syntactic problems which hardly ever hinder the comprehension of the text.

In contrast to the comprehension process, that of expression cannot miss any choice of morphological markers and a word order. As the syntax is limited, it is not too difficult to teach this on the basis of L1, particularly with a view to expression. Here a certain amount of judicious translation can be useful.

The attempt by Meijers (1978) to design a self-teaching system is interesting in this respect. It is a course of grammar intended for preparing (future) scientists for a congress held in French; that is to say understanding a paper, asking questions, and taking part in a discussion, all in the context of their speciality. A self-evaluation system is also proposed: students must translate from Dutch (L1) into French (L2) either in oral or written form a list of sentences in which the words are given in the "neutral" form (infinitive, masculine, singular) and in an incorrect order. Morphology and word order can be tested this way.

In a course intended to teach the ST register it is best to take account of prior knowledge both of the CL, and - with care - of the knowledge of the native language. However, it should be preferred not to dwell too long on cross-linguistic variants. For languages such as German, English, French and Dutch it is more profitable to highlight the constants.

Editor's note: Author Ulijn's article is accompanied by a 10-page bibliography which may be obtained from the author (or from the LSP Centre, The Copenhagen School of Economics) upon request.

CONFERENCE REPORTS:

THE FIFTH EUROPEAN SYMPOSIUM ON LSP. Leuven (Belgium) August 26-30, 1985

The Vth LSP symposium was organized by the Instituut voor Levende Talen at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, under the auspices of the AILA Scientific Commission on LSP and the Belgian Organization of Applied Linguistics. The symposium was presided over by Professor Dr. L. K. Engels and it had tempted over two hundred participants from all over the world, the majority from the European countries.

The four main themes of the Symposium, one for each working day, were in chronological order:

THE LEARNER: ASSESSING THE OBJECTIVES ON THE BASIS OF THE LEARNER'S NEEDS
MATERIAL DESIGN IN FUNCTION OF DEFINED OBJECTIVES
DIDACTIC USE OF RESOURCES: AUTHENTIC SAMPLES AND MEDIA
COMPUTER IN LSP
There were two plenary sessions each day, the first session being devoted to the theme of the day. The plenary speakers and their topics were

**Monday:**
- Pauline Robinson, University of Reading: "Needs Analysis: From Product to Process"
- Thomas G. Sticht, the ABC's, San Diego: "Identifying Literacy and Language Requirements for Work"

**Tuesday:**
- Lothar Hoffmann, Karl Marx University, Leipzig: "Material Design in Function of Defined Objectives" (Paper read by Manfred Gerbert)
- Larry Selinker, University of Michigan: "The Problem of Comparing Episodes in Discourse Domains in LSP and Interlanguage Studies"

**Thursday:**
- Ronald Mackay, Concordia University, Montreal: "Responsiveness in LSP Programming"
- András Szöllösy, Budapest: "On the Contribution of LSP to Linguistic Theory"

**Friday:**
- David Wyatt, Cambridge University: "Putting the Computer in Its Place (in LSP)"
- Kurt Opitz, Fachhochschule, Hamburg: "Beads or Bracelets or, How Do We Approach LSP?"

The topics of the various parallel sections were grouped more or less tightly under the theme of the day. The topics of the parallel sessions were:

**Monday:**
- Morning Session: Learning Strategies, Motivation, Vocabulary; Theoretical Aspects, Reading Discourse

**Afternoon Session:**
- Testing, The "LSP" Teacher, Vocabulary Teaching

**Tuesday:**
- Syntax, Course Material, Vocabulary in LSP, Text Analysis & Teaching Implications

**Course Material:**
- Course Design, Terminology and Dictionaries, The Continua of Legal and Technical English

**Friday:**
- Oral Communication, Software Elaboration

**Assessing Needs:**
- Course Design, General View on LSP

**Translation:**
- Software Elaboration
Further forms of activities were a special EMP (English for Medi-
cal Purposes) colloquium organized by N. Bruce, Kuwait Universi-
ty. The colloquium included a keynote address and contributed 
papers and went on all Tuesday; 
Swap-shops on Tuesday and Thursday for exchanging information, 
outlining research activities, discussing questions of principle, 
etc. The topics of the swap-shops were: Translators, Business 
English, Le Français des Affaires, Legal Languages, Science and 
Technology, Beginners, Vocational (LSP for Migrant Workers) (LSP 
in the Third World) and on Thursday Role-Playing and Simulation 
in LSP, Basic Principles of Reading and Listening Comprehension, 
Transfer from Reading Strategies to Other Skills and Other Lan-
guages, Video/Computer Assisted Teaching and Learning, Func-
tional/Cognitive Approach to Grammar in LSP, Vocabulary Selection 
and Teaching in LSP, Testing in view of the Specific Needs in 
Professional Life; 

Two Panel discussions on "Publishers and LSP" organized by Ed-
ward Johnson on Tuesday and on "Does an Operational Definition of 
LSP Exist?" organized by Jan Ulijn on Thursday. 

Their spare time the participants could spend in studying the 
book exhibition, attending demonstrations of computer-aided lan-
guage teaching as studied and practised in Leuven or visiting the 
much-acclaimed Language laboratories of the host university. 

It should become clear from the above that the symposium was a 
hard-working gathering and that the day-off on Wednesday was 
well-learned. 

The emphasis of the Leuven symposium was on the didactic aspects 
of LSP. In practice this meant that the majority of contributors 
dealt with actual teaching situations, the use of various "tools" 
for teaching, course and material design, needs analysis rather 
than on theoretical or empirical research on LSP (including ter-
minology). It is, of course, the indefiniteness of the concept of 
LSP that allows the shift of emphases or different profiles be-
tween successive LSP symposia, in a way new pragmatic definitions 
for each occasion. This need not be a bad thing but could be seen 
as a chance of high-lighting one or the other area of the multi-
dimensional continuum of LSP. The danger is, of course, that LSP 
with all the new fringe areas which are necessarily included each 
time, will grow beyond recognition and will soon have to undergo 
redenitions and restrictions, maybe a new naming process. 

If one tries to place the plenary lectures on the scale of LSP, 
then one could perhaps say that the lectures of Hoffmann, 
Szöllösy and Opitz belonged to the common core of LSP. The con-
tribution of Hoffmann (who could unfortunately not attend himself 
owing to a sudden illness but whose paper was well and thought-
fully presented by Manfred Gerbert) was a thorough survey of ap-
proaches to LSP material design. Szöllösy's paper was a quest for 
an adequate theory of LSP that would make functional approach to 
LSP possible. Opitz discussed the analytic and synthetic approa-
ches to LSP issues and called for a comprehensive, holistic 
theory that would help us to see the beads of LSP as parts of a 
unbroken bracelet.
The lectures given by Pauline Robinson, Ronald Mackay and David Wyatt were firmly anchored in the "didactic, needs analysis, materials design, new tools" end of the LSP continuum. Robinson discussed LSP as a pedagogic enterprise the aim of which is to lead the learner from the starting point to the target product. Mackay dealt with the need for sensitivity to learner expectations in LSP teaching and its effect on materials design and student motivation. Wyatt captivated his audience by arguing persuasively for the benefits of computers in LSP teaching and course and materials design. It is slightly more difficult to place the two remaining plenary lectures within the framework of LSP. One might even be tempted to say that they introduced new fringe areas into the concept. Larry Selinker talked about the interface between LSP and the concept of inter-language and tried to persuade his audience to appreciate the importance of their relations within various discourse domains. Thomas Sticht was himself not sure how his topic was related to LSP. He dealt with the improvement of literacy skills in various target groups.

The problem of being able to do justice to all papers given at numerous parallel sessions is well-known, especially when discussing a symposium of this scale. That is why only the main topics of the sections have been listed above. For the individual participant the dilemma is often the very difficult one of choosing what to hear, when many of the day's most tempting offerings are billed simultaneously. The organizers deserve thanks for sticking to the timetable rigorously so that switching from one scene to another was really possible this time. Advance information about the inevitable changes and cancellations was also very efficient and few participants were seen pacing the corridors in frustration. The consolation for missing interesting papers was that you could discuss them with the authors over beer or coffee in the conference hall or that you can eventually read them in the symposium proceedings that will soon go to press.

The novelty item of the gathering, the swap-shops, worked reasonably well, but with improved structuring and pre-planning they could function even better and become a valuable on-the-spot clearinghouse for all kinds of LSP exchange.

The first panel discussion on "Publishers and LSP" left the listener confused as to whether LSP had become ESP. The British ESP dominance was so pronounced that, for a more balanced view on LSP publishing and on what is being published, another panel would have been necessary. The second panel on the definition of LSP also attracted a large audience. Professors Sager and Gerbert were true to the theme and expanded on their standpoints from the angles of LSP vs. special language and terminology & lexicography, respectively. The other two speakers dealt with different problems. C. V. Browning gave the Silicon Valley view of the requirements for technical writers and L. J. Jennings discussed translation and information technology. The result was that the panel discussion became more like a collection of individual statements without a common denominator.

Despite the criticism, panels of this kind are valuable. They could become an even more stimulating regular feature of LSP symposia.
Finally, sincere congratulations are due to the organizers who did a marvellously efficient job and had thought about everything conceivable to make the symposium a success (even good weather). They managed to create a very friendly atmosphere and in addition to being immersed in LSP - Leuven style- the participants learnt to appreciate the old cultural milieu of Leuven (including brewe- ry products) and its hospitality. The Wednesday excursion to his- toric Bruges was an unforgettable experience.

The only wish one could belatedly express is that the abstracts and the list of participants had been sent in advance. To receive them on arrival was somewhat of a blind date which, however, in this case turned out to be worthwhile. It is a great challenge that Leuven passes on to Vaasa, Finland, the organizers of the VIth European symposium, August 3/7, 1987.

KRISTA VARANTOLA