to one-House.

12 books suggests that machine l prove to be faster and more effi- s to be entirely satisfactory. With p-dating will have to be done con- procedure such as translating the isting and making the indicated unusual style or word usage that ut making a complete retranslation n seems to be ensured by the fact listing will be read at least in part, ates the fail-safe principle, thereby The only remaining factor that onomic and APH has given this a er possible accurate records have w within reason the cost of punch- ow, too, the cost of embossing the ve been made; however, there are an the actual per word cost of the ed enough to handle the braille : area, it is necessary that the cards be sent to and from a computer installation in another city; that the job be fitted into the computer schedule and an operator familiar with the braille project be provided. Since this presents so many incidental problems, the best solution found so far is to have a member of the APH staff actually carry the cards to the computer (after arrangements have been made of course), translate the cards, and bring the output cards back to Louisville. It is obvious that this procedure is both time consuming and costly—so costly that it appears necessary that a computer be obtained for use at APH if machine translation is to be a production operation.

Since the cost of the computer is so indefinite, we might approach the economics of the automated system in reverse order. That is, we might take the cost of a plate with the manual system and subtract from it the known cost with the automated system. The difference would then be the amount that could be allowed for the unknown operations. Following this reasoning, we find that the average cost of a braille plate with the manual system is \$1.80; this is the cost of one numbered page of approximately 900 characters. With the proposed automated system it would cost 50 to 55 cents to prepare the input for a similar amount of material. While the cost of the output is approximately 15 cents per page, the metal costs 10 cents per page. These amounts add to approximately 80 cents. The difference between this amount and the present cost of the manual operation would then be \$1.00 per page—the absolute maximum that could be allowed for the computer cost and still make machine translation economically feasible.

Pursuing this line of thought further, we find that APH produces approximately 120 thousand braille plates per year; it is estimated that this figure will reach 150 thousand plates within the next two years. Since, however, a sizable amount of this work consists of mathematics, music, foreign languages, and other technical publications for which programs have not been written and machine translation may not be practical, it seems reasonable to assume that one-half of the total could be done on the automated system. Then assuming that some 60 to 75 thousand plates could be machine produced at a \$1.00 per page, we would have available 60 to 75 thousand dollars as a maximum we could spend for the computer, its maintenance, and its operation annually and still be within the present plate cost.

Personnel to operate the machine would probably cost 7 to 8 thousand dollars a year; maintenance 20 to 25 thousand dollars per year; and an additional 10 thousand dollars will be needed for power and air conditioning. If the installation cost can be written off a saving in plate cost of 20 to 25

thousand dollars a year might be realized. This is equal to a saving of 20 to 25 percent in the cost of the plates made by this process over those made in the conventional manner. It should be emphasized that these are only estimates; however, if these figures are reasonably accurate the use of machine translation could result in a saving.

Looking to the future: additional titles should be translated as early as possible, as there is much to be learned. A great deal was learned from the first 12 titles; we know of course that machine translation can be faster, probably more accurate, and far more flexible than the manual system, but the actual per plate cost and the percentage of the total work load that can be handled in this manner efficiently can only be proven in regular day to day operation.

Since a computer sophisticated enough to handle the project is not now available in the Louisville area, it seems wise to take steps to obtain one for use at APH. There are several colleges in Louisville, including the Speed Engineering School; possibly the computer needs of these schools can be pooled with APH, thereby providing computer time not now available and at a reasonable cost.

Constant development underway in the computer field suggests that machines of this type will continue to become smaller, less costly to purchase, and easier to operate. If we assume that these developments will result in a lower per word cost while the cost of labor continues to spiral upward, the use of the computer becomes more of a necessity than a convenience or a novelty if we are to meet the needs of blind people for adequate reading material.

ENHANCING THE AVAILABILITY OF BRAILLE*

ROBERT W. MANN

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

INTRODUCTION

The striking and woeful unbalance between the availability of printed and written material to the sighted and to the blind has inspired the study, design, and fabrication of systems and devices to enhance the blind person's access to the sighted person's world. The interest of Mechanical Engineering faculty at MIT in the problems of the blind was initiated by the biweekly Sensory Research Discussions originated and chaired since the fall of 1959 by John K. Dupress, Director of Technological Research of the American Foundation for the Blind. Initial investigations were unsupported and conducted entirely within the context of undergraduate laboratory and design project and theses work. Subsequently, a small grant from the American Foundation for the Blind made possible the fabrication of, and experiments with, several research devices. As of January 1961 the project has had formal support from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The contract funds several research and development tasks in the fields of sensory aids and prostheses

* The work reported has been supported primarily by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the U. S. Government Department of Health, Education and Welfare under contract SAV-1004-61. Mr. John K. Dupress, Director of Technological Research, American Foundation for the Blind has inspired and encouraged our efforts, including his sponsorship of a small grant from the Foundation which sustained student work on the early stages of the investigation.

The project is undertaken in the context of our academic laboratory (the Engineering Projects Laboratory) and so benefits directly from the involvement of faculty, graduate, and undergraduate students. Professor D. M. Baumann has supervised the development of the Braille and Typewriter Accessory assisted by graduate research assistants D. W. Kennedy and G. F. Staack, and undergraduates D. G. Eglinton, S. A. Lichtman, and J. A. Robertson. Professor E. E. Blanco and graduate student K. F. Johansen have participated in the development of the braille transducers, and freshmen A. S. Ivestor and P. J. Siemens have contributed significantly to the type compositor's tape to mechanized braille study.