

## DL or a Dictionary

The proponents of DL are quite proud of having a huge language model (540 billion nodes!). But what they have is the surface. If the machine has some grammatical chops, it can have a much deeper understanding with many fewer nodes – millions instead of billions.

Sure, dictionaries have problems – circularity as one. A machine that has read a dictionary can find all the problems within itself, because at this stage it understands complex commands in English. It is not limited to the simple text you would expect on Facebook, but can handle the most complex text, employing bulleting, switching of existence of blocks of text, a glossary defining words. If it doesn't know a word, it looks it up – where else?

It seems so obvious – why didn't we do this thirty years ago, when it became possible with machines having large memories. We always seem to seek an easy way, where we don't need to think. Yes, it is hard to get over the first hurdle, of bootstrapping a machine from knowing nothing to knowing the meanings of tens of thousands of words, where some words may have fifty different meanings (run). Once done, the rest is easy. Now, where can I get some sunglasses to hide its beady red eyes.

Without giving too much away, you can't just "read the dictionary" – it needs some curating – will only take you five years or so. The dictionary writer assumes an Unconscious Mind is scooping up the info, instead of something that isn't all there yet.

