

## **The Functional vs. the Structural Syllabus: The 'New Toy' Effect**

**Mohammad Farghal**

*Assistant Professor, Language Centre, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan*

(Received 17/9/1411; accepted 27/4/1412)

**Abstract.** This paper aims to demonstrate that structural and functional syllabuses are two sides of the same coin; they both endeavor to reduce language to definable units. It is shown that neither the structural nor the functional syllabus takes account of the facts it is meant to, for the programmatic nature of both syllabus types falls short of covering the diversity of form and function in human language. Besides, many language facts are out of the reach of the reductionistic approach embraced by both: such facts would be taken care of only if the focus is shifted from the figure 'language form' and/or 'language function' to the ground 'context of situation enveloping a piece of discourse' such that the figure is always viewed in relation to the ground. For example, the paper draws a distinction between the variability of context sensitivity within a language function, on the one hand, and the variability of a language function within a language form, on the other. Finally, the paper calls for discourse-based syllabuses and urges that the reductionistic approach to foreign language teaching give way to a holistic approach that incorporates the reductionistic but that goes well beyond it by shifting the emphasis from the discrete units to the communicative acts, that is, language in operation.

The teaching of English as a foreign language has taken various avenues over the past four decades. With the flourishing of behaviorism and structuralism as one of its offshoots, language acquisition, whether it be  $L_1$  or  $L_2$ , was assumed to be a matter of habit-formation,<sup>(1)</sup> giving rise to what was then known as the audiolingual methodology. Although there is no explicit reference to the teaching of grammatical rules per se, these rules permeate this teaching method by disguising them in pedagogically – contrived language. The behaviorist and structuralist movements

---

(1) For further details see: B. Skinner, *Verbal Behavior* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1975), *passim*; J. Carroll, "The Contributions of Psychological Theory and Educational Research to the Teaching of Foreign Language," *MLT*, 49 (1965), 272-81; N. Chomsky, "Review of Skinner," *Language*, 35 (1959), 29-46.

were followed by the gestaltist and/or cognitivist and generativist movements, loosely giving birth to the cognitive-code methodology in which language acquisition is no longer a habit-formation; rather, it is the perceiving of the underlying structures of what is to be learned, that is, language. Thus the generative power of the grammatical rules are explicitly focused on. In both methodologies, therefore, the major emphasis was on imparting grammatical competence to the L<sub>2</sub> learner. As a consequence, the speech as well as the writing of L<sub>2</sub> learners was overshadowed by the conscious adherence to grammatical rules. The overemphasis of usage or code at the expense of use or function<sup>(2)</sup> has led to the phenomenon of the structurally competent but communicatively incompetent students. Newmark<sup>(3)</sup> cites L<sub>2</sub> learners' examples such as 'Do you have fire?' 'Do you have illumination?', and 'Are you a match's owner?' to show the trap in which structural language teaching has fallen.

The predominance of grammatical competence from 1930-1970 in foreign language teaching has been called into question in the past two decades. Historically, it was the speech act theorists Austin<sup>(4)</sup> and Searle<sup>(5)</sup> who drew syllabus writers' attention to the great importance of the illocutionary forces of utterances, which are more commonly known in language teaching as 'Language Functions.'<sup>(6)</sup> More tacitly, it was Halliday<sup>(7)</sup> that drew syllabus writers' attention to the fact that language has three major functions: ideational, interpersonal and textual, which, to him, are intertwined. He writes,<sup>(8)</sup> "The nature of language is closely related to the demands that we make on it, the functions it has to serve." Having realized that structural syllabus writers have largely confined themselves to exploiting the ideational function of language, some course designers have taken recourse to the interpersonal function of language, giving birth to what is commonly known nowadays as 'functional syllabuses.' Thus, structural syllabuses have been attacked on the grounds that the ability to manipulate the structures of the language correctly is only a part of what is involved in learning a language, because there is 'something else' which concerns the ability to be appropriate<sup>(9)</sup> or as Hymes<sup>(10)</sup> puts it, "There are rules of use without

---

(2) H. Widdowson, *Teaching Language as Communication* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 1-21.

(3) L. Newmark, "How Not to Interfere with Language Learning," in *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*, eds. C. Brumfit and K. Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 160-82.

(4) J. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), *passim*.

(5) J. Searle, *Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), *passim*.

(6) For instance see: D. Wilkins, *Notional Syllabuses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 4-54.

(7) M. Halliday, "Language Structure and Language Function," in *New Horizons in Linguistics*, ed. V. Lyons (London: Cox & Wyman, 1970), pp. 144-65.

(8) Halliday, p. 144.

(9) K. Johnson, *Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982), pp. 1-2.

(10) D. Hymes, "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life," in *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, eds. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), pp. 35-71.

which the rules of grammar would be useless.”

The present paper aims to show that the structural and the functional syllabus are two sides of the same coin; they both reduce language to definable units, that is, language forms and/or functions, thus destroying the essence of language, that is, pieces of discourse. The former revolves around the ideational function of language by endeavoring vigorously to account for the forms in a language system. The latter focuses on the interpersonal function of language by attempting forcefully to highlight the illocutionary values of utterances and providing lengthy lists of language functions. Murdoch<sup>(11)</sup> writes, while criticizing the structural and functional syllabuses, “However, these courses run the danger of making the whole process more complex than necessary for the student and, perhaps more significantly, neglecting the pragmatics of meaning production — the actual workings of language are rarely as neat as the structural and functional descriptions would have us believe.” This points to the trap into which structural and functional syllabuses have fallen by neglecting the interrelation of language forms and language functions, on the one hand, and their pragmatic features, on the other.<sup>(12)</sup> More recently, Halliday and Hasan<sup>(13)</sup> spell it out more eloquently; while explaining the notion of pragmatic language used in a context of situation: they cite, saying, “it was language in action, in which it was impossible to understand the message unless you knew what was going on, unless you had some sort of audio-video record of what was actually happening at the time.”

However unfortunate it may be, the reduction of human language to forms and/or functions does not take account of its intricate nature, which goes well beyond the meaning of words and propositions to incorporate the context of situation whereby pragmatics comes into play. Firth<sup>(14)</sup> suggests that a context of situation encompasses the following categories:<sup>(15)</sup>

1. a. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
  - i. The verbal action of the participants.
  - ii. The non-verbal action of the participants.
- b. The relevant objects.
- c. The effect of the verbal action.

As can be observed, the structural syllabus selectively focuses on the verbal action of the participants, i.e., the locutionary function of the participants’ utterances,

(11) G. Murdoch, “A Pragmatic Basis for Course Design,” *Forum*, 27, No. 1 (1989), 15-18.

(12) For more information on pragmatics, see: S. Levinson. *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 97-166, 226-83.

(13) M. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language Social-Semiotic Perspective* (Deakin University, 1985), p. 98.

(14) J. Firth, *Papers in Linguistics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 182.

(15) For a somewhat similar analysis of context of situation, see: Hymes, pp. 35-71.

whereas the functional syllabus stresses the effect of the verbal action, i.e., the illocutionary function of the participants' utterances. Thus the other features of the context of situation are overlooked in these syllabus types. Put differently, a language form and/or function can have a range of meanings from which the intended one can only be determined by the context of situation. In a more articulate analysis, Halliday & Hasan<sup>(16)</sup> identify the context of situation in terms of three features: field, tenor and mode.

Consequently, structural and functional syllabuses don't take account of the key properties of human language, for many of these are out of the reach of the reductionistic approach embraced by both. Such properties can be taken care of only if syllabus writers broaden their views in a way such that they incorporate the textual function — the heart of human language. Thus all paralinguistic features, i.e., stress, pitch, intonation, etc., and extralinguistic features, i.e., gestures, facial expressions, relevant objects, etc., will be recoverable from the context of situation accompanying any text or piece of discourse. To illustrate, observe the piece of discourse in (2),<sup>(17)</sup> which can by no means be interpreted coherently without making direct reference to the context of situation.

2. Nancy: That's the telephone  
 Ron: I'm in the bath  
 Nancy: O.K.

The example in (2) points to the fundamental fact that, on top of the linguistic knowledge, language users must possess ample knowledge of how conversational interaction works in order to cope with such texts.

Furthermore, it should be noted that neither the structural nor the functional syllabus takes care of the facts it is meant to. To concretize this claim, we start out with the structural syllabus which approaches language by providing taxonomies of language forms. These taxonomies can't cover all the formal properties of a language form, say interrogative, which usually enjoys a diversity that can't be captured by an exceptionless rule. To see this, observe the following interrogatives which don't involve subj-aux inversion — the trademark of questions.

3. a. You speak English?  
 b. Who scored the highest on the math test?  
 c. How about going to the beach?  
 d. How come you didn't fix your car, yet?  
 e. What about the trip to Petra?

(16) Halliday and Hasan, pp. 29-41.

(17) G. Yule, *The Study of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 100-107.

- f. Where to?
- c. Coffee?

Besides, there are three types of interrogatives which are virtually neglected in the structural syllabus although they occupy their places in the native speaker's repertoire. The first type is echo-questions, i.e., questions that echo other speakers' statements with full interrogative force. Observe (4) below:

- 4. Speaker A: I passed my driving test today.  
Speaker B: You passed what today?

The second type is multiple-questions, i.e., questions where more than one variable is missing. Observe the example in (5) below:

- 5. Hold it ! Who did what to whom?

The third type is rhetorical questions which need no answers, for the co-text has prepared the foreground for questions to which the answers are taken for granted. Observe (6) below:

- 6. Perhaps we can find alternative energy sources from the sun and the wind, but alternatives to metals — where will we find them?

The example in (6) ends with a rhetorical question which takes its legitimacy from the co-text it is embedded in, for the authors must have been arguing forcefully for a certain cause before venturing such a question.

Still worse, the language input used in the structural syllabus is overwhelmingly pedagogically-contrived. Observe the following interaction exercise for 'asking a friend for help' taken from a popular structural syllabus.

- 7. S1: -----, can you help me -----?  
S2: Of course. I'll help you -----?,  
if you help me -----?.

As can be noted, the embedding of the teaching of conditionals has destroyed the naturalness of this exercise, for when a friend offers help to another, he usually does that willingly rather than conditionally. Normally, structural syllabuses are packed with such unnatural language tasks.

Apparently, the structural syllabus violates most, if not all, of the types of reward that should be catered for in foreign language teaching materials as suggested

by Stevick<sup>(18)</sup> and can be summarized as (8) below:

8. a. Relevance — of the content to the student's own language needs.
- b. Completeness — inclusion of all the language necessary for the stated aims.
- c. Authenticity — the material should be both linguistically and culturally authentic.
- d. Satisfaction — the student should leave each lesson feeling he has benefited more than simply progressed.
- e. Immediacy — the student can use the material in a lesson straight away.

The overemphasis of form at the expense of function in the structural syllabus has provided a strong rationale for the emergence of the functional syllabus, which shifts the emphasis from form to function. Subsequently, examples that skew the formal taxonomies are frequently cited and the notion of multivalency of language forms and functions is capitalized on. To illustrate, if we take the language function 'suggesting,' we can easily see that this function can be expressed in many forms; thus, all the examples in (9) below embrace the above function:

9. a. I suggest that we go to the movies.
- b. Let's go to the movies.
- c. What about going to the movies?
- d. Shall we go to the movies?
- e. Why don't we go to the movies?

Consequently, the functional syllabus writer has taken the pains of incorporating lengthy lists of language functions and their linguistic exponents in the teaching materials. Moreover, the functional syllabus demonstrates the fact that one form, say interrogative, can perform various language functions. Observe the examples in (10):

10. a. How did you come to school today?
- b. How is it going?
- c. How about going to the swimming pool?
- d. Nice day, isn't it?
- e. Haven't you finished your breakfast, yet?

It would be the most bizarre situation if the interlocutor of (10b) set out to recount to the speaker the pains and hassles he had gone through recently because (10b) was meant to be a 'greeting' rather than an 'information-seeker.' Or it would be weird if

---

(18) E. Stevick, "Evaluating and Adapting Language Materials," in *Teaching English as a Second Language*, eds. H. Allen and R. Capbell (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 102-107.

the interlocutor walked away after responding to (10d) by 'yes, it is.' since (10d) was meant to be a 'conversation starter' rather than a 'question.' Yule<sup>(19)</sup> distinguishes between two types of speech act, i.e. language function: direct speech act and indirect speech act. According to this dichotomy, example (10a) is a direct speech act because the form matches the function, i.e., it is an 'information seeker'; whereas, examples (10b), (10c), (10d) and (10e) are indirect speech acts, because there is a mismatch between form and function.

Of central importance in the functional syllabus is the notion of 'appropriateness.' Blum-Kulka<sup>(20)</sup> distinguishes three types of rules determining the effectiveness of a language function: pragmatic rules, social-appropriateness rules and linguistic-realization rules. Drawing partly on Blum-Kulka, Canale<sup>(21)</sup> talks about two types of appropriateness: appropriateness of meaning and appropriateness of form. They relate to the appropriateness of a particular communicative function and a certain verbal and/or non-verbal form, respectively, in a given sociolinguistic context. The introduction of the notion of appropriateness by the functional syllabus constitutes a valuable insight; however, it has its limitations. As Swan<sup>(22)</sup> puts it, "we must understand, however, that 'appropriacy' is one aspect among many — an important corner of linguistic description, but not by any means a feature of the language as a whole." Put differently, there is a host of language expressions that can not be marked for social appropriateness.

Moreover, the notion of appropriateness has so far been used in the functional syllabus to refer to social-appropriateness rules and linguistic-realizations rules, thus overlooking the pragmatic rules which play a key role in language use. To illustrate, the exponents in (11) and (12) would be put forward by a functional syllabus as two ways for 'making a polite request,' which they are exactly.

11. Could you lend me your Jaguar, please?
12. You couldn't lend me your Jaguar, could you?

However, as far as (11) maintains a neutral reading, i.e., paralinguistic factors such as contrastive stress are excluded, it can be abstracted away as a polite request without superimposing any situational constraints, whereas (12) can't be used as a polite request without superimposing a situational constraint, that is, embarrassment on the part of the speaker of (12). More interestingly, the shifting of negation in (12) from the statement introducing the tag to the tag itself will superimpose another situ-

(19) Yule, pp. 100-102.

(20) Cited in: M. Canale, "From Communicative Competence to Communicative Pedagogy," in *Language and Communication*, eds. J. Richards and R. Schmidt (London: Longman, 1983), pp. 2-27.

(21) Canale, p. 7.

(22) M. Swan, "Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (1)," *ELT Journal*, 39, No. 1 (1985), 2-12.

ational constraint through the obvious assertiveness on the part of the speaker as in (13) below:

13. You could lend me your Jaguar, couldn't you?

Consequently, the exponents of a language function should be placed on a gradient of context-sensitiveness.

By contrast, there is another major distinction that involves the variability of the language function while the linguistic realization is stable. This distinction concerns context-free vs. context-bound language functions, which can be looked at in terms of linguistic markedness. To illustrate, the unmarked language function of (14) below is an 'information-seeker':

14. How long are you going to wait for Sarah?

This uniform functional analysis is, however, broken in circumstances where (14) carries context-bound functions. Observe (14) repeated as (15) and (16), which carry the functions of 'expressing surprise' and 'complaining,' respectively.

15. How long are you going to wait for Sarah?  
(In response to the interlocuter's statement, "I'm going to wait for Sarah for three hours.")
16. How long are you going to wait for Sarah?  
(The speaker is getting irritated and wants to terminate the waiting.)

The functioning of (15) and (16) as 'expressing surprise' and 'complaining,' respectively, are entailed by the paralinguistic and extralinguistic factors accompanying them; therefore, they are context-bound. Riley<sup>(23)</sup> criticizes the confining of the premise of function to speech acts which should fall under a broader class, that is, communicative acts. He writes, "Communicative acts may be realized verbally, paralinguistically or non-verbally. That is, the speech acts to which most writers on the subject limit their attention are only one type or realization of the wider class, communicative acts."

This evasive operation of language functions points to the fundamental fact that the abstracting away of forms to carry out particular functions is far from being accurate. In the best of worlds, this procedure would take care of only unmarked functions, leaving unravelled a host of context-bound functions. Moreover, it overlooks the significant variability figuring on the context-sensitiveness gradient within the

---

(23) P. Riley, "Towards a Contrastive Paralinguistics," in *Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher*, ed. J. Fisiak (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981), pp. 121-46.



same language function. This intricacy of human language is brought about by the conflation of pragmatic action and semiotic interaction within a communicative transaction.<sup>(24)</sup> The language user's awareness of this is so important that a misappreciation of it will definitely lead to a breakdown in communication. Consider the importance of the language user's realization that (17) is an advertisement rather than a letter:<sup>(25)</sup>

#### 17. Dear Jinny

I'm so glad that you introduced me to Glo-Quick's Super-Facial. It's just unbelievable what a difference it has made to me in less than a week. I must say it's a new and a very pleasant sensation to be noticed with envious admiration .....

Obviously, neither the structural nor the functional syllabus can take account of all the facts of a language although each of them contributes significantly to the improvement of foreign language teaching. It is the 'new toy' effect that spoils the insights of a certain methodology rather than its nature, for there is no one correct methodology for teaching a foreign language. Along these lines, Canale<sup>(26)</sup> divides communicative competence into four major components: Grammatical, Sociolinguistic, Discourse and Strategic competences. An ideal foreign language syllabus would take account of all these competences in a balanced mode, for the overlooking of any of them would leave a gap in such a syllabus. Likewise, the overemphasis of one competence at the expense of others would do the same detriment. We have already observed this in structural and functional syllabuses. Swan<sup>(27)</sup> ridicules the basing of a syllabus on strategic competence, because the 'tabula rasa' attitude is not valid with reference to L<sub>2</sub> learners who already possess various types of strategies in their native language.

As for the discourse competence which can be traced back to Halliday's third function of language — the textual component — it is the least researched by far. However, some insightful work has been done at Birmingham University, led by Sinclair<sup>(28)</sup> and his co-workers. These authors highlight the great discrepancy between classroom discourse and discourse outside the classroom. Sinclair proposes seven principles of discourse: unfolding, open-endedness, outcome, multiple-source, artifacts and determination. A major corollary to these principles of dis-

(24) B. Hatim, "A Text-Linguistic Model for the Analysis of Discourse Errors: Contributions from Arabic Linguistics," in *Grammar in the Construction of Texts*, ed. J. Monaghan. (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).

(25) Halliday ad Hasan, p. 98.

(26) Canale, pp. 2-27.

(27) Swan, p. 11.

(28) J. Sinclair, "Planes of Discourse," in *The Twofold Voice: Essays in Honour of Ramesh Mohan*, ed. S. Ritzvi (New Delhi: Pitambur Publishing Company, 1983), pp. 70-91.

course is explicitness; Sinclair states that it is a characteristic of a competent discourse to be inexplicit or context-dependent. As a consequence, L<sub>2</sub> learners are at a serious disadvantage because they are always taught to be explicit. Warren<sup>(29)</sup> adds two other corollaries: responsibility and cooperation. Commenting on 'responsibility': he writes, "Inside the classroom it is in fact extremely rare for students to be given full responsibility for what is said. Normally the teacher assumes total control and with it full responsibility; even those activities which claim to create openings for 'natural' communication are frequently so heavily prescribed and contrived that the teacher, even though he/she may not be a participant, is very much the controller."

With regard to cooperation as a corollary ensuing the implementation of discourse principles, it derives from the pioneering article of Grice<sup>(30)</sup> in which he articulates the cooperative principle as the governor of spoken discourse. In this article, he states his four famous maxims of conversation: quantity, quality, relation and manner. The flouting of one or more of these maxims usually results in conversational implicature. Conversational implicature is all-pervasive in human language, giving birth to a host of implicatures which are worked out on the basis of the cooperative principle. Observe the following example:

18. It's cold in here.  
(said when it is hot in there)

At the outset, (18) would seem contradictory, but it is readily interpretable because the cooperative principle is assumed to be at work by the interlocutors. Thus the flouting of the quality maxim gives rise to implicature, which is cooperatively conveyed and arrived at between the addressor and the addressee, respectively.<sup>(31)</sup> The exploitation of these maxims as expounded by Grice should be a key issue in syllabus writing. Warren<sup>(32)</sup> comments, "If discourse is to be taught effectively in the classroom then the important role played by the participants co-operating in the production of language should not be denied."

How could the syllabus writers spur the foreign language teachers to conceptualize and materialize the principles of discourse and their corollaries in the classroom? First and foremost, a language unit must be topic-based, i.e., all exercises and activities revolve around a text functioning as a peg or a superordinate for its satellites. The text should be authentic and as far as possible in its original form, i.e., not simplified. The issue of simplification is, however, controversial, for the learners'

(29) M. Warren. "Communicative Activities and Discourse Activities," in *Discussing Discourse* (Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham, 1987), pp. 196-212.

(30) H. Grice. "Logic and Conversation," in *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, eds. P. Cole and J. Morgan (New York: Academic Press, 1975), pp. 41-58.

(31) See: Grice, pp. 41-58 and related literature.

(32) Warren, p. 202.

level may sometimes entail this. In any case, texts should maintain their naturalness in order to be suitable for L<sub>2</sub> learners. This means that simplification can be legitimate so far as it doesn't destroy the naturalness of the text. In this way, the text's level of explicitness is kept constant, while some aspects of the linguistic signal are altered. After all, as Davies<sup>(33)</sup> puts it, "It is the teacher who simplifies, the learner who authenticates." Commenting on grading EFL writing materials, Farghal<sup>(34)</sup> writes, "The issue of grading in writing materials is a two-edge sword; while it is legitimate to focus on a figure, say grammatical cohesion, i.e., reference, ellipsis, and substitution (Halliday & Hasan 1976), it is illegitimate to embroider a text with a cohesion-type, say, conjunctive ties, which are there only for pedagogic purposes, i.e., they are not functional."

Second, the syllabus writers must endeavor to introduce discourse activities that cater for responsibility and cooperation on the part of learners. Thus prefabricated activities, so-called communication activities, will give way to genuine discourse exercises that constitute an extension of the input text. Such activities will engage the learners in highly individualistic things worked out through the cooperative principle and of which the learners hold total responsibility. The realization of learners' cooperation and their shouldering the responsibility over what they say in classroom oral exchanges will bring foreign language teaching into the heart of events and will, therefore, make it meaningful.

Last but not least, the coursebook writers should utilize field-dependent alongside field-independent activities in their language units. The unjustified focus on the figure, i.e., a lexical item, a piece of information, a language form, a language function, a cohesion-type, etc., should go side by side with holistic activities which deal with the figure in relation to the ground rather than in isolation. In lexis, for example, instead of presenting hideous vocabulary lists and vainly asking the students to learn them, the coursebook writers should devise exercises that tackle various lexical relations in the input text, i.e., synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, polesemy, etc., that feed into the learners' awareness of the dynamic nature of discourse. By the same token, the syllabus writers should provide task-based activities that shed light on some key thought relationships in the input text, i.e., spatial development, chronological development, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, etc., instead of the traditional search questions whose answers are linearly located in most cases.

To conclude this paper, language syllabuses should shift the focus from the

---

(33) A. Davies, "Simple, Simplified and Simplification: What is Authentic?," in *Reading in a Foreign Language*, eds. J. Alderson and A. Urquhart (London: Longman, 1987), 181-96.

(34) M. Farghal, "Cohesion and the Notion of Naturalness in EFL Writing Classes," to appear in *IRAL*, I, (1992).

figure 'language form' and/or 'language function' to the ground 'piece of discourse.' The figure should always be viewed as a dependent variable that must be interpreted in relation to the ground. Thus the reductionistic approach to foreign language teaching should yield to a holistic approach that incorporates the reductionistic, but that goes well beyond it. Only when this is achieved will the conflation of pragmatic action and semiotic interaction within a communicative transaction come to light in the foreign language syllabus. In so doing, the circulation of blood linking the skeleton, i.e., language forms, and the flesh, i.e., language functions, will be duly worked.

## المنهاجان الوظيفي والتركيبى : تأثير الحداثة

محمد فرغل

أستاذ مساعد، مركز اللغات، جامعة اليرموك، إربد، الأردن

ملخص البحث . يهدف هذا البحث إلى تبيان أن المنهاج التركيبى والمنهاج الوظيفي في تدريس اللغة هما وجهان لعملة واحدة، حيث إن كليهما يهدف إلى النزول باللغة إلى مرتبة عناصر محددة. ويبين هذا البحث أن أيا من هذين المنهاجين لا يستطيع الإحاطة بالحقائق التي وجد من أجلها، وذلك لأن الطبيعة البرمجية التي يتصف بها هذان النوعان من المنهاج تقف عاجزة عن الإحاطة بتشعب التركيب والوظيفة في اللغة البشرية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك يعتبر كثير من الحقائق اللغوية خارج متناول المنحنى التقليدي المتبع في هذين المنهاجين. ويمكن الإحاطة بهذه الحقائق فقط عندما يتم تحويل الاهتمام من الجزء، أي «التركيب اللغوي» أو «الوظيفة اللغوية»، إلى الكل، أي «السياق الذي يلف النص»، بحيث يتم فهم الجزء على ضوء علاقته بالكل. فمثلاً تفرق هذه الدراسة بين تغير الحساسية لعناصر السياق ضمن الوظيفة اللغوية من جهة، وبين تغير الوظيفة اللغوية ضمن التركيب اللغوي الواحد من جهة أخرى. وأخيراً، تدعو هذه الدراسة إلى تبني منهاج يعتمد على النص وتبحث على التخلي عن المنحنى التقليدي في تدريس اللغة الأجنبية لمصلحة المنحنى الكلي الذي يتضمن المنحنى التقليدي ولكنه يتعداه كثيراً بتركيزه على المواقف التواصلية التي تمثل آلية اللغة الحقيقية بدلاً من التركيز على العناصر المحددة فيها.