

LEXICAL PATTERNING IN TEXT – A WAY TO “AUTOMATIC” SUMMARIES

Hilkka Stotesbury
University of Joensuu

Summarizing is an important skill in academic life. In having attempted to discover problems students face in summary writing and how to alleviate their difficulties, I have been concerned with the concept of the ideal summary. Even if the communicative purpose is perhaps the most decisive factor in the outcome of a summarizing product, it is interesting to look at other procedures developed for the purpose of obtaining summaries. Michael Hoey (1991) has presented a model of lexical pattern tracing which will be used here to arrive at different summaries of a particular source text. The principles of lexical patterning are: first, to find simple and complex repetitions and paraphrases in a text (an article from a semi-academic magazine in the present case); second, to produce a matrix of lexical repetitions, i.e. a matrix of bonding, on the basis of which so-called 'bands' can be determined to indicate the sentences with different numbers of repetitive links; third, to employ the bands as the key to various levels of automatic summaries. One exemplary summary created by lexical repetition tracing will be contrasted with a subject specialist and a student summary. The value and applications of "automatic" summaries will then be discussed.

This paper briefly describes a procedure called **lexical patterning**, devised by Michael Hoey (1988, 1991), which makes an attempt at arriving at a standard set of summaries on the basis of any (expository) source text. Secondly, one 'automatic' summary gained through the procedure is compared to some 'real-world'¹ summaries. Thirdly, the value of the method and its pedagogical applications will be discussed.

My interest in the lexical patterning method derives from a need to obtain reliable summaries of a particular source text to be used as content criteria when assessing student or 'novice' summaries. Subject-specialist or 'mature'

¹Cohen (1989) designates a summary as a 'real-world' one if it has been written for somebody who is not familiar with the source text and only wants the gist of it. This requirement also applies in the case of these exemplary summaries.

summaries are, however, difficult to obtain and I have therefore welcomed any other procedures supplementing the more conventional methods of summarization, such as finding the macrostructure of the source text (Kintsch and van Dijk 1978) or the application of the problem-solution model (e.g., Winter 1977 and Hoey 1983: 31–106). Although the communicative purpose of summarization is undoubtedly a decisive factor for the surface structure of any summary, my intention is to find whether there might be some way of arriving at an ideal, or at least a standard, summary of any source text. Michael Hoey's method of lexical patterning in text provides an interesting approach to the problems involved.

HOEY'S LEXICAL PATTERNING METHOD

Hoey argues for a new way of looking at the storing and processing of language. He considers that Halliday and Hasan's 1976 study of cohesion, and other similar works, do not supply the whole answer to the question of how cohesion is interpreted (Hoey 1991: 10–14). Hoey's argument is that lexical cohesion is the most important of all cohesion-creating devices in discourse and points us toward the central areas of text. Thus, if some textual areas contain no repetition, we are dealing with marginal sentences and the ideas expressed through these sentences should generally not be included in a summary.

MAIN CATEGORIES OF LEXICAL REPETITION

The main categories of lexical repetition are:

1. **Simple lexical repetition (SR)**, which means that lexical items appear in an identical form in text or, if there are differences, these are only within the same grammatical paradigm; e.g., *debate* (sg.) – *debates* (pl.)
2. **Complex repetition (CR)** covers the cases sharing a lexical morpheme (e.g. *history* – *historian*); antonymy formed by affixes (e.g. *significant* – *insignificant*), and such identical forms

which have different grammatical functions; e.g., *debate* (n.) – *debate* (v.).

3. **Simple lexical paraphrase (SP).** Simple lexical paraphrases may be either mutual or partial. Partial paraphrase would be, for example, reference made by a paraphrase, *historian*, to a person whose name was mentioned earlier (*Edward Keenan*). This does not, however, function in the reverse direction, hence the term partial paraphrase.
4. **Complex paraphrase** covers three different cases: The first includes antonyms not formed with affixes (e.g. *willing* – *reluctant*); the other two cases of paraphrases are created through a so-called link triangle. The link triangle comes into play when there are two repetitive links already identified, e.g., a complex repetition between *history* and *historian* and a simple paraphrase, such as between the words *historian* and *scholar*. The third case of complex paraphrase occurs when one of the two links is missing but could be imagined to exist in a particular textual context. For instance, if the lexical item *historian* had not been mentioned but only the lexeme *scholar*, then through the link triangle the putative relationship between *history* and *scholar* could be established.

In addition, there are other instances of cohesion which can be considered as making connections in texts, such as substitution, co-reference, ellipsis and deixis. The proforms (s/he, they, it) are identified as restricted or partial cases of repetition since they work one way only.²

ACTUAL ANALYSIS

The first phase of the analysis was to find lexical repetitions and paraphrases in the source text. The article consisted of 59 sentences, so the scanning of repetitions was arduous by the time the latter part of the text was reached, when the most repeated items could be found to occur in more than 20 different sentences.³

²For a detailed discussion of the types of repetition, see Hoey 1991: 52–74.

³Samples of the first phase of analysis are shown in Appendix 7.

Although it may seem that finding connections over the text and picking out the lexical repetitions is unproblematic enough, the task involved many difficulties. The initial problems related to genre. The source text (see Appendix 5) was taken from a magazine called *History Today*. Thus the demands of the academic discourse community of historians had to be considered in the analysis. For instance, how far ought different eras and their particular historical denotations to be respected? Could the Soviet Union and Russia be regarded as lexical repetitions in the context of situation of the source text? How should ideological references, such as *Communism*, *Socialism* and *Bolshevism*, be treated? Problem areas and sources of ambiguity emerged through questions of directionality and partiality of reference, polysemy and semantic drift, as well as the fact that meanings are re-negotiated in discourse (e.g., McCarthy 1988: 185–198). A problem with co-reference appeared with the word *counterpart*, which referred to *Soviet investigators* in one instance and to *the French revolution* in the other.

TABLE 2. Sentence-by-sentence-account of bonding.

1	connects with	1 47,57
2	" "	1 4,48
3	" "	1 18,24,35,48
4	" "	2, 1 18,24,46,55
5	does not connect	
6	connects with	1 12,17,18,40,47,56,57
7	" "	1 26,27,30,33,42,49
8	" "	1 9,18
9	" "	8, 1 12,22,47,57
10	does not connect	
11	" " "	
12	connects with	6,9, 1 13,17,18,26,47,48,51,52,54,55,57
13	" "	12, 1 14,17,55
14	" "	13 1
15	" "	1 16
16	" "	15, 1 21
17	" "	6,12,13, 1 18,19
18	" "	3,4,6,8,12,17 1 35,36,42,47,48,51,57
19	" "	17 1
20	does not connect	
21	connects with	16 1
22	" "	9 1
23	" "	1 35,46(?),47,48
24	" "	3,4, 1
25	does not connect	
26	connects with	7,12, 1 30,33,35,47
27	" "	7, 1 30,35,48,50
28	" "	1 29
29	" "	28 1
30	" "	7,26,27 1
31	does not connect	
32	" " "	
33	connects with	7,26, 1 36,47,57
34	" "	1 35,41(?),49,57
35	" "	3,18,23,26,27,34 1 42,47,48
36	" "	18,33 1
37	" "	1 39
38	" "	1 39
39	" "	37,38 1
40	" "	6, 1 44,50
41	" "	34(?) 1
42	" "	7,18,35, 1 47,48,51
43	does not connect	
44	connects with	40 1
45	does not connect	
46	connects with	4,23(?) 1
47	" "	1,6,9,12,18,23,26,33,35,42, 1 48,51,57
48	" "	2,3,12,18,23(?),27,35,42,47, 1 49,51,54,55,56,57
49	" "	7,34,48 1
50	" "	27,40 1
51	" "	12,18,42,47,48, 1 52,57
52	" "	12,51 1
53	does not connect	
54	connects with	12,48, 1 55,57
55	" "	4,12,13,48,54 1
56	" "	6,48 1
57	" "	1,6,9,12,18,33,34,47,48,51,54 1
58	does not connect	
59	" " "	

BONDING SENTENCES

Once all the repetition links had been identified, they were counted in order to find sentences with three or more links. Sentences with a minimum of three repetitions are termed **bonding** sentences by Hoey.⁴ The next phase was to create a bonding matrix (Table 1), where we can see which sentences bond with which and how many times. Thus, for example, sentence (18) has three links with sentences (3), (4), (6) and (17) and four links with sentences (8) and (12). The same information can also be provided in the shape of a tree matrix (See Appendix 8), which shows where the emphasis of repetition is concentrated in the text. The first sentence of a great many texts functions as a focus of information (i.e., as a topic-opening sentence). In the present case, where the source text starts in the formulaic fashion of a news magazine with a reference to a particular event in time when some important person states something (van Dijk and Kintsch 1983: 245), the first actual sentence (i.e., sentence No. 2 since No. 1 designates the heading) does not bond more than once.

SENTENCE-BY-SENTENCE ACCOUNT OF BONDING

The next step in dealing with the bonds was to draw up a sentence-by-sentence account of bonding (shown in Table 2). The numbers in Table 2 refer to the sentences of the source text. A vertical line between the sentence numbers marks a division between the bonding sentences before and after a particular sentence. This provides information on the agglomeration of repetition links across a particular text.

The same information can also be encoded in the form of sentence co-ordinates, which tell us how many of the bonding sentences are located before and after a particular sentence. Sentences with (0,0) co-ordinates usually have metadiscursive function: They do not repeat the main information of the arti-

⁴A bond may be defined to have more than three links depending on the length and lexical density of sentences (Hoey 1991: 91-92).

cle but realize anaphoric or cataphoric references, signal, comment or evaluate. (The sentence co-ordinates are given in Appendix 1.)

The sentence-by-sentence account, in turn, will suggest some logical-looking **bands**. A band is formed by sentences with a similar number of bonding. The present analysis seemed to generate the following bands shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Account of bonding sentences

1 sentence with	15 bonds:	48	
3 sentences with	11 bonds:	12,18,47	(5)
1 sentence with	11 bonds:	57	
1 sentence with	9 bonds:	35	
2 sentences with	7 bonds:	6,51	(6)
3 sentences with	6 bonds:	7,26,42	
6 sentences with	5 bonds:	4,9,17,27,33,55	
5 sentences with	4 bonds:	3,13,23(?),34,54	(14)
3 sentences with	3 bonds:	30,40,49	
11 sentences with	2 bonds:	1,2,8,16,24,36,39,46,50,52,56	
11 sentences with	1 bond:	14,15,19,21,22,28,29,37,38,41,44	(34)
12 sentences with	no bonds:	5,10,11,20,25,31,32,43,45,53,58,59	

Summary 1: (Eliminating the last 34 sentences)

3,4,6,7,9,12,13,17,18,23,26,27,30,33,34,35,40,42,47,48,49,51,54,55,57

Summary 2: (Eliminating the last 48 sentences)

6,7,12,18,26,35,42,47,48,51,57

Summary 3: (Eliminating all but 5 sentences)

12,18,47,48,57

Summary 4: (The last 4 sentences)

12,18,47,48

Summary 5: (All sentences bonding with the most bonding sentence: 48)

2,3,12,18,23(?), 27,35,42,47,48,49,51,54,55,56,57 (The underlined sentences do not appear in any other summary)

Summary 6: The most bonding sentence: 48

If we now refer back to the sentence-by-sentence account (Table 2) and the bands, as shown in Table 3, we can see which sentences we have to include in the so-called "automatic" summaries⁵. On the basis of bonding we can produce various lengths of summaries, which are all shown in Appendix 2.

Summary 1 includes all the sentences of the original except those with 1, 2, or no bonds, i.e., it eliminates 34 least bonding sentences or the lowest band.

Summary 2 leaves out the two lowest bands eliminating 48 sentences.

Summary 3 comprises five most bonding sentences.

Summary 4 ideally includes only three most bonding sentences, but the present case posited three sentences at the second place, each with 13 bonds, hence Summary 4 includes four sentences.

Summary 5 is the one including all the sentences which bond with the most bonding sentence of the source text.

Summary 6 finally gives the putative gist sentence by being the most bonding sentence of the text: In this case it is sentence (48), which is, however, rather unsatisfactory as the gist of the present source text.

⁵It should be fairly obvious by now that this method is not automatic at all, but extremely labour-intensive when performed manually. The idea of automaticity refers to the fact that this sort of summarizing would eventually suit computerization.

RAW AUTOMATIC SUMMARIES

The raw automatic summaries still need a finishing touch. In other words, all **unwanted cohesion** in the new summaries must be removed and all **local non-lexical cohesive features** must be filled with their original referents so that each summary can be interpreted correctly. In addition, if some sentences are not coherent or mutually relevant, they can and should be deleted from the summary⁶.

When the automatic summaries 1–6 (given in Appendix 2) are looked at more closely the following features emerge:

Summary 1 is lengthy and hardly deserves the title of summary, as it is loaded with details.

Summary 2 seems to concentrate on the latter part of the source text. It does not display either of the two lists in the original article, apart from one item in the form of sentence (26). Hoey (1986) offers the explanation that lists are a kind of colonies in the sequence of text.⁷ Therefore they do not bond very often with the more central sentences of the text. Summary 2 comprises several sentences that are not mutually relevant with their adjacent sentences. Consequently, it does not really satisfy the requirements of a summary of the present source text.

Summary 3, in turn, gives the gist of the source text fairly well. The only problem turns out to be with the last sentence, which is not coherent since the first member of the contrast introduced by the connective *on the other hand* is missing. The second reference is made to *the problems that Soviet re-*

⁶The incoherent or mutually irrelevant sentences have not been deleted from Summary 5; instead, they are not given in bold type-face as the more relevant parts of the automatic summary are (see Appendix 2).

⁷The concept of *colony* will be discussed in more detail in the comparison of Summary 5 to the subject-specialist summary.

searchers have had in their study in the past. With the elimination of that cohesive tie, which is permitted by the method, the summary would be almost perfect.

The same problem does not arise with **Summary 4** as it does not have the last sentence (57). Sentence (49) ought to be present in both Summary 3 and 4 as the topic of *classical* revolution does not come across without the contrast with *now*.⁸ **Summary 5** is quite a good summary of the present source text and will be further discussed in the next section. **Summary 6** is intended to summarize the whole source text, although it fails to achieve this. To make Summary 6 at all intelligible, it would require the Commission's complete name to be filled in. Sentence (48), in other words Summary 6, is a long sentence with *Academician Mints* and other key details mentioned; hence its connections to most topics in the source text.

COMPARISON OF SUMMARY 5 AND TWO REAL-WORLD SUMMARIES

Before attempting a contrast between the "automatic" Summary 5 and two real-world summaries written on the basis of the same source text, it may be observed that the most conspicuous difference between the "automatic" summaries and the source text is that the comparison of the Russian Revolution to other world revolutions is not mentioned in Summary 5. (One of the three items from a list explaining the similarities between major revolutions appears, however, in Summary 1, which is the longest of the automatic summaries.) One reason for this might be that the comparison of revolutions is an extraneous topic, an episode within the main text. Therefore, we might leave it out of the summary completely. The heading of the source text does not presuppose the discussion of contrastive research into revolutions. Nevertheless, we should remember that headings can be quite misleading as guidelines to summarizing (Stotesbury 1991: 37).

⁸An earlier study of real-world summaries (Stotesbury 1990) indicated that the question of the Russian Revolution having reached the stage of a 'classical' revolution was regarded as a detail not necessarily worth bringing into a summary.

Summary 5 and a subject-specialist summary

Summary 5 (given in Appendix 2) largely includes the same ideas as a subject-specialist summary, which was written by a British scholar of East European studies (enclosed in Appendix 3). The subject-specialist summary displays only three or four sentences not included in Summary 5, and one of those sentences includes an item from a list contained in the source text (i.e., sentence 22). "Automatic" summaries do not seem to include list items. The reason might be that lists tend to work as 'colonies'. A colony⁹ is a type of discourse where its different constituents do not relate to its context but can be separated and the order of the items can be changed (Hoey 1986: 4–14). This is an interesting finding, as lists often boast an appearance of pseudo-importance. The lexical patterning would suggest, however, that the information value of list constituents may be marginal and we should generalize the information instead of presenting it item by item.

The information from sentences (35) and (51)–(55) is not mentioned in the native speaker summary but, as pointed out earlier, the same sentences were judged rather irrelevant and peripheral for Summary 5 and should have been deleted from it in any case. Thus we can regard the native-speaker subject-specialist summary as successful on the criteria of summaries created by lexical repetition.

Summary 5 and a student summary

Comparison between Summary 5 and a student summary (given in Appendix 4) makes the student summary appear much further removed than the subject-specialist summary from the "automatic" summary 5. The student summary chosen for the comparison is by no means the best summary created by student summarizers, but it is an intriguing one in that it has been created by

⁹The term *colony* was first used by Hoey 1986: 4, 26.

selection and deletion strategies (in Kintsch and van Dijk's 1978 terminology) or by the quoting strategy, as I have chosen to call the same phenomenon¹⁰, i.e., by cutting chunks of original text, adding a few connectives and cohesive links and making a few transpositions between the items chopped from the source text. (The method of the student's creation of the summary is accounted for in Appendices 5 and 6.) In a way, this procedure of summarization seems to work, however unorthodox it is. Yet, as far as the analysis of lexical repetition is concerned, it turns out to be on false lines; i.e., it focusses on ideas not judged relevant by the lexical patterning analysis.

IS THE QUOTING STRATEGY ACCEPTABLE IN SUMMARIZATION?

The quoting strategy used by the student summarizer raises the further question of whether quoting may be an acceptable strategy in summarization. In a way, Hoey's method would appear to endorse this view, since he believes that the focal sentences can be located, put in a sequential order, and, once unwanted non-lexical cohesion and sentences which are mutually irrelevant or incoherent have been removed, the result is a summary. If quoting is accepted as a regular strategy for summary writing, the danger of plagiarism becomes imminent (see also Drury 1991: 431). This may not be so serious in an ordinary language classroom as it is when unprofessional quoting techniques are carried over to more serious writing, such as academic papers and theses.

The traditional method of summarizing aims at generalizations and constructions in one's own words. Mere surface structural selections do not usually meet the requirements of a 'good'¹¹ summary. Nevertheless, Hoey's method may be quite fruitful and applicable to the more standardized creation of some summary genres, such as book, film and TV previews, dust-jacket

¹⁰For a more detailed discussion of summarizing strategies, see Stotesbury (1990: 43-49).

¹¹The question of the quality of summarization is not without problems. As is the case with the assessment of translation quality, it is difficult to evaluate summaries. Consequently, they should rather be judged in terms of their communicative purpose, in other words, whether they have fulfilled the requirements set by the purpose (Toury 1991: personal communication).

blurbs, advertisements, and possibly for abridged versions of books, e.g., easy readers.

Why the “automatic” Summary 5 is not a proficient summary of its source text may partly be due to the fact that Hoey’s method is intended mainly for non-narrative texts. The present text, however, though argumentative when looked at globally, includes narrative sequences as well, which may affect the success of automatic summarization.¹² Moreover, an abridgement produced through a string of surface sentences will seldom create as elegant an effect as a well-formulated generalized summary with transformations and re-wordings. Yet the same information seems to be conveyed by automatic summaries as by the more conventional ones. Another interesting question is whether this method is English-specific or whether it might work in other languages as well. Applications to other languages have yet to be carried out.

In sum, it can be noted that the “automatic” Summary 5 seems to cover the main information of the source text. Hoey’s expectation of the efficiency of his methodology was: “it might be possible to use central sentences to produce a readable summary of the text or to trace themes through the text by using all the sentences that link with a particular sentence.” (Hoey 1991: 34) It can be said that this requirement has been met in the present Summary 5: First, it has produced a readable summary and, second, it has traced the themes through the source text. Nevertheless, the summary does not include lists as they are a separate colony-type of texts that do not usually share the same lexis as central sentences in text. On the basis of the present analysis it seems possible to conclude that lists mainly contain marginal¹³ information and what they are trying to clarify is usually stated in their introduction. Consequently, lists should be dealt with in the way of examples in summaries, and either generalized or left out altogether (Stotesbury 1991: 35).

¹²Hoey recognizes the possibility of complications created by differences in genre, text-type and style (Hoey 1991: 189–190).

¹³The words *central* and *marginal* are used here with reference to the quantity of shared lexis.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The lexical patterning method suggests some explorable avenues for pedagogical applications, in particular in the teaching of both lexis and writing.

The results seem to indicate that we should teach the core lexis and the bond-making items (Hoey 1991: 241); i.e., those lexical items that appear frequently rather than infrequently. Hoey's argument is that "relevance is in part a function of multiple repetition" and "our understanding of texts in part depends on our ability to make connections across text on the same factor of multiple repetition" (ibid.: 240). Therefore, as every language teacher knows, it does not make any sense to learn words out of context.

What is the implication of this idea for the teaching of ESP and EAP? In these classes students are overwhelmed with arrays of special vocabulary and terminology, whereas the lexical patterning model would argue for quite the opposite approach: instead of concentrating on low-frequency specialist words, attention should be paid to core vocabulary (Carter 1987a: *passim*; 1988: 171–173)¹⁴; in other words, the repetition of a basic or central or nuclear lexicon of disciplines, which organizes our reading and understanding. According to Carter, subject-specific vocabulary is always non-core in relation to a whole language, although he also recognizes 'subject-core' vocabulary, which "will be only expressive of a particular field" and "will be neutral as far as the domain of the discourse is concerned" (Carter 1988: 172).

For the teaching of writing Hoey's advice is: repetition in writing should be handled by complex repetition instead of simple repetition; in other words, by varying the grammatical functions of lexemes. Adjacent sentences do not bond very often in mature English writing¹⁵. Therefore the old advice to avoid repetition still holds in principle. Yet instead of instructing learners to

¹⁴For the discussion of the concept of core vocabulary, see e.g. Carter (1987a and b).

¹⁵Only 13 out of 58 sentences bond with adjacent sentences in the present analysis.

be cautious of repetition they should be taught and encouraged to make connections across texts rather than between previous or subsequent sentences. Thus lexical repetition *per se* is not bad, but learners should learn to use it correctly.

REFERENCES

- Carter, R. 1987a. *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistics Perspectives*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Carter, R. 1987b. Is there a core vocabulary?: some implications for language teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 8:2, 178–93.
- Carter, R. 1988. Vocabulary, cloze and discourse: an applied linguistic view. In R. Carter and M. McCarthy (eds.) *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Carter, R. and M. McCarthy (eds.) 1988. *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Cohen, A. 1989. *The role of instructions in testing summarizing ability*. School of Education. Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- van Dijk, T.A. and W. Kintsch 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. London: Academic Press.
- Drury, H. 1991. The use of systemic linguistics to describe student summaries at university level. In E. Ventola (ed.) *Functional and Systemic Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dukes, P. 1987. 'Glasnost' and the Russian Revolution. *History Today* 37: (October), 11–14.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Hoey, M. 1986. The Discourse Colony: a preliminary study of a neglected discourse type. In M. Coulthard (ed.) *Talking about Text*. Discourse analysis monograph No. 13. English Language Research. University of Birmingham.
- Hoey, M. 1988. The clustering of lexical cohesion in non-narrative text. *Trondheim Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Vol. IV, 154–180.
- Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kintsch, W. and T.A. van Dijk 1978. Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review* 85:5, 363–394.

-
- McCarthy, M. 1988. Some vocabulary patterns in conversation. In R. Carter and M. McCarthy (eds.) *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Stotesbury, H. 1990. *Finnish History Students as 'Liminal' Summarizers on the Threshold of Academia*. Reports from the Language Centre for Finnish Universities No 38. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Korkeakoulujen kielikeskus.
- Stotesbury, H. 1991. The teaching of summarization. *FINLANCE. The Finnish Journal of Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Vol. X, 29-41.
- Toury, G. 1991. Postgraduate Seminar on "Recent Trends in Translation Theory and Machine Translation". Savonlinnan kääntäjänkoulutuslaitos 27.-31.5.1991. Personal communication.
- Winter, E. 1977. A clause relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science* 6:1, 1-92.

Appendix 1 Sentence co-ordinates

Sentence	1	(-,2)	
"	2	(0,2)	
"	3	(0,4)	
"	4	(1,4)	
"	5	(0,0)	
"	6	(0,7)	
"	7	(0,6)	
"	8	(0,2)	
"	9	(1,4)	
"	10	(0,0)	Signalling sentence: back- & forward
"	11	(0,0)	Signalling sentence: back- & forward
"	12	(2,11)	
"	13	(1,3)	
"	14	(1,0)	
"	15	(0,1)	
"	16	(1,1)	
"	17	(3,2)	
"	18	(6,7)	
"	19	(1,0)	
"	20	(0,0)	Signalling backward
"	21	(1,0)	
"	22	(1,0)	
"	23	(0,4)	
"	24	(2,0)	
"	25	(0,0)	Explaining previous action
"	26	(2,4)	
"	27	(1,4)	
"	28	(0,1)	
"	29	(1,0)	
"	30	(3,0)	
"	31	(0,0)	Signalling sentence: back- & forward
"	32	(0,0)	Signalling sentence: back- & forward
"	33	(2,3)	
"	34	(0,4)	
"	35	(6,3)	
"	36	(2,0)	
"	37	(0,1)	
"	38	(0,1)	
"	39	(2,0)	
"	40	(1,2)	
"	41	(1,0)	
"	42	(3,3)	
"	43	(0,0)	Signalling sentence: comment
"	44	(1,0)	
"	45	(0,0)	Rhetorical question: backward reference
"	46	(2,0)	
"	47	(10,3)	
"	48	(9,6)	
"	49	(3,0)	
"	50	(2,0)	
"	51	(5,2)	
"	52	(2,0)	
"	53	(0,0)	Signalling: forward reference
"	54	(2,2)	
"	55	(5,2)	
"	56	(2,0)	
"	57	(11,0)	
"	58	(0,0)	Comment
"	59	(0,0)	Comment

Appendix 2¹⁶ The “automatic” summaries 1-6

Summary 1

(The last 34 sentences removed; those with 1,2 or no bonds)

(3) Speaking of October 1917 in particular, <he> [Mr Gorbachev] said: We should not move into shade [sic] those who made the revolution. (4) We must not forget the names, and even more immoral is to forget or to keep silent about whole periods in the life of the people who lived, believed and worked under the leadership of the party in the name of socialism. (6) The Soviet leader’s remarks have been accompanied by a vigorous and far-ranging debate among Soviet academics and others about the legacy of Lenin and Stalin, and of Khrushchev and Brezhnev, too. (7) Undoubtedly, the perspective of seventy years onwards that we are all now acquiring encourages consideration not only of the Russian Revolution but also of its place in the longer time-scale, including the decades since and the centuries before. (9) Since the beginning of *glasnost* in 1985, <these> [the] former unpersons [– Bukharin, Trotsky and many more –] have made more of a reappearance in imaginative literature than in factual history, but there are strong rumours of the possibility of partial rehabilitation in academic analysis for many if not all of them. (12) The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israeleovich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. (13) ‘But we are not going to do so’, asserts Mints, continuing: Can we forget the crime committed by Trotsky, who during the Brest peace talks in 1918 breached Lenin’s directive to sign a peace agreement?

(17) While not necessarily disagreeing with Mints, several of his colleagues would want to take the business of revision further and faster, claiming that this would mean a return to the true Leninist path after too many years of Stalinist deviation from it. (18) They argue that the *Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. (23) <Secondly,> awkward questions must be asked by Soviet investigators as well as by their foreign counterparts. (26) <Thirdly> and <no less importantly,> discussion of the Russian Revolution must be fitted into the larger framework of time and space. (27) Appropriately enough for such a purpose, as we commemorate the Seventieth Anniversary of the October Revolution, we may recall that other revolutions are also reaching significant milestones. (30) And this very year, in September, <a similar amount of time> [two hundred years] <has> [have] elapsed since the composition of the American Constitution, an important sequel to the American Revolution, of 1776. (33) One consequence of <this> [the fact that each of the revolutions constituted the foundation of a form of government] has been that none of them could become a subject for completely open public discussion for a considerable period after the event, although the degree of conformity varied according to time and place and the nature of the revolution. (34) To take just one example, the Revolution of 1688 made certain that the tendency towards Roman Catholicism of the later Stuart kings would now be reversed with an insistence on adherence to the principles of the established Protestant churches. [IRRELEVANT] (35) Needless to say, in difficult internal and international cir-

¹⁶Item(s) between the arrows display the original (here: unwanted) cohesion of the source text; word(s) in square brackets give the revised versions; i.e., the referents intended by the source text.

circumstances but also in conformity with a long-established tradition, there has been strict assertion in the Soviet Union of the fundamental importance of the October Revolution. [INCOHERENT] (40) An important accompanying problem in <this> [the Soviet] case has been that of the degree of continuity between the Lenin Revolution and the Stalin Revolution. (42) As far as the October Revolution is concerned, one recent Western interpretation of Soviet history barely mentions it: Edward Keenan has written of a Muscovite political culture formed in the second half of the fifteenth century and re-emerging towards the end of the 1930s. (47) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. (48) At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'. (49) Now the Russian Revolution is widely accepted as the peer of its French and other predecessors. (51) Western scholars usually include the Russian example in their historical sociology of revolutions, and have carried out in recent years impressive empirical research on it. (54) No doubt, Academician Mints remembers that he was heavily reprimanded in the late 1940s for giving insufficient emphasis to the 'national liberation' aspects of Great October. (55) Some of his juniors have not forgotten that they in their turn were censured in the late 1960s for their formulations on 1917 concerning the degree of spontaneity in the mass movement and the level of factionalism [sic] in the Bolshevik Party. (57) On the other hand, taking Mr Gorbachev at his word, Academician Mints and most of the rest are attempting in various ways to make *glasnost* a reality in the study of the Russian Revolution.

Summary 2

(The last 48 sentences removed)

(6) The Soviet leader's remarks [that there should be no forgotten names and no blank pages in history and literature] have been accompanied by a vigorous and far-ranging debate among Soviet academics and others about the legacy of Lenin and Stalin, and of Khrushchev and Brezhnev, too. (7) Undoubtedly, the perspective of seventy years onwards that we are all now acquiring encourages consideration not only of the Russian Revolution but also of its place in the longer time-scale, including the decades since and the centuries before. (12) The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israelevich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. (18) <They> [Several of his colleagues] argue that the *Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. (26) <Thirdly and no less importantly> [To discover what the 'concept of truth today' is], discussion of the Russian Revolution must be fitted into the larger framework of time and space.

[OMISSION OF COMPARISON TO OTHER REVOLUTIONS]

[NOT MUTUALLY RELEVANT] (35) Needless to say, in difficult internal and international circumstances but also in conformity with a long-established tradition, there has been

strict assertion in the Soviet Union of the fundamental importance of the October Revolution. [NOT MUTUALLY RELEVANT] (42) As far as the October Revolution is concerned, one recent Western interpretation of Soviet history barely mentions it: Edward Keenan has written of a Muscovite political culture formed in the second half of the fifteenth century and re-emerging towards the end of the 1930s.

(47) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. (48) At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'. [NOT MUTUALLY RELEVANT] (51) Western scholars usually include the Russian example in their historical sociology of revolutions, and have carried out in recent years impressive empirical research on it. [NOT MUTUALLY RELEVANT] (57) On the other hand, taking Mr Gorbachev at his word, Academician Mints and most of the rest are attempting in various ways to make *glasnost* a reality in the study of the Russian Revolution.

Summary 3

(All but 5 sentences removed)

(12) The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israelevich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. (18) <They> [Several of his colleagues] argue that the *Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. (47) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. (48) At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'. [INCOHERENT] (57) On the other hand, taking Mr Gorbachev at his word, Academician Mints and most of the rest are attempting in various ways to make *glasnost* a reality in the study of the Russian Revolution.

Summary 4

(The last 4 sentences)

(12) The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israelevich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. (18) <They> [Several of his colleagues]

argue that the *Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. (47) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. (48) At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'.

Summary 5¹⁷

(All the sentences bonding with the most bonding sentence:48)

(2) In February 1987, Mr Gorbachev declared that there should be 'no forgotten names and no blank pages in history and literature'. (3) Speaking of October 1917 in particular, he said: We should not move into shade [sic] those who made the revolution. (12) The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israelevich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. (18) <They> [Several of his colleagues] argue that the *Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. (23) <Secondly> [To discover what the 'concept of truth today' is], awkward questions must be asked by Soviet investigators as well as by their foreign counterparts. (27) Appropriately enough for <such a purpose> [the need of fitting the discussion of the Russian Revolution into the larger framework of time and space], as we commemorate the Seventieth Anniversary of the October Revolution, we may recall that other revolutions are also reaching significant milestones. [NOT MUTUALLY RELEVANT] (35) Needless to say, in difficult internal and international circumstances but also in conformity with a long-established tradition, there has been strict assertion in the Soviet Union of the fundamental importance of the October Revolution. [SLIGHTLY INCOHERENT] (42) As far as the October Revolution is concerned, one recent Western interpretation of Soviet history barely mentions it: Edward Keenan has written of a Muscovite political culture formed in the second half of the fifteenth century and re-emerging towards the end of the 1930s. (47) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. (48) At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a

¹⁷Bold type-face indicates the mutually relevant and coherent sections of the summary.

request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'. (49) Now the Russian Revolution is widely accepted as the peer of its French and other predecessors. (51) Western scholars usually include the Russian example in their historical sociology of revolutions, and have carried out in recent years impressive empirical research on it. (54) No doubt, Academician Mints remembers that he was heavily reprimanded in the late 1940s for giving insufficient emphasis to the 'national liberation' aspects of Great October. (55) Some of his juniors have not forgotten that they in their turn were censured in the late 1960s for their formulations on 1917 concerning the degree of spontaneity in the mass movement and the level of factionalism [sic] in the Bolshevik Party. (56) Recalling the manner in which the Khrushchev 'thaw' was succeeded by the Brezhnev 'refreeze', they sometimes therefore approach the present 'reconstruction' in a gingerly fashion. (57) On the other hand, taking Mr Gorbachev at his word, Academician Mints and most of the rest are attempting in various ways to make *glasnost* a reality in the study of the Russian Revolution.

Summary 6

(The most bonding sentence)

(48) At the <Commission's> most recent meeting [of the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution] at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'.

Appendix 3 A summary written by a subject specialist

Summary of Paul Duker, "Glasnost' and the Russian Revolution," *History Today*, October 1987.

- (47), (57) Soviet history is being more openly debated in
 (2) the USSR. In February 1987 Gorbachev
 encouraged this tendency. The names of Trotsky
 (-) and Bukharin have appeared in print in the
 Soviet Union again. Some Soviet historians
 (12) acknowledge the need for fuller discussion but
 call for the maintenance of orthodox
 (18) judgements. Others go further, but in the name
 of true Leninism. Others again want to
 (-) reassess Lenin and the Revolution. What is
 needed is full access to the evidence, the
 (23) [Sentence 22 of ST]
 addressing of all awkward questions in Soviet
 history and the placing of the Russian
 Revolution in the context of world history. It
 <- (27) should also be related to the history of
 (such a purpose) revolutions in general. All revolutions,
 including the British, French and American
 (-) revolutions, create a national orthodoxy for a
 period after the revolution. Their
 relationship to other events nonetheless
 becomes a subject of debate. And some
 (42) historians have come to downgrade revolutions
 (E. Keenan) in general, arguing that they do not
 necessarily mark major turning-points. At a
 May 1987 meeting of Soviet and foreign
 [(47)](48) historians in Odessa all these subjects were
 raised. Soviet historians' work is now moving
 (56) ahead, albeit with caution. More open Soviet
 (57) analysis of Soviet history is to be welcomed.

Sentence numbers in the left margin refer to Summary 5.
 Sentences (35), (49), (51), (54) and (55) of Summary 5 are not
 covered in this summary written by a British subject specialist.

Appendix 5 The source text: 'Glasnost' and the Russian Revolution by Paul Dukes, *History Today*, October 1987. (Photocopy with boxed sections that a student summarizer has used in his summary.)

(1) 'GLASNOST' AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION		
	HISTORY TODAY OCTOBER 1987	
Paul Dukes	(2) IN FEBRUARY 1987, MR GORBACHEV declared that there should be 'no forgotten names and no blank pages in history and literature'. Speaking of October 1917 in particular, he said:	
	(4) We should not move into shade those who made the revolution. We must not forget the names, and even more immoral is to forget or to keep silent about whole periods in the life of the people who lived, believed and worked under the leadership of the party in the name of socialism.	
	(5) He went on to mention the 1930s, the period of collectivisation and industrialisation with 'all its contradictions, its achievements and its mistakes'.	
	(6) The Soviet leader's remarks have been accompanied by a vigorous and far-ranging debate among Soviet academics and others about the legacy of Lenin and Stalin, and of Khrushchev and Brezhnev, too. Undoubtedly, the perspective of seventy years onwards that we are all now acquiring encourages consideration not only of the Russian Revolution but also of its place in the longer time-scale, including the decades since and the centuries before.	
	(7) We must not forget the names, then, which include several which have barely been in official existence since the 1930s - Bukharin, Trotsky and many more. Since the beginning of glasnost in 1985, these former unpersons have made more of a reappearance in imaginative literature than in factual history, but there are strong rumours of the possibility of partial rehabilitation in academic analysis for many if not all of them.	
	3. Like (8) Certainly, the once forbidden names are now being uttered in open discussion. How far this will go, however, it is difficult to say. The doyen of Soviet specialists on the Revolution, a former participant in it as well as a survivor of subsequent great debates, the ninety-two-year-old Academician Isaak Israelevich Mints, has attacked journalists for wanting to chase sensations, for revealing in the process a desire to rehabilitate the opponents of Bolshevism. But we are not going to do so', asserts Mints, continuing:	
	(13) Can we forget the crime committed by Trotsky, who during the Brest peace talks in 1918 breached Lenin's directive to sign a peace agreement? We have not forgotten either that Bukharin nearly caused a split in the party by his opposition to Lenin's call for struggle against the imperialist war. Naturally, these names should not be committed to oblivion, but one should take a class approach. We take a similar approach to the concept of truth today.	
	(14) (15) (16)	(17) Many Soviet specialists on the Revolution with Mints, several of his colleagues would want to take the business of revision (whether and fast) claiming that this would mean a return to the true Leninist path after too many years of Stalinist deviation from it. They argue that the <i>Short Course History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union</i> , first authorised in 1938 and including a most distorted view of the Revolution, still holds too much sway over recent interpretation, that the shadow over the names of those who made the Revolution remains that of Stalin. Then, there are those who would dare to suggest that even Lenin needs cutting down to size. These might be Russian nationalists, neo-Slavophiles or even simply seekers after the truth.
	(18) (19) (20) But, to recall the phrase of Academician Mints, what is the concept of truth today? In the first place, we need the full facts, more open access to the archives for all serious scholars of whatever outlook. Secondly, awkward questions must be asked by Soviet investigators as well as by their foreign counterparts. It is not enough to talk of the heroic march of the working class towards socialism without mention of those proletarians who protested against the policies adopted by the government after the October Revolution. The complexities of the Civil War require a more complete explanation without all the blame for reverses and failures being laid at the door of the Allied Interventionists, troublesome though the British, French, American and Japanese forces indubitably were. Thirdly and no less importantly, discussion of the Russian Revolution must be fitted into the larger framework of time and space.	
	(21) (22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28) (29) (30) (31) The	But discuss and 1. 2. 3. and

- (32) Each of the revolutions constituted the foundation of a form of government. One consequence of this has been that none of them could become a subject for completely open public discussion for a considerable period after the event, although the degree of conformity varied according to time and place and the nature of the revolution. To take just one example, the Revolution of 1688 made certain that the tendency towards Roman Catholicism of the later Stuart kings would now be reversed with an insistence on adherence to the principles of the established Protestant churches. Needless to say, in difficult internal and international circumstances but also in conformity with a long-established tradition, there has been strict assertion in the Soviet Union of the fundamental importance of the October Revolution.
- (34) A second comparative point to make about the revolutions under consideration is that their relation to other events in the history of the same countries has been a subject of lively discussion. Thus, in the American case, the Constitution of 1787 has been viewed as the necessary introduction of order after the chaos of the immediately preceding years. This development has appeared similar to the Thermidorean reaction taking place in France seven years later. In the Soviet case, the launching of the Five Year Plans in 1928 and the subsequent collectivisation of the peasantry have seemed (although never officially) another Thermidor. An important accompanying problem in this case has been that of the degree of continuity between the Lenin Revolution and the Stalin Revolution.
- (36) Thirdly, along with the movement away from the single revolution as an all-embracing centre of attention, there has been a marked tendency to downgrade revolutions in general. As far as the October Revolution is concerned, one recent Western interpretation of Soviet history barely mentions it: Edward Keenan has written of a Muscovite political culture formed in the second half of the fifteenth century and re-emerging towards the end of the 1930s. At least some historians find such a view nonsensical. While not denying the importance of long-term continuity, they would want to ask, why is it so much greater in the Russian/Soviet case than in any other? And can the momentous events of 1917 be reduced to little significance? However, there are certainly those who would answer the second question in the affirmative, arguing that the nobility had largely lost power and the bourgeoisie had shown itself too weak to assume it some years before 1917, and that power was not then seized by the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry, but taken by the Bolsheviks on behalf of a stratum of society that soon developed into a new class aloof from the people as a whole.
- (37) These general and more particular questions have been openly discussed since 1985 by Soviet historians and foreign colleagues in the International Commission on the History of the October Revolution, an affiliate of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. At the Commission's most recent meeting at Odessa in May 1987, Academician Mints recalled that when Soviet historians approached the International Committee in the 1920s with a request for the formation of a section on the Russian Revolution along the lines of one already constituted for its French counterpart, they were told that the events of 1917 had not yet become 'classical'. Now the Russian Revolution is widely accepted as the peer of its French and other predecessors. (Has it yet been joined in such company by the Chinese Revolution of 1949, also soon to celebrate an important anniversary?) Western scholars usually include the Russian example in their historical sociology of revolutions, and have carried out in recent years impressive empirical research on it. While not ceasing to criticise what they see as the shortcomings of Soviet work on the subject, they have developed a deeper understanding of its presuppositions along with a higher appreciation of its achievements.
- (38) For their part, Soviet historians are moving ahead, too. No doubt, Academician Mints remembers that he was heavily reprimanded in the late 1940s for giving insufficient emphasis to the 'national liberation' aspects of Great October. Some of his Juniors have not forgotten that they in their turn were censured in the late 1960s for their formulations on 1917 concerning the degree of spontaneity in the mass movement and the level of factionalism in the Bolshevik Party. Recalling the manner in which the Khrushchev 'thaw' was succeeded by the Brezhnev 'refreeze', they sometimes therefore approach the present 'reconstruction' in a gingerly fashion. On the other hand, taking Mr Gorbachev at his word, Academician Mints and most of the rest are attempting in various ways to make *glasnost* a reality in the study of the Russian Revolution. Certainly, the more they present the full story, the less possible it will be for others to remain in error or misunderstanding. And the more they are able to lift the weight of the past, the greater will be their contribution towards a lighter future.
- (39) Soviet specialists on the Revolution

Appendix 6 The quoting strategy of a student summarizer¹⁸

EH/XIII: 'Glasnost' and the russian revolution

In february 1987 Mr. Gorbachev declared that there should be 'no forgotten names and no blank pages in history and literature'. Since the beginning of glasnost in 1985, the once forbidden names like Bukharin, Trotsky and many more are now being uttered in open discussion. <Several of his <<Mints>> colleagues> [**Many Soviet specialists on the Revolution**] wants to take the business of revision far and fast, claiming that this would mean a return to the true Leninist path after too many years of Stalinist deviation from it. **But** discussion of the Russian Revolution must be fitted into the larger framework of time and space. **The** other revolutions are appropriately enough for such a purpose **and** chronological coincidence encourages historians to think in terms of comparisons. Each of the revolutions constituted the foundation of a form of government. One consequence of this has been that none of them could become a subject for completely open public discussion for a considerable period after the event. <Their> [**Revolutions**] relation to other events in the history of the same countries has been a subject of lively discussion. Along with the movement away from the single revolution as an all-embracing centre of attention, there has been a marked tendency to downgrade revolutions in general. Now the Russian Revolution is widely accepted as the peer of its French and other predecessors. The more <they> [**Soviet specialists on the Revolution**] present the full story, the less possible it will be for others to remain in error or misunderstanding.

¹⁸The words between the arrows give the original wordings in the source text (cf. the source text and boxes in Appendix 5); bold type-face indicates the transformations and additions carried out by the student.

Appendix 7 Some samples of Lexical Patterning Analysis (Source Text: 'Glasnost' and the Russian Revolution)

Lexeme	Type of Repetition	Sentence(s) referred to	Item(s) repeated
Sentence 9			
beginning glasnost 1985 former unpersons made reappearance imaginative literature factual history strong rumours possibility partial rehabilitation academic analysis many all them	Simple Repetition (SR) General Noun (GN) SR SR SR SR Complex Repetition (CR) SR SR Proform	1 (title) 8 3 2 2 6 8 7 8	glasnost Bukharin, Trotsky made literature history academics many all Bukharin, Trotsky and many more

Sentence 52			
ceasing criticise they see shortcomings Soviet " work " " subject developed " deeper understanding presuppositions higher appreciation achievements	Complex Paraphrase (CP) Proform SR CP CR Simple Paraphrase (SP) SP GN SR CR SP SR	12 51 6, 12, 18, 23, 35, 39, 42, 47, 48 1, 7, 20, 26, 44, 49, 51 4 9 51 1, 3, 7, 12, 18, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 46 38 25 5	attacked Western scholars Soviet Russian worked academic analysis research study of the Russian Rev:n developed development more complete achievements
